COMMONWEALTH *of* VIRGINIA

BOARD OF EDUCATION
413 Stuart Circle, Suite 130
Richmond, VA 23220
(804) 237-8909
(804) 237-8901 (FAX)

Mark E. Emblidge, Ph.D.
President

May 1, 2008

The Honorable Kerri L. Briggs
Assistant Secretary
Office of Elementary and Secondary Education
U.S. Department of Education
400 Maryland Avenue, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20202-6132

Dear Dr. Briggs:

I am pleased to submit the Virginia Board of Education proposal for a Differentiated Accountability Pilot under the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001*. The announcement required states to submit their proposal by May 2, 2008.

If you have questions or require additional information relative to this transmittal, please contact Kathleen Smith, director of school improvement at the Virginia Department of Education, at (804) 786-5819 or Kathleen.Smith@doe.virginia.gov.

Sincerely,

Mark E. Emblidge

MEE/dj

Enclosure

c: Billy K. Cannaday, Jr., Ed.D.
Superintendent of Public Instruction

Differentiated Accountability Pilot Proposal Under *No Child Left Behind* (NCLB)

May 1, 2008

Virginia Department of Education
James Monroe Building
101 North 14th Street
Richmond, VA 23219

Contact Person:

Dr. Kathleen M. Smith
Director
Office of School Improvement
Phone: (804) 786-5819
E-mail: Kathleen.Smith@doe.virginia.gov

Table of Contents

DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PILOT

Page

I. Executive Summary 1

II. The Proposed Differentiated Accountability Model 4

III. Core Principles 6

Additional Questions: Key Issues 45

IV. Conclusion 47

Attachment A: 2007 School Improvement Status

I. Executive Summary

Key Issues	State Response
• **State your intent to propose and adopt a differentiated accountability model and when the model will be implemented if approved (this year, phase in, etc.).**	The proposed differentiated accountability model will offer Public School Choice (PSC) and Supplemental Educational Services (SES) based on priority of need for services. The proposed differentiated model will prioritize PSC and SES to low-academic and low-income students who: 1) belong to the subgroup(s) for which the school did not make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP); 2) fail the test(s) in the subject(s) in which the school did not make AYP. Schools identified for school improvement prior to 2008-2009 will continue in the current accountability model. The prioritization plan will apply only to those Title I schools in Years 1 and 2 of improvement for the first time in 2008-2009 based on assessment results in 2007-2008 as described below. **Year 1:** **<u>Public School Choice</u>** The public school choice (PSC) option will be offered to parents based on priority of need for services as follows. **Priority 1:** PSC will be offered to parents of low-academic and low-income students in the same subject and subgroup for which the school did not make AYP. **Priority 2:** PSC will be offered to parents of all other low-academic and low-income students regardless of the subject or subgroup. **Priority 3:** PSC will be offered to parents of all students as is currently required under Section 1116 (b)(1)(E) of the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001*(NCLB). **Year 2:** **<u>Public School Choice</u>** The PSC option will be offered to parents based on priority of need for services as described above. **<u>Supplemental Educational Services</u>** The supplemental educational services (SES) option will be offered to parents based on priority of need for services as follows. **Priority 1:** SES will be offered to parents of low-income and low-academic students in the same subject and subgroup for which the school did not make AYP. **Priority 2:** SES will be offered to parents of all other low-income and low-academic students regardless of subject or subgroup. **Priority 3:** SES will be offered to parents of all students. **Year 3 and Beyond:** The sanctions will be implemented as indicated under current NCLB statute. **Note:** Schools identified for Title I school improvement prior to 2008-2009 would remain in the existing accountability system.

Key Issues	State Response
• **Address how a state has met USED's eligibility criteria, including:** ▪ Assurance that a state's standards and assessments system has been fully approved and administered in 2007-2008. ▪ Assurance that a state has no significant NCLB monitoring findings. ▪ Assurance that a state has an approved HQT plan. ▪ Assurance and proof that a state has provided timely and transparent AYP information to parents over the period of the last two years. Note: references to "assurances" in this template should not require significant narrative explanation or justification. A simple statement with appropriate citation or cross-reference (e.g., to USED approval letter) should suffice.	Virginia has met the United States Department of Education's (USED) eligibility criteria as follows. ▪ Full approval of Virginia's standards and assessment system for 2007-2008 as evidenced by an approval letter from Assistant Secretary, Kerri L. Briggs, Ph.D., on December 18, 2007. The link to the letter is provided below. http://www.ed.gov/admins/divisiond/account/nclbfinalassess/va6.html ▪ No significant NCLB monitoring findings. The links to the most recent monitoring report for Title I, Part A, programs is provided below. http://www.ed.gov/admins/divisiond/account/monitoring/reports05.html ▪ An approved Highly Qualified Teacher (HQT) plan as evidenced by an approval letter from former Assistant Secretary, Henry L. Johnson, on December 14, 2006. http://www.ed.gov/programs/teacherqual/hqtplans/vacl2.pdf ▪ Final AYP results were released on August 23, 2007, for the 2007-2008 school year and August 31, 2006, for the 2006-2007 school year as evidenced by the link to the press releases provided below. http://www.doe.virginia.gov/VDOE/NewHome/pressredivisionses/2007/aug23.html http://www.doe.virginia.gov/VDOE/NewHome/pressredivisionses/2006/aug31.html
• **As appropriate, address whether your state / model meets the following USED priority criteria:** ▪ A state has at least 20% of its Title 1 schools identified as in need of improvement, and it has been a challenge to provide meaningful, intensive reform to all its identified Title I schools. ▪ For a state with less than 20% of its Title I schools identified as in need of improvement, explain why a state needs a differentiated accountability model. ▪ A state proposes to take significant and comprehensive interventions for its lowest-performing schools earlier in the timeline, i.e., before schools reach the restructuring phase. ▪ A state proposes an innovative model of differentiation and system of interventions.	Although Virginia has fewer than 20 percent of its Title I schools identified as in need of improvement, a differentiated accountability model is needed to focus federal funds on the group of students that have the greatest academic need. Virginia has defined the students with greatest academic need as those who belong to the subgroup(s) for which the school did not make AYP and are failing the test(s) in the subject(s) in which the school did not make AYP. For the 2007-2008 school year, 9.5 percent of the Title I schools (69 out of 726) were classified as in need of improvement. The interventions proposed for the schools in the pilot program will focus on those schools that are in their first two years of improvement status. The purpose of the focus earlier in the timeline is to ensure that schools have the ability to focus needed resources on the students that have the greatest need. Focusing resources earlier in the timeline will enable schools to exit the Title I school improvement status instead of advancing to a more severe level of improvement. The innovative model and system of intervention will allow schools to prioritize needed resources toward the students that have the greatest need for assistance.
• **Address the educational policy reasons for proposing the use of a differentiated accountability model.** ▪ Explain briefly the focus of the model and why it makes sound educational sense in the state context. ▪ How does the model raise expectations and foster the state's	The educational policy reason for proposing the differentiated accountability model is based on the Virginia Board of Education's concern that the NCLB statute treats all schools that fail to make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) equally. The NCLB sanctions for Title I schools in improvement are the same regardless of whether such failure is based on one subgroup failing to make AYP in one subject, or all subgroups failing to make AYP in both

Key Issues	State Response
educational goals to improve student achievement and close achievement gaps? ▪ Will the model facilitate the use of assessments to diagnose and treat the instructional needs of individual students and to develop state and local policy? ▪ Will the model be understood by parents and the public? ▪ How does the model build on and complement other state policies? ▪ As applicable, describe a state's historic and continuing interest in and any experience with differentiated accountability.	reading/language arts and mathematics. The proposed model targets public school choice (PSC) and supplemental educational services (SES) to the subgroup and individual students failing the state assessments. This concept should be easily understood by parents and the public. Currently, all students in a Title I school in improvement status are eligible for school choice with priority given to those students with the greatest academic need. In addition, all low-income students in a school in Year 2 of improvement status or beyond are eligible to receive supplemental educational services regardless of their performance on the state assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics. The model raises expectations and fosters the state's educational goal of eliminating the achievement gap by ensuring all students are proficient on state assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics. School divisions will use the results of the state assessments to determine areas of need for each subgroup(s) and individual student. The results of the assessments will be used to plan and implement appropriate instructional remedies. The model supports the objectives set forth by the Virginia Board of Education in its comprehensive plan for 2007-2012. Specifically, the model supports objective 2, the Board's commitment to providing leadership to help schools and school divisions eliminate the achievement gap between groups of students and increase the academic success of all students. The link to the Board's comprehensive plan is listed below. http://www.doe.virginia.gov/boe/plan/comprehensiveplan.pdf
• **Explain in summary form (e.g., bulleted list) that the ten core principles needed for differentiated accountability models are met, or when they will be met. The 10 core principles are:** ▪ AYP determinations are made for all public schools; ▪ AYP determinations are transparent and easy to understand; ▪ Title 1 schools continue to be identified for improvement as outlined in a state's accountability plan; ▪ Differentiation method is technically and educationally sound, based on robust data analysis, and uniform across the state; ▪ State's transition to proposed differentiated accountability model considers the current status of schools and previous intervention implementation efforts; ▪ Differentiation process and resulting interventions are data-driven, understandable, and transparent; ▪ Title 1 schools are subject to interventions, and interventions will increase with intensity over time;	Virginia meets the ten core principles as described below. ▪ AYP determinations are made for all public schools as evidenced by reporting of the determinations on an annual basis through the state report card. The link to the report card is provided below. https://p1pe.doe.virginia.gov/reportcard/ ▪ AYP determinations are transparent and easy to understand. The AYP determinations are made available on an annual basis through the state report card. The link to the report card is provided above. ▪ Title I schools are identified for improvement as described in the state's accountability plan which states, a Title I school is identified for improvement and sanctions in accordance with NCLB if it does not make AYP in the same subject area for two consecutive years. The reference is contained on p. 25 of the Virginia Consolidated State Application Amended Accountability Workbook, July 16, 2007. The link to the accountability workbook is provided below. http://www.doe.virginia.gov/VDOE/nclb/VA-AcctWkbk.pdf

Key Issues	State Response
▪ Interventions must be educationally sound; ▪ The model is designed to result in an increased number of students participating in public school choice and supplemental educational services (even if eligibility is limited); and ▪ A category of differentiation for, at least, a subset of the lowest-performing schools.	▪ The proposed differentiation method is technically and educationally sound as it allows schools to focus needed resources on the students in greatest need. Determinations for priorities will be made based on the AYP calculations for the 2008-2009 school year. The priorities will be applied uniformly across the state. ▪ The proposed differentiated accountability model will apply only to those Title I schools in Years 1 and 2 of improvement for the first time in 2008-2009. Schools identified for Title I school improvement prior to 2008-2009 would remain in the existing accountability system. ▪ The differentiation process is driven by the data on the school report indicating the subgroup(s) and subject(s) that are causing the school(s) not to make AYP. The priorities for implementation of PSC and SES are clearly stated. ▪ Title I schools in Year 1 of improvement are required to implement PSC based on priority of need. Title I schools in Year 2 of improvement are required to implement PSC and SES based on priority of need. Title I schools in Year 3 and beyond will implement sanctions as indicated under current NCLB statute. ▪ The prioritization of the PSC and SES sanctions to those students with the greatest academic need are based on the educationally sound practice of providing additional interventions to those students who are failing the state benchmark assessments. ▪ The proposed model is designed to result in an increased number of students participating in PSC and SES as the model will focus services on those students with the greatest academic need. ▪ The proposed model differentiates for Title I schools entering Year 1 or Year 2 of school improvement for the 2008-2009 school year. This group represents a subset of the lowest-performing schools in the state.
• **Provide other key background and assurances, including:** ▪ Provide an assurance that, if approved, your state will cooperate in a USED evaluation of the differentiated accountability model, including providing data to show how student achievement has differed prior to and after the implementation of the differentiated accountability pilot.	If approved, Virginia will cooperate in a USED evaluation of the differentiated accountability model, including providing data to show how student achievement has differed prior to and after the implementation of the differentiated accountability pilot.

