VIRGINIA

Consolidated State Application
September 1, 2003 Submission

Amended November 24, 2003

Amended May 26, 2004

for State Grants under Title IX, Part C, Section 9302 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (Public Law 107-110)

Due: September 1, 2003

U. S. Department of Education
Office of Elementary and Secondary Education
Washington, D.C. 20202

Instructions for Completing the Consolidated State Application September 1, 2003 Submission

As described in the May 7, 2002, Consolidated State Application Package, States' submissions of their consolidated applications have been divided into multiple submissions and information requests. The information States are to provide in their September 1, 2003, consolidated applications is listed below.

Summary of Information Required for September 1, 2003 Submission

Baseline Data and Performance Targets for ESEA GOALS AND ESEA INDICATORS

Performance Goal 2: All limited English proficient students will become proficient in English and reach high academic standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.

2.1 Performance indicator: The percentage of limited English proficient students, determined by cohort, who have attained English proficiency by the end of the school year.

Performance goal 3: By 2005-2006, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.

3.1 Performance indicator: The percentage of classes being taught by "highly qualified" teachers (as the term is defined in section 9101(23) of the ESEA), in the aggregate and in "high-poverty" schools (as the term is defined in section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) of the ESEA).

3.2 Performance indicator: The percentage of teachers receiving high-quality professional development (as the term, "professional development," is defined in section 9101 (34)).

3.3 Performance indicator: The percentage of paraprofessionals (excluding those with sole duties as translators and parental involvement assistants) who are qualified. (See criteria in section 1119(c) and (d)).

Performance goal 4: All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free, and conducive to learning.

4.1 Performance indicator: The number of persistently dangerous schools, as defined by the State.

Performance Goal 5: All students will graduate from high school.

5.1 Performance indicator: The percentage of students who graduate from high school each year with a regular diploma.

5.2 Performance indicator: The percentage of students who drop out of school.

This workbook format has been developed to facilitate preparation and submission of the information required in this September 1, 2003, submission. States may use this format or another format of their choosing provided that all required information is provided in a clear and concise manner. The deadline for submission of this application is September 1, 2003.

Transmittal Instructions

To expedite the receipt of this September 1, 2003, Consolidated State Application submission, please send your submission via the Internet as a .doc file, pdf file, rtf or .txt file or provide the URL for the site where your submission is posted on the Internet. Send electronic submissions to conapp@ed.gov.

A State that submits only a paper submission should mail the submission by express courier to:

Celia Sims
U.S. Department of Education
400 Maryland Ave., SW
Room 3W300
Washington, D.C. 20202-6400
(202) 401-0113

ESEA GOALS and ESEA INDICATORS

Performance Indicator 2.1: The percentage of limited English proficient students, determined by cohort, who have attained English proficiency by the end of the school year.

For this September 1, 2003, Consolidated State Application submission, States must report information related to their standards and assessments for English language proficiency and baseline data and performance targets for ESEA Performance Indicator 2.1.

A. English Language Proficiency (ELP) Standards and Assessments

Please describe the status of the State's efforts to establish ELP standards that relate to the development and attainment of English proficiency by limited English proficient students. Specifically, describe how the State's ELP standards:

- **Address grades K through 12**
- **Address the four domains of listening, speaking, reading, and writing**
- **Are linked to the academic content and achievement standards in reading/language arts and mathematics, and in science (by 2005-2006)**

STATE RESPONSE

English Language Proficiency Standards of Learning for limited English proficient (LEP) students were adopted by the Virginia Board of Education in November 2002. The standards contain four levels of English proficiency, designated level 1, level 2, level 3, and level 4, which span across four grade clusters. The grade clusters have been divided as follows; K-2, 3-5, 6-8 and 9-12. Additionally, within each of the proficiency levels and grade clusters, the standards have been further defined by the domains of oral language (listening and speaking), reading, and writing. These standards represent what an LEP student should know and be able to do upon achieving at each level.

