

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT PART II

For reporting on

School Year 2008-09



**PART II DUE FEBRUARY 26, 2010
5PM EST**

Revised April 21, 2010

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT:
Parts I and II**

**for
STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS
under the
ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT
As amended by the
No Child Left Behind Act of 2001**

For reporting on
School Year 2008-09

VIRGINIA



**PART I DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 18, 2009
PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 12, 2010**

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202**

INTRODUCTION

Sections 9302 and 9303 of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)*, as amended by the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB)* provide to States the option of applying for and reporting on multiple *ESEA* programs through a single consolidated application and report. Although a central, practical purpose of the Consolidated State Application and Report is to reduce "red tape" and burden on States, the Consolidated State Application and Report are also intended to have the important purpose of encouraging the integration of State, local, and *ESEA* programs in comprehensive planning and service delivery and enhancing the likelihood that the State will coordinate planning and service delivery across multiple State and local programs. The combined goal of all educational agencies—State, local, and Federal—is a more coherent, well-integrated educational plan that will result in improved teaching and learning. The Consolidated State Application and Report includes the following *ESEA* programs:

- Title I, Part A – *Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies*
- Title I, Part B, Subpart 3 – *William F. Goodling Even Start Family Literacy Programs*
- Title I, Part C – *Education of Migratory Children* (Includes the Migrant Child Count)
- Title I, Part D – *Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk*
- Title II, Part A – *Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund)*
- Title III, Part A – *English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement Act*
- Title IV, Part A, Subpart 1 – *Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities State Grants*
- Title IV, Part A, Subpart 2 – *Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Activities (Community Service Grant Program)*
- Title V, Part A – *Innovative Programs*
- Title VI, Section 6111 – *Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities*
- Title VI, Part B – *Rural Education Achievement Program*
- Title X, Part C – *Education for Homeless Children and Youths*

The *NCLB* Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2008-09 consists of two Parts, Part I and Part II.

PART I

Part I of the CSPR requests information related to the five *ESEA* Goals, established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application, and information required for the Annual State Report to the Secretary, as described in Section 1111(h)(4) of the *ESEA*. The five *ESEA* Goals established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application are:

- **Performance Goal 1:** By SY 2013-14, all students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.
- **Performance Goal 2:** All limited English proficient students will become proficient in English and reach high academic standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.
- **Performance Goal 3:** By SY 2005-06, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.
- **Performance Goal 4:** All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free, and conducive to learning.
- **Performance Goal 5:** All students will graduate from high school.

Beginning with the CSPR SY 2005-06 collection, the Education of Homeless Children and Youths was added. The Migrant Child count was added for the SY 2006-07 collection.

PART II

Part II of the CSPR consists of information related to State activities and outcomes of specific *ESEA* programs. While the information requested varies from program to program, the specific information requested for this report meets the following criteria:

1. The information is needed for Department program performance plans or for other program needs.
2. The information is not available from another source, including program evaluations pending full implementation of required ED Facts submission.
3. The information will provide valid evidence of program outcomes or results.

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 2008-09 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, December 18, 2009**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 12, 2010**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2008-09, unless otherwise noted.

The format states will use to submit the Consolidated State Performance Report has changed to an online submission starting with SY 2004-05. This online submission system is being developed through the Education Data Exchange Network (EDEN) and will make the submission process less burdensome. Please see the following section on transmittal instructions for more information on how to submit this year's Consolidated State Performance Report.

TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

The Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) data will be collected online from the SEAs, using the EDEN web site. The EDEN web site will be modified to include a separate area (sub-domain) for CSPR data entry. This area will utilize EDEN formatting to the extent possible and the data will be entered in the order of the current CSPR forms. The data entry screens will include or provide access to all instructions and notes on the current CSPR forms; additionally, an effort will be made to design the screens to balance efficient data collection and reduction of visual clutter.

Initially, a state user will log onto EDEN and be provided with an option that takes him or her to the "SY 2008-09 CSPR". The main CSPR screen will allow the user to select the section of the CSPR that he or she needs to either view or enter data. After selecting a section of the CSPR, the user will be presented with a screen or set of screens where the user can input the data for that section of the CSPR. A user can only select one section of the CSPR at a time. After a state has included all available data in the designated sections of a particular CSPR Part, a lead state user will certify that Part and transmit it to the Department. Once a Part has been transmitted, ED will have access to the data. States may still make changes or additions to the transmitted data, by creating an updated version of the CSPR. Detailed instructions for transmitting the SY 2008-09 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1965, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1810-0614. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 111 hours per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimates(s) contact School Support and Technology Programs, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW, Washington DC 20202-6140. Questions about the new electronic CSPR submission process, should be directed to the EDEN Partner Support Center at 1-877-HLP-EDEN (1-877-457-3336).

		OMB Number: 1810-0614
		Expiration Date: 10/31/2010
<p>Consolidated State Performance Report For State Formula Grant Programs under the Elementary And Secondary Education Act as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001</p>		
Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: <input type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2008-09 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2008-09		
Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report: Virginia Department of Education		
Address: P. O. Box 2120 Richmond, VA 23218-2120		
Person to contact about this report:		
Name: Ms. Rebecca Marable, Title I Coordinator		
Telephone: (804) 371-0044		
Fax: (804) 371-7347		
e-mail: Rebecca.Marable@doe.virginia.gov		
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Dr. Patricia I. Wright, Superintendent of Public Instruction		
_____ Signature		_____ Date
		Wednesday, April 21, 2010, 9:44:05 AM

2.1 IMPROVING BASIC PROGRAMS OPERATED BY LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES (TITLE I, PART A)

This section collects data on Title I, Part A programs.

2.1.1 Student Achievement in Schools with Title I, Part A Programs

The following sections collect data on student academic achievement on the State's assessments in schools that receive Title I, Part A funds and operate either Schoolwide programs or Targeted Assistance programs.

2.1.1.1 Student Achievement in Mathematics in Schoolwide Schools (SWP)

In the format of the table below, provide the number of students in SWP schools who completed the assessment and for whom a proficiency level was assigned, in grades 3 through 8 and high school, on the State's mathematics assessments under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*. Also, provide the number of those students who scored at or above proficient. The percentage of students who scored at or above proficient is calculated automatically.

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring At or Above Proficient	Percentage At or Above Proficient
3	23,214	19,476	83.9
4	22,064	17,879	81.0
5	20,305	17,517	86.3
6	6,026	4,367	72.5
7	3,121	2,060	66.0
8	2,881	2,357	81.8
High School	1,554	1,355	87.2
Total	79,165	65,011	82.1

Comments:

2.1.1.2 Student Achievement in Reading/Language Arts in Schoolwide Schools (SWP)

This section is similar to 2.1.1.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on performance on the State's reading/language arts assessment in SWP.

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring At or Above Proficient	Percentage At or Above Proficient
3	23,164	18,997	82.0
4	22,015	18,588	84.4
5	20,515	18,154	88.5
6	6,354	5,293	83.3
7	3,329	2,788	83.8
8	2,866	2,379	83.0
High School	300	253	84.3
Total	78,543	66,452	84.6

Comments:

2.1.1.3 Student Achievement in Mathematics in Targeted Assistance Schools (TAS)

In the table below, provide the number of all students in TAS who completed the assessment and for whom a proficiency level was assigned, in grades 3 through 8 and high school, on the State's mathematics assessments under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*. Also, provide the number of those students who scored at or above proficient. The percentage of students who scored at or above proficient is calculated automatically.

