

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 2010-11**

VIRGINIA



**PART I DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 16, 2011
PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 2012**

**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) 2010-11 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 2010-11 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, December 16, 2011**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 17, 2012**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2010-11, 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 2010-11 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 2010-11 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
<p style="text-align: center;">Consolidated State Performance Report For State Formula Grant Programs under the Elementary And Secondary Education Act as amended in 2001</p>		
Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2010-11 <input type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2010-11		
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		
		Friday, March 2, 2012, 2:19:57 PM
Signature		Date

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART I**

For reporting on
School Year 2010-11



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 16, 2011
5PM EST**

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

STANDARDS OF ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

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

1.1.1 Academic Content Standards

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

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

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

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

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

1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts and Science

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

Virginia's science assessments, including the alternate assessments for students with disabilities who are pursuing alternate achievement standards and the grade level alternatives, will be revised in 2013 to reflect the new science content standards adopted by the Virginia Board of Education in 2010. New cut scores for the revised tests will also be adopted by the Virginia Board of Education in 2012-2013.

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

1.1.3 Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities**1.1.3.1 Percentages of Funds Used for Standards and Assessment Development and Other Purposes**

For funds your State had available under *ESEA* section 6111 (Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities) during SY 2010-11, 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)	62.0
To administer assessments required by section 1111(b) or to carry out other activities described in section 6111 and other activities related to ensuring that the State's schools and local educational agencies are held accountable for the results	38.0
Comments:	

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

For funds your State had available under *ESEA* section 6111 (Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities) during SY 2010-11 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)	<u>Yes</u>
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)	<u>No</u>
Developing or improving assessments of English language proficiency necessary to comply with section 1111(b)(7)	<u>No</u>
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	<u>Yes</u>
Developing multiple measures to increase the reliability and validity of State assessment systems	<u>No</u>
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	<u>Yes</u>
Expanding the range of accommodations available to students with limited English proficiency and students with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) to improve the rates of inclusion of such students, including professional development activities aligned with State academic achievement standards and assessments	<u>Yes</u>
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	<u>Yes</u>
Other	<u>No</u>
Comments:	

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	788,282		>97
American Indian or Alaskan Native	2,604		>97
Asian	46,455		>97
Black or African American	189,478		>97
Hispanic or Latino	87,320		>97
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	1,054		>97
White	429,502		>97
Two or more races	31,869		>97
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	96,463		>97
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	48,292		>97
Economically disadvantaged students	290,542		>97
Migratory students	199		>97
Male	401,196		>97
Female	387,086		>97
Comments:			

1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Mathematics Assessment

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	35,903	37.5
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	45,696	47.7
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	6,889	7.2
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	7,265	7.6
Total	95,753	
Comments:		

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	647,416		>97
American Indian or Alaskan Native	2,071		>97
Asian	37,916		>97
Black or African American	155,465		>97
Hispanic or Latino	69,987		>97
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	873		>97
White	354,528		>97
Two or more races	26,576		>97
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	82,937		>97
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	37,996		>97
Economically disadvantaged students	242,295		>97
Migratory students	167		>97
Male	330,891		>97
Female	316,525		>97
Comments:			

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

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

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

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 (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	43,760	53.0
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	23,695	28.7
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	7,888	9.5
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	7,258	8.8
LEP < 12 months, took ELP		
Total	82,601	
Comments:		

1.2.5 Participation of All Students in the Science Assessment

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	517,895	512,444	>97
American Indian or Alaskan Native	1,713		>97
Asian	30,738		>97
Black or African American	122,474		>97
Hispanic or Latino	55,677	53,442	96.0
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	679		>97
White	285,994		>97
Two or more races	20,620		>97
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	59,358		>97
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	29,219	26,207	89.7
Economically disadvantaged students	181,722		>97
Migratory students	122	109	89.3
Male	261,813		>97
Female	256,082		>97
Comments:			

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

1.2.6 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Science Assessment

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	25,265	43.3
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	28,346	48.6
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	651	<3
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	4,096	7.0
Total	58,358	
Comments:		

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	92,753	84,410	91.0
American Indian or Alaskan Native	293	258	88.1
Asian	5,857	5,654	96.5
Black or African American	21,615	18,070	83.6
Hispanic or Latino	11,582	10,206	88.1
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	132	125	94.7
White	49,081	46,230	94.2
Two or more races	4,193	3,867	92.2
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	12,203	9,040	74.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	9,422	8,015	85.1
Economically disadvantaged students	38,303	32,559	85.0
Migratory students	37	29	78.4
Male	47,506	42,893	90.3
Female	45,247	41,517	91.8
Comments:			

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

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	92,547	76,815	83.0
American Indian or Alaskan Native	296	231	78.0
Asian	5,715	5,136	89.9
Black or African American	21,657	15,596	72.0
Hispanic or Latino	11,441	8,688	75.9
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	132	111	84.1
White	49,105	43,401	88.4
Two or more races	4,201	3,652	86.9
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	12,208	7,860	64.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	9,032	6,217	68.8
Economically disadvantaged students	38,164	28,077	73.6
Migratory students	34	25	73.5
Male	47,403	38,344	80.9
Female	45,144	38,471	85.2
Comments:			