The English Language Proficiency (ELP) Standards of Learning are linked to the academic content and achievement standards in reading/language arts. The ELP standards have been published as an integrated section of the English Standards of Learning. The descriptors for both the English Standards of Learning and ELP standards are the same; the indicators beneath the descriptors differ. This difference reflects the skills and abilities that the LEP student can accomplish at the designated proficiency level. The linkage to the Mathematics Standards of Learning is currently in process. A group of statewide mathematics teachers, LEP teachers, and special education teachers began work during the summer of 2003 to develop lesson plans and strategies for teachers to use in helping LEP students achieve the Mathematics Standards of Learning. A final draft of the linkage project is expected by fall 2003. A committee will begin the work of linking the ELP Standards to the Science Standards of Learning during the summer of 2004.

The ELP Standards can be accessed via the link below:

http://www.pen.k12.va.us/VDOE/Superintendent/Sols/home.shtml.

B. Baseline Data for Performance Indicator 2.1

In the following table, please provide English language proficiency (ELP) baseline data from the 2002-2003 school year test administration. English language proficiency baseline data should include all students in the State who were identified as limited English proficient by State-selected English language proficiency assessments, regardless of student participation in Title III supported programs.

1. The ELP baseline data should include the following:

- Total number of students identified as LEP by each State-selected ELP assessment(s);
- Total number and percentage of LEP students at each level of English language proficiency as defined by State ELP standards and ELP assessments; and
- A list of each of the ELP assessment(s) used to determine level of English language proficiency.

2. The baseline data should:

- Indicate all levels of English language proficiency; and
- Be aggregated at the State level.
- If a State is reporting data using an ELP composite score (e.g., a total score that consists of a sum or average of scores in the domains of listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension), the State must:
    - Describe how the composite score was derived;
    - Describe how all five domains of English language proficiency were incorporated into the composite score; and
    - Describe how the domains were weighted to develop the composite score.

States may use the sample format below or another format to report the required information.

See Attachment 1 for responses to questions 1 and 2.

Baseline Data for 2002-2003					
ELP Assessment(s) (1)*	Total number of LEP Identified (2)	Number and Percentage at Basic or **Level 1** (3)	Number and Percentage at Intermediate or **Level 2** (4)	Number and Percentage at Advanced or **Level 3** (5)	Number and Percentage at **Proficient** or **Level 4** (6)

*
(1) List all of the State-selected ELP assessment(s) used during the 2002-2003 school year to assess LEP students.

(2) Total number of students identified as LEP according to ELP assessments(s).

(3-6) Number and percentage of students at each level of English language proficiency, as defined by State ELP standards and ELP assessments. If the State uses labels such as Level 1, Level 2, etc., the level at which students are designated "Proficient" should be indicated. For example, in this sample format, students at Level 4 are considered proficient in English. States should use the same ELP labels as defined in State ELP standards and assessment(s). If the ELP standards and assessment(s) define more than four levels, the table should be expanded to incorporate all levels.

Please provide the following additional information:

1. English language proficiency assessment(s) used, including the grades and domains addressed by each assessment (e.g., IDEA Oral Language Proficiency Test (IPT I), grades K-6, listening and speaking).

See Attachment 1.

2. Total number of students **assessed** for English language proficiency on State-selected ELP assessment(s) (number of students referred for assessment and evaluated using State-selected ELP assessments).

49,840

3. Total number of students **identified** as LEP on State-selected ELP assessment(s) (number of students determined to be LEP on State-selected ELP assessment(s)).

49,652

C. Performance Targets (Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives) for English Language Proficiency

Section 3122(a)(3) requires that States' annual measurable achievement objectives for English language proficiency include annual increases in the number or percentage of children attaining English proficiency. Please provide the State's definition of "proficient" in English as defined by the State's English language proficiency standards. Please include in your response:

- **The test score range or cut scores for each of the State's ELP assessments**
- **A description of how the five domains of listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension are incorporated or weighted in the State's definition of "proficient" in English.**

STATE RESPONSE

School divisions in Virginia used the following English language proficiency (ELP) assessments for the 2002-03 school year – the Language Assessment Scale (LAS), the Idea Proficiency Test (IPT), the Woodcock-Munoz, or a locally developed assessment that was submitted for Virginia Board of Education approval. A list of the ELP instruments used by school divisions for the 2002-03 school year is included in Attachment 1.