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring At or Above Proficient	Percentage At or Above Proficient
3	22,637	19,973	88.2
4	22,282	18,843	84.6
5	20,798	18,327	88.1
6	3,668	2,685	73.2
7	2,592	1,839	71.0
8	1,991	1,697	85.2
High School	933	889	95.3
Total	74,901	64,253	85.8
Comments:			

2.1.1.4 Student Achievement in Reading/Language Arts in Targeted Assistance Schools (TAS)

This section is similar to 2.1.1.3. The only difference is that this section collects data on performance on the State's reading/language arts assessment by all students in TAS.

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring At or Above Proficient	Percentage At or Above Proficient
3	22,591	19,052	84.3
4	22,244	19,212	86.4
5	20,935	18,810	89.8
6	3,867	3,247	84.0
7	3,238	2,732	84.4
8	1,478	1,194	80.8
High School	55	49	89.1
Total	74,408	64,296	86.4
Comments:			

2.1.2 Title I, Part A Student Participation

The following sections collect data on students participating in Title I, Part A by various student characteristics.

2.1.2.1 Student Participation in Public Title I, Part A by Special Services or Programs

In the table below, provide the number of public school students served by either Public Title I SW or TAS programs at any time during the regular school year for each category listed. Count each student only once in each category even if the student participated during more than one term or in more than one school or district in the State. Count each student in as many of the categories that are applicable to the student. Include pre-kindergarten through grade 12. Do not include the following individuals: (1) adult participants of adult literacy programs funded by Title I, (2) private school students participating in Title I programs operated by local educational agencies, or (3) students served in Part A local neglected programs.

	# Students Served
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	32,158
Limited English proficient students	22,774
Students who are homeless	3,133
Migratory students	371
Comments:	

2.1.2.2 Student Participation in Public Title I, Part A by Racial/Ethnic Group

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of public school students served by either public Title I SWP or TAS at any time during the regular school year. Each student should be reported in only one racial/ethnic category. Include pre-kindergarten through grade 12. The total number of students served will be calculated automatically.

Do not include: (1) adult participants of adult literacy programs funded by Title I, (2) private school students participating in Title I programs operated by local educational agencies, or (3) students served in Part A local neglected programs.

Race/Ethnicity	# Students Served
American Indian or Alaska Native	413
Asian or Pacific Islander	5,893
Black, non-Hispanic	91,201
Hispanic	22,789
White, non-Hispanic	76,163
Total	196,459
Comments:	

2.1.2.3 Student Participation in Title I, Part A by Grade Level

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of students participating in Title I, Part A programs by grade level and by type of program: Title I public targeted assistance programs (Public TAS), Title I schoolwide programs (Public SWP), private school students participating in Title I programs (private), and Part A local neglected programs (local neglected). The totals column by type of program will be automatically calculated.

Age/Grade	Public TAS	Public SWP	Private	Local Neglected	Total
Age 0-2	6	146	0	0	152
Age 3-5 (not Kindergarten)	209	4,952	0	0	5,161
K	3,445	33,942	0	0	37,387
1	5,236	25,972	0	0	31,208
2	5,056	25,347	0	0	30,403
3	4,558	24,235	0	0	28,793
4	3,670	23,015	0	0	26,685
5	2,930	21,408	0	0	24,338
6	454	6,610	0	0	7,064
7	531	3,473	0	0	4,004
8	324	2,987	0	0	3,311
9	153	450	0	0	603
10	67	288	0	0	355
11	37	224	0	0	261
12	16	214	0	0	230
Ungraded					
TOTALS	26,692	173,263	0	0	199,955
Comments:					

2.1.2.4 Student Participation in Title I, Part A Targeted Assistance Programs by Instructional and Support Services

The following sections collect data about the participation of students in TAS.

2.1.2.4.1 Student Participation in Title I, Part A Targeted Assistance Programs by Instructional Services

In the table below, provide the number of students receiving each of the listed instructional services through a TAS program funded by Title I, Part A. Students may be reported as receiving more than one instructional service. However, students should be reported only once for each instructional service regardless of the frequency with which they received the service.

	# Students Served
Mathematics	3,000
Reading/language arts	18,868
Science	
Social studies	
Vocational/career	
Other instructional services	4,823
Comments: Other instructional services - Students received services in both Reading/Language arts and Mathematics combined.	

2.1.2.4.2 Student Participation in Title I, Part A Targeted Assistance Programs by Support Services

In the table below, provide the number of students receiving each of the listed support services through a TAS program funded by Title I, Part A. Students may be reported as receiving more than one support service. However, students should be reported only once for each support service regardless of the frequency with which they received the service.

	# Students Served
Health, dental, and eye care	1
Supporting guidance/advocacy	
Other support services	0
Comments:	

2.1.3 Staff Information for Title I, Part A Targeted Assistance Programs (TAS)

In the table below, provide the number of full-time equivalent (FTE) staff funded by a Title I, Part A TAS in each of the staff categories. For staff who work with both TAS and SWP, report only the FTE attributable to their TAS responsibilities.

For paraprofessionals only, provide the percentage of paraprofessionals who were qualified in accordance with Section 1119 (c) and (d) of *ESEA*.

See the FAQs following the table for additional information.

Staff Category	Staff FTE	Percentage Qualified
Teachers	1,027	
Paraprofessionals ¹	198	99.7
Other paraprofessionals (translators, parental involvement, computer assistance) ²	16	
Clerical support staff	35	
Administrators (non-clerical)	28	
Comments:		

¹ Consistent with *ESEA*, Title I, Section 1119(g)(2).

² Consistent with *ESEA*, Title I, Section 1119(e).

2.1.3.1 Paraprofessional Information for Title I, Part A Schoolwide Programs

In the table below, provide the number of FTE paraprofessionals who served in SWP and the percentage of these paraprofessionals who were qualified in accordance with Section 1119 (c) and (d) of *ESEA*. Use the additional guidance found below the previous table.

	Paraprofessionals FTE	Percentage Qualified
Paraprofessionals ³	2,703.00	96.6
Comments:		

³ Consistent with *ESEA*, Title I, Section 1119(g)(2).

2.2 WILLIAM F. GOODLING EVEN START FAMILY LITERACY PROGRAMS (TITLE I, PART B, SUBPART 3)**2.2.1 Subgrants and Even Start Program Participants**

In the tables below, please provide information requested for the reporting program year July 1, 2008 to June 30, 2009.

2.2.1.1 Federally Funded Even Start Subgrants in the State

Number of federally funded Even Start subgrants	6
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.2.1.2 Even Start Families Participating During the Year

In the table below, provide the number of participants for each of the groups listed below. The following terms apply:

1. "Participating" means enrolled and participating in all four core instructional components.
2. "Adults" includes teen parents.
3. For continuing children, calculate the age of the child on July 1, 2008. For newly enrolled children, calculate their age at the time of enrollment in Even Start.
4. Do not use rounding rules to calculate children's ages .

The total number of participating children will be calculated automatically.