1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	89,792	80,244	89.4
American Indian or Alaskan Native	280	246	87.9
Asian	5,326	5,066	95.1
Black or African American	21,407	17,023	79.5
Hispanic or Latino	9,645	8,255	85.6
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	129	116	89.9
White	48,823	45,715	93.6
Two or more races	4,182	3,823	91.4
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	11,736	8,595	73.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,441	5,163	80.2
Economically disadvantaged students	36,045	29,496	81.8
Migratory students	24	21	87.5
Male	46,012	40,916	88.9
Female	43,780	39,328	89.8
Comments:			

1.3.1.2 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	93,347	82,613	88.5
American Indian or Alaskan Native	266	238	89.5
Asian	5,736	5,461	95.2
Black or African American	21,747	17,373	79.9
Hispanic or Latino	10,924	9,148	83.7
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	132	126	95.5
White	50,490	46,630	92.4
Two or more races	4,052	3,637	89.8
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	12,608	8,861	70.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,942	5,302	76.4
Economically disadvantaged students	37,637	30,497	81.0
Migratory students	35	25	71.4
Male	47,618	41,984	88.2
Female	45,729	40,629	88.8
Comments:			

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

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	93,137	80,899	86.9
American Indian or Alaskan Native	263	225	85.6
Asian	5,611	5,221	93.0
Black or African American	21,731	16,731	77.0
Hispanic or Latino	10,813	8,760	81.0
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	131	118	90.1
White	50,536	46,249	91.5
Two or more races	4,052	3,595	88.7
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	12,601	8,650	68.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,568	4,649	70.8
Economically disadvantaged students	37,450	29,301	78.2
Migratory students	31	21	67.7
Male	47,525	40,266	84.7
Female	45,612	40,633	89.1
Comments:			

1.3.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaskan Native			
Asian			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: Virginia does not administer the Standards of Learning assessments in science for grade 4.			

1.3.1.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	88,557	78,511	88.7
American Indian or Alaskan Native	276	241	87.3
Asian	4,704	4,477	95.2
Black or African American	21,982	17,970	81.7
Hispanic or Latino	10,142	8,678	85.6
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	106	94	88.7
White	47,701	43,783	91.8
Two or more races	3,646	3,268	89.6
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	12,342	8,626	69.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,823	4,542	78.0
Economically disadvantaged students	36,704	30,198	82.3
Migratory students	34	25	73.5
Male	45,302	39,782	87.8
Female	43,255	38,729	89.5
Comments:			

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

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	93,399	83,305	89.2
American Indian or Alaskan Native	291	264	90.7
Asian	5,584	5,278	94.5
Black or African American	22,280	18,249	81.9
Hispanic or Latino	10,390	8,702	83.8
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	111	101	91.0
White	50,824	47,150	92.8
Two or more races	3,919	3,561	90.9
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	12,528	8,889	71.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,527	3,995	72.3
Economically disadvantaged students	37,018	30,294	81.8
Migratory students	31	22	71.0
Male	47,934	41,980	87.6
Female	45,465	41,325	90.9
Comments:			

1.3.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	93,680	81,359	86.8
American Indian or Alaskan Native	291	258	88.7
Asian	5,710	5,230	91.6
Black or African American	22,308	17,206	77.1
Hispanic or Latino	10,515	8,084	76.9
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	111	97	87.4
White	50,839	46,963	92.4
Two or more races	3,906	3,521	90.1
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	12,523	8,074	64.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,882	3,444	58.6
Economically disadvantaged students	37,230	28,667	77.0
Migratory students	33	22	66.7
Male	48,062	42,210	87.8
Female	45,618	39,149	85.8
Comments:			

1.3.1.4 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	79,985	57,656	72.1
American Indian or Alaskan Native	305	211	69.2
Asian	4,058	3,550	87.5
Black or African American	20,221	11,391	56.3
Hispanic or Latino	9,125	6,010	65.9
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	107	75	70.1
White	42,868	33,927	79.1
Two or more races	3,301	2,492	75.5
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	11,416	5,428	47.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,860	2,469	50.8
Economically disadvantaged students	33,240	19,590	58.9
Migratory students	23	12	52.2
Male	41,036	29,038	70.8
Female	38,949	28,618	73.5

Comments: In Virginia, mathematics instruction is accelerated. There are grade 6 students taking higher level math courses and the associated assessments. Therefore, fewer grade 6 math 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	91,574	79,520	86.8
American Indian or Alaskan Native	341	288	84.5
Asian	5,156	4,890	94.8
Black or African American	22,011	16,838	76.5
Hispanic or Latino	9,720	7,989	82.2
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	127	109	85.8
White	50,301	45,887	91.2
Two or more races	3,918	3,519	89.8
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	11,616	7,194	61.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,567	3,035	66.5
Economically disadvantaged students	35,351	27,211	77.0
Migratory students	22	11	50.0
Male	46,938	39,746	84.7
Female	44,636	39,774	89.1

Comments: In Virginia, mathematics instruction is accelerated. There are grade 6 students taking higher level math courses and the associated assessments. Therefore, fewer grade 6 math 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 Alaskan Native			
Asian			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: Virginia does not administer the Standards of Learning assessments in science for grade 6.			