For those school divisions that used the Language Assessment Scale (LAS) or the Idea Proficiency Test (IPT), the publishers provided a correlation chart for school divisions to use to determine which of the four levels of English proficiency corresponded to the students' composite scores on each of the assessments.

The correlation chart for the IPT appears on their Web site at the link listed below. https://www.ballard-tighe.com/Ballard-Tighe/source/Product/OurProducts.asp

The correlation chart for the LAS is attached in Attachment 2.

The five domains of listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension are incorporated into the state's definition of "proficient" in English through the English language proficiency standards of learning descriptions for each of the skill levels in each of the domains. Virginia is one of 17 states participating in the consortium of states that is working together to develop the English Language Development Assessment (ELDA). The consortium is funded through a USED Enhanced Assessment Grant with Nevada serving as the lead state, the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) serving as the management team, and the American Institutes for Research (AIR) serving as the test developer. Through this consortium Virginia is working to develop a definition of "proficient" in English that will align with the ELP standards and the ELDA assessment.

~~Beginning with the 2003-04 school year, school divisions in Virginia will choose between the ELDA and a locally developed instrument to measure the English language proficiency of LEP students.~~ For the 2003-2004 school year, school divisions will choose between the Stanford English Language Proficiency (SELP) test and a locally-developed or selected instrument to measure the English language proficiency of the

LEP students. School divisions will use the SELP cut-scores as one criterion to determine the LEP student's: 1) progress from one level of proficiency to the next; 2) exit from direct language instructional programs; 3) placement into monitor year 1 and monitor year 2 status; and 4) reclassification as non-LEP. Additional criteria may include school division data regarding LEP student performance. Locally developed instruments will need to be submitted to the Board of Education for approval.

Section 3122(a)(3) requires that States' annual measurable achievement objectives for English language proficiency include annual increases in the number or percentage of children making progress in learning English. Please provide the State's definition of "making progress" in learning English as defined by the State's English language proficiency standards and assessments. Please include in your response:

- **A description of the English language proficiency levels and any sub-levels as defined by the State's English language proficiency standards and assessments**
- **A description of the criteria students must meet to progress from one proficiency level to the next (e.g., narrative descriptions, cut scores, formula, data from multiple sources)**
- **A description of the language domains in which students must make progress in moving from one English language proficiency level to the next**

STATE RESPONSE

The English language proficiency levels are defined below as they appear in the English Language Proficiency Standards of Learning as level 1, level 2, level 3, and level 4. LEP students at level 1 are described through the four domains of listening, speaking, reading, and writing. With regard to the listening and speaking domain, level 1 students can comprehend simple statements and questions. They understand the general idea of basic messages and conversations. They can comprehend language consisting of basic vocabulary and grammatical structures in face-to-face conversations. They can initiate and respond to basic statements and engage in basic face-to-face conversations with more fluent speakers. With regard to the reading domain, level 1 students can understand basic material. They can understand the general message of basic reading passages that contain simple language structures and syntax. Students at proficiency level 1 rely on visual cues and prior knowledge or experience with the topic. Comprehension is limited to simple language containing high-frequency vocabulary and predictable grammatical patterns. Students at proficiency level 1 are beginning to use reading strategies to guess the meaning of unfamiliar words through the use of pictures, diagrams, cognates, and text context. With regard to the writing domain, students at proficiency level 1 can express basic personal needs and compose short passages on familiar topics. Basic vocabulary and structures in simple sentences and phrases are characteristic of student writing at this level. Errors in spelling and grammar are frequent and characteristic of language production at this stage.