	# Participants
1. Families participating	168
2. Adults participating	176
3. Adults participating who are limited English proficient (Adult English Learners)	85
4. Participating children	250
a. Birth through 2 years	63
b. Ages 3 through 5	101
c. Ages 6 through 8	73
c. Above age 8	13
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.2.1.3 Characteristics of Newly Enrolled Families at the Time of Enrollment

In the table below, provide the number of newly enrolled families for each of the groups listed below. The term "newly enrolled family" means a family who enrolls for the first time in the Even Start project or who had previously been in Even Start and re-enrolls during the year.

	#
1. Number of newly enrolled families	89
2. Number of newly enrolled adult participants	93
3. Number of newly enrolled families at or below the federal poverty level at the time of enrollment	89
4. Number of newly enrolled adult participants without a high school diploma or GED at the time of enrollment	81
5. Number of newly enrolled adult participants who have not gone beyond the 9 th grade at the time of enrollment	45
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.2.1.4 Retention of Families

In the table below, provide the number of families who are newly enrolled, those who exited the program during the year, and those continuing in the program. For families who have exited, count the time between the family's start date and exit date. For families continuing to participate, count the time between the family's start date and the end of the reporting year (June 30, 2009). For families who had previously exited Even Start and then enrolled during the reporting year, begin counting from the time of the family's original enrollment date. **Report each family only once in lines 1-4.** Note enrolled families means a family who is participating in all four core instructional components. The total number of families participating will be automatically calculated.

Time in Program	#
1. Number of families enrolled 90 days or less	20
2. Number of families enrolled more than 90 but less than 180 days	32
3. Number of families enrolled 180 or more days but less than 365 days	46
4. Number of families enrolled 365 days or more	70
5. Total families enrolled	168
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.2.2 Federal Even Start Performance Indicators

This section collects data about the federal Even Start Performance Indicators

2.2.2.1 Adults Showing Significant Learning Gains on Measures of Reading

In the table below, provide the number of adults who showed significant learning gains on measures of reading. Only report data from the TABE reading test on the TABE line. Likewise, only report data from the CASAS reading test on the CASAS line. Data from the other TABE or CASAS tests or combination of both tests should be reported on the "other" line.

To be counted under "pre- and post-test", an individual must have completed **both** the pre- and post-tests.

The definition of "significant learning gains" for adult education is determined at the State level either by your State's adult education program in conjunction with the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Vocational and Adult Education (OVAE), or as defined by your Even Start State Performance Indicators.

These instructions/definitions apply to both 2.2.2.1 and 2.2.2.2.

Note: Do not include the Adult English Learners counted in 2.2.2.2.

	# Pre- and Post-Tested	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (if applicable)
TABE	58	39	Significant progress is defined as a gain of 27 points or more between pre- and post-test.
CASAS			Virginia does not use CASAS.
Other	55	36	Results are for TABE Mathematics. Significant progress is defined as a gain of 27 points or more between pre- and post-test.
Comments:			

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.2.2.2 Adult English Learners Showing Significant Learning Gains on Measures of Reading

In the table below, provide the number of Adult English Learners who showed significant learning gains on measures of reading.

	# Pre- and Post-Tested	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (if applicable)
TABE			Virginia does not use TABE for English language learners.
CASAS			Virginia does not use CASAS.
BEST			Virginia does not use Best for English language learners.
BEST Plus	73	55	Significant progress is defined as a gain of 20 points or more between pre- and post-test.
BEST Literacy			Virginia does not require the use of BEST Literacy section.
Other			
Comments:			

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.2.2.3 Adults Earning a High School Diploma or GED

In the table below, provide the number of school-age and non-school age adults who earned a high school diploma or GED during the reporting year.

The following terms apply:

1. "School-age adults" is defined as any parent attending an elementary or secondary school. This also includes those adults within the State's compulsory attendance range who are being served in an alternative school setting, such as directly through the Even Start program.
2. "Non-school-age" adults are any adults who do not meet the definition of "school-age."
3. Include only the number of adult participants who had a realistic goal of earning a high school diploma or GED. Note that age limitations on taking the GED differ by State, so you should include only those adult participants for whom attainment of a GED or high school diploma is a possibility.

School-Age Adults	# with goal	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (if applicable)
Diploma	1	1	
GED			
Other			
Comments:			

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Non-School-Age Adults	# with goal	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (if applicable)
Diploma			
GED	30	11	In addition to the 11 adults who obtained the GED, 28 passed one or more of the sub-tests.
Other			
Comments:			

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.2.2.4 Children Age-Eligible for Kindergarten Who Are Achieving Significant Learning Gains on Measures of Language Development

In the table below, provide the number of children who are achieving significant learning gains on measures of language development.

The following terms apply:

1. "Age-Eligible" includes the total number of children who are old enough to enter kindergarten in the school year following the reporting year who have been in Even Start for at least six months.
2. "Tested" includes the number of age-eligible children who took both a pre- and post-test with at least 6 months of Even Start service in between.
3. A "significant learning gain" is considered to be a standard score increase of 4 or more points.
4. "Exempted" includes the number of children who could not take the test (based on the practice items) due to a severe disability or inability to understand the directions.

	# Age-Eligible	# Pre- and Post-Tested	# Who Met Goal	# Exempted	Explanation (if applicable)
PPVT-III					Virginia did not use PPVT-III in 2008-2009.
PPVT-IV	39	17	12	22	Virginia defines age-eligible children as those who will be 5 by September 30 of the next year. Of the 22 children who were not tested, 16 were English language learners and 6 had been in the program for less than six months.
TVIP					
Comments:					

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.2.2.4.1 Children Age-Eligible for Kindergarten Who Demonstrate Age-Appropriate Oral Language Skills

The following terms apply:

1. "Age-Eligible" includes the total number of children who are old enough to enter kindergarten in the school year following the reporting year who have been in Even Start for at least six months.
2. "Tested" includes the number of age-eligible children who took the PPVT-III or TVIP in the spring of the reporting year.
3. # who met goal includes children who score a Standard Score of 85 or higher on the spring PPVT-III
4. "Exempted" includes the number of children who could not take the test (based on the practice items) due to a severe disability or inability to understand the directions in English.

Note: Projects may use the PPVT-III or the PPVT-IV if the PPVT-III is no longer available, but results for the two versions of the assessment should be reported separately.

	# Age-Eligible	# Tested	# Who Met Goal	# Exempted	Explanation (if applicable)
PPVT-III					Virginia did not use PPVT-III in 2008-2009.
PPVT-IV	39	17	14	22	Virginia defines age-eligible children as those who will be 5 by September 30 of the next year. Of the 22 children who were not tested, 16 were English language learners and 6 had been in the program for less than six months.
TVIP					
Comments:					

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

2.2.2.5 The Average Number of Letters Children Can Identify as Measured by the PALS Pre-K Upper Case Letter Naming Subtask

In the table below, provide the average number of letters children can identify as measure by PALS subtask.

The following terms apply:

1. "Age-Eligible" includes the total number of children who are old enough to enter kindergarten in the school year following the reporting year.
2. "Tested" includes the number of age-eligible children who received Even Start services and who took the PALS Pre-K Upper Case Letter Naming Subtask in the spring of 2009 (or latest test within the reporting year).
3. "Exempted" includes the number of children exempted from testing due to a severe disability or inability to understand the directions in English.
4. "Average number of letters" includes the average score for the children in your State who participated in this assessment. This should be provided as a weighted average (An example of how to calculate a weighted average is included in the program training materials) and rounded to one decimal.