1.3.1.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	64,663	49,756	76.9
American Indian or Alaskan Native	216	161	74.5
Asian	4,081	3,736	91.5
Black or African American	14,534	8,999	61.9
Hispanic or Latino	7,433	5,181	69.7
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	85	65	76.5
White	35,763	29,559	82.7
Two or more races	2,551	2,055	80.6
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	9,893	5,241	53.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,724	2,855	60.4
Economically disadvantaged students	25,203	16,269	64.6
Migratory students	15	7	46.7
Male	33,605	25,264	75.2
Female	31,058	24,492	78.9

Comments: In Virginia, mathematics instruction is accelerated. There are grade 7 students taking the end-of-course Algebra I, Algebra II, and Geometry assessments associated with high school courses. Therefore, fewer grade 7 math assessments are taken than grade 7 reading/language arts.

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	91,324	80,978	88.7
American Indian or Alaskan Native	297	272	91.6
Asian	5,274	5,004	94.9
Black or African American	22,123	17,612	79.6
Hispanic or Latino	9,517	8,056	84.6
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	128	118	92.2
White	50,271	46,505	92.5
Two or more races	3,714	3,411	91.8
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	11,381	7,315	64.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,113	3,777	73.9
Economically disadvantaged students	33,894	26,974	79.6
Migratory students	20	13	65.0
Male	46,799	40,536	86.6
Female	44,525	40,442	90.8

Comments: In Virginia, mathematics instruction is accelerated. There are grade 7 students taking the end-of-course Algebra I, Algebra II, and Geometry assessments associated with high school courses. Therefore, fewer grade 7 math 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 Alaskan Native			
Asian			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: Virginia does not administer the Standards of Learning assessments in science for grade 7.			

1.3.1.6 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	77,772	64,003	82.3
American Indian or Alaskan Native	271	225	83.0
Asian	3,408	3,163	92.8
Black or African American	20,996	15,090	71.9
Hispanic or Latino	8,597	6,735	78.3
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	105	88	83.8
White	41,288	36,018	87.2
Two or more races	3,107	2,684	86.4
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	11,443	6,892	60.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,697	3,277	69.8
Economically disadvantaged students	31,213	22,787	73.0
Migratory students	18	11	61.1
Male	40,428	32,316	79.9
Female	37,344	31,687	84.9

Comments: 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 math assessments are taken than grade 8 science and reading/language arts.

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

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	91,537	82,741	90.4
American Indian or Alaskan Native	303	271	89.4
Asian	5,164	4,942	95.7
Black or African American	21,858	18,003	82.4
Hispanic or Latino	9,483	8,293	87.5
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	113	101	89.4
White	50,968	47,688	93.6
Two or more races	3,648	3,443	94.4
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	12,054	8,226	68.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,729	3,625	76.7
Economically disadvantaged students	32,717	27,026	82.6
Migratory students	19	14	73.7
Male	47,064	41,650	88.5
Female	44,473	41,091	92.4

Comments: 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 math assessments are taken than grade 8 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	87,224	80,271	92.0
American Indian or Alaskan Native	268	253	94.4
Asian	5,040	4,790	95.0
Black or African American	20,373	17,206	84.5
Hispanic or Latino	9,341	8,009	85.7
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	106	98	92.5
White	48,593	46,572	95.8
Two or more races	3,503	3,343	95.4
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	10,981	7,942	72.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,927	3,500	71.0
Economically disadvantaged students	31,219	26,339	84.4
Migratory students	21	13	61.9
Male	44,715	41,094	91.9
Female	42,509	39,177	92.2

Comments: 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 math 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	287,145	259,857	90.5
American Indian or Alaskan Native	956	881	92.2
Asian	18,447	17,719	96.1
Black or African American	67,114	55,594	82.8
Hispanic or Latino	28,935	25,105	86.8
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	383	341	89.0
White	160,469	150,155	93.6
Two or more races	10,841	10,062	92.8
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	25,848	19,601	75.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	11,575	9,494	82.0
Economically disadvantaged students	86,281	72,695	84.3
Migratory students	37		≥90
Male	143,297	128,799	89.9
Female	143,848	131,058	91.1
Comments:			

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

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	92,605	86,984	93.9
American Indian or Alaskan Native	273	252	92.3
Asian	5,361	5,150	96.1
Black or African American	23,306	20,684	88.7
Hispanic or Latino	8,490	7,724	91.0
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	129	121	93.8
White	51,970	50,102	96.4
Two or more races	3,076	2,951	95.9
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	10,213	7,793	76.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,408	1,746	72.5
Economically disadvantaged students	26,940	23,859	88.6
Migratory students	10	7	70.0
Male	46,469	43,380	93.4
Female	46,136	43,604	94.5
Comments:			