LEP students at proficiency level 2 are described through the four domains of listening, speaking, reading, and writing. With regard to the listening and speaking domain, level 2 students can comprehend short conversations on simple topics. They can understand frequently used verb tenses and word-order patterns in simple sentences. They demonstrate a detailed understanding of short conversations and messages but only have a general understanding of longer conversations and messages. Students at proficiency level 2 can initiate and sustain a conversation, although they often speak with hesitation and rely on a known vocabulary. They typically use the more common verb tense forms (present, past, and future), but make numerous errors in tense formation and proper selection of verbs. They can express some details and nuances by using appropriate modifiers. They can use word order accurately in simple sentences, but make errors when using complex patterns. Extended communication is

typically a series of short, familiar structures. Students at proficiency level 2 often have to repeat themselves to be understood. They rely on familiar structures and utterances. They use repetition, gestures, and other nonverbal cues to sustain conversations. With regard to the reading domain, level 2 students can understand basic narrative text and authentic materials. They can use contextual and visual cues to derive meaning from texts that contain unfamiliar words, expressions, and structures. They can comprehend passages written in basic sentence patterns, but they frequently have to guess at the meanings of more complex materials. They begin to make informed guesses about meaning from context. They can begin to identify the main idea and supporting details of passages. With regard to the writing domain, students at proficiency level 2 can write simple notes, make brief journal entries, and write short reports, using basic vocabulary and common language structures. They can express ideas in the present, future, and past tenses. Frequent errors are characteristic of this level especially when the students try to express thoughts that require more complex language structures.

LEP students at proficiency level 3 are described through the four domains of listening, speaking, reading, and writing. With regard to the listening and speaking domain, level 3 students can understand standard speech delivered in most settings, given some repetition and rewording. They can understand the main ideas and relevant details of extended discussions or presentations. They draw on a wide range of language forms, vocabulary, idioms, and structures. They can comprehend many subtle nuances, given repetition and/or rephrasing. Students at proficiency level 3 are beginning to detect affective undertones, and they understand inferences in spoken language. They can communicate orally in most situations. They may have difficulty producing complex sentence structure, using verb tenses correctly, and discussing academic topics in-depth without prior preparation. They can engage in extended conversations on a broad range of topics. They have mastered basic sentence structure and verb tenses. With regard to the reading domain, students at proficiency level 3 can comprehend the content of many texts independently. They still require support in understanding texts in the academic content areas. They have a high degree of success with factual information in non-technical prose. They can read many literature selections for pleasure. They can separate main ideas from supporting ones. They can begin to analyze reading passages written at a level appropriate for the general public. They can use the context of a passage and prior knowledge to increase their comprehension. They can detect the overall tone and intent of text. With regard to the writing domain, students at proficiency level 3 can write multi-paragraph compositions, journal entries, personal and business letters, and creative passages. They can present their thoughts in an organized manner that is easily understood by the reader. They show good control of English word structure and of the most frequently used grammatical structures, but errors are still present. They can express complex ideas and use a wide range of vocabulary, idioms, and structures, including the full range of verb tenses.

LEP students at proficiency level 4 are described through the four domains of listening, speaking, reading, and writing. With regard to the listening and speaking domain, they can understand most standard speech. They can understand and identify the main ideas and relevant details of discussions or presentations on a wide range of topics, including unfamiliar ones. Proficiency level 4 students are able to understand the

nuances in meaning represented by variations in stress, intonation, pace, and rhythm. They can engage in most communicative situations with minimal errors. They have a high degree of fluency and accuracy when speaking, although with some language forms they may make errors that do not interfere with meaning, and they lack the content area vocabulary possessed by their native English-speaking peers. With regard to the reading domain, level 4 students understand and obtain meaning from a wide range of texts. They use the same reading strategies as their native English-speaking peers to derive meaning from text. They are approaching grade-level mastery of the language structures and vocabulary necessary for understanding academic-content, subject-area texts. With regard to the writing domain, level 4 students are approaching fluency in writing in the content areas. They are able to use the language structures and content vocabulary required for each academic subject, although they make errors. They begin to use the subtleties of written language and can write for different audiences and purposes.