	# Age-Eligible	# Tested	# Exempted	Average Number of Letters (Weighted Average)	Explanation (if applicable)
PALS PreK Upper Case	39	31	8	21.7	Virginia defines age-eligible children as those who will be 5 by September 30 of the next year. Of the 8 exempted children, all were English language learners.
Comments:					

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.2.2.6 School-Aged Children Reading on Grade Level

In the table below, provide the number of school-age children who read on or above grade level ("met goal"). The source of these data is usually determined by the State and, in some cases, by school district. Please indicate the source(s) of the data in the "Explanation" field.

Grade	# In Cohort	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (include source of data)
K	29	25	Data represent student performance based on Phonological Awareness Literacy Screening (PALS). Two children who did not achieve the goal were English language learners.
1	23	18	Data represent student performance based on Phonological Awareness Literacy Screening (PALS). Four children who did not achieve the goal were English language learners.
2	19	19	Data represent student performance based on Phonological Awareness Literacy Screening (PALS).
3	10	10	Data represent student performance based on Standards of Learning (SOL) Reading assessment.
Comments:			

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.2.2.7 Parents Who Show Improvement on Measures of Parental Support for Children's Learning in the Home, School Environment, and Through Interactive Learning Activities

In the table below, provide the number of parents who show improvement ("met goal") on measures of parental support for children's learning in the home, school environment, and through interactive learning activities.

While many states are using the PEP, other assessments of parenting education are acceptable. Please describe results and the source(s) of any non-PEP data in the "Other" field, with appropriate information in the Explanation field.

	# In Cohort	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (if applicable)
PEP Scale I			
PEP Scale II			
PEP Scale III			
PEP Scale IV			
Other	128	128	Virginia uses local observation tools/records, and the state designed Parent Education and Parent and Child Together/Integrated Literacy Activities (PACT/ILA) form to measure and assess progress.
Comments: Virginia does not use the PEP, Virginia uses the Parent and Child Together (PACT) observation form.			

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.3 EDUCATION OF MIGRANT CHILDREN (TITLE I, PART C)

This section collects data on the Migrant Education Program (Title I, Part C) for the reporting period of September 1, 2008 through August 31, 2009. This section is composed of the following subsections:

- Population data of eligible migrant children;
- Academic data of eligible migrant students;
- Participation data of migrant children served during either the regular school year, summer/intersession term, or program year;
- School data;
- Project data;
- Personnel data.

Where the table collects data by age/grade, report children in the highest age/grade that they attained during the reporting period. For example, a child who turns 3 during the reporting period would only be reported in the "Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)" row.

FAQs in section 1.10 contain definitions of out-of-school and ungraded that are used in this section.

2.3.1 Population Data

The following questions collect data on eligible migrant children.

2.3.1.1 Eligible Migrant Children

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children by age/grade. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Eligible Migrant Children
Age birth through 2	29
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	116
K	85
1	90
2	97
3	65
4	75
5	63
6	41
7	46
8	63
9	32
10	42
11	27
12	27
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	302
Total	1,200

Comments: Virginia does not have any students classified as ungraded.

2.3.1.2 Priority for Services

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children who have been classified as having "Priority for Services." The total is calculated automatically. Below the table is a FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Age/Grade	Priority for Services
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	50
K	50
1	56
2	65
3	38
4	46
5	46
6	30
7	38
8	51
9	21
10	31
11	13
12	16
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	135
Total	686
Comments: The increase in the number of migrant students identified as having "Priority for Services" is due to increased technical assistance to school divisions in identification and classification of migrant students.	
Virginia does not have any students classified as ungraded.	

FAQ on priority for services:

Who is classified as having "priority for service?" Migratory children who are failing, or most at risk of failing to meet the State's challenging academic content standards and student academic achievement standards, and whose education has been interrupted during the regular school year.

2.3.1.3 Limited English Proficient

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children who are also limited English proficient (LEP). The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Limited English Proficient (LEP)
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	58
K	68
1	74
2	79
3	56
4	61
5	59
6	32
7	39
8	50
9	21
10	29
11	19
12	19
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	20
Total	684

Comments: The decrease in the number of eligible migrant children who are also limited English proficient (LEP) compared to the previous year can be attributed to an overall decrease in the total number of migrant children during the 2008-2009 school year.

Virginia does not have any students classified as ungraded.

2.3.1.4 Children with Disabilities (IDEA)

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children who are also Children with Disabilities (*IDEA*) under Part B or Part C of the *IDEA*. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Children with Disabilities (IDEA)
Age birth through 2	1
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	5
K	3
1	3
2	1
3	
4	2
5	3
6	1
7	2
8	1
9	1
10	2
11	
12	1
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	7
Total	33

Comments: The decrease in the number of eligible migrant children who are also children with disabilities compared to the previous year can be attributed to an overall decrease in the total number of migrant children during the 2008-2009 school year.

Virginia does not have any students in grades 3 or 11 for this category.

Virginia does not have any students classified as ungraded.

2.3.1.5 Last Qualifying Move

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children by when the last qualifying move occurred. The months are calculated from the last day of the reporting period, August 31, 2008. The totals are calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Last Qualifying Move Is within X months from the last day of the reporting period			
	12 Months	Previous 13 – 24 Months	Previous 25 – 36 Months	Previous 37 – 48 Months
Age birth through 2	15	9	5	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	39	45	18	14
K	37	23	9	16
1	33	21	23	13
2	44	22	17	14
3	27	15	14	9
4	29	20	19	7
5	22	13	13	15
6	15	13	6	7
7	24	9	7	6
8	18	19	12	14
9	14	10	7	1
10	15	16	5	6
11	7	8	9	3
12	9	11	2	5
Ungraded				
Out-of-school	103	156	29	14
Total	451	410	195	144

Comments: The decrease in the number of migrant children reported with a previous 37-48 month qualifying move compared to the previous year can be attributed to an overall decrease in the total number of migrant children during the 2008-2009 school year.

Virginia does not have any students classified as ungraded.

2.3.1.6 Qualifying Move During Regular School Year

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children with any qualifying move during the regular school year within the previous 36 months calculated from the last day of the reporting period, August 31, 2008. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Move During Regular School Year
Age birth through 2	14
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	58
K	35
1	32
2	40
3	34
4	43
5	31
6	17
7	28
8	36
9	18
10	30
11	15
12	14
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	129
Total	574
Comments: Virginia does not have any students classified as ungraded.	

2.3.2 Academic Status

The following questions collect data about the academic status of **eligible** migrant students.

2.3.2.1 Dropouts

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant students who dropped out of school. The total is calculated automatically.

Grade	Dropped Out
7	1
8	
9	1
10	1
11	2
12	4
Ungraded	
Total	9

Comments: Virginia does not have any students classified as ungraded.

FAQ on Dropouts:

How is "dropped out of school" defined? The term used for students, who, during the reporting period, were enrolled in a public or private school for at least one day, but who subsequently left school with no plans on returning to enroll in a school and continue toward a high school diploma. Students who dropped out-of-school prior to the 2007-08 reporting period should be classified NOT as "dropped-out-of-school" but as "out-of-school youth."