1.3.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Science - High School

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	241,748	219,192	90.7
American Indian or Alaskan Native	842	763	90.6
Asian	14,085	13,316	94.5
Black or African American	57,181	46,705	81.7
Hispanic or Latino	23,941	20,169	84.2
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	329	304	92.4
White	136,463	129,589	95.0
Two or more races	8,907	8,346	93.7
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	23,118	16,240	70.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	8,957	6,226	69.5
Economically disadvantaged students	73,592	60,361	82.0
Migratory students	31	23	74.2
Male	120,046	109,142	90.9
Female	121,702	110,050	90.4
Comments:			

1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY

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

1.4.1 All Schools and Districts Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public elementary and secondary schools and districts in the State, including charters, and the total number of those schools and districts that made AYP based on data for SY 2010-11. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2010-11	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2010-11
Schools	1,847	721	39.0
Districts	132	4	3.0

Comments: The total number of schools making AYP, both Title I and non-Title I, decreased significantly over the previous year due to higher targets in reading and mathematics. Both targets increased by five points from previous years' targets.

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 2010-11. 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 2010-11	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2010-11
All Title I schools	732	298	40.7
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	433	166	38.3
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	299	132	44.1

Comments: The total number of Title I schools making AYP decreased significantly over the previous year due to higher targets in reading and mathematics. Both targets increased by five points from previous years' targets.

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 2010-11. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds in SY 2010-11	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2010-11	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2010-11
132	4	3.0

Comments:

1.4.4 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

1.4.4.1 List of Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

In the following table, provide a list of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 for the SY 2011-12 based on the data from SY 2010-11. For each school on the list, provide the following:

- District Name
- District NCES ID Code
- School Name
- School NCES ID Code
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the school met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2011-12 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: School Improvement - Year 1, School Improvement - Year 2, Corrective Action, Restructuring Year 1 (planning), or Restructuring Year 2 (implementing))
- Whether (yes or no) the school is or is not a Title I school (*This column **must be completed** by States that choose to list all schools in improvement. Column is optional for States that list only Title I schools.*)
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003(a).
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003 (g).

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

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

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

1.4.4.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for schools in corrective action, provide the number of schools for which the listed corrective actions under *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2010-11 (based on SY 2009-10 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2010-11
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	5
Extension of the school year or school day	3
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	2
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	1
Replacement of the principal	
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	3
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	8
Comments:	

1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2

In the table below, for schools in restructuring – year 2 (implementation year), provide the number of schools for which the listed restructuring actions under *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2010-11 (based on SY 2009-10 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)	2
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	3
Comments:	

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

Information about the PASS initiative can be found at the following Web site:
http://www.doe.virginia.gov/support/school_improvement/resources/pass/index.shtml

*Emphasis has been placed on the selection of outside experts with expertise in core subject areas, especially reading and mathematics, and school reform or school leadership experience. Certain schools in Year 2 of restructuring receive

academic coaches in addition to the alternative governance experts on the committees as a result of blended restructuring requirements under the state's Standards of Accreditation and alternative governance restructuring requirements under the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001.

1.4.5 Districts That Received Title I Funds Identified for Improvement

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

In the following table, provide a list of districts that received Title I funds and were identified for improvement or corrective action under Section 1116 for the SY 2011-12 based on the data from SY 2010-11. For each district on the list, provide the following:

- District Name
- District NCES ID Code
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the district met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2011-12 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: Improvement or Corrective Action²)
- Whether the district is a district that received Title I funds. Indicate "Yes" if the district received Title I funds and "No" if the district did not receive Title I funds. (**This column must be completed by States that choose to list all districts or all districts in improvement.** This column is optional for States that list only districts in improvement that receive Title I funds.)

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

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

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Virginia had no divisions identified 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 2010-11 (based on SY 2009-10 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 2010-11
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 2009-10 and beginning of SY 2010-11 as a corrective action)	0
Comments:	

1.4.7 Appeal of AYP and Identification Determinations

In the table below, provide the number of districts and schools that appealed their AYP designations based on SY 2010-11 data and the results of those appeals.

	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts	0	0
Schools	20	14
Comments:		

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2010-11 data was complete	10/04/11
---	----------

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 2010-11.

1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2010 (SY 2010-11) Title I, Part A allocation that the SEA reserved in accordance with Section 1003(a) of *ESEA* and §200.100(a) of ED's regulations governing the reservation of funds for school improvement under Section 1003(a) of *ESEA*: 4.0 %

Comments:

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

For SY 2010-11 there is no need to upload a spreadsheet to answer this question in the CSPR.

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

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

Section 1003(g)(8) of *ESEA* allows States to reserve up to five percent of Section 1003(g) funds for administration and to meet the evaluation and technical assistance requirements for this program. In the space below, identify and describe the specific Section 1003(g) evaluation and technical assistance activities that your State conducted during SY 2010-11.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

In an effort to meet the varied needs of schools the 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.