For the 2002-03 school year, school divisions used data from multiple sources to determine progress from one proficiency level to the next. The data included English language proficiency assessment scores and locally developed criteria regarding LEP student performance. School divisions were instructed to determine LEP student placement into the appropriate ELP level based on the collection of evidence regarding the LEP student's performance.

Beginning with the 2003-04 school year, school divisions will use the ELDA cut-scores to determine progress from one level of proficiency to the next as well as exit from formal ESL services and being placed on monitor status.

In the table that follows, please provide performance targets/annual measurable achievement objectives for:

- The percentage or number of LEP students who will make progress in learning English

- The percentage or number of LEP students who will attain English language proficiency

Performance targets/annual measurable achievement objectives are projections for increases in the percentage or number of LEP students who will make progress in learning English and who will attain English language proficiency.

A table has been provided to accommodate States' varying approaches for establishing their performance targets/annual measurable achievement objectives. Some States may establish the same performance targets/annual measurable achievement objectives for all grade levels in the State. Other States may establish separate performance targets/annual measurable achievement objectives for elementary, middle, and high school, for example. If a State establishes different performance targets/annual measurable achievement objectives for different grade levels/grade spans/cohorts, the State should complete a separate table for each grade level/grade span/cohort and indicate next to the "unit of analysis/cohort" the grade level/grade span/cohort to which the performance targets/annual measurable achievement objectives apply.

Please provide the State's definition of cohort(s). Include a description of the specific characteristics of the cohort(s) in the State, e.g., grade/grade span or other characteristics.

STATE RESPONSE

The LEP cohort for performance indicator 2.1 will be defined as all LEP students who have been enrolled in a Virginia public school for a full academic year. The annual measurable achievement objectives for attaining English language proficiency are projections for ~~the percentage of~~ LEP students at each grade cluster K-2, 3-5, 6-8, 9-12 who are to be reclassified as non-LEP after receiving direct language instruction for 5 consecutive years or less. Non-LEP students shall be defined as those students who maintain full proficiency in English by scoring at the proficient level on the reading and writing portions of the English language proficiency assessment for two consecutive years after formally exiting the language instruction program.

~~The percentage of LEP students~~ The annual measurable achievement objectives for making progress are projections ~~shall be determined by the percentage of~~ for LEP students who have been enrolled for a full academic year in a Virginia public school to ~~and have~~ increase~~d~~ one level or more on the English Language Proficiency Standards of Learning as measured by a body of evidence that includes the ~~their composite score on a~~ state-approved English language proficiency assessment results. ~~aligned to the Standards of Learning.~~

English Language Proficiency Performance Targets/Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives

***Unit of Analysis/Cohort: See above description of cohort.**
(Note: States should specify the defining characteristics of each cohort addressed, e.g., grades/grade spans)

English Language Proficiency Targets	Percent or Number of LEP Students Making Progress in Acquiring English Language Proficiency	Percent or Number of LEP Students Attaining English Language Proficiency
2003-2004 School Year	20%	10%
2004-2005 School Year	25%	15%
2005-2006 School Year	30%	20%
2006-2007 School Year	35%	25%
2007-2008 School Year	40%	30%

Baseline Data and Performance Targets for Goal 3, Performance Indicator 3.1: The percentage of classes being taught by "highly qualified" teachers (as the term is defined in section 9101(23) of the ESEA), in the aggregate and in "high-poverty" schools (as the term is defined in section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) of the ESEA).

NCLB places a major emphasis upon teacher quality as a factor in improving student achievement. The new Title II programs focus on preparing, training, and recruiting high-quality teachers and principals and requires States to develop plans with annual measurable objectives that will ensure that all teachers teaching in core academic subjects are highly qualified by the end of the 2005-2006 school year.

The requirement that teachers be highly qualified, as defined in Section 9101(23) of the ESEA, applies to public elementary and secondary school teachers teaching in core academic subjects. (The term "core academic subjects" means English, reading or language arts, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, and geography *(Section 9101(11*)). For more detailed information on highly qualified teachers, please refer to the Improving Teacher Quality State Grants Guidance, available at:

http://www.ed.gov/offices/OESE/SIP/TitleIIguidance2002.doc

A. In the following chart, please provide baseline data and targets for the percentage of classes in the core academic subjects being taught by "highly qualified" teachers (as the term is defined in Section 9101(23) of the ESEA), in the aggregate and in "high-poverty" schools (as the term is defined in Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) of the ESEA). Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "high-poverty" schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State.