II. The Proposed Differentiated Accountability Model

Key Issues	State Response
• **Describe the nature of the differentiated accountability model and how it will work, including how it is related to your current approved AYP workbook and aligned with / improve your state accountability system.** ▪ What is the focus of the proposed model? ▪ How will it work?	The proposed differentiated accountability model will offer Public School Choice (PSC) and Supplemental Educational Services (SES) based on priority of need for services. The proposed differentiated model will prioritize PSC and SES to low-academic and low-income students who: 1) belong to the subgroup(s) for which the school did not make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP); 2) fail the test(s) in the subject(s) in which the school did not make AYP. Schools identified for school improvement prior to 2008-2009 will continue in the

Key Issues	State Response
▪ How much will it change? ▪ How does it fit within broader state reforms regarding accountability and improvement? ▪ How will the model help improve student achievement?	current accountability model. The prioritization plan will apply only to those Title I schools in Years 1 and 2 of improvement for the first time in 2008-2009 based on assessment results in 2007-2008 as described below. **Year 1:** **<u>Public School Choice</u>** The public school choice (PSC) option will be offered to parents based on priority of need for services as follows. **Priority 1:** PSC will be offered to parents of low-academic and low-income students in the same subject and subgroup for which the school did not make AYP. **Priority 2:** PSC will be offered to parents of all other low-academic and low-income students regardless of the subject or subgroup. **Priority 3:** PSC will be offered to parents of all students as is currently required under Section 1116 (b)(1)(E) of the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001*(NCLB). **Year 2:** **<u>Public School Choice</u>** The PSC option will be offered to parents based on priority of need for services as described above. **<u>Supplemental Educational Services</u>** The supplemental educational services (SES) option will be offered to parents based on priority of need for services as follows. **Priority 1:** SES will be offered to parents of low-income and low-academic students in the same subject and subgroup for which the school did not make AYP. **Priority 2:** SES will be offered to parents of all other low-income and low-academic students regardless of subject or subgroup. **Priority 3:** SES will be offered to parents of all students. **Year 3 and Beyond:** The sanctions will be implemented as indicated under current NCLB statute. **Note:** Schools identified for Title I school improvement prior to 2008-2009 would remain in the existing accountability system. **Rationale:** The NCLB statute treats all schools that fail to make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) equally, regardless of whether such failure is based on one subgroup failing to make AYP in one subject, or all subgroups failing to make AYP in both reading/language arts and mathematics. Currently, all students in a Title I school in school improvement status are eligible for school choice with priority given to academic need. In addition, all low-income students in a school that is in Year 2 school improvement status or beyond are eligible to

Key Issues	State Response
	receive supplemental educational services, regardless of their performance on the Standards of Learning (SOL) assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics. Using federal funds to provide school choice to all students impacts the level of assistance available to serve students in the school that are not meeting the proficiency targets on the state assessments. Additionally, school divisions have reported that the majority of students who choose the choice option are not from low-income families nor are they students who are struggling academically. Similarly, using federal funds to provide tutoring services to all low-income students in a school reduces funds available to serve subgroups and individual students that are not meeting the proficiency targets on the state assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics. Since NCLB focuses on ensuring that 100 percent of Virginia's students are proficient in reading/language arts and mathematics by 2013-2014, the proposed differentiated accountability model targets available resources to those students who are not proficient.

III. Core Principles

Core Principle (CP)	Key Issues	Discussion	State Response
• ***CP 1:* AYP Determinations consistent with state's Consolidated Accountability Workbook** *A state makes annual AYP determinations for all public schools as required by NCLB and as described in the state's accountability plan. The state's accountability system continues to hold schools accountable and ensure that all students are proficient in reading/ language arts and mathematics by 2013-14.*	*1.1. Has the state demonstrated that the state's accountability system continues to hold schools and school divisions accountable and ensures that all students are proficient by 2013-14?* *1.2. Has the state demonstrated that it makes annual AYP determinations for all public schools and school divisions as required by NCLB and as described in the state's accountability plan?*	▪ A state should provide assurances that it will abide by provisions for annual AYP determinations and AMOs for all schools and divisions, consistent with the state's accountability workbook. A substantial narrative is unnecessary.	Virginia has made AYP determinations on an annual basis beginning with the 2002-2003 school year for all schools and school divisions in the state. The annual AYP ratings are determined based on the policies and procedures described in the Virginia Consolidated State Application Amended Accountability Workbook, July 2007. The link to the workbook is provided below. http://www.doe.virginia.gov/VDOE/nclb/VA-AcctWkbk.pdf The policies and procedures described in the workbook require schools and divisions to reach the goal of having 100 percent of the students proficient in reading/language arts and mathematics by 2013-2014.

Core Principle (CP)	Key Issues	Discussion	State Response
• ***<u>CP 2:</u> Transparent Information about AYP Calculations*** *A state provides the public with clear and understandable explanations of how the state calculates AYP for all its schools and school divisions and how it includes all students in its accountability system.*	***2.1. Has the state explained how it ensures that the components of its AYP calculations include all students?*** *2.1.1. Has the state documented its methods for validly and reliably including all students in AYP calculations (i.e., full academic year definition, minimum group size)?* *2.1.2. Has the state clearly described its process for calculating AYP, including the use of averaging, performance index, confidence intervals, standard error of measurement, and any other statistical adjustments?* *2.1.3. Has the state provided documentation that all schools and school divisions receive AYP determinations?*	▪ To help peer reviewers better understand a state's AYP system, a state should briefly explain the method for calculating AYP. Simply referring to a state's Consolidated Accountability Workbook is insufficient.	Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) ratings are calculated on an annual basis for schools, divisions, and the state. Yearly achievement benchmarks in reading/language arts and mathematics were established by the Virginia Board of Education beginning in 2002-2003 and are known as Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). The AMOs increase incrementally through 2013-2014 when 100 percent proficiency is required. For a school, division, or the state to make AYP, the following three conditions must be met. First, 95 percent of the students (in the aggregate and by subgroups) enrolled in grades 3 through 8 and in high school must participate in the statewide assessment in reading/language arts and mathematics. Secondly, the pass rate for all students (in the aggregate and by subgroup) must meet or exceed the designated AMO in reading/language arts and mathematics for each school year. Finally, the other academic indicator of attendance, science performance, history/social science performance, or writing performance for elementary and middle schools or the graduation rate AMO for schools with a graduating class must be met or progress made. Schools may also make AYP through the safe harbor provision; reducing the failure rate by at least 10 percent in a subject where the AMO was not met and meeting or making progress in the other academic indicator. Students are considered to be enrolled for a full academic year in a school, division, or the state if the student is in membership in the school, division, or state by September 30 of the school year and continues in membership through test administration. The Board of Education holds the expectation that all eligible students will participate in statewide assessments. However, the minimum number of students in a subgroup below which the 95 percent

Core Principle (CP)	Key Issues	Discussion	State Response
			participation requirement for AYP will not be required is 50. Virginia uses the uniform averaging procedure for AYP calculations. For the 2008-2009 school year based on assessments administered during the 2007-2008 school year, all tests given in grades 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and End-of-Course subjects will be included in the participation and performance calculations for AYP. Schools and divisions can make AYP in one of two ways: 1) current year performance; or 2) the average of student performance in grades 3 through 8 and End-of-Course for the previous three years. Safe harbor is applied if a school does not make AYP through the current or three-year average.
	2.2. How has the state provided the public with transparent and easily accessible information about how the state calculates AYP? *2.2.1. Has the state adequately explained to the public its process of calculating AYP in a manner that is easily understood and transparent?* *2.2.2. How has the state provided the public with clear documentation if its accountability system under NCLB?*	▪ A state should provide evidence as to how it has explained its system and method for calculating AYP to the public, including the state report card and other public materials.	Virginia provides the public with clear and understandable explanations of how AYP is calculated for all schools and divisions through two primary sources. The first source is the state report card. The second source is a publication entitled, Accountability and Virginia Public Schools. The publication is a link on the state report card page and includes the following: ▪ The requirement for annual testing in grades 3-8 and at least once in high school to measure student progress in reading/language arts and mathematics. ▪ The requirement for schools, school divisions, and states to meet annual objectives for AYP for student performance on statewide tests in reading/language arts and mathematics. ▪ The requirement to identify whether schools, school divisions, and the state made AYP. ▪ The requirement for AYP to apply to all students and to the following subgroups; students with disabilities, limited English proficient (LEP) students, economically disadvantaged students, white students,

Core Principle (CP)	Key Issues	Discussion	State Response
			African-American students, and Hispanic students. ▪ The provision that allows for assessments administered during the three most recent years to be averaged for AYP calculations. ▪ The addition of a proxy percentage of 14 percent for reading/language arts and 15 percent for mathematics for students with disabilities who would have demonstrated proficiency on modified reading/language arts and mathematics assessments during 2006-2007 had such assessments been available. ▪ The provision for including LEP students in their first year of enrollment in a U.S. public school as participating in Virginia's assessment system, but their reading/language arts scores are excluded from the calculation of AYP. ▪ The provision for LEP students at the lowest levels of English language proficiency to be assessed with the Virginia Grade Level Alternative Assessment (VGLA) for reading/language arts. ▪ The requirement to meet another academic indicator as well as the AYP benchmarks in reading/language arts and mathematics to make AYP. ▪ The provision for making AYP called safe harbor which involves reducing the failure rate by at least 10 percent. ▪ The sanctions for Title I schools in school improvement classified by year of improvement. The link to the publication is provided below. http://www.doe.virginia.gov/VDOE/src/vps-accountability.pdf The link to the state report card is also provided below. https://p1pe.doe.virginia.gov/reportcard/

Core Principle (CP)	Key Issues	Discussion	State Response
• ***CP 3:* Title 1 Schools continue to be identified for improvement as required by NCLB** *A state continues to identify for improvement Title I schools and school divisions as required by NCLB and as outlined in the state's accountability plan. However, the state may change the identification labels (i.e., schools in need of improvement, corrective action, restructuring) to reflect how interventions are differentiated.*	***3.1. Does the state identify schools and school divisions for improvement and publicly report such determinations?*** *3.1.1. Has the state ensured that it will identify for improvement (or a new label) all schools and school divisions receiving Title I funds after missing AYP for 2 years, as required by NCLB and as outlined in the state's accountability plan?* *3.1.2. Has the state provided evidence that it annually reports to the public school and school division identifications?*	▪ A state should provide an assurance or brief information that NCLB identification requirements will continue to be met. ▪ A state may want to consider attaching or linking to the state report card and date it was published.	Virginia identifies Title I schools for improvement as required by NCLB. Title I schools have been identified for school improvement status each year beginning with the 2002-2003 school year and the required NCLB sanctions have been applied. The sanctions are applied based on the improvement status of the school. Statewide information for the Title I schools in improvement status can be found in the school report card at the link provided below. http://www.doe.virginia.gov/VDOE/src/title1.shtml
• ***CP 4:* Method of Differentiation** *A state's method for differentiation of identified schools is technically and educationally sound, based upon robust data analysis, and the state applies its method of differentiation uniformly across the state. The differentiation in the identification of schools for improvement is based primarily on students' demonstration of proficiency in reading/language arts and mathematics.*	***4.1. Has the state established technically and educationally sound criteria to distinguish between the phases (e.g., from "improvement" to "restructuring") of differentiation?*** *4.1.1. Has the state clearly described the criteria it will use to distinguish between the phases of improvement?* *4.1.2. Has the state clearly identified the labels it will apply to schools or school divisions for each phase of improvement?* *4.1.3. Has the state demonstrated that the phases of improvement are based substantially on students' academic*	▪ In sum, a state should compare the proposed phases of differentiation to current law and provide educational and technical evidence for distinguishing between the phases of differentiation. For example, if a state would like to target schools that have missed the most numbers of indicators, it should provide data on that issue. Or, if a state proposes to focus on schools that are dramatically underperforming, it should provide data on the extent to which schools are missing each indicator. ▪ In addition, a state should provide a brief analysis comparing current and proposed categories, using most recent data, to show in the aggregate	Virginia proposes to differentiate sanctions for schools entering school improvement for the first time in 2008-2009. Schools identified for school improvement prior to 2008-2009 would remain in the existing accountability system. In addition, sanctions for schools in school improvement would remain unchanged from the current accountability system. Virginia has established technically and educationally sound criteria to distinguish between the levels of differentiation and maintains the three levels of improvement in the current accountability systems (improvement, corrective action, and restructuring), but will differentiate in the first and second year of school improvement based on individual student and subgroup performance in reading/language arts and mathematics. In the first year of school improvement, first priority for public school choice (PCS) will be offered to parents of low-academic and low-income students in the subject(s) and subgroup(s) for which the school

Core Principle (CP)	Key Issues	Discussion	State Response
	proficiency in reading/language arts and mathematics?	how schools/divisions would change categories, disaggregated by student groups (major racial/ethnic groups, ELL, students with disabilities, and economically disadvantaged); urban versus suburban versus rural schools; and large versus small schools.	did not make AYP. The second priority for PCS will be offered to parents of all other low-academic and low-income students regardless of subject or subgroup. After resources have been provided to these two priority groups of students, PCS will be offered to parents of all students. Currently, all students in a Title I school in school improvement status are eligible for school choice with priority given to academic need. In addition, all low-income students in a school that is in the second year of school improvement, corrective action, or restructuring are eligible to receive supplemental educational services, regardless of their performance on the Standards of Learning (SOL) assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics. Using federal funds to provide school choice to all students reduces the amount of funds available to serve students in the school that are not meeting the proficiency targets on the SOL assessments. Additionally, school divisions have reported that the majority of students who choose the choice option are not from low-income families nor are they students who are struggling academically. In the second year of school improvement, the priorities indicated above for public school choice would remain the same. First priority for supplemental educational services (SES) will be offered to parents of low-income and low-academic students in the same subject(s) and subgroup(s) for which the school did not make AYP. As a second priority, SES will be offered to parents of all other low-income and low-academic students regardless of subject or subgroup. After resources have been offered to these two priority groups of students, SES will be offered to parents of all students. Using federal funds to provide tutoring services to all low-income students in a school reduces funds available to serve subgroups and individual students

Core Principle (CP)	Key Issues	Discussion	State Response
			that are not meeting the proficiency targets on the SOL assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics. Since NCLB focuses on ensuring that one hundred 100 percent of Virginia's students are proficient in reading/language arts and mathematics by 2013-2014, it is imperative that all available resources are targeted toward those students who are not proficient. Using financial resources for students who are proficient in reading/language arts and mathematics limits the resources that could be used for students who are not proficient.
	4.2. Has the state established technically and educationally sound criteria to differentiate between categories (e.g., between "targeted" and "comprehensive") within a phase of improvement? *4.2.1. Has the state clearly defined the technically and educationally sound criteria it will use to differentiate between identified schools?* *4.2.2. Has the state provided a justification or rationale for the criteria it will use to differentiate between categories and the procedures or methods for applying such criteria?* *4.2.3. Has the state provided evidence that the method of differentiation is not limited by the achievement of a particular student group? Note: A state shall not differentiate among schools based on the criteria of whether the*	▪ A state should provide evidence, including research/statistical modeling, to support the rationale for the proposed method and need for differentiated accountability. ▪ A state's evidence should be based primarily on students' demonstrated proficiency in reading/language arts and mathematics.	Schools are assigned to the sanctions based on the previous year's assessment data before the beginning of the school year and as indicated in the current approved accountability system. No changes will be made to how schools are identified for making AYP. Virginia will publically report the proposed labels to ensure transparency, particularly as the transition to the differentiated model takes place only for those schools entering school improvement for the first time in 2008-2009.