Collaboration 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® division 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 2010-2011 that provided background research and information about selected strands of the improvement models, facilitated sharing, and suggested promising strategies and timelines for implementation, and made recommendations to division teams regarding 1003(g) compliance and the implementation of the transformation and turnaround models.

Virginia Foundation for Educational Leadership

The Virginia Foundation for Educational Leadership (VFEL) - a PreK through 16 leadership services organization developed materials that meet the specific needs of the VDOE to address the findings of the academic review of those schools that are in improvement. Ongoing training, including the summer institute and Web conference sessions provided knowledge and skills necessary to support the efforts needed for improvement. VFEL provided Breaking Ranks in the Middle (BRIM) training in the summer of 2010. In addition, VFEL completed a study of division practices of five successful divisions that have developed processes and practices to support their schools in improvement. This study was shared with all schools and divisions in the Commonwealth through the department's Web site. The printed document was also sent to superintendents and school boards throughout the Commonwealth. VFEL also provided webinars based on the school and district indicators provided through Indistar and the Center on Innovation and Improvement.

Virginia Association of Elementary School Principals

The Virginia Association of Elementary School Principals provided schoolwide and classroom-based strategies for implementing small group literacy teams (i.e., Early Literacy Groups (ELGs)). This technical assistance included samples of elementary school schedules that provide time for teacher collaboration and for ELGs to meet twice daily and formal/informal assessments can be used to plan and implement effective ELG instruction. Lesson plans for use with emergent, beginning and intermediate readers were also shared.

Tools developed by the VDOE in Partnership with Editure, iStation, the CII, and Casenex Indistar®, an online portal created and managed by the CII, was used by all schools in improvement schools, division staff, and Lead Turnaround Partners (LTP) 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 individual indicators of effective practice or rubrics for assessment.

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. Results from the diagnostic test were available immediately online 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 2010-2011 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.

Teacher Leader Training

In an effort to ensure schools in school improvement receive the Training for Instructional Leaders from the CII, four sequential training sessions were scheduled for the 2010-2011 school year. This was a train-the-trainer model where the participants returned to their respective schools and trained their colleagues. During the training sessions the participants were taught research-based strategies proven effective in working with at-risk student populations and schools that are struggling with reaching Annual Yearly Progress (AYP).

Evaluation

Participants in webinars provided immediate feedback during brief polling sessions at the end of each webinar.

Participant feedback was shared with webinar instructors as needed in order to make adjustments in future webinars.

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 2010-11 that were supported by **funds other than Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) funds** to address the achievement problems of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of *ESEA*.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

Tier 1 Intervention

Schools received an enhanced academic review and are assigned a school support team. The support team consists of experts in the content area(s) and/or subgroup(s) with which the school is struggling.

Tier 2 Intervention

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

Tier 3 Intervention

School divisions are assigned a chief academic officer. The chief academic officer serves as the on-site academic coach to the entire division. The technical assistance provided is customized based on the needs of the division.

SEA staff members work closely with the schools, divisions, and the assigned support system for each tier.

1.4.9 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

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

1.4.9.1 Public School Choice

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

1.4.9.1.2 Public School Choice – Students

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

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

The number of students who applied to transfer should include:

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

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

	# Students
Eligible for public school choice	67,266
Applied to transfer	1,888
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	1,472
Comments:	

1.4.9.1.3 Funds Spent on Public School Choice

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

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$ 2,831,736

1.4.9.1.4 Availability of Public School Choice Options

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

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

	# LEAs
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	9

FAQs about public school choice:

- a. How should States report data on Title I public school choice for those LEAs that have open enrollment and other choice programs? For those LEAs that implement open enrollment or other school choice programs in addition to public school choice under Section 1116 of *ESEA*, the State may consider a student as having applied to transfer if the student meets the following:
 - Has a "home" or "neighborhood" school (to which the student would have been assigned, in the absence of a school choice program) that receives Title I funds and has been identified, under the statute, as in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring; and
 - Has elected to enroll, at some point since July 1, 2002 (the effective date of the Title I choice provisions), and after the home school has been identified as in need of improvement, in a school that has not been so identified and is attending that school; and
 - Is using district transportation services to attend such a school.

In addition, the State may consider costs for transporting a student meeting the above conditions towards the funds spent by an LEA on transportation for public school choice if the student is using district transportation services to attend the non-identified school.

- b. How should States report on public school choice for those LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice? In the count of LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice (for any of the reasons specified in 1.4.9.1.4), States should include those LEAs that are unable to offer public school choice at one or more grade levels. For instance, if an LEA is able to provide public school choice to eligible students at the elementary level but not at the secondary level, the State should include the LEA in the count. States should also include LEAs that are not able to provide public school choice at all (i.e., at any grade level). States should provide the reason(s) why public school choice was not possible in these LEAs at the grade level(s) in the Comment section. In addition, States may also include in the Comment section a separate count just of LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice at any grade level.