For baseline data, please indicate the percentage of classes in core academic subjects taught by "highly qualified" teachers both in the aggregate for the State and for high-poverty schools in the State in the 2002-2003 school year. For targets, please indicate the percentage of classes in core academic subjects that will be taught by highly qualified teachers by the end of the 2005-2006 school year.

Baseline Data and Targets	Percentage of Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers State Aggregate	Percentage of Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers High-Poverty Schools
2002-2003 Baseline	83%	77%
2003-2004 Target	85%	80%
2004-2005 Target	90%	90%
2005-2006 Target	100%	100%

B. To best understand the data provided by States, please provide the State's definition of a highly qualified teacher below.

Based on the No Child Left Behind legislation and the nonregulatory draft guidance document titled, *Improving Teacher Quality, State Grants,* Title II, Part A, June 6, 2002, the term "highly qualified" used in reference to any public elementary, middle, or secondary school teacher in the core academic subjects means that the teacher: holds full state licensure as a teacher, including licensure through alternate routes; and teaches only in the area or areas of endorsement.

In addition, a teacher who is entering the profession through an alternate route program may meet the definition of a highly qualified teacher if the participant in the program: (1) is permitted by the state to assume functions as a regular classroom teacher; (2) has a bachelor's degree; (3) has demonstrated subject matter competence by passing the state professional teacher assessments; and (4) is making satisfactory progress toward full licensure, as prescribed by the Board of Education.

Baseline Data and Performance Targets for Goal 3, Performance Indicator 3.2: The percentage of teachers receiving high-quality professional development (as the term, "professional development," is defined in section 9101 (34).)

In the following chart, please provide baseline data and targets for the percentage of teachers receiving high-quality professional development. The term "high-quality professional development" means professional development that meets the criteria outlined in the definition of professional development in Title IX, Section 9101(34) of ESEA. For more detailed information on high-quality professional development, please refer to the Improving Teacher Quality State Grants Guidance, available at:

http://www.ed.gov/offices/OESE/SIP/TitleIIguidance2002.doc

For baseline data, please indicate the percentage of teachers who received "high-quality professional development" in the 2002-2003 school year. For targets, please indicate the percentage of teachers who will receive "high-quality professional development" through the 2005-2006 school year. The data for this element should include all public elementary and secondary school teachers in the State.

Baseline Data and Targets	Percentage of Teachers Receiving High-Quality Professional Development
2002-2003 Baseline	85%
2003-2004 Target	87%
2004-2005 Target	90%
2005-2006 Target	100%

Baseline Data and Performance Targets for Goal 3, Performance Indicator 3.3: The percentage of paraprofessionals (excluding those with sole duties as translators and parental involvement assistants) who are qualified. (See criteria in section 1119(c) and (d).)

The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 defines a qualified paraprofessional as an employee who provides instructional support in a program supported by Title I, Part A funds who has (1) completed two years of study at an institution of higher education; (2) obtained an associate's (or higher) degree; or (3) met a rigorous standard of quality and be able to demonstrate, through a formal State or local academic assessment, knowledge of and the ability to assist in instructing reading, writing, and mathematics (or, as appropriate, reading readiness, writing readiness, and mathematics readiness) (Section 1119(c) and (d).) For more information on qualified paraprofessionals, please refer to the Title I paraprofessionals Guidance, available at:

http://www.ed.gov/offices/OESE/SASA/paraguidance.doc

In the following chart, please provide baseline data and targets for the percentage of Title I paraprofessionals (excluding those with sole duties as translators and parental involvement assistants) who are qualified. For baseline data, please indicate the percentage of Title I paraprofessionals who were qualified, as defined above, in the 2002-2003 school year. For targets, please indicate the percentage of Title I paraprofessionals who will be qualified by the end of the 2005-2006 school year.