2.3.2.2 GED

In the table below, provide the total unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant students who obtained a General Education Development (GED) Certificate in your state.

Obtained a GED in your state	0
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.3.2.3 Participation in State Assessments

The following questions collect data about the participation of eligible migrant students in State Assessments.

2.3.2.3.1 Reading/Language Arts Participation

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant students enrolled in school during the State testing window and tested by the State reading/language arts assessment by grade level. The totals are calculated automatically.

Grade	Enrolled	Tested
3	46	46
4	38	38
5	32	32
6	31	31
7	28	28
8	27	27
9		
10		
11	18	18
12		
Total	220	220

Comments: The decrease in the number of eligible migrant children who participated in the reading/language arts assessment compared to the previous year can be attributed to an overall decrease in the total number of migrant children during the 2008-2009 school year.

Virginia does not have any students in grades 9, 10, or 12 for this category.

2.3.2.3.2 Mathematics Participation

This section is similar to 2.3.2.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on migrant students and the State's mathematics assessment.

Grade	Enrolled	Tested
3	47	47
4	38	38
5	34	34
6	31	31
7	21	21
8	26	26
9		
10		
11	55	54
12		
Total	252	251

Comments: The decrease in the number of eligible migrant children who participated in the mathematics assessment compared to the previous year can be attributed to an overall decrease in the total number of migrant children during the 2008-2009 school year.

Virginia does not have any students in grades 9, 10, or 12 for this category.

2.3.3 MEP Participation Data

The following questions collect data about the participation of migrant students served during the regular school year, summer/intersession term, or program year.

Unless otherwise indicated, participating migrant children include:

- Children who received instructional or support services funded in whole or in part with MEP funds.
- Children who received a MEP-funded service, even those children who continued to receive services (1) during the term their eligibility ended, (2) for one additional school year after their eligibility ended, if comparable services were not available through other programs, and (3) in secondary school after their eligibility ended, and served through credit accrual programs until graduation (e.g., children served under the continuation of services authority, Section 1304(e)(1–3)).

Do not include:

- Children who were served through a Title I SWP where MEP funds were consolidated with those of other programs.
- Children who were served by a "referred" service only.

2.3.3.1 MEP Participation – Regular School Year

The following questions collect data on migrant children who participated in the MEP during the **regular** school year. Do not include:

- Children who were only served during the summer/intersession term.

2.3.3.1.1 MEP Students Served During the Regular School Year

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **participating** migrant children who received MEP-funded instructional or support services during the regular school year. Do **not** count the number of times an individual child received a service intervention. The total number of students served is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Served During Regular School Year
Age Birth through 2	17
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	80
K	63
1	90
2	60
3	61
4	59
5	53
6	40
7	40
8	51
9	32
10	42
11	26
12	25
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	223
Total	962

Comments: Migrant Education Program students served during the regular school year decreased compared to the previous year due to an overall decrease in migrant students.

Virginia does not have any students classified as ungraded.

2.3.3.1.2 Priority for Services – During the Regular School Year

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **participating** migrant children who have been classified as having "priority for services" and who received instructional or support services during the regular school year. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Priority for Services
Age 3 through 5	36
K	33
1	45
2	31
3	28
4	28
5	28
6	23
7	22
8	30
9	18
10	23
11	7
12	15
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	62
Total	429
<p>Comments: The increase in the number of migrant students identified as having "Priority for Services" is due to increased technical assistance to school divisions in identification and classification of migrant students.</p> <p>Virginia does not have any students classified as ungraded.</p>	

2.3.3.1.3 Continuation of Services – During the Regular School Year

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **participating** migrant children who received instructional or support services during the regular school year served under the continuation of services authority Sections 1304(e)(2)–(3). Do **not** include children served under Section 1304(e)(1), which are children whose eligibility expired during the school term. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Continuation of Services
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	10
K	10
1	11
2	4
3	10
4	9
5	7
6	5
7	10
8	9
9	7
10	16
11	10
12	11
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	5
Total	134

Comments: The decrease in the number of eligible migrant children who received instructional or support services compared to the previous year can be attributed to an overall decrease in the total number of migrant children during the 2008-2009 school year.

Virginia does not have any students classified as ungraded.

2.3.3.1.4 Services

The following questions collect data on the services provided to participating migrant children during the regular school year.

FAQ on Services:

What are services? Services are a subset of all allowable activities that the MEP can provide through its programs and projects. "Services" are those educational or educationally related activities that: (1) directly benefit a migrant child; (2) address a need of a migrant child consistent with the SEA's comprehensive needs assessment and service delivery plan; (3) are grounded in scientifically based research or, in the case of support services, are a generally accepted practice; and (4) are designed to enable the program to meet its measurable outcomes and contribute to the achievement of the State's performance targets. Activities related to identification and recruitment activities, parental involvement, program evaluation, professional development, or administration of the program are examples of allowable activities that are not considered services. Other examples of an allowable activity that would not be considered a service would be the one-time act of providing instructional packets to a child or family, and handing out leaflets to migrant families on available reading programs as part of an effort to increase the reading skills of migrant children. Although these are allowable activities, they are not services because they do not meet all of the criteria above.

2.3.3.1.4.1 Instructional Service – During the Regular School Year

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **participating** migrant children who received any type of MEP-funded instructional service during the regular school year. Include children who received instructional services provided by either a teacher or a paraprofessional. Children should be reported only once regardless of the frequency with which they received a service intervention. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Children Receiving an Instructional Service
Age birth through 2	4
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	55
K	60
1	85
2	57
3	61
4	54
5	49
6	36
7	34
8	42
9	26
10	36
11	26
12	24
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	88
Total	737

Comments: Virginia does not have any students classified as ungraded.

2.3.3.1.4.2 Type of Instructional Service

In the table below, provide the number of **participating** migrant children reported in the table above who received reading instruction, mathematics instruction, or high school credit accrual during the regular school year. Include children who received such instructional services provided by a teacher only. Children may be reported as having received more than one type of instructional service in the table. However, children should be reported only once within each type of instructional service that they received regardless of the frequency with which they received the instructional service. The totals are calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Reading Instruction	Mathematics Instruction	High School Credit Accrual
Age birth through 2	1		
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	40	37	
K	53	51	
1	72	67	
2	44	44	
3	50	45	
4	43	41	
5	32	30	
6	32	32	
7	27	25	
8	20	27	
9	10	15	26
10	10	18	36
11	6	8	26
12	7	12	24
Ungraded			
Out-of-school	30		
Total	477	452	112

Comments: The decrease in the number of eligible migrant children who participated in the high school credit accruals compared to the previous year can be attributed to an overall decrease in the total number of migrant children during the 2008-2009 school year.

Virginia does not have any students classified as ungraded.

FAQ on Types of Instructional Services:

What is "*high school credit accrual*"? Instruction in courses that accrue credits needed for high school graduation provided by a teacher for students on a regular or systematic basis, usually for a predetermined period of time. Includes correspondence courses taken by a student under the supervision of a teacher.

2.3.3.1.4.3 Support Services with Breakout for Counseling Service

In the table below, in the column titled **Support Services**, provide the unduplicated number of **participating** migrant children who received any MEP-funded support service during the regular school year. In the column titled **Counseling Service**, provide the unduplicated number of **participating** migrant children who received a counseling service during the regular school year. Children should be reported only once in each column regardless of the frequency with which they received a support service intervention. The totals are calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Children Receiving Support Services	Breakout of Children Receiving Counseling Service
Age birth through 2	17	2
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	77	36
K	61	42
1	89	47
2	58	37
3	58	27
4	58	29
5	53	27
6	40	26
7	40	29
8	50	35
9	32	15
10	42	21
11	26	15
12	25	16
Ungraded		
Out-of-school	223	13
Total	949	417

Comments: Virginia does not have any students classified as ungraded.

FAQs on Support Services:

- a. *What are support services?* These MEP-funded services include, but are not limited to, health, nutrition, counseling, and social services for migrant families; necessary educational supplies, and transportation. The one-time act of providing instructional or informational packets to a child or family does not constitute a support service.
- b. *What are counseling services?* Services to help a student to better identify and enhance his or her educational, personal, or occupational potential; relate his or her abilities, emotions, and aptitudes to educational and career opportunities; utilize his or her abilities in formulating realistic plans; and achieve satisfying personal and social development. These activities take place between one or more counselors and one or more students as counselees, between students and students, and between counselors and other staff members. The services can also help the child address life problems or personal crisis that result from the culture of migrancy.

2.3.3.1.4.4 Referred Service – During the Regular School Year

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **participating** migrant children who, during the regular school year, received an educational or educationally related service funded by another non-MEP program/organization that they would not have otherwise received without efforts supported by MEP funds. Children should be reported only once regardless of the frequency with which they received a referred service. Include children who were served by a referred service only or who received both a referred service and MEP-funded services. Do not include children who were referred, but received no services. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Referred Service
Age birth through 2	1
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	9
K	6
1	4
2	1
3	6
4	4
5	6
6	1
7	4
8	4
9	1
10	
11	1
12	1
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	1
Total	50
Comments: Virginia does not have any students in grade 10 for this category.	
Virginia does not have any students classified as ungraded.	

2.3.3.2 MEP Participation – Summer/Intersession Term

The questions in this subsection are similar to the questions in the previous section with one difference. The questions in this subsection collect data on the **summer/intersession term** instead of the regular school year.

2.3.3.2.1 MEP Students Served During the Summer/Intersession Term

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **participating** migrant children who received MEP-funded instructional or support services during the summer/intersession term. Do not count the number of times an individual child received a service intervention. The total number of students served is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Served During Summer/Intersession Term
Age Birth through 2	25
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	77
K	51
1	77
2	82
3	53
4	63
5	53
6	36
7	31
8	41
9	28
10	28
11	26
12	18
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	137
Total	826

Comments: The decrease in the number of eligible migrant children who received instructional or support services during the summer/intersession compared to the previous year can be attributed to an overall decrease in the total number of migrant children during the 2008-2009 school year.

Virginia does not have any students classified as ungraded.

2.3.3.2.2 Priority for Services – During the Summer/Intersession Term

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **participating** migrant children who have been classified as having "priority for services" and who received instructional or support services during the summer/intersession term. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Priority for Services
Age 3 through 5	26
K	24
1	44
2	47
3	31
4	38
5	28
6	22
7	20
8	27
9	16
10	19
11	10
12	7
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	98
Total	457
<p>Comments: The increase in the number of migrant students identified as having "Priority for Services" is due to increased technical assistance to school divisions in identification and classification of migrant students.</p> <p>Virginia does not have any students classified as ungraded.</p>	

2.3.3.2.3 Continuation of Services – During the Summer/Intersession Term

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **participating** migrant children who received instructional or support services during the summer/intersession term served under the continuation of services authority Sections 1304(e)(2)–(3). Do **not** include children served under Section 1304(e)(1), which are children whose eligibility expired during the school term. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Continuation of Services
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	3
K	2
1	4
2	7
3	3
4	3
5	5
6	2
7	1
8	3
9	1
10	4
11	6
12	7
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	1
Total	52

Comments: The decrease in the number of eligible migrant children who received continuation of services through the summer/intersession term compared to the previous year can be attributed to an overall decrease in the total number of migrant children during the 2008-2009 school year.

Virginia does not have any students classified as ungraded.

2.3.3.2.4 Services

The following questions collect data on the services provided to participating migrant children during the summer/intersession term.

FAQ on Services:

What are services? Services are a subset of all allowable activities that the MEP can provide through its programs and projects. "Services" are those educational or educationally related activities that: (1) directly benefit a migrant child; (2) address a need of a migrant child consistent with the SEA's comprehensive needs assessment and service delivery plan; (3) are grounded in scientifically based research or, in the case of support services, are a generally accepted practice; and (4) are designed to enable the program to meet its measurable outcomes and contribute to the achievement of the State's performance targets. Activities related to identification and recruitment activities, parental involvement, program evaluation, professional development, or administration of the program are examples of allowable activities that are NOT considered services. Other examples of an allowable activity that would not be considered a service would be the one-time act of providing instructional packets to a child or family, and handing out leaflets to migrant families on available reading programs as part of an effort to increase the reading skills of migrant children. Although these are allowable activities, they are not services because they do not meet all of the criteria above.

2.3.3.2.4.1 Instructional Service – During the Summer/Intersession Term

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **participating** migrant children who received any type of MEP-funded instructional service during the summer/intersession term. Include children who received instructional services provided by either a teacher or a paraprofessional. Children should be reported only once regardless of the frequency with which they received a service intervention. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Children Receiving an Instructional Service
Age birth through 2	9
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	56
K	44
1	65
2	65
3	42
4	50
5	37
6	23
7	20
8	25
9	16
10	9
11	12
12	
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	38
Total	511

Comments: The decrease in the number of eligible migrant children who received instructional services through the summer/intersession term compared to the previous year can be attributed to an overall decrease in the total number of migrant children during the 2008-2009 school year.

Virginia does not have any students in grade 12 for this category.

Virginia does not have any students classified as ungraded.

2.3.3.2.4.2 Type of Instructional Service

In the table below, provide the number of **participating** migrant children reported in the table above who received reading instruction, mathematics instruction, or high school credit accrual during the summer/intersession term. Include children who received such instructional services provided by a teacher only. Children may be reported as having received more than one type of instructional service in the table. However, children should be reported only once within each type of instructional service that they received regardless of the frequency with which they received the instructional service. The totals are calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Reading Instruction	Mathematics Instruction	High School Credit Accrual
Age birth through 2	1		
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	41	40	
K	39	38	
1	57	55	
2	54	53	
3	37	34	
4	46	42	
5	25	25	
6	18	17	
7	16	15	
8	14	12	
9	9	8	16
10	4	3	9
11	6	2	12
12			
Ungraded			
Out-of-school			
Total	367	344	37

Comments: The decrease in the number of eligible migrant children who received high school credit accrual instructional services through the summer/intersession term compared to the previous year can be attributed to an overall decrease in the total number of migrant children during the 2008-2009 school year.

Virginia does not have any students in grade 12 or Out-of-school for this category.

Virginia does not have any students classified as ungraded.