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

Comments:

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

1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

1.4.9.2.2 Supplemental Educational Services – Students

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

	# Students
Eligible for supplemental educational services	33,936
Applied for supplemental educational services	7,903
Received supplemental educational services	7,307
Comments:	

1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services

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

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$ 10,257,741
Comments:	

1.5 TEACHER QUALITY

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

1.5.1 Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified

In the table below, provide the number of core academic classes for the grade levels listed, the number of those core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified, and the number taught by teachers who are not highly qualified. The percentage of core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified and the percentage taught by teachers who are not highly qualified will be calculated automatically. Below the table are FAQs about these data.

	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are <u>NOT</u> Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are <u>NOT</u> Highly Qualified
All classes	227,438	225,949	99.3	1,489	0.7
All elementary classes	63,330	63,058	99.6	272	0.4
All secondary classes	164,108	162,891	99.3	1,217	0.7

Virginia confirms reported numbers are correct.

Virginia reports the data as submitted by the school divisions. The school divisions' on-going strategies to constantly improve the educational services that they provide to students would determine the quantity and type of courses assigned to teachers each school year.

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.	<u>Yes</u>
---	------------

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

FAQs about highly qualified teachers and core academic subjects:

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

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

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

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

	Percentage
Elementary School Classes	
Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	67.0
Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	24.0
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	9.0
Other (please explain in comment box below)	
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

	Percentage
Secondary School Classes	
Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	77.0
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	11.0
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	12.0
Other (please explain in comment box below)	
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

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

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	13,581	13,483	99.3
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	24,075	24,013	99.7
Secondary Schools			
High Poverty secondary Schools	22,613	22,260	98.4
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	55,127	54,913	99.6

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	64.3	26.5
Poverty metric used	Virginia uses the percentages of students who qualify for the free or reduced-price lunch program.	
Secondary schools	53.5	24.3
Poverty metric used	Virginia uses the percentages of students who qualify for the free or reduced-price lunch program.	

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

- a. *What is a "high-poverty school"?* Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "high-poverty" schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State.
- b. *What is a "low-poverty school"?* Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "low-poverty" schools as schools in the bottom quartile of poverty in the State.
- c. *How are the poverty quartiles determined?* Separately rank order elementary and secondary schools from highest to lowest on your percentage poverty measure. Divide the list into four equal groups. Schools in the first (highest group) are high-poverty schools. Schools in the last group (lowest group) are the low-poverty schools. Generally, States use the percentage of students who qualify for the free or reduced-price lunch program for this calculation.
- d. *Since the poverty data are collected at the school and not classroom level, how do we classify schools as either elementary or secondary for this purpose?* States may include as elementary schools all schools that serve children in grades K through 5 (including K through 8 or K through 12 schools) and would therefore include as secondary schools those that exclusively serve children in grades 6 and higher.

1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

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

1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

1. **Types of Programs** = Types of programs described in the subgrantee's local plan (as submitted to the State or as implemented) that is closest to the descriptions in http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/files/uploads/5/Language_Instruction_Educational_Programs.pdf.
2. **Other Language** = Name of the language of instruction, other than English, used in the program.

Check Types of Programs	Type of Program	Other Language
<u>Yes</u>	Dual language	Spanish
<u>Yes</u>	Two-way immersion	Spanish
<u>Yes</u>	Transitional bilingual programs	Spanish
<u>No</u>	Developmental bilingual	Spanish
<u>Yes</u>	Heritage language	Spanish
<u>Yes</u>	Sheltered English instruction	
<u>Yes</u>	Structured English immersion	
<u>Yes</u>	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)	
<u>Yes</u>	Content-based ESL	
<u>Yes</u>	Pull-out ESL	
<u>Yes</u>	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	97,033
Comments:	

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

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

	#
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	96,735
Comments:	

1.6.2.3 Most Commonly Spoken Languages in the State

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

Language	# LEP Students
Spanish; Castilian	60,728
Arabic	4,704
Vietnamese	3,410
Korean	2,858
Urdu	2,842

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).

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	97,033
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	0
Total	97,033
Comments:	

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

	#
Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	13,493
Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	13.9
Comments:	

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.

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	96,735
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	0
Total	96,735
Comments:	
In the table below, provide the number of Title III students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time and whose progress cannot be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO1. Report this number ONLY if the State did not include these students in establishing AMAO1/ making progress target and did not include them in the calculations for AMAO1/ making progress (# and % making progress).	
	#
Number of Title III students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time whose progress cannot be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO 1.	27,152

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

	Results		Targets	
	#	%	#	%
Making progress	58,302	83.8		65.00
Attained proficiency	13,460	13.9		16.00
Comments:				

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

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

1.6.3.5.2 Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given

[illegible]

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

[illegible]

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

[illegible]

1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students

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

1.6.3.6.1 Title III Served MFLEP Students by Year Monitored

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

Monitored Former LEP students include:

- Students who have transitioned out of a language instruction educational program.
- Students who are no longer receiving LEP services and who are being monitored for academic content achievement for 2 years after the transition.