Baseline Data and Targets	Percentage of Qualified Title I Paraprofessionals
2002-2003 Baseline	24%
2003-2004 Target	40%
2004-2005 Target	75%
2005-2006 Target	100%

Baseline data and performance targets for Goal 4, Performance Indicator 4.1: The number of persistently dangerous schools, as defined by the State.

In the following chart, please provide baseline data and targets for the number of schools identified as persistently dangerous as determined by the State. For further guidance on persistently dangerous schools, please refer to the Unsafe School Choice Option Non-Regulatory Guidance, available at:

http://www.ed.gov/offices/OSDFS/unsafeschoolchoice.doc.

For baseline data, please provide the number of schools identified as persistently dangerous by the start of the 2003-2004 school year. For performance targets, please provide the number of schools that will be identified as persistently dangerous through the 2013-2014 school year.

Baseline Data and Targets	Number of Persistently Dangerous Schools
2003-2004 Baseline	<0.25%*
2004-2005 Target	<0.25%
2005-2006 Target	<0.25%
2006-2007 Target	<0.25%
2007-2008 Target	<0.25%
2008-2009 Target	<0.25%
2009-2010 Target	<0.25%
2010-2011 Target	<0.25%
2011-2012 Target	<0.25%
2012-2013 Target	<0.25%
2013-2014 Target	<0.25%

* In 2003-2004, Virginia has zero (0) schools that meet the Board of Education's criteria for persistently dangerous.

Baseline Data and Performance Targets for Goal 5, Performance Indicator 5.1: The percentage of students who graduate from high school each year with a regular diploma, disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged.

In the May 7, 2002, Consolidated State Application Package, indicator 5.1 read: "The percentage of students who graduate from high school each year with a regular diploma – disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged—calculated in the same manner as used in National Center for Education Statistics reports on Common Core of Data." However, section 200.19 of the Title I regulations issued under the No Child Left Behind Act on December 2, 2002, defines graduation rate to mean:

- The percentage of students, measured from the beginning of the school year, who graduate from public high school with a regular diploma (not including a GED or any other diploma not fully aligned with the State's academic standards) in the standard number of years; or,
- Another more accurate definition developed by the State and approved by the Secretary in the State plan that more accurately measures the rate of students who graduate from high school with a regular diploma; and
- Avoids counting a dropout as a transfer.

The Secretary approved each State's definition of the graduation rate, consistent with section 200.19 of the Title I regulations, as part of each State's accountability plan. To reduce burden, provide flexibility, and promote more consistent data collection by the Department, we ask that the information you submit in this September 1, 2003, consolidated State application reflect this Title I definition rather than the definition used in the NCES Common Core of Data.

Using the definition of the graduation rate that was approved as part of your State's accountability plan, in the following charts please provide baseline data and performance targets for the graduation rate. For baseline data, please provide the graduation rate for the 2001-2002 school year. For performance targets, please indicate what the State graduation rate will be through the 2013-2014 school year.

Baseline Data: GRADUATION RATE

High School Graduates	High School Graduation Rate
Student Group	01-02 Baseline
All Students	84.7%
African American/Black	78.4%
American Indian/Native Alaskan	*
Asian/Pacific Islander	*
Hispanic	73.7%
White	87.3%
Other	*
Students with Disabilities	*
Students without Disabilities	*
Limited English Proficient	*
Economically Disadvantaged	*
Non-Economically Disadvantaged	*
Migrant	*
Male	81.9%
Female	87.4%