Core Principle (CP)	Key Issues	Discussion	State Response
	schools missed targets in the students with disabilities or limited English proficient student group.		
	4.3. Has the state provided a description and detailed examples of how schools could move between different categories and phases of improvement? *4.3.1. Has the state provided a description of how a school may move between different categories of differentiation (e.g., between "targeted" and "comprehensive") and phases of improvement over time?* *4.3.2. Has the state clearly described how a school moves between categories of differentiation over time?* *4.3.3. Has the state provided evidence that the proposed method of differentiation does not systemically allow for a school to repeatedly miss targets in a particular student group over time and remain in the division's comprehensive category of differentiation?*	▪ A state may also want to explain how reform efforts will continue in schools that move between categories.	Schools are assigned to the sanctions based on the previous year's assessment data before the beginning of the school year and as indicated in the current approved accountability system. No changes will be made to how schools are identified for making AYP. Virginia will publically report the proposed labels to ensure transparency, particularly as the transition to the differentiated model takes place only for those schools entering school improvement for the first time in 2008-2009. The proposed differentiated accountability model will prioritize public school choice (PSC) and supplemental educational services (SES) to low-academic and low-income students who 1) belong to the subgroup(s) for which the school did not make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) and 2) who failed the test in the subject(s) in which the school did not make AYP. The prioritization plan, which will apply only to those Title I schools in Years 1 and 2 of improvement, will be implemented as follows: **Year 1:** <u>Public School Choice</u> **Priority 1:** PCS will be offered to parents of low-academic and low-income students in the same subject and subgroup for which the school did not make AYP. **Priority 2:** PCS will be offered to parents of all other low-academic and low-income students regardless of subject or subgroup. **Priority 3:** PCS will be offered to parents of all students.

Core Principle (CP)	Key Issues	Discussion	State Response
			Year 2: <u>Public School Choice</u> Same priorities as described above. <u>Supplemental Educational Services</u> **Priority 1:** SES will be offered to parents of low-income and low-academic students in the same subject and subgroup for which the school did not make AYP. **Priority 2:** SES will be offered to parents of all other low-income and low-academic students regardless of subject or subgroup. **Priority 3:** SES will be offered to parents of all students. **Year 3 and Beyond:** Sanctions as indicated under current NCLB statute will remain without change.
	4.4. Has the state proposed a technically and educationally sound process for using valid and reliable additional academic indicators (e.g., science assessments, academic improvement over time) to differentiate among identified schools or school divisions? Are these additional academic indicators applicable to all students within a grade span? *4.4.1. Has the state clearly listed all additional academic indicators that it will use to differentiate among schools?* *4.4.2. Are the indicators valid and reliable measures of academic achievement?*	▪ A state that does not propose using additional indicators should skip this item. ▪ If a state does use additional indicators, it needs to show its capacity to apply the additional indicators as valid measures for all students in tested grades. ▪ Note that school characteristics, such as students' demographic information, are not acceptable indicators, and confidence intervals may not be used as additional indicators.	The use of other academic indicators to determine which level of differentiation was not considered in the proposed model. In addition, the proposed model will not differentiate for schools that are identified in Year 3 (corrective action) and beyond (restructuring). These schools are under the same sanctions as required by the current statute. This ensures that the method of differentiation is not limited by the achievement of a particular student group. Schools missing AYP targets will continue to progress through school improvement, corrective action and restructuring. The proposed model does not allow schools to move between various categories within school improvement, corrective action, or restructuring. The difference in the proposed system of accountability is how students in Year 1 and Year 2 of improvement are identified as a priority for the division to provide supplemental educational services (SES) and/or public school choice (PSC).

Core Principle (CP)	Key Issues	Discussion	State Response
	4.4.3 Are the additional academic indicators applicable to all students within a particular grade span (elementary, middle, or high school)? *4.4.4. Has the state demonstrated that the additional academic indicators do not overly compensate for low achievement in reading/language arts and mathematics?* *4.4.5. Has the state demonstrated its capacity for entering, sorting, retrieving, and analyzing the large number of records on additional academic indicators that it would need to accumulate over time?* *4.4.6. Has the state provided evidence that it will publicly report on the additional academic indicators on an annual basis in a format consistent with the results of reading/language arts and mathematics assessments? What information will the state and its school divisions provide to schools, parents, and the public and in what format?*		
• ***CP 5:* Transitioning to a Differentiated Accountability Model**	***5.1. How does the differentiated accountability model consider the current status of a school***	▪ The proposal should include the number of schools that would be in each phase and category of	Virginia will not include schools previously identified for improvement in the proposed accountability system. Schools identified for school improvement

Core Principle (CP)	Key Issues	Discussion	State Response
A state's proposal includes an educationally sound method for transitioning services provided to students and interventions offered to schools between 2007-08 and 2008-09 or later school years.	***(e.g., how will a school transition from corrective action in 2007-08 to a new phase under the differentiated accountability model in 2008-09 without starting over in the intervention timeline)?*** *5.1.1. Has the state ensured that schools previously identified for improvement will continue to be identified, although the label and interventions may differ?* *5.1.2. Has the state included in its proposal a plan to transition to the proposed interventions offered to schools between 2007-08 and 2008-09 or later school years?*	improvement under the differentiated accountability model.	prior to 2008-2009 will continue in the current accountability model. The proposed differentiated model begins with those schools identified for school improvement for the first time in 2008-2009. This will ensure that schools currently in school improvement will not be required to transition to the new model. Phasing in the proposed accountability system beginning with schools identified for school improvement for the first time in 2008-2009 will ensure that students participating in public school choice (PSC) and supplemental educational services (SES) during the 2007-2008 school year will continue to have those options available to them.
	5.2. How will the state ensure students participating in public school choice (PSC) and supplemental educational services (SES) during the 2007-08 school year continue to have those options available to them during the transition, even if they would not be eligible under the state's proposed differentiated accountability model? *5.2.1. Does the state ensure that students participating in PSC and SES during the 2007-08 school year (and who would continue to be eligible under current practice) will continue to have those options available to them?*	▪ A state should include in its response a description of how long the transition period is expected to last for these purposes (at least for school year 2008-09), and explain the potential impact, if any, on students' participation in PSC and SES.	

Core Principle (CP)	Key Issues	Discussion	State Response
• ***CP 6:* Transparency of Differentiation and Interventions** *A state establishes a process for differentiation that is data-driven and understandable and accessible to the public.*	***6.1. How has the state ensured that the process for differentiation is data-driven and accessible to the public?*** *6.1.1. Has the state described a method for differentiation that is data-driven?* *6.1.2. Has the state described its plan to report results in a manner that parents and the public will easily understand?* *6.1.3. How does the state ensure that it will publicly report the status of identified schools and school divisions under the differentiated accountability model?*	▪ A state should include information regarding how it plans to report school status and student achievement results to the public, e.g., through a state report card.	The process for differentiation is based on the school's data from the Virginia SOL assessments in English and mathematics. The identification for improvement used in the current system will not change in the proposed accountability system. Measureable benchmarks required for making AYP based on Standards of Learning (SOL) assessments will be unchanged for both language arts and mathematics. Differentiation in the proposed model only refers to how divisions will prioritize students for supplemental educational services and/or public school choice based on the student's academic status in the subject(s) and subgroup(s) for which the school did not make AYP and the student's socio-economic status. Virginia's state school report card includes all the required data elements and is available to the public at the beginning of the academic year. Assessment results and other academic indicators (including graduation rates) are reported by student subgroups. All elements in the school report card are indicated in the current accountability workbook in section 1.5. In addition, Virginia is prepared to include the proposed differentiated accountability system information for parents in the report card as required before the beginning of school in 2008-2009. These results will be reported in a manner in which parents and the public will easily understand.
• ***CP 7:* Intervention Timeline** *A state's model establishes a comprehensive system of interventions which ensures that Title I schools and school divisions identified for improvement that continue to miss AYP progress though an intervention timeline with*	***7.1. Has the state established a comprehensive system of interventions and clearly described how the interventions relate to the academic achievement of the schools?*** *7.1.1. Has the state specified what interventions will take place in each phase and category of improvement?*	▪ In sum, a state needs to describe an intervention system that applies to all Title I schools, with increasing interventions over time, and, as applicable, addresses how differentiation will be phased in or focused on a subset of schools.	The interventions for each phase of improvement under the proposed differentiated accountability model are the same as what is used in the current system and as required by NCLB. The proposed model will allow schools in Years 1 and 2 of improvement to prioritize public school choice (PSC) and supplemental educational services (SES) to low-academic and low-income students who 1) belong to the subgroup(s) for which the school did not make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) and

Core Principle (CP)	Key Issues	Discussion	State Response
interventions increasing in intensity over time.	*7.1.2. How does the differentiated accountability model ensure that schools in which a particular student group repeatedly misses targets are not systemically placed in the category of schools with the least comprehensive interventions? Note: A state shall not systemically place schools that repeatedly miss targets in the students with disabilities or limited English proficient student group in the category of schools receiving the least comprehensive interventions.* *7.1.3. Has the state explained how the proposed interventions are related to the academic achievement of the schools in each category and phase of improvement?*		2) who failed the test in the subject(s) in which the school did not make AYP. As indicated in Core Principle 4, Virginia's proposed model ensures that all Title I schools identified for improvement that persist in missing AYP targets based on students' academic performance in reading/language arts and mathematics will progress through an intervention timeline with interventions increasing in intensity over time. As indicated in Core Principle 4, the following are the proposed interventions: **Year 1:** <u>Public School Choice</u> **Priority 1:** PCS will be offered to parents of low-academic and low-income students in the same subject and subgroup for which the school did not make AYP. **Priority 2:** PCS will be offered to parents of all other low-academic and low-income students regardless of subject or subgroup. **Priority 3:** PCS will be offered to parents of all students. **Year 2:** <u>Public School Choice</u> Same priorities as described above. <u>Supplemental Educational Services</u> **Priority 1:** SES will be offered to parents of low-income and low-academic students in the same subject and subgroup for which the school did not make AYP. **Priority 2:** SES will be offered to parents of all other low-income and low-academic students regardless of subject or subgroup.

Core Principle (CP)	Key Issues	Discussion	State Response
			Priority 3: SES will be offered to parents of all students. **Year 3 and Beyond:** Sanctions as indicated under current NCLB statute will remain without change.
	7.2. Has the state explained how its proposed differentiated accountability system of interventions aligns with and builds on current state interventions?		The proposed model allows the state's school improvement funds to be used in the lowest-performing schools and schools that continue to miss AYP benchmarks for certain subgroups. The lowest-performing schools are the schools in Year 3 and beyond of school improvement. State directed school support teams and stated directed improvement initiatives will be employed in these schools. This builds on Virginia's Statewide System of Support. State resources are provided to the lowest-performing schools that have remained low-performing schools for the greatest amount of time. If the school continues in school improvement, the state provides intensive support not only to the school, but to support the division in the restructuring process.
	7.3. How does the state's model ensure that Title I schools and school divisions identified for improvement that continue to miss AYP progress through an intervention timeline with interventions increasing in intensity over time? *7.3.1. Has the state provided a clear description of its proposed timeline for the application of interventions?* *7.3.2. Has the state clearly demonstrated that at least a subset of the lowest-performing schools not meeting annual measurable objectives in*		As indicated in Core Principle 4, Virginia's proposed model ensures that all Title I schools identified for improvement that persist in missing AYP targets based on students' academic performance in reading/language arts and mathematics will progress through an intervention timeline with interventions increasing in intensity over time. As indicated in Core Principle 4, the following are the proposed interventions: **Year 1:** <u>Public School Choice</u> **Priority 1:** PCS will be offered to parents of low-academic and low-income students in the same subject and subgroup for which the school did not make AYP.