Table 1.6.3.6.1 Definitions:

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

# Year One	# Year Two	Total
16,038	8,869	24,907
Comments:		

1.6.3.6.2 In the table below, report the number of MFLEP students who took the annual mathematics assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned out of language instruction educational programs and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
21,440	19,885	92.7	1,555
Comments:			

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
17,740	17,007	95.9	733

Comments:

1.6.3.6.4 MFLEP Students Results for Science

In the table below, report results for monitored former LEP(MFLEP) students who took the annual science assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned out of language instruction educational programs and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

Table 1.6.3.6.4 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
12,471	11,651	93.4	820

Comments:

1.6.4 Title III Subgrantees

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

1.6.4.1 Title III Subgrantee Performance

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

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

	#
# - Total number of subgrantees for the year	58
# - Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	3
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	58
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	24
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	6
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	0
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2009-10 and 2010-11)	35
# - Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2010-11 for not meeting Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years	11
# - Number of subgrantees that have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2007-08, 2008-09, 2009-10, and 2010-11)	2

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

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments: The Virginia 2011-2012 Title III AMAO results, based on 2010-2011 assessment data, includes 64 divisions participating in 12 consortia. AMAOs 1 and 2 were calculated at the consortia level. For 2010-2011 Title III AMAO results, based on 2009-2010 assessment data, AMAOs 1 and 2 were calculated at the individual division level.

For 2011-2012 Title III AMAO results, based on 2010-2011 assessments Virginia calculated AMAO 1 and AMAO 2 results at the consortia level, whereas the previous year's results were calculated at the division level. The variation in calculations between both years is based on guidance provided by the USED Title III policy group in accordance with those Title III provisions that define subgrantee accountability.

1.6.4.2 State Accountability

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

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

State met <u>all</u> three Title III AMAOs	No
Comments:	

1.6.4.3 Termination of Title III Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

Were any Title III language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> activities terminated for failure to reach program goals?	No
If yes, provide the number of language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> activities for immigrant children and	

youth terminated.

Comments:

1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students

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

1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students

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

Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:

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

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants
24,612	5,646	21

If state reports zero (0) students in programs or zero (0) subgrants, explain in comment box below.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development

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

1.6.6.1 Teacher Information

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

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

Note: Section 3301(8) v The term 'Language 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.

	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	1,899
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 1.6.1.1 and 1.6.4.1.)
3. **Total Number of Participants** = Number of teachers, administrators and other personnel who participated in each type of the professional development activities reported.
4. **Total** = Number of all participants in professional development (PD) activities

Type of Professional Development Activity	# Subgrantees	
Instructional strategies for LEP students	56	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	50	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	54	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	45	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	35	
Other (Explain in comment box)	0	
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	55	12,433
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	57	4,211
PD provided to principals	54	1,578
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	47	2,248
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	47	2,248
PD provided to community based organization personnel	31	1,183
Total		23,901

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities

This section collects data on State grant activities.

1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process

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

Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:

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

Example: State received SY 2010-11 funds July 1, 2010, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2010, for SY 2010-11 programs. Then the "# of days/\$\$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
07/27/10	09/11/10	46
Comments:		

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS

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

	#
Persistently Dangerous Schools	0
Comments: Virginia has no persistently dangerous schools.	

1.8 GRADUATION RATES AND DROPOUT RATES

This section collects graduation and dropout rates.

1.8.1 Graduation Rates

In the table below, provide the graduation rates calculated using the methodology that was approved as part of the State's accountability plan for the **previous school year** (SY 2009-10). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	79.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	77.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	88.4
Black, non-Hispanic	70.5
Hispanic	65.9
White, non-Hispanic	85.1
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	44.4
Limited English proficient	60.4
Economically disadvantaged	66.2
Migratory students	56.8
Male	75.8
Female	84.2
Comments:	

FAQs on graduation rates:

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.8.2 Dropout Rates

In the table below, provide the dropout rates calculated using the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's (NCES) Common Core of Data (CCD) for the **previous school year** (SY 2009-10). Below the table is a FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Dropout Rate
All Students	1.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	1.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	0.8
Black, non-Hispanic	2.2
Hispanic	3.1
White, non-Hispanic	1.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1.7
Limited English proficient	2.1
Economically disadvantaged	1.8
Migratory students	3.8
Male	1.7
Female	1.3
Comments:	

FAQ on dropout rates:

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

1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS PROGRAM

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

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

	#	# LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	103	103
LEAs with subgrants	29	29
Total	132	132
Comments:		

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

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

1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youths

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

Age/Grade	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	133	357
K	468	1,161
1	446	1,067
2	383	1,016
3	412	1,013
4	371	952
5	334	951
6	336	835
7	276	806
8	264	733
9	324	987
10	230	767
11	173	641
12	262	722
Ungraded	0	0
Total	4,412	12,008
Comments:		

1.9.1.2 Primary Nighttime Residence of Homeless Children and Youths

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

	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	671	1,792
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	3,015	8,320
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	93	327
Hotels/Motels	633	1,569
Total	4,412	12,008
Comments:		

1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

1.9.2.1 Homeless Children and Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

Age/Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	442
K	1,105
1	1,010
2	963
3	945
4	885
5	905
6	794
7	765
8	686
9	929
10	718
11	617
12	738
Ungraded	
Total	11,502
Comments:	