FAQ on Types of Instructional Services:

What is "*high school credit accrual*"? Instruction in courses that accrue credits needed for high school graduation provided by a teacher for students on a regular or systematic basis, usually for a predetermined period of time. Includes correspondence courses taken by a student under the supervision of a teacher.

2.3.3.2.4.3 Support Services with Breakout for Counseling Service

In the table below, in the column titled **Support Services**, provide the unduplicated number of **participating** migrant children who received any MEP-funded support service during the summer/intersession term. In the column titled **Counseling Service**, provide the unduplicated number of **participating** migrant children who received a counseling service during the summer/intersession term. Children should be reported only once in each column regardless of the frequency with which they received a support service intervention. The totals are calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Children Receiving Support Services	Breakout of Children Receiving Counseling Service
Age birth through 2	20	3
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	67	11
K	48	7
1	73	8
2	78	14
3	49	5
4	58	3
5	51	13
6	32	4
7	29	4
8	38	9
9	25	7
10	27	8
11	24	6
12	16	1
Ungraded		
Out-of-school	134	3
Total	769	106

Comments: The decrease in the number of eligible migrant children who received counseling services through the summer/intersession term compared to the previous year can be attributed to an overall decrease in the total number of migrant children during the 2008-2009 school year.

Virginia does not have any students classified as ungraded.

FAQs on Support Services:

- a. *What are support services?* These MEP-funded services include, but are not limited to, health, nutrition, counseling, and social services for migrant families; necessary educational supplies, and transportation. The one-time act of providing instructional or informational packets to a child or family does not constitute a support service.
- b. *What are counseling services?* Services to help a student to better identify and enhance his or her educational, personal, or occupational potential; relate his or her abilities, emotions, and aptitudes to educational and career opportunities; utilize his or her abilities in formulating realistic plans; and achieve satisfying personal and social development. These activities take place between one or more counselors and one or more students as counselees, between students and students, and between counselors and other staff members. The services can also help the child address life problems or personal crisis that result from the culture of migrancy.

2.3.3.2.4.4 Referred Service – During the Summer/Intersession Term

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **participating** migrant children who, during the summer/intersession term, received an educational or educationally related service funded by another non-MEP program/organization that they would not have otherwise received without efforts supported by MEP funds. Children should be reported only once regardless of the frequency with which they received a referred service. Include children who were served by a referred service only or who received both a referred service and MEP-funded services. Do not include children who were referred, but received no services. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Referred Service
Age birth through 2	1
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	2
K	
1	1
2	
3	1
4	2
5	
6	
7	1
8	1
9	
10	
11	
12	
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	1
Total	10

Comments: Virginia does not have any students in grades K, 2, 5, 6, 9, 10, 11 or 12 for this category.

Virginia does not have any students classified as ungraded.

2.3.3.3 MEP Participation – Program Year

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **participating** migrant children who received MEP-funded instructional or support services at any time during the program year. Do not count the number of times an individual child received a service intervention. The total number of students served is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Served During the Program Year
Age Birth through 2	24
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	97
K	75
1	75
2	91
3	60
4	71
5	56
6	37
7	42
8	60
9	24
10	34
11	27
12	20
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	284
Total	1,077
Comments: Virginia does not have any students classified as ungraded.	

2.3.4 School Data

The following questions are about the enrollment of eligible migrant children in schools during the regular school year.

2.3.4.1 Schools and Enrollment

In the table below, provide the number of public schools that enrolled **eligible** migrant children at any time during the regular school year. Schools include public schools that serve school age (e.g., grades K through 12) children. Also, provide the number of **eligible** migrant children who were enrolled in those schools. Since more than one school in a State may enroll the same migrant child at some time during the year, the number of children may include duplicates.

	#
Number of schools that enrolled eligible migrant children	122
Number of eligible migrant children enrolled in those schools	753
Comments:	

2.3.4.2 Schools Where MEP Funds Were Consolidated in Schoolwide Programs

In the table below, provide the number of schools where MEP funds were consolidated in an SWP. Also, provide the number of **eligible** migrant children who were enrolled in those schools at any time during the regular school year. Since more than one school in a State may enroll the same migrant child at some time during the year, the number of children may include duplicates.

	#
Number of schools where MEP funds were consolidated in a schoolwide program	
Number of eligible migrant children enrolled in those schools	
Comments: Virginia does not have schools where MEP funds were consolidated in a schoolwide program.	

2.3.5 MEP Project Data

The following questions collect data on MEP projects.

2.3.5.1 Type of MEP Project

In the table below, provide the number of projects that are funded in whole or in part with MEP funds. A MEP project is the entity that receives MEP funds by a subgrant from the State or through an intermediate entity that receives the subgrant and provides services directly to the migrant child. Do not include projects where MEP funds were consolidated in SWP.

Also, provide the number of migrant children **participating** in the projects. Since children may participate in more than one project, the number of children may include duplicates.

Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

Type of MEP Project	Number of MEP Projects	Number of Migrant Children Participating in the Projects
Regular school year – school day only	2	85
Regular school year – school day/extended day	1	158
Summer/intersession only	1	178
Year round	6	998
Comments: The type of migrant education projects have been adjusted from those implemented the previous year based on programmatic needs.		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

FAQs on type of MEP project:

- a. *What is a project?* A project is any entity that receives MEP funds either as a subgrantee or from a subgrantee and provides services directly to migrant children in accordance with the State Service Delivery Plan and State approved subgrant applications. A project's services may be provided in one or more sites.
- b. *What are Regular School Year – School Day Only projects?* Projects where all MEP services are provided during the school day during the regular school year.
- c. *What are Regular School Year – School Day/Extended Day projects?* Projects where some or all MEP services are provided during an extended day or week during the regular school year (e.g., some services are provided during the school day and some outside of the school day; e.g., all services are provided outside of the school day).
- d. *What are Summer/Intersession Only projects?* Projects where all MEP services are provided during the summer/intersession term.
- e. *What are Year Round projects?* Projects where all MEP services are provided during the regular school year and summer/intersession term.

2.3.6 MEP Personnel Data

The following questions collect data on MEP personnel data.

2.3.6.1 Key MEP Personnel

The following questions collect data about the key MEP personnel.

2.3.6.1.1 MEP State Director

In the table below, provide the FTE amount of time the State director performs MEP duties (regardless of whether the director is funded by State, MEP, or other funds) during the reporting period (e.g., September 1 through August 31). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

State Director FTE	0.50
Comments: The increase in amount of time the State director performs MEP duties can be attributed to the receipt of a USED Consortium Incentive Grant (CIG).	

FAQs on the MEP State director

- a. *How is the FTE calculated for the State director?* Calculate the FTE using the number of days worked for the MEP. To do so, first define how many full-time days constitute one *FTE* for the State director in your State for the reporting period. To calculate the FTE number, sum the total days the State director worked for the MEP during the reporting period and divide this sum by the number of full-time days that constitute one FTE in the reporting period.
- b. *Who is the State director?* The manager within the SEA who administers the MEP on a statewide basis.