Core Principle (CP)	Key Issues	Discussion	State Response
	reading/language arts or mathematics or the target for the other academic indicator for five years will be subject to the most substantive and comprehensive interventions? *7.3.3. Has the state explained how schools that do not increase achievement in reading/language arts or mathematics will progress through the intervention timeline?*		**Priority 2:** PCS will be offered to parents of all other low-academic and low-income students regardless of subject or subgroup. **Priority 3:** PCS will be offered to parents of all students. **Year 2:** <u>Public School Choice</u> Same priorities as described above. <u>Supplemental Educational Services</u> **Priority 1:** SES will be offered to parents of low-income and low-academic students in the same subject and subgroup for which the school did not make AYP. **Priority 2:** SES will be offered to parents of all other low-income and low-academic students regardless of subject or subgroup. **Priority 3:** SES will be offered to parents of all students. **Year 3 and Beyond:** Sanctions as indicated under current NCLB statute will remain without change.
	7.4. How will the state and its school divisions ensure that students in schools needing the most comprehensive interventions have access to teachers and principals with a demonstrated history of improving student achievement? How will the state and its school divisions target resources to improve teacher and principal effectiveness? *7.4.1. Has the state provided evidence that the state and its school divisions will ensure an equitable distribution of teachers*	▪ A state needs to describe its strategy for addressing teacher quality in schools that need the most extensive interventions, including addressing issues relating to the equitable distribution of effective teachers, professional development for teachers and principals (including use of data in decision-making), and possible use of performance incentives. USED is not expecting states to develop a definition of "effective teachers." ▪ A state's plan should include data regarding teacher quality for	**Teacher Quality** Virginia recognizes that teacher quality is an essential component of school improvement and supports providing students in struggling schools with highly qualified and effective teachers. Under the differentiated consequences pilot, school divisions would be expected to examine the equitable distribution of highly qualified teachers through the use of the annual Instructional Personnel and Licensure Report (IPAL), teacher experience surveys, as well as achievement data. The IPAL report provides detailed teacher quality information at the school and division level, including current endorsements, highly qualified status, and the reasons why teachers are or are not highly qualified. A summary of current teacher quality data in schools

Core Principle (CP)	Key Issues	Discussion	State Response
	with a demonstrated record of improving student academic achievement across the state and within divisions and schools, particularly those schools needing the most comprehensive interventions? *7.4.2. Does the state or its school divisions plan to improve performance-based incentives to ensure that schools needing the most comprehensive interventions have access to teachers with a demonstrated history of improving academic achievement? If so, has the state clearly described its plan and the steps the state has taken to implement the plan?* *7.4.3. How does the state's model target resources to improve teacher and principal effectiveness?* *7.4.4. Has the state included a plan to ensure that teachers and principals are trained in data-driven decision-making and using scientifically-based research to improve instruction?* *7.4.5. Has the state explained how it plans to improve professional development or teacher training to ensure that schools*	schools in each phase and category of improvement.	identified for improvement during 2006-2007 is provided below. ***Table 1*** **Average Highly Qualified Teacher (HQT) Percentages 2006-2007** Table 1 compares the average HQT percentages in Title I schools versus non-Title I schools based on improvement status. Title I schools have a higher average HQT percentage compared to all non-Title I schools and non-Title I schools not in improvement. Efforts will be focused on strategies to improve the highly qualified teacher status in Title I schools identified for improvement to ensure that these students receive instruction from highly qualified and effective teachers. Additionally, teacher quality data from Title I schools in improvement during 2006-2007 indicate the following: • Out of 117 non-highly qualified teachers reported: o 23 were in the area of special education (20 percent)

	Number of Schools	Average HQT Percentage
All Title I Schools	714	97.41
All Non-Title I schools	1130	97.00
Title I Schools Not in Improvement	645	97.68
Non-Title I Schools Not in Improvement	922	97.22
Title I Schools in Years 1 or 2 Improvement	43	95.26

Core Principle (CP)	Key Issues	Discussion	State Response
	needing the most comprehensive interventions have access to teachers with a demonstrated history of improving student achievement?		o 43 were in grades K-3 (37 percent) o 25 were in grades 4-7 (21 percent) o 9 were in the areas of Reading Specialist, Remedial Reading, or English (8 percent) o 5 were in the areas of middle school mathematics or algebra (4 percent) o 12 were in other areas - physical science, art, music, or history (10 percent) Among efforts that would be employed to address issues indicated from the above data and ensure the equitable distribution of highly qualified and highly effective teachers under the differentiated consequences pilot proposal are: • *Title II, Part A, Federal Program Monitoring.* The equitable distribution of highly qualified teachers is examined during Title II, Part A federal program monitoring. Divisions identify strategies being employed to address equitable distribution and are provided with technical assistance in developing additional strategies. Divisions with schools entering improvement status for the first time in 2008-2009 would receive priority for this monitoring and assistance. • *Highly Qualified Teacher Scholarship Funds*. These are funds that have been allocated to teachers in the highest poverty schools to assist them in activities to become highly qualified. Non-highly qualified teachers teaching in schools entering improvement status would be targeted to receive priority for these funds in 2008-2009. • *Virginia Middle School Mathematics Teacher Corps.* This program provides a salary differential (up to $10,000) and specialized training to teachers with a proven record for improving student achievement to

Core Principle (CP)	Key Issues	Discussion	State Response
			transfer or remain in a struggling school to provide coaching to other staff members and to work directly with students to improve student achievement. This program also encourages the development of leadership teams to attend training programs to facilitate meaningful school reform in the area of mathematics at the middle school level. • *Become One Campaign*. http://www.teachvirginia.org/becomeone This program offers several opportunities for aspiring and current special educators to receive financial incentives and support. Examples include the Commonwealth Special Education Endorsement Program (CSEEP) and Metro READY: University-Community Partnerships to Prepare and Support Early Intervention and Early Childhood Special Educators in Urban Inclusive Settings. The goals are to increase the pool of qualified special education teachers and to offer additional opportunities for increased content coursework. • *Tuition Assistance for Special Educators*. This program offers up to $1,500 per teacher per year for necessary coursework to satisfy endorsement or competency requirements. • *Teach Virginia*. Virginia provides support to school divisions with their recruitment efforts through this program, particularly in hard-to-fill areas. • *National Board Certification Assistance*. These funds have been prioritized to teachers in hard-to-staff schools. Funding could be prioritized to assist teachers in schools entering school improvement status as well. • *Hard-to-Staff Mentoring Funds*. In addition to base appropriations provided by the Virginia General Assembly, these funds provide additional support to schools

Core Principle (CP)	Key Issues	Discussion	State Response
			identified as hard-to-staff to enhance new teacher mentoring and induction programs to improve teacher retention efforts. • *Revised Licensure Regulations*. The Virginia Board of Education has adopted revised teacher licensure regulations in which the following career ladder designations have been added for inclusion on teaching licenses: Career Teacher; Teacher as Mentor; and Teacher as Leader. Many divisions are offering differentiated pay to teachers who earn these designations. • *Signing Bonuses*. Divisions are supported in their use of signing bonuses to attract highly qualified and highly effective teachers in hard-to-fill positions, particularly in struggling schools. • *Use of Available Funding*. Technical assistance is provided to divisions to assist in the targeting of available funds for specific interventions (i.e., increasing the number of highly qualified teachers through improved recruitment efforts; developing or implementing performance pay initiatives, such as the Hard-to-Staff Teacher Incentive program; signing bonuses; improved mentoring; and/or targeted professional development to improve content knowledge or instructional effectiveness.) **Improving Instructional Effectiveness with Targeted Student Populations** Virginia recognizes that, in addition to the provision of highly qualified teachers, strategic professional development programs are critical to assuring success and to build content knowledge and improve instructional delivery. Toward that end, student achievement data, disaggregated by subgroup performance, is analyzed. Based on those results and depending on the particular needs identified for

Core Principle (CP)	Key Issues	Discussion	State Response

			specific schools entering improvement status, priority participation in the following activities would be ensured:
			• *Coursework for Teachers of Limited English Proficient (LEP) Students.* Through a partnership with George Mason University, teachers are offered these specialized courses on working with LEP students in the areas of reading and writing.
			• *Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) Training*. In conjunction with the Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL), this course provides school teams, including administrators and teacher coaches, with critical research-based strategies to assist English Language Learners.
			• *Parents as Educational Partners (PEP).* This training program assists ESL educators in increasing parental involvement, developing an ESL family literacy curriculum, assessing student progress, and improving instructional strategies.
			• *Regional Assistance Centers*:
			  o Technical Training and Assistance Centers (T/TAC). These regional service centers provide specialized assistance in the area of special education to schools and divisions throughout the Commonwealth.
			  o NCLB Regional Assistance Center. This center provides professional development and individualized assistance to divisions and schools in the areas of school improvement and data analysis to improve instruction.
			• *Response to Intervention* – This program offers specialized training in the areas of reading and mathematics to provide early interventions to at-risk students.

Core Principle (CP)	Key Issues	Discussion	State Response
			• *Reading First*. This program provides training in the area of reading instruction. Reading First coaches provide job-embedded support to teachers to deliver high quality, research-based instruction. Specialized training is also offered to special education teachers. • *Summer Content Teaching Academies*. These summer academies offer in-depth content coursework to teachers. Specialized content courses are also tailored to special education teachers, ESL teachers, and instructional leaders. • *School Support Teams* – These teams assist teachers in the areas of data analysis, remediation, and instructional delivery for schools in improvement. **Support for Instructional Leaders** Virginia recognizes that a critical component of an effective school is a highly trained instructional leader. Several programs have been developed to assist school leaders. Priority would be given to principals and division leaders from schools entering improvement status: • *Special Education Leadership Academies*. This program provides a year-long series of professional development activities for aspiring division-level special education leaders. • *PASS Coaches*. These leadership coaches provide embedded professional development and mentoring to school leaders in schools entering improvement status. Particular emphasis is on data-driven decision making and implementation of effective school improvement strategies. • *Administrative Content Teaching Academies.* A specialized course is provided during the Summer Content Teaching Academies for

Core Principle (CP)	Key Issues	Discussion	State Response
			instructional leaders. In addition to the administrative course, leaders are encouraged to participate in the teacher academies as well. • *Literacy Leadership Team Training*. This initiative provides ongoing training to school leadership teams to improve instruction in the area of English/Reading. • *School Leadership Grants*. These grants are offered on a competitive basis annually by the General Assembly to improve instructional leadership. Consideration could be given to provide priority funding to schools or divisions in improvement. • *E-Conferences*. The Virginia Department of Education offers a series of targeted online technical assistance and professional development modules to struggling schools to assist with school improvement efforts. • *Vision to Practice Academy* – This professional development activity provides instructional leaders with critical content in focused areas of school improvement.
• ***<u>CP 8:</u> Types of Interventions*** *A state's differentiated accountability model includes interventions that are educationally sound and designed to promote meaningful reform in schools.*	***8.1. Has the state proposed interventions that are educationally sound and designed to promote meaningful reform in schools?*** *8.1.1. Has the state provided a rationale for each proposed intervention?* *8.1.2. How does the research or other evidence of effectiveness support the interventions proposed for the lowest-performing schools (in terms of students' academic achievement)?*	▪ In responding, the state should provide data which shows the effectiveness of proposed interventions on student achievement for students in similar schools. ▪ A state may use existing research that has proven the effectiveness of a particular intervention or set of interventions.	The rationale for the proposed model is to ensure that priority is given to the neediest students as defined by socio-economic status and academic need. The proposed model requires the same sanctions as the current model but provides priority to these students. The NCLB statute treats all schools that fail to make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) equally, regardless of whether such failure is based on one subgroup failing to make AYP in one subject, or all subgroups failing to make AYP in both reading/language arts and mathematics. Currently, all students in a Title I school in school improvement status are eligible for school choice with priority given to academic need. In addition, all low-income students in a school that is in the second year of school improvement or beyond are eligible to receive supplemental educational services, regardless of their performance on the

Core Principle (CP)	Key Issues	Discussion	State Response
			Standards of Learning (SOL) assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics. Using federal funds to provide school choice for all students impacts the level of assistance available to serve students in the school that are not meeting the proficiency targets on the SOL assessments. Additionally, school divisions have reported that the majority of students who choose the choice option are not from low-income families nor are they students who are struggling academically. This data supports the proposed model. Similarly, using federal funds to provide tutoring services to all low-income students in a school reduces funds available to serve subgroups and individual students that are not meeting the proficiency targets on the SOL assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics. Since NCLB focuses on ensuring that one hundred (100) percent of Virginia's students are proficient in reading/language arts and mathematics by 2013-2014, the proposed differentiated accountability model targets available resources to those students who are not proficient. Since the proposed model does not change the order of the sanctions nor the sanction as indicated in the current accountability plan, the proposed model, with only changes to which students will be targeted for public school choice and supplemental educational services, will be easily implemented for schools entering school improvement for the first time in 2008-2009. As stated in Core Principle 7, the proposed model allows the state's school improvement funds to be used in the lowest-performing schools and, although not low-performing for all students, schools that continue to miss AYP benchmarks for certain subgroups. The lowest-performing schools are the schools in Year 3 and beyond of school improvement.

Core Principle (CP)	Key Issues	Discussion	State Response
			State directed school support teams and state directed improvement initiatives will continue to be employed in these schools. The proposed model is similar in scope and capacity to the current statewide system of support. Schools in school improvement receive support from a school support team. This team is both state and locally directed. Locally directed teams are teams with membership comprised of division staff, division staff from other high-performing schools and divisions, and, if needed, consultants paid for with state improvement funds. Division staff are trained with state school improvement resources. School support teams for schools in Years 1 and 2 of school improvement will be locally directed, diverting funds for more intensive state directed teams for schools in Year 3 and beyond of school improvement. An overview of what takes place in Year 1 of school improvement follows. For those schools in Year 1 of school improvement, the school support team completes the on-site review to identify and analyze instructional and organizational factors affecting student achievement. The focus of the review process is on the systems, processes, and practices that are being implemented at the school and division levels. The school support team consists of Department of Education staff and/or independent contractors and division staff trained in the academic review process. The school support team assists the school in writing or modifying the school improvement plan based on the final report of findings. Concurrent with developing a school improvement plan, priority assistance is prescribed by the academic review team and approved by the Department of Education for immediate delivery. Based on research regarding school improvement, the school support team reviews the following areas:

Core Principle (CP)	Key Issues	Discussion	State Response
			▪ Implementation of curriculum aligned with the Standards of Learning ▪ Use of time and scheduling practices that maximize instruction ▪ Use of data to make instructional and planning decisions ▪ Design of ongoing, school-based program of professional development ▪ Implementation of a school improvement plan addressing identified areas of weakness ▪ Implementation of research-based instructional interventions for schools warned in English or mathematics ▪ Organizational systems and processes o Use of school improvement planning process that includes data analysis and input of faculty, parents, and community o School culture, including engagement of parents and the community o Use of learning environments that foster student achievement o Allocation of resources aligned to areas of need These areas of review provide a framework for the school-level academic review process. Within each of these areas, indicators reflecting effective practices have been identified for review. These areas of review are based on state and federal regulations, and research-based practices found to be effective in improving student achievement. The school support team collects and analyzes data that demonstrate the school's status in implementing these practices. Based on their findings, the team provides the school and the division with information that can be used to develop or revise, and implement the school's improvement plan as required by NCLB. The school support team provides quarterly follow-up at divisions throughout the year.

Core Principle (CP)	Key Issues	Discussion	State Response
			For those schools entering Year 2 of school improvement, the school support team reviews the current plan and provides technical assistance to the school to update the school improvement plan based on new accountability data. The school support team consists of Department of Education staff and/or independent contractors, and division staff trained in developing, implementing, and monitoring the school improvement plan. The school support team provides focused technical assistance and monitors the school improvement plan throughout the year as prescribed by the level of assistance assigned. The school support team quarterly provides follow-up at divisions throughout the year. For those schools entering Years 3 and 4 of school improvement, a state directed team is employed to assist the school in monitoring and implementing a school improvement plan. Experts in the area of need are provided to the school. The school improvement funding is monitored for compliance not only with NCLB mandates, but also to ensure that the school improvement plan is implemented with fidelity using all resources available. Schools in Years 3 and 4 of Title I School Improvement may enter the Partnership for Achieving Successful Schools (PASS) and receive targeted assistance from a coach with experience in working with high-poverty schools or are followed by an auditor employed by the Virginia Department of Education (VDOE). Reading/language arts and mathematics are the areas targeted for improvement. The level of assistance provided to each Year 4 school is reached through an agreement with the division and the Virginia Department of Education. The coach or auditor meets monthly with the school and division instructional leadership. Year 5 schools receive a Virginia Department of Education contracted auditor to monitor the

Core Principle (CP)	Key Issues	Discussion	State Response
			alternative governance or the otherwise "new management" structure in the building. Auditors advise the Department's Office of School Improvement on the progress the school is making in improving instruction through the new structure. Schools in Year 5 of Title I School Improvement may receive technical assistance via a division-wide intervention that is monitored by an auditor and staff from the Office of School Improvement. In some cases, when the division has a number of schools in school improvement, a chief academic officer is employed by the Virginia Department of Education as an academic coach/auditor for the entire instructional program of the division with the authority to manage federal funds as well as instructional initiatives supported with such funds. This team meets with the schools and division staff monthly to analyze data and to support the division in modifying the schools' improvement plans. Schools in Year 5 may also be directed through a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the Virginia Department of Education and the division's school board, or governing body. In the MOU, school divisions are asked to adhere to certain academic improvement benchmarks set forth by the state. Included in the MOU, for example, may also be professional development, teacher quality and staffing, technology, and student drop-out requirements. Consequences for a failure to attain benchmarks are also set forth the in the Memorandum of Understanding. School divisions are required to report progress on attaining the benchmark requirements to the Virginia Board of Education's Accountability Committee. Academic coaches, auditors, and chief academic officers are responsible for providing leadership, curriculum, and instructional technical assistance to

Core Principle (CP)	Key Issues	Discussion	State Response
			school staff. School support team members, coaches, auditors, and chief academic officers must be able to: • Assist building level principals in focusing on crucial aspects of instruction throughout the year; • Assist with identifying strategies for maximizing use of instructional time; • Assist with implementating and monitoring the school improvement plan; • Analyze assessment data for the purpose of modifying instruction and developing remediation plans; • Assist in planning staff development strategies based on needs identified in the school improvement plan; and, • Provide job-embedded professional development for principals consistent with the division's professional development plan;
	8.2. How will the state align its resources to increase state and local capacity to ensure substantive and comprehensive support for consistently underperforming schools including plans to leverage school improvement funds received under section 1003(g) of the ESEA, and Title II funds to provide targeted intervention, particularly to those schools subject to the most intensive interventions?	▪ This is an opportunity for a state to better target school improvement funds and to seek greater flexibility in how these funds are used.	In the proposed model, employing division staff and division staff from high performing schools and divisions allows Virginia to leverage school improvement funds received under section 1003(g) of the ESEA to provide targeted intervention, particularly to those schools requiring the most intensive interventions through more targeted assistance by state directed teams that provide follow-up to divisions monthly. By training division staff to monitor the interventions, Virginia will build the capacity of its school divisions to put in place successful interventions for low-performing schools. In addition, Virginia will build state-level capacity to move more state directed resources to the lowest-performing schools.

Core Principle (CP)	Key Issues	Discussion	State Response
	8.2.1. Does the state explain how the proposed plan will leverage school improvement funds received under section 1003(g) of the ESEA to provide targeted interventions, particularly to those schools requiring the most intensive interventions? To the extent practicable, has the state explained how it will use section 1003(a) of the ESEA to provide targeted intervention? *8.2.2. Does the state use or propose to use the transferability provision (section 6123 of the ESEA) to better target resources?* *8.2.3. How does the state plan to use or improve its statewide system of support?* *8.2.4. How does the state plan to strengthen its own capacity, as well as the capacity of its school divisions, to work with low-performing schools?*		
• ***<u>CP 9:</u> Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services*** *A state establishes clear eligibility criteria for public school choice (PSC) and supplemental educational services (SES) and an*	***9.1. Has the state established clear eligibility criteria for PSC and SES?*** *9.1.1. Has the state clearly articulated the student eligibility criteria for PSC and SES that would apply for each phase and category if different from*	▪ In responding, a state should address how PSC/SES opportunities will be available in K-2, as well as other schools.	Public school choice and supplemental educational services will be implemented according to the description below for the cohort of Title I schools that enter School Improvement for the first time in the 2008-2009 school year. In Year 1 and Year 2 school improvement schools, the priorities for public school choice and supplemental services in Virginia's proposal are as

Core Principle (CP)	Key Issues	Discussion	State Response
educationally sound model that is designed to result in an increased number of students participating in PSC and SES at the state level.	*the requirements in the ESEA?* *9.1.2. How will the state, at a minimum, offer PSC and SES to all low-income, non-proficient students?*		indicated below. Public School Choice • **Priority 1:** Virginia will target public school choice for Title I schools in School Improvement to the students, ranked by low-academic and low-income, in the same subject(s) and subgroup(s) for which the school did not make AYP. • **Priority 2:** Public school choice will be offered to parents of all other low-academic and low-income students regardless of subject or subgroup. • **Priority 3:** Public school choice will be offered to all other students. Supplemental Educational Services • **Priority 1:** Virginia will target supplemental educational services for Title I schools in School Improvement to the students, ranked by low-income and low-academic, in the same subject(s) and subgroup(s) for which the school did not make AYP. • **Priority 2:** Supplemental educational services will be offered to parents of all other low-income and low-academic students regardless of subject or subgroup. • **Priority 3:** Supplemental educational services will be offered to all other students. In Year 3 and beyond school improvement schools, sanctions as indicated under current No Child Left Behind (NCLB) statute will remain without change. A focus on choice and SES to students and subgroups prioritized as indicated above has the potential to increase the number of students who are served through public school choice and supplemental educational services, as this group has traditionally been underserved according to data. Divisions will be

Core Principle (CP)	Key Issues	Discussion	State Response
			forced to seek out students in the first two priorities before opening up to all parents for all students.
	9.2. Has the state established an educationally sound plan to increase the number of students participating, in the aggregate, in PSC and SES at the state level (even if the number of students eligible for these options decreases)? *9.2.1. Has the state provided the statewide number and percentage of eligible students participating in PSC and SES and the steps the state plans to take to improve participation?* *9.2.2. Has the state provided a plan to increase the awareness of PSC and SES options to parents of eligible students?* *9.2.3. Has the state described plans to improve the delivery of PSC and SES?*	▪ Using prior year data as necessary, a state should provide information on the number of students eligible for PSC and SES under the differentiated accountability model. ▪ If possible, using previous year data, a state should project how the new differentiated accountability model will increase the absolute numbers of students participating in PSC and SES. ▪ In sum, a state should describe its plan to work with divisions to enhance PSC and SES programs, enhance the visibility and accessibility of the programs, and monitor participation, including plans to tackle impediments to participation.	A focus on choice and SES to students and subgroups prioritized as indicated above has the potential to increase the number of students who are served through public school choice and supplemental educational services, as this group has traditionally been underserved according to data. Divisions will be forced to seek out students in the first two priorities before opening up to all parents for all students. The state collects Title I school improvement data related to PSC and SES through the School Improvement Implementation Survey (SIIS). In 2006-2007, 785 students in 19 school divisions participated in public school choice, representing three (3) percent of students eligible for PSC. In the same year, 3,030 students in 22 school divisions participated in SES, representing 18 percent of students eligible for SES. Virginia has participated in the USED SES/PSC reversal pilot program for the last three Years (2005-2006, 2006-2007, and 2007-2008). Participation in the pilot is intended to increase the rate of SES participation for eligible students. The state conducts an annual evaluation of SES providers that includes the results of a descriptive and an evaluative study. The descriptive study measures the perceptions of SES stakeholders (parents, division coordinators, and providers). The evaluative study measures the impact of SES services on student achievement through analyses of Standards of Learning (SOL) data. The evaluation has become more comprehensive as multiple-year test data becomes available for students participating in SES. The state is considering SES studies, to be conducted in addition to the annual SES evaluation that would control for a number of variables such as gender, race, and other factors that may influence the effect of SES on student achievement.

Core Principle (CP)	Key Issues	Discussion	State Response
			The state provides ongoing PSC and SES technical assistance to school divisions to ensure understanding of the requirements, share effective practices, and share ways to improve participation rates for both sanctions. Technical assistance opportunities include the following: • *New Coordinators' Academy* designed to train new school division coordinators of federal programs; • *Audio Workshop for School Divisions with Title I Schools on the "Watch" List* designed to prepare school divisions to offer public school choice for the first time; • *SES Fall Meeting* designed to inform school division administrators and SES providers about regulations for SES and share effective practices and strategies; and • *WebEx trainings* on requirements and effective practices for PSC and SES. In addition, the state provides a number of online resources for school divisions and parents to ensure timely notification of PSC and SES options. The state Web site contains several federal PSC publications: • *Creating Strong Division School Choice Programs*; • *Help Parents Make Informed Choices* (which includes a sample of choice letters to parents); and • *Virtual Schools as a Public School Choice*. The site also provides links to the USED Non-regulatory Guidance for PSC and SES. During the state's Federal Program Monitoring, conducted by Title I staff, all provisions of PSC and SES are reviewed for consistency with federal regulations. Parents are interviewed during site visits to ensure they are knowledgeable about PSC and SES options.

Core Principle (CP)	Key Issues	Discussion	State Response
			The state will continue to provide ongoing technical assistance on PSC and SES to school divisions as needed.
• ***CP 10:* Significant and Comprehensive Interventions for Consistently Lowest-Performing Schools** *A state's model establishes an educationally sound timeline for the lowest-performing schools to receive the most substantive and comprehensive interventions.*	***10.1. How does the state ensure that interventions for the lowest-performing schools are the most comprehensive?*** *10.1.1. Has the state clearly described the substantive and comprehensive interventions for the consistently lowest-performing schools (in terms of students' academic achievement)?* *10.1.2. How has the state demonstrated that these interventions would be at least as substantive and comprehensive as the first four options listed in section 1116(b)(8)(B) (reopening the school as a public charter school, replacing all or most of the school staff, entering into a contract with an entity to operate the public school, and turning the operation of the school over to the State educational agency) or other options that are demonstrated to be as rigorous as these four options (e.g., closing the school or transferring authority of the school or school division to the mayor)?*	▪ In responding to this item, a state should present research or evidence to support proposed interventions for the lowest-performing schools and address impediments to "restructuring" options (e.g., authority, limits applicable to authorizing charter schools, replacing staff, school take-over). ▪ A state also should provide a data analysis regarding how schools subject to restructuring implementation in 2007-08 would be affected under the new model.	Schools that are among the lowest-performing are assigned a school support team (SST), an academic coach, or an auditor. School support teams are formed and assigned based on student data that reveal the academic challenges a school is experiencing. For schools in Year 3 and beyond of school improvement, technical assistance is provided to school and division staff in the areas of leadership, developing curriculum, and instructional delivery to school and division staff by Department staff and Department contracted staff. Contracted building level coaches and auditors: • Assist building level principals in focusing on crucial aspects of instruction throughout the year; • Assist with identifying strategies for maximizing use of instructional time; • Assist with implementating and monitoring the school improvement plan; • Analyze assessment data for the purpose of modifying instruction and developing remediation plans; • Assist in planning staff development strategies based on needs identified in the school improvement plan; and, • Provide job-embedded professional development for principals consistent with the division's professional development plan; In addition to providing the restructuring option to the lowest-performing schools as the major technical assistance intervention, the Virginia Department of Education provides specialized services to these schools. Measures are both preventative and corrective. Following are examples of such services.

Core Principle (CP)	Key Issues	Discussion	State Response
	10.1.3. What steps have the state and its school divisions taken to ensure that the four options listed in section 1116(b)(8)(B) are readily available to schools? *10.1.4. Has the state provided a rationale for the substantive and comprehensive interventions it proposes to implement in the lowest-performing schools?* *10.1.5. Has the state provided a justification and data for the number of schools in restructuring implementation for 2007-08 that would be subject to the most substantive and comprehensive interventions under its differentiated accountability model?*		• The Virginia Department of Education partners with the Center on Innovation and Improvement (CII) to provide services to low-performing schools. Current technical assistance projects include *Restructuring* and *Statewide Systems of Support*. • The Virginia Department of Education partners with the Appalachia Regional Comprehensive Center and the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) to train division, contractors, and SEA support team members in leadership modules: *Building Rigor, Root Cause Analysis, Assessment, Change, Creating a High-Performance Learning Culture*; *Building and Leading Effective Teams; Providing Focused and Sustained Professional Development;* and *Building and Maintaining a Focused Drive Toward Student Achievement.* • Marilyn Friend's "Collaborating for Student Success" institute was sponsored by the collaborative efforts of the Virginia Department of Education's Office of School Improvement, Office of Special Education Instructional Services, Virginia's Training and Technical Assistance Centers, Virginia Association of Secondary School Principals, and the Virginia Foundation for Educational Leadership. This institute was implemented in each education region and provided a framework for inclusion practices that support increased performance for students with disabilities. • WebEx discussions are provided monthly to small groups of division and school leaders. These discussions are planned and implemented by the Office of School Improvement based on analysis of monthly reports.

Core Principle (CP)	Key Issues	Discussion	State Response
			The additional technical assistance provided by the Virginia Department of Education to schools in Year 5 of Title I School Improvement is more intensive than the NCLB requirements. Below is a description of the progressive state-directed interventions beginning with Year 3 schools. For those schools entering Years 3 and 4 of school improvement, a state directed team is employed to assist the school in monitoring and implementing a school improvement plan. Experts in the area of need are provided to the school. The school improvement funding is monitored for compliance not only with NCLB mandates but also to ensure that the school improvement plan is implemented with fidelity using all resources available. Schools in Years 3 and 4 of Title I School Improvement may enter the Partnership for Achieving Successful Schools (PASS) and receive targeted assistance from a coach with experience in working with high-poverty schools or are followed by an auditor employed by VDOE. Reading/language arts and mathematics are the areas targeted for improvement. Although provided as an option, in the PASS model, schools are not released until they have met AYP for two consecutive years. The level of assistance provided to each Year 4 school is reached through an agreement with the division and the Virginia Department of Education. The coach or auditor meets with the school and division instructional leadership at least monthly. In the PASS model, for example, the coach meets with the school's leadership twice per month. Year 5 schools receive a Virginia Department of Education contracted auditor to monitor the alternative governance or the otherwise "new management" structure in the building. Auditors advise the Office of School Improvement on the

Core Principle (CP)	Key Issues	Discussion	State Response
			progress the school is making in improving instruction through the new structure. Schools in Year 5 of Title I School Improvement may receive technical assistance via a division-wide intervention that is monitored by an auditor and staff from the Office of School Improvement. In some cases, when the division has a number of schools in school improvement, a chief academic officer is employed by the Virginia Department of Education as an academic coach/auditor for the entire instructional program of the division with the authority to manage federal funds as well as instructional initiatives supported with such funds. This team meets with the school and division staff at least monthly to analyze data and to support the divisions in modifying the schools' improvement plans. Schools in Year 5 may also be directed through a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the Virginia Department of Education and the division's school board, or governing body. In the MOU, school divisions are asked to adhere to certain academic improvement benchmarks set forth by the state. Included in the MOU, for example, may also be professional development, teacher quality and staffing, technology, and student drop-out requirements. Consequences for a failure to attain benchmarks are also set in the Memorandum of Understanding. School divisions are required to report progress on attaining the benchmark requirements to the Virginia Board of Education's Accountability Committee. The communication regarding the implementation of Year 5 NCLB sanction requirements are under the rigorous oversight of the Virginia Department of Education's Office of School Improvement and Office of Program Administration and Accountability.

Core Principle (CP)	Key Issues	Discussion	State Response
			In addition to distributing communication regarding implementation, the department monitors the implementation of Year 5 requirements through detailed monthly reports from coaches, auditors, and chief academic officers and provides an analysis of findings to the Virginia Board of Education's School and Division Accountability Committee. Through its federal monitoring process, all school divisions receive information on the requirements via a convenient certification document. Although Virginia's legislature does provide for the establishment of charter schools, and information has been disseminated via a charter school committee established by the General Assembly and managed by the Virginia Department of Education, this sanction as an NCLB option has not been selected by any Virginia school. Likewise, there are no impediments to school divisions replacing all or most of a school staff. This is a local decision in which the state has no authority. School divisions follow local board guidelines. In addition, school divisions have the authority to turn over the operation of a school to a private company without consultation with state. The *Code of Virginia* established by the Virginia General Assembly does not permit the state to take over a school division. This information has been disseminated to schools and school divisions since the inception of No Child Left Behind. Virginia's comprehensive approach to interventions for the lowest-performing schools is embodied in its Statewide System of Support, which can be accessed from the Virginia Department of Education's Web site at http://www.doe.virginia.gov VDOE/nclb/statewidesupportcomp.pdf

Core Principle (CP)	Key Issues	Discussion	State Response
			Additionally, since NCLB focuses on ensuring that 100 percent of Virginia's students are proficient in reading/language arts and mathematics by 2013-2014, the proposed public school choice and supplemental educational services delivery models will ensure that all available resources are targeted toward those students who are not proficient. Using financial resources for students who are proficient in reading/language arts and mathematics limits the resources that could be used for students who are not proficient. Research on substantially improving schools supports the targeted use of funds.
	10.2. Has the state established an educationally sound timeline for schools to enter and exit the most comprehensive interventions? *10.2.1. Has the state ensured that the timeline for interventions would be at least as rigorous as outlined in NCLB (i.e., after five years of missing annual achievement targets)?* *10.2.2. Has the state sufficiently described how a school exits the category receiving the most comprehensive interventions?* *10.2.3. If the state proposes to take substantive and comprehensive interventions (such as those listed in the statute for schools in the restructuring phase) for the lowest-performing schools earlier in the*		Virginia's differentiation accountability plan will be applied to Title I schools entering Year 1 of Title I School Improvement for the 2008-2009 School Year based on 2007-2008 assessments. These schools will advance through and exit School Improvement according to the timeline set forth in the NCLB statute, but with differentiated sanctions applied at the appropriate intervals. Schools currently in School Improvement will follow the established NCLB timeline. School divisions that elect to create (constitute) a new school as a result of a particular school's continued failure to make Adequate Yearly Progress must follow the Virginia Board of Education's guidelines for establishing a new school. It should be noted that the creation of a new school in Virginia does not automatically result in a change of AYP status. This ensures that the spirit of NCLB with regard to the need to improve the education of low-performing students is not masked by a different building or a different school number with the same teachers and instructional leaders.

Core Principle (CP)	Key Issues	Discussion	State Response
	improvement timeline (i.e., earlier than after five years of missing annual achievement targets), does the state clearly describe that timeline?		
	10.3. Has the state proposed to limit the number of schools that receive the most substantive and comprehensive interventions? If so, has the state provided an educationally sound justification or rationale for this capacity cap? *10.3.1. Has the state proposed to implement the capacity cap at the state or school division level?* *10.3.2. Has the state justified any limits on its capacity, and the capacity of its divisions, to implement the most substantive and comprehensive interventions?* *10.3.3. Has the state described how it will implement interventions and its timeline for doing so in schools that are outside that capacity cap?*	▪ In sum, a state needs to provide a justification for targeting (or "capping") schools for the most extensive interventions, at both the state and division levels. ▪ The state also should address how its capacity, as well as that of the division, will be strengthened and evaluated.	Virginia does not anticipate a need to limit the number of schools that receive the most substantive and comprehensive interventions or impose a "capacity cap."
	10.4. How has the state worked with its school divisions to ensure that school divisions are implementing interventions for the lowest-performing schools? *10.4.1. Has the state described plans to increase the capacity of its divisions to implement interventions in*		Ensuring that school divisions are implementing interventions for the lowest-performing schools is a function of both the federal compliance office at the Virginia Department of Education (Program Administration and Accountability) and the Office of School Improvement. Through the compliance office, regular federal program monitoring occurs as well as frequent

Core Principle (CP)	Key Issues	Discussion	State Response
	lowest-performing schools?		technical assistance workshops both live and electronic. The federal program monitoring technical assistance document can be found on the Virginia Department of Education's Web site at http://www.doe.virginia.gov/VDOE/Instruction/title1/FederalProgramMonitoring.pdf The sole responsibility of the Office of School Improvement at the Virginia Department of Education is to provide technical assistance for the lowest-performing schools in the state and to assist school divisions to provide technical assistance to their schools that are not achieving the state's high standards. The Virginia Department of Education considers the two charges as one. Trainings and other provisions of technical assistance by the state to school divisions are considered models for the provision of technical assistance by school divisions to their schools. The relationship between the state and the school division is symbiotic—a "partnership." Virginia submits the complete Section 10 of this application as a response to this 10.4.

Additional Questions. Key Issues	State Response
• **Differentiation Data Analysis.** A state will be expected to provide data analyses to support the proposed model of differentiation. A state should view the following questions as a checklist of possible evidence. If the evidence was not embedded as part of the response to core principles above, the state should consider adding it here or referencing attachments that include the data, as appropriate in supporting the proposal. ▪ *Has the state provided the data analyses that were used in developing the state's proposed method of differentiation?* ▪ *Has the state provided evidence, including any available statistical modeling, to support the rationale for the proposed method of differentiation? Has the state provided any available evidence to provide a justification for the method and need for differentiated accountability?* ▪ *Has the state provided the total number of schools that would be in each phase and category of improvement, using prior year data as necessary, under the differentiated accountability model?*	Virginia analyzed the performance of each subgroup and each subject area for every Title I school in improvement status for the 2007-2008 school year. Within the analysis, the percentage difference from the AYP target for each subject group and each subject area was considered. Attachment A depicts the analysis. It is estimated that 30 to 40 schools will implement the proposed model during the 2008-2009 school year. This number is based on the number of Title I schools that may enter Year 1 of Title I school improvement status for the 2008-2009 school year. The total number of schools in the state for the 2007-2008 school year is 1,823. AYP determinations have been made for each of these schools. One thousand three hundred fifty-three, or 74 percent, made AYP and 470 or 26 percent did not make AYP. The link to the school report card with the above information is provided below. http://www.doe.virginia.gov/VDOE/src/ayp.shtml The number of students eligible for PSC for the 2006-2007 school year was 29,409. Of those 752 applied to transfer to another school and 666 transferred to another school. The number of

Core Principle (CP)	Key Issues	Discussion	State Response
	▪ *Has the state provided an analysis, using prior year data as necessary, on the overall academic achievement of schools in each phase and category of improvement?* ▪ *Has the state provided an analysis, using prior year data as necessary, on the academic achievement of schools in each phase and category of improvement disaggregated by the following: student groups (major racial/ethnic groups, students with disabilities, limited English proficient, and economically disadvantaged); urban versus suburban versus rural schools; and large versus small schools?* ▪ *Has the state provided evidence, including any statistical modeling, to demonstrate the rationale for the proposed method of differentiation; or provided any empirical evidence or data models to provide a theoretical justification for the method and need for differentiated accountability?* ▪ *Has the state provided the number of students eligible for PSC and SES, using prior year data as necessary, under the differentiated accountability model?* ▪ *Has the state provided data regarding teacher quality for schools in each phase and category of improvement?* ▪ *Has the state provided the number of students enrolled in tested grades in the state disaggregated by student group and the number and percent of these students included in AYP calculations at the school and school division level?* ▪ *Has the state provided the total number of schools in the state and the number of schools for which AYP determinations were made?*		students eligible for SES for the 2006-2007 school year was 14,578. Of those, 2,993 applied for and 2,769 were reported as receiving services. The data provided are reported in the 2006-2007 Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) as shown in the link below. http://www.doe.virginia.gov/VDOE/nclb/vaconsperfreport12-28-07.pdf The number of students enrolled in tested grades in the state disaggregated by student group and the number and percent of these students included in AYP calculations by grade and subject area is included in the 2006-2007 CSPR as shown in the link below. http://www.doe.virginia.gov/VDOE/nclb/vaconsperfreport12-28-07.pdf
• **Annual Evaluation Plan.** A state should include an annual evaluation plan for its differentiated accountability model and should provide an assurance that, if approved, it will cooperate in a USED evaluation of the differentiated accountability model and describe a state mechanism for evaluation. Specifically, it should address the following questions: ▪ *Does the state describe how it will annually evaluate the implementation and outcomes of the proposed model? Is the data collection plan clear and achievable (and what is the evidence of that)?* ▪ *Does the state include a description of the criteria it will use to evaluate the appropriateness and effectiveness of the proposed model and how it will analyze the effects of differentiating accountability on student achievement and school reform?*			Virginia will annually evaluate the implementation and outcomes of the proposed model. The proposed differentiated accountability model prioritizes public school choice (PSC) and supplemental educational services (SES) to low-academic and low-income students who 1) belong to the subgroup(s) for which the school did not make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP); and 2) who failed the test in the subject(s) in which the school did not make AYP. For each school entering Year 1 or Year 2 of school improvement for the first time in the 2008-2009 school year, the Standards of Learning (SOL) assessment data for each subgroup(s) and subject(s) for which the school did not make AYP based on assessments given in 2008-2009 will be compared to the SOL assessment data for each of the same subgroup(s) and subject(s) based on assessments in 2009-2010. In subsequent years of implementation, for each school included in the new accountability system, the SOL assessment data for each subgroup(s) and subject(s) for which the school did

Core Principle (CP)	Key Issues	Discussion	State Response
	▪ *Does the state evaluation plan provide for data analyses on how the proposed model would affect the identification of student groups, schools, and school divisions as compared with the current system?* ▪ *Does the state evaluation plan include a review of identifications of schools and school divisions under the differentiated accountability model as compared to school and school division identification for improvement in accordance with current statute and regulations? Does the evaluation plan also include a review of student achievement for schools in each category and phase of improvement under the differentiated accountability model?* ▪ *Does the state include a plan to review school divisions' capacity to implement the substantive and comprehensive interventions for the lowest-performing schools?*	not make AYP will be compared to the next year's SOL assessment data for each of the same subgroup(s) and subject(s). In addition, Virginia will determine the number of schools that advance to the next year of school improvement in 2009-2010 compared to the number of schools identified for school improvement in the proposed model for the first time in 2008-2009. As schools are focusing services on the lowest income and lowest achieving students sooner, the number of schools advancing to Year 3 and beyond should decrease. This indicator will also be used as a measure to determine the school division's capacity to implement the substantive and comprehensive interventions for the lowest-performing schools. Since public school choice and supplemental educational services are required in each year of school improvement until the school exits school improvement, the evaluation plan includes a review of student achievement for schools in each phase of school improvement. The proposed accountability system does not affect the current identification of schools in improvement nor does it affect the sanctions currently required by NCLB.	

IV. Conclusion

Key Issues	State Response
• **Summarize how your proposal is consistent with the core principles and broader purpose of NCLB.** ▪ How will the differentiated accountability model permit the state to focus its school and/or division intervention efforts? ▪ How will the differential accountability model facilitate raising the bar for student achievement for all groups? ▪ How will the differentiated accountability model permit the state to enhance public understanding of AYP and the necessary interventions?	The proposed model will permit Virginia to focus its school and division efforts on those students with the greatest academic needs. Virginia has defined the students with greatest academic need as those who belong to the subgroup(s) for which the school did not make AYP and who failed the test(s) in the subject(s) in which the school did not make AYP. The model will facilitate raising the bar for student achievement for all groups of students by focusing federal funds on elimination of the achievement gap. By focusing federal resources on those students in greatest need, more schools will become proficient on state assessments, thus increasing the number of schools making AYP. Public understanding of AYP will improve because the results of implementing the model will show that targeting federal resources to students with greatest academic needs results in more schools making AYP.
• **Summarize your success and efforts in raising student achievement and closing the achievement gap and how your proposal will enable you to build on that record.**	As of the 2007-2008 school year, 74 percent of Virginia's public schools made AYP. Statewide performance in mathematics improved from 76 percent of students scoring at the proficient level on state assessments in 2005-2006 to 80 percent of students scoring at the proficient level on state assessments in 2006-2007. Statewide performance in mathematics improved for every subgroup from the 2005-2006 school year to the 2006-2007 school year.

Key Issues	State Response
	The performance of students with disabilities, economically disadvantaged, and limited English proficient students in mathematics each increased the greatest amount with a five percentage point increase. Statewide performance in reading/language arts improved slightly in 2006-2007 with 85 percent of the students scoring proficient on the statewide assessments compared to 84 percent scoring at the proficient level in 2005-2006. The performance of black students increased the most in reading/language arts with a 3 percentage point increase. Additionally, 12 Title I schools exited school improvement status for the 2007-2008 school year by making AYP in the same subject area for two consecutive years. The number of Title I schools in improvement decreased from 110 Title I schools in improvement for the 2005-2006 school year to 63 in 2006-2007 and 69 in 2007-2008.

Division	School	2006-07 Status	2007-08 Status	Reason for School Improvement	Subgroups Failing To Make AYP	AYP Target	Actual Result	Percentage Difference
Amherst County	Central ES		Year 1	Eng: Read	All Students	73%	69.86%	3.04%
	Central ES		Year 1	Eng: Read	Disadvantaged	73%	64.51%	8.49%
Arlington County	Randolph ES	Year 2	Year 3	Eng: Read	All Students	73%	66.44%	6.56%
	Randolph ES	Year 2	Year 3	Eng: Read	Hispanic	73%	61.53%	11.47%
	Randolph ES	Year 2	Year 3	Eng: Read	LEP	73%	62.26%	10.74%
	Randolph ES	Year 2	Year 3	Eng: Read	Disadvantaged	73%	61.57%	11.43%
	Carlin Springs	Year 2	Year 3	Eng: Read	All Students	73%	63.23%	9.77%
	Carlin Springs	Year 2	Year 3	Eng: Read	Hispanic	73%	59.36%	13.64%
	Carlin Springs	Year 2	Year 3	Eng: Read	LEP	73%	63.44%	9.56%
	Carlin Springs	Year 2	Year 3	Eng: Read	Disadvantaged	73%	59.13%	13.87%
	Barcroft ES	Year 2	Year 3	Eng: Read	All Students	73%	72.38%	0.62%
	Barcroft ES	Year 2	Year 3	Eng: Read	Hispanic	73%	59.34%	13.66%
	Barcroft ES	Year 2	Year 3	Eng: Read	LEP	73%	63.69%	9.31%
	Barcroft ES	Year 2	Year 3	Eng: Read	Disadvantaged	73%	63.50%	9.50%
	Hoffman-Boston ES	Year 3	Year 4	Eng: Read	All Students	73%	66.66%	6.34%
	Hoffman-Boston ES	Year 3	Year 4	Eng: Read	Black	73%	65.51%	7.49%
	Hoffman-Boston ES	Year 3	Year 4	Eng: Read	LEP	73%	66.66%	6.34%
	Hoffman-Boston ES	Year 3	Year 4	Eng: Read	Disadvantaged	73%	65.05%	7.95%
	Hoffman-Boston ES	Year 1	Year 1	Math	HOLDING	71%	78.64%	Made AYP
	Claremont Immersion School		Year 1	Eng: Read	Hispanic	73%	63.37%	9.63%
	Claremont Immersion School		Year 2	Eng: Read	LEP	73%	66.05%	6.95%

Division	School	2006-07 Status	2007-08 Status	Reason for School Improvement	Subgroups Failing To Make AYP	AYP Target	Actual Result	Percentage Difference
Caroline County	Bowling Green Primary	Year 1	Exited					
Charles City County	Charles City County ES	Year 2	Year 2	Math	HOLDING	71%	77.27%	Made AYP
Chesterfield County	Falling Creek Middle	Year 1	Exited					
Culpeper County	Pearl Sample ES	Year 1	Year 1	Eng: Read	HOLDING	73%	R10 Black	Made AYP
Dickenson County	Ervinton ES		Year 1	Eng: Read	All Students	73%	69.28%	3.72%
	Ervinton ES		Year 1	Eng: Read	Disadvantaged	73%	65.38%	7.62%
	Ervinton ES		Year 1	Eng: Read	White	73%	69.06%	3.94%
Essex County	Essex Intermediate	Year 2	Year 3	Eng: Read	Disabled	73%	48.48%	24.52%
	Essex Intermediate	Year 1	Year 1	Math	HOLDING	71%	74.31%	Made AYP
	Tappahannock ES	Year 3	Year 4	Eng: Read	All Students	73%	71.42%	1.58%
	Tappahannock ES	Year 3	Year 4	Eng: Read	Black	73%	63.02%	9.98%
Fairfax County	Mount Vernon Woods ES	Year 1	Year 2	Eng: Read	All Students	73%	71.95%	1.05%
	Mount Vernon Woods ES	Year 1	Year 2	Eng: Read	Black	73%	61.15%	11.85%
	Mount Vernon Woods ES		Year 1	Math	All Students	71%	69.31%	1.69%
	Mount Vernon Woods ES		Year 1	Math	Black	71%	57.98%	13.02%
	Mount Vernon Woods ES		Year 1	Math	LEP	71%	68.86%	2.14%
	Mount Vernon Woods ES		Year 1	Math	Disadvantaged	71%	66.43%	4.57%
	Dogwood ES	Year 2	Year 3	Eng: Read	All Students	73%	67.01%	5.99%
	Dogwood ES	Year 2	Year 3	Eng: Read	Hispanic	73%	65.65%	7.35%
	Dogwood ES	Year 2	Year 3	Eng: Read	LEP	73%	63.80%	9.20%

Division	School	2006-07 Status	2007-08 Status	Reason for School Improvement	Subgroups Failing To Make AYP	AYP Target	Actual Result	Percentage Difference
	Dogwood ES	Year 2	Year 3	Eng: Read	Disadvantaged	73%	61.29%	11.71%
	Hybla Valley ES		Year 1-PILOT	Eng: Read	All Students	73%	68.70%	4.30%
	Hybla Valley ES		Year 1-PILOT	Eng: Read	Hispanic	73%	67.48%	5.52%
	Hybla Valley ES		Year 1-PILOT	Eng: Read	LEP	73%	64.13%	8.87%
	Hybla Valley ES		Year 1-PILOT	Eng: Read	Disadvantaged	73%	69.20%	3.80%
Fairfax County	McNair ES	Year 2	Year 3	Eng: Read	All Students	73%	67.11%	5.89%
	McNair ES	Year 2	Year 3	Eng: Read	Black	73%	57.89%	15.11%
	McNair ES	Year 2	Year 3	Eng: Read	Hispanic	73%	53.48%	19.52%
	McNair ES	Year 2	Year 3	Eng: Read	LEP	73%	63.22%	9.78%
	McNair ES	Year 2	Year 3	Eng: Read	Disadvantaged	73%	55.73%	17.27%
	McNair ES	Year 2	Year 3	Eng: Read	Disabled	73%	35.61%	37.39%
	McNair ES	Year 1	Year 2	Math	Hispanic	71%	62.13%	8.87%
	McNair ES	Year 1	Year 2	Math	Disadvantaged	71%	67.79%	3.21%
	McNair ES	Year 1	Year 2	Math	Disabled	71%	50.52%	20.48%
	Riverside ES		Year 1-PILOT	Eng: Read	Black	73%	68.29%	4.71%
	Riverside ES		Year 1-PILOT	Eng: Read	LEP	73%	70.50%	2.50%
	Riverside ES		Year 1-PILOT	Eng: Read	Disadvantaged	73%	65.94%	7.06%
	Riverside ES		Year 1-PILOT	Math	LEP	71%	68.34%	2.66%
	Riverside ES		Year 1-PILOT	Math	Disadvantaged	71%	69.64%	1.36%

Division	School	2006-07 Status	2007-08 Status	Reason for School Improvement	Subgroups Failing To Make AYP	AYP Target	Actual Result	Percentage Difference
Fauquier County	Brumfield ES		Year 1-PILOT	Eng: Read	Black	73%	54.41%	18.59%
	Brumfield ES		Year 1-PILOT	Eng: Read	Disadvantaged	73%	56.45%	16.55%
Henrico County	New Bridge Intermediate		Year 1	Eng: Read	All Students	73%	47.84%	25.16%
	New Bridge Intermediate		Year 1	Eng: Read	Black	73%	45.83%	27.17%
	New Bridge Intermediate		Year 1	Eng: Read	Disadvantaged	73%	47.01%	25.99%
	Mt. Vernon Middle	not Title I Year 1	Year 1 Holding	Eng: Read	HOLDING	73%	**R10**	Made AYP
	Mt. Vernon Middle	not Title I Year 1	Year 1 Holding	Math	HOLDING	71%	**R10**	Made AYP
	Lakeside Elementary		Year 1	Math	Black	71%	65.00%	6.00%
Henry County	Axton ES	Year 2	Year 2	Eng: Read	HOLDING	73%	82.40%	Made AYP
	Mount Olivet ES	Year 1	Year 1 (Holding)-PILOT	Eng: Read	HOLDING	73%	90.90%	Made AYP
King George County	King George ES	Year 2	Year 2	Eng: Read	HOLDING	73%	86.78%	Made AYP
	Potomac ES		Year 1	Eng: Read	All Students	73%	71.79%	1.21%
	Potomac ES		Year 1	Eng: Read	Disadvantaged	73%	54.23%	18.77%
	Potomac ES		Year 1	Math	Black	71%	47.00%	24.00%
	Potomac ES		Year 1	Math	Disadvantaged	71%	43.58%	27.42%
King and Queen	King & Queen ES		Year 1	Eng: Read	White	73%	71.87%	1.13%
King William County	Acquinton ES	Year 2	Exited					
	Cool Spring Primary	Year 1 Holding	Exited					

Division	School	2006-07 Status	2007-08 Status	Reason for School Improvement	Subgroups Failing To Make AYP	AYP Target	Actual Result	Percentage Difference
Lancaster County	Lancaster Primary		Year 1	Eng: Read	Black	73%	65.06%	7.94%
	Lancaster Primary		Year 1	Eng: Read	Disadvantaged	73%	65.58%	7.42%
Louisa County	Trevilians ES	Year 2	Year 3	Eng: Read	Black	73%	66.15%	6.85%
	Trevilians ES	Year 2	Year 3	Eng: Read	Disadvantaged	73%	68.42%	4.58%
Loudoun County	Catoctin ES		Year 1	Eng: Read	Hispanic	73%	62.63%	10.37%
Lunenburg County	Kenbridge ES	Year 1	Year 1	Eng: Read	HOLDING	73%	73.86%	Made AYP
Montgomery County	Shawsville ES	Year 1	Year 2	Eng: Read	Disadvantaged	73%	66.07%	6.93%
	Shawsville ES	Year 1	Year 2	Eng: Read	White	73%	71.73%	1.27%
Nottoway County	Nottoway Intermediate	Year 2 Holding	Exited					
Orange County	Orange ES	Year 2	Year 2	Eng: Read	HOLDING	73%	74.11%	Made AYP
	Orange ES	Year 1	Year 1	Math	HOLDING	71%	81.60%	Made AYP
Page County	Page County High	Year 1 Holding	Exited					
Pittsylvania County	Gretna Middle		Year 1	Math	Disabled	71%	43.39%	27.61%
	Dan River Middle		Year 1	Math	Disabled	71%	45.12%	25.88%
	Southside ES	Year 2	Year 2	Math	HOLDING	71%	84.97%	Made AYP
Prince Edward County	Prince Edward Middle	Year 3	Year 4	Eng: Read	Black	73%	62.23%	10.77%

Division	School	2006-07 Status	2007-08 Status	Reason for School Improvement	Subgroups Failing To Make AYP	AYP Target	Actual Result	Percentage Difference
	Prince Edward Middle	Year 3	Year 3	Math	HOLDING	71%	R10	Made AYP
Prince William	Belmont ES		Year 1	Eng: Read	Disadvantaged	73%	69.23%	3.77%
Stafford County	Kate Waller Barrett ES	Year 0- PILOT						
	Rocky Run Elem School	Year 1	Year 2	Eng: Read	Black	73%	69.17%	3.83%
	Rocky Run Elem School	Year 1	Year 2	Eng: Read	Disadvantaged	73%	49.52%	23.48%
	Rocky Run Elem School	Year 2	Year 3	Math	Black	71%	64.77%	6.2%
	Rocky Run Elem School	Year 2	Year 3	Math	Disadvantaged	71%	52.55%	18.5%
Sussex County	Annie B Jackson ES	Year 2	Year 3	Eng: Read	Black	73%	50.58%	22.42%
	Ellen W Chambliss ES	Year 3	Exited					
Wythe County	Jackson Memorial ES	Year 2	Year 2	Eng: Read	HOLDING	73%	88.46%	Made AYP
Alexandria City	Cora Kelly ES	Year 0- PILOT	Year 1	Eng: Read	All Students	73%	68.08%	4.92%
	Cora Kelly ES	Year 0- PILOT	Year 1	Eng: Read	Black	73%	71.55%	1.45%
	Cora Kelly ES	Year 0- PILOT	Year 1	Eng: Read	Hispanic	73%	62.69%	10.31%
	Cora Kelly ES	Year 0- PILOT	Year 1	Eng: Read	LEP	73%	58.97%	14.03%
	Cora Kelly ES	Year 0- PILOT	Year 1	Eng: Read	Disadvantaged	73%	60.24%	12.76%
	Jefferson-Houston ES	Year 2	Year 3	Eng: Read	All Students	73%	62.35%	10.65%
	Jefferson-Houston ES	Year 2	Year 3	Eng: Read	Black	73%	60.56%	12.44%
	Jefferson-Houston ES	Year 2	Year 3	Eng: Read	Disadvantaged	73%	59.40%	13.60%
Fredericksbrg City	Hugh Mercer ES		Year 1	Eng: Read	Disabled	73%	52.88%	20.12%
	Lafayette Upper ES		Year 1	Eng: Read	Disabled	73%	66.22%	6.78%

Division	School	2006-07 Status	2007-08 Status	Reason for School Improvement	Subgroups Failing To Make AYP	AYP Target	Actual Result	Percentage Difference
Hampton City	Cesar Tarrant ES	Year 2	Year 2	Eng: Read	HOLDING	73%	**R10**	Made AYP
	Cesar Tarrant ES	Year 2	Year 2	Math	HOLDING	71%	78.39%	Made AYP
	Aberdeen ES	Year 2	Year 2	Eng: Read	HOLDING	73%	**R10**	Made AYP
	Jane H Bryan ES	Year 2	Year 2	Eng: Read	HOLDING	73%	**R10**	Made AYP
	Jane H Bryan ES	Year 2	Year 2	Math	HOLDING	71%	75.14%	Made AYP
	Lee ES		Year 1-PILOT	Eng: Read	All Students	73%	68.82%	4.18%
	Lee ES		Year 1-PILOT	Eng: Read	Disadvantaged	73%	65.00%	8.00%
	Francis Mallory ES	Year 2	Year 2	Eng: Read	HOLDING	73%	75.98%	Made AYP
	Francis Mallory ES		Year 1	Math	Black	71%	65.48%	5.52%
Lynchburg City	Heritage ES	Year 1	Exited					
Newport News City	L. F. Palmer ES	Year 2	Year 2	Eng: Read	HOLDING	73%	80.29%	Made AYP
	Carver ES	Year 1-PILOT	Exited					
	Sedgefield ES	Year 1-PILOT	Year 1-PILOT	Eng: Read	HOLDING	73%	76.13%	Made AYP

Division	School	2006-07 Status	2007-08 Status	Reason for School Improvement	Subgroups Failing To Make AYP	AYP Target	Actual Result	Percentage Difference
Petersburg City	A.P. Hill ES		Year 1	Eng: Read	All Students	73%	58.78%	14.22%
	A.P. Hill ES		Year 1	Eng: Read	Black	73%	58.49%	14.51%
	A.P. Hill ES		Year 1	Eng: Read	Disadvantaged	73%	59.14%	13.86%
	Peabody Middle	Year 3	Year 4	Eng: Read	All Students	73%	45.14%	27.86%
	Peabody Middle	Year 3	Year 4	Eng: Read	Black	73%	45.11%	27.89%
	Peabody Middle	Year 3	Year 4	Eng: Read	Disadvantaged	73%	45.43%	27.57%
	Westview ES	Year 4		SCHOOL REORGANIZED AS A PRESCHOOL				
	J. E. B. Stuart ES	Year 3	Year 4	Eng: Read	All Students	73%	65.66%	7.34%
	J. E. B. Stuart ES	Year 3	Year 4	Eng: Read	Black	73%	63.57%	9.43%
	J. E. B. Stuart ES	Year 3	Year 4	Eng: Read	Disadvantaged	73%	65.64%	7.36%
	J. E. B. Stuart ES		Year 1	Math	All Students	71%	61.80%	9.20%
	J. E. B. Stuart ES		Year 1	Math	Black	71%	61.21%	9.79%
	J. E. B. Stuart ES		Year 1	Math	Disadvantaged	71%	62.05%	8.95%
	Vernon Johns Middle	Year 3	Year 4	Eng: Read	All Students	73%	55.82%	17.18%
	Vernon Johns Middle	Year 3	Year 4	Eng: Read	Black	73%	56.51%	16.49%
	Vernon Johns Middle	Year 3	Year 4	Eng: Read	Disadvantaged	73%	56.81%	16.19%
	Vernon Johns Middle	Year 5	Year 6	Math	All Students	71%	63.60%	7.40%
	Vernon Johns Middle	Year 5	Year 6	Math	Black	71%	63.16%	7.84%
	Vernon Johns Middle	Year 5	Year 6	Math	Disadvantaged	71%	66.55%	4.45%
	Blandford Academy	Year 1	Year 1 Holding Not Title I					
Portsmouth City	Churchland Academy ES		Year 1	Eng: Read	Disabled	73%	48.30%	24.70%
	Westhaven ES	Year 2	Exited					

Division	School	2006-07 Status	2007-08 Status	Reason for School Improvement	Subgroups Failing To Make AYP	AYP Target	Actual Result	Percentage Difference
Richmond City	Elkhardt Middle	Year 2	Year 2	Eng: Read	HOLDING	73%	73.91%	Made AYP
	Elkhardt Middle	Year 4	Year 5	Math Part	Hispanic	95%	93.22%	1.78%
	Elkhardt Middle	Year 4	Year 5	Math Part	LEP	95%	89.88%	5.12%
	G. H. Reid ES	Year 3	Year 3	Eng: Read	HOLDING	73%	77.41%	Made AYP
	Martin Luther King Jr. Middle	Year 3	Year 3	Eng: Read	HOLDING	73%	78.70%	Made AYP
	Thomas C. Boushall Middle	Year 3	Year 3	Eng: Read	HOLDING	73%	**R10**	Made AYP
	Chandler Middle	Year 5	Year 5	Eng: Read	HOLDING	73%	**R10**	Made AYP
	Chandler Middle	Year 2	Year 2	Math	HOLDING	71%	**R10**	Made AYP
	Lucille M. Brown Middle	Year 2	Exited					
	Miles Jones ES	Year 1	Exited					
	Richmond Alternative	Year 1	not Title I Year 2					
	Richmond Alternative	Year 1	not Title I Year 2					
Roanoke City	Addison Aerospace Middle	not Title I Year 2	Year 2	Math	HOLDING	71%	72.27%	Made AYP
	Oakland Intermediate	Year 2	Exited					
	Garden City ES	Year 2	Year 2	Eng: Read	HOLDING	73%	80.31%	Made AYP

Division	School	2006-07 Status	2007-08 Status	Reason for School Improvement	Subgroups Failing To Make AYP	AYP Target	Actual Result	Percentage Difference
	Preston Park Primary	Year 2	Exited					
Roanoke City	Lincoln Terrace Saturn Network	Year 3	Year 3	Eng: Read	HOLDING	73%	**R10**	Made AYP
	Hurt Park ES	Year 2	Year 2	Eng: Read	HOLDING	73%	81.15%	Made AYP
	Forest Park Magnet	Year 2	Year 3	Eng: Read	Black	71%	69.00%	2.00%
	Forest Park Magnet	Year 2	Year 3	Eng: Read	Disadvantaged	71%	67.61%	3.39%
	Fallon Park ES	Year 1	Exited					
Suffolk City	Elephant's Fork ES	Year 1	Year 1	Eng: Read	HOLDING	73%	81.78%	Made AYP
	Elephant's Fork ES	Year 1	Year 1	Math	HOLDING	71%	79.25%	Made AYP
Franklin City	King Jr. Middle		Year 1	Eng: Read	Disabled	73%	47.05%	25.95%
Colonial Beach	Colonial Beach ES		Year 1	Eng: Read	Black	73%	59.61%	13.39%
	Colonial Beach ES		Year 1	Eng: Read	Disadvantaged	73%	62.37%	10.63%

Actual Result= SOL results for All Students using the higher score between 3 year average and current year.

Year 1- SES Pilot- selected by USED to offer SES in Year 1 of Title I School Improvement

Special- SES Pilot- selected by USED to offer SES although not in any year of school improvement

Year 3- Corrective Action

Year 4- Planning for Alternative Governance

Year 5- Alternative Governance