1.9.2.2 Subgroups of Homeless Students Served

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

	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied youth	1,248
Migratory children/youth	58
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	2,081
Limited English proficient students	1,494
Comments:	

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	1,237	836
4	1,153	812
5	1,134	885
6	1,011	705
7	948	685
8	852	644
High School	767	653
Comments:		

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	1,243	961
4	1,157	851
5	1,119	843
6	969	501
7	774	423
8	849	530
High School	2,223	1,735
Comments:		

1.10 MIGRANT CHILD COUNTS

This section collects the Title I, Part C, Migrant Education Program (MEP) child counts which States are required to provide and may be used to determine the annual State allocations under Title I, Part C. The child counts should reflect the reporting period of September 1, 2010 through August 31, 2011. 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, 2010 through August 31, 2011. 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)	92
K	76
1	94
2	66
3	71
4	66
5	58
6	40
7	34
8	30
9	26
10	29
11	19
12	14
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	183
Total	898
Comments: Virginia has no migrant students under the classification of ungraded.	

1.10.1.1 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

For the past six 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, or workers finding permanent employment. In addition, there has been an increase of male-only camps, which do not allow families. Therefore, this has resulted in fewer students requiring migrant services.

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, 2010 through August 31, 2011. 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)	66
K	67
1	77
2	53
3	53
4	59
5	55
6	30
7	30
8	20
9	19
10	18
11	N<
12	N<
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	128
Total	696

Comments: Virginia has no migrant students under the classification of ungraded.

1.10.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Category 2 increase is due to targeted identification and recruitment efforts across the state. However, programs operating summer programs experienced higher enrollment and services provided to out-of-school youth. Virginia used the Migrant Student Data Collection system to generate the 2010-2011 Category 2 child count.

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 2009-2010 and 2010-2011 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.

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, 2010 through August 31, 2011.

The data collected are found on the Certificate of Eligibility (COE). The COE is divided into five sections: 1) parent data; 2) child data; 3) eligibility data; 4) verification; and 5) state specific data. The parent data include parent or guardian names as well as current and home addresses. The child data include name, birth date, type of documentation used to confirm birth date, gender, grade enrollment date, and service location. Virginia began using the national COE in the spring of 2009. Additional state required data were added to the national COE. These data 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 2010-2011 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' Technical Assistance 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 that is included on the COE. This number is used to cross check assessment data and information in the state database.

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 in 2010-2011 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. 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.

Migrant student data is reviewed regularly at the local level during the regular school year and summer/intercession term by the local migrant coordinators prior to submission to the state Migrant Student Data Collection (MSDC). To maintain accurate counts of eligible students, the MSDC 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/intercession 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 close the data collection window for the reporting period.

At the state level, the MSDC is reviewed based on peak enrollment patterns around the state, allowing local programs the time to input the majority of their students. A statewide student enrollment report is generated and cross checks are compared against data entered in the MSDC as well as the Migrant Student Information Exchange database. Discrepancies are addressed with the local migrant coordinators should inconsistencies exist.

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 are 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 close the data collection window for the reporting period.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Virginia has several steps that are taken to ensure proper eligibility of children in the Migrant Education Program (MEP). Virginia uses 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 students themselves in the case of emancipated youth. The qualifying arrival date, residency date, qualifying activity, and withdrawal dates are examples of data elements within the COE used to determine whether a student held residency status during the reporting period.

Local recruiters 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 COE from each MEP are cross-checked 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 COE to eliminate within-state duplication.

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

In addition, for the 2010-2011 school year, the Virginia Department of Education (VDOE) provided a refresher training on eligibility requirements and MSDC system updates for local migrant coordinators on April 13, 2011. Technical assistance is provided by the VDOE 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 2010-2011 school year. In compliance with Section 200.89(b)(2) of the Code of Federal Regulations effective August 28, 2008, Virginia sampled 62 COE from the current year's eligibility pool. The COE were randomly sampled from migrant education programs that had not previously been through a re-interview process. Recruiters not involved in the initial determination of eligibility were responsible for conducting the re-interviewing. Re-interviewing was conducted via face-to-face and/or by phone during the spring and summer of 2011.

Of the 62 migrant families randomly sampled for the re-interview process, 50 re-interviews were conducted. From the 50 re-interviews, one family was found to be ineligible for the Migrant Education Program and services were immediately terminated and data were removed from the local and state database. The 12 families unavailable for re-interviews moved prior to this process.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

Throughout the year, the local migrant recruiters submit updated COE 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) Recordkeeping. 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 Recordkeeping, 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, the VDOE updated the Migrant Education Identification and Recruitment Manual in January 2011. Key federal definitions such as temporary and continuation of services provision, the use of the Migrant Student Data Collection (MSDC) and the Migrant Student Information Exchange were emphasized. In addition, the VDOE provided refresher training on eligibility requirements and MSDC system updates for local migrant coordinators on April 13, 2011. All local migrant coordinators were in attendance. Technical assistance is provided by the VDOE as needed throughout the year.

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.