2.3.6.1.2 MEP Staff

In the table below, provide the headcount and FTE by job classification of the staff funded by the MEP. Do **not** include staff employed in SWP where MEP funds were combined with those of other programs. Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

Job Classification	Regular School Year		Summer/Intersession Term	
	Headcount	FTE	Headcount	FTE
Teachers	10	3.80	34	29.50
Counselors	0	0.00	0	0.00
All paraprofessionals	11	9.79	20	19.50
Recruiters	2	1.50	6	6.00
Records transfer staff	2	0.77	3	1.77
Comments: The increase and/or decrease in the number of migrant education program personnel reported funded by migrant education programs compared to the previous year can be attributed to adjustments made by school divisions to meet programmatic needs.				

Note: The Headcount value displayed represents the greatest whole number submitted in file specification N/X065 for the corresponding Job Classification. For example, an ESS submitted value of 9.8 will be represented in your CSPR as 9.

FAQs on MEP staff:

- a. *How is the FTE calculated?* The FTE may be calculated using one of two methods:
 1. To calculate the FTE, in each job category, sum the percentage of time that staff were funded by the MEP and enter the total FTE for that category.
 2. Calculate the FTE using the number of days worked. To do so, first define how many full-time days constitute one FTE for each job classification in your State for each term. (For example, one regular-term FTE may equal 180 full-time (8 hour) work days; one summer term FTE may equal 30 full-time work days; or one intersession FTE may equal 45 full-time work days split between three 15-day non-contiguous blocks throughout the year.) To calculate the FTE number, sum the total days the individuals worked in a particular job classification for a term and divide this sum by the number of full-time days that constitute one FTE in that term.
- b. *Who is a teacher?* A classroom instructor who is licensed and meets any other teaching requirements in the State.
- c. *Who is a counselor?* A professional staff member who guides individuals, families, groups, and communities by assisting them in problem-solving, decision-making, discovering meaning, and articulating goals related to personal, educational, and career development.
- d. *Who is a paraprofessional?* An individual who: (1) provides one-on-one tutoring if such tutoring is scheduled at a time when a student would not otherwise receive instruction from a teacher; (2) assists with classroom management, such as organizing instructional and other materials; (3) provides instructional assistance in a computer laboratory; (4) conducts parental involvement activities; (5) provides support in a library or media center; (6) acts as a translator; or (7) provides instructional support services under the direct supervision of a teacher (Title I, Section 1119(g)(2)). Because a paraprofessional provides instructional support, he/she should not be providing planned direct instruction or introducing to students new skills, concepts, or academic content. Individuals who work in food services, cafeteria or playground supervision, personal care services, non-instructional computer assistance, and similar positions are not considered paraprofessionals under Title I.
- e. *Who is a recruiter?* A staff person responsible for identifying and recruiting children as eligible for the MEP and documenting their eligibility on the Certificate of Eligibility.
- f. *Who is a record transfer staffer?* An individual who is responsible for entering, retrieving, or sending student records from or to another school or student records system.

2.3.6.1.3 Qualified Paraprofessionals

In the table below, provide the headcount and FTE of the qualified paraprofessionals funded by the MEP. Do **not** include staff employed in SWP where MEP funds were combined with those of other programs. Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

	Regular School Year		Summer/Intersession Term	
	Headcount	FTE	Headcount	FTE
Qualified paraprofessionals	2	2.00	20	20.00
Comments: The decrease in the number of qualified paraprofessionals reported during the regular school year compared to the previous year can be attributed to adjustment made by school divisions to meet programmatic needs.				

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

FAQs on qualified paraprofessionals:

- a. *How is the FTE calculated?* The FTE may be calculated using one of two methods:
 1. To calculate the FTE, sum the percentage of time that staff were funded by the MEP and enter the total FTE for that category.
 2. Calculate the FTE using the number of days worked. To do so, first define how many full-time days constitute one FTE in your State for each term. (For example, one regular-term FTE may equal 180 full-time (8 hour) work days; one summer term FTE may equal 30 full-time work days; or one intersession FTE may equal 45 full-time work days split between three 15-day non-contiguous blocks throughout the year.) To calculate the FTE number, sum the total days the individuals worked for a term and divide this sum by the number of full-time days that constitute one FTE in that term.
- b. *Who is a qualified paraprofessional?* A qualified paraprofessional must have a secondary school diploma or its recognized equivalent and have (1) completed 2 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) (Sections 1119(c) and (d) of *ESEA*).

2.4 PREVENTION AND INTERVENTION PROGRAMS FOR CHILDREN AND YOUTH WHO ARE NEGLECTED, DELINQUENT, OR AT RISK (TITLE I, PART D, SUBPARTS 1 AND 2)

This section collects data on programs and facilities that serve students who are neglected, delinquent, or at risk under Title I, Part D, and characteristics about and services provided to these students.

Throughout this section:

- Report data for the program year of July 1, 2008 through June 30, 2009.
- Count programs/facilities based on how the program was classified to ED for funding purposes.
- Do not include programs funded solely through Title I, Part A.
- Use the definitions listed below:
 - **Adult Corrections:** An adult correctional institution is a facility in which persons, including persons 21 or under, are confined as a result of conviction for a criminal offense.
 - **At-Risk Programs:** Programs operated (through LEAs) that target students who are at risk of academic failure, have a drug or alcohol problem, are pregnant or parenting, have been in contact with the juvenile justice system in the past, are at least 1 year behind the expected age/grade level, have limited English proficiency, are gang members, have dropped out of school in the past, or have a high absenteeism rate at school.
 - **Juvenile Corrections:** An institution for delinquent children and youth is a public or private residential facility other than a foster home that is operated for the care of children and youth who have been adjudicated delinquent or in need of supervision. Include any programs serving adjudicated youth (including non-secure facilities and group homes) in this category.
 - **Juvenile Detention Facilities:** Detention facilities are shorter-term institutions that provide care to children who require secure custody pending court adjudication, court disposition, or execution of a court order, or care to children after commitment.
 - **Multiple Purpose Facility:** An institution/facility/program that serves more than one programming purpose. For example, the same facility may run both a juvenile correction program and a juvenile detention program.
 - **Neglected Programs:** An institution for neglected children and youth is a public or private residential facility, other than a foster home, that is operated primarily for the care of children who have been committed to the institution or voluntarily placed under applicable State law due to abandonment, neglect, or death of their parents or guardians.
 - **Other:** Any other programs, not defined above, which receive Title I, Part D funds and serve non-adjudicated children and youth.

2.4.1 State Agency Title I, Part D Programs and Facilities – Subpart 1

The following questions collect data on Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 programs and facilities.

2.4.1.1 Programs and Facilities - Subpart 1

In the table below, provide the number of State agency Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 programs and facilities that serve neglected and delinquent students and the average length of stay by program/facility type, for these students. Report only programs and facilities that received Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 funding during the reporting year. Count a facility once if it offers only one type of program. If a facility offers more than one type of program (i.e., it is a multipurpose facility), then count each of the separate programs. Make sure to identify the number of multipurpose facilities that were included in the facility/program count in the second table. The total number of programs/facilities will be automatically calculated. Below the table is a FAQ about the data collected in this table.

State Program/Facility Type	# Programs/Facilities	Average Length of Stay in Days
Neglected programs	0	0
Juvenile detention	24	66
Juvenile corrections	8	365
Adult corrections	0	0
Other	0	0
Total	32	215

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

How many of the programs listed in the table above are in a multiple purpose facility?

	#
Programs in a multiple purpose facility	0
Comments:	

FAQ on Programs and