*No data are available for these subgroups

PERFORMANCE TARGETS: GRADUATION RATE

High School Graduates Student Group	02-03 School Year	03-04 School Year	04-05 School Year	05-06 School Year	06-07 School Year	07-08 School Year	08-09 School Year	09-10 School Year	10-11 School Year	11-12 School Year	12-13 School Year	13-14 School Year
All Students	57.0	57.0	57.0	57.0	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
African American/Black	57.0	57.0	57.0	57.0	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
American Indian/Native Alaskan	57.0	57.0	57.0	57.0	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
Asian/Pacific Islander	57.0	57.0	57.0	57.0	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
Hispanic	57.0	57.0	57.0	57.0	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
White	57.0	57.0	57.0	57.0	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
Other	57.0	57.0	57.0	57.0	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
Students with Disabilities	57.0	57.0	57.0	57.0	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
Students without Disabilities	57.0	57.0	57.0	57.0	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
Limited English Proficient	57.0	57.0	57.0	57.0	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
Economically Disadvantaged	57.0	57.0	57.0	57.0	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
Non-Economically Disadvantaged	57.0	57.0	57.0	57.0	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
Migrant	57.0	57.0	57.0	57.0	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
Male	57.0	57.0	57.0	57.0	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
Female	57.0	57.0	57.0	57.0	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD

Note: These annual measurable objectives are based upon a 57.2% starting point, which represents the median graduation rate of the 10% of secondary schools having the lowest graduation rate in Virginia.

Baseline Data and Performance Targets for Goal 5, Performance Indicator 5.2: The percentage of students who drop out of school, disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged.

For purposes of calculating and reporting a dropout rate for this performance indicator, States should use the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistics' (NCES) Common Core of Data.

Consistent with this requirement, States must use NCES' definition of "high school dropout," An individual who: 1) was enrolled in school at some time during the previous school year; and 2) was not enrolled at the beginning of the current school year; and 3) has not graduated from high school or completed a state- or district-approved educational program; and 4) does not meet any of the following exclusionary conditions: a) transfer to another public school district, private school, or state- or district approved educational program (including correctional or health facility programs); b) temporary absence due to suspension or school-excused illness; or c) death.

In the following charts, please provide baseline data and targets for the percentage of students who drop out of high school, disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged. For baseline data, in the following charts please indicate the State high school dropout rate for the 2001-2002 school year. For targets, please indicate the State high school dropout rate through the 2013-2014 school year.

BASELINE DATA: DROPOUT RATE

Student Dropouts	Student Dropout Rate
Student Group	01-02 Baseline
All Students	5.7%*
African American/Black	
American Indian/Native Alaskan	
Asian/Pacific Islander	
Hispanic	
White	
Other	
Students with Disabilities	
Students without Disabilities	
Limited English Proficient	
Economically Disadvantaged	
Non-Economically Disadvantaged	
Migrant	
Male	
Female	

*No data are available for subgroups

PERFORMANCE TARGETS: DROPOUT RATE

Student Dropouts Student Group	02-03 School Year	03-04 School Year	04-05 School Year	05-06 School Year	06-07 School Year	07-08 School Year	08-09 School Year	09-10 School Year	10-11 School Year	11-12 School Year	12-13 School Year	13-14 School Year
All Students	5	5	4	4	4	3	3	3	2	2	2	0
African American/Black	5	5	4	4	4	3	3	3	2	2	2	0
American Indian/Native Alaskan	5	5	4	4	4	3	3	3	2	2	2	0
Asian/Pacific Islander	5	5	4	4	4	3	3	3	2	2	2	0
Hispanic	5	5	4	4	4	3	3	3	2	2	2	0
White	5	5	4	4	4	3	3	3	2	2	2	0
Other	5	5	4	4	4	3	3	3	2	2	2	0
Students with Disabilities	5	5	4	4	4	3	3	3	2	2	2	0
Students without Disabilities	5	5	4	4	4	3	3	3	2	2	2	0
Limited English Proficient	5	5	4	4	4	3	3	3	2	2	2	0
Economically Disadvantaged	5	5	4	4	4	3	3	3	2	2	2	0
Non-Economically Disadvantaged	5	5	4	4	4	3	3	3	2	2	2	0
Migrant	5	5	4	4	4	3	3	3	2	2	2	0
Male	5	5	4	4	4	3	3	3	2	2	2	0
Female	5	5	4	4	4	3	3	3	2	2	2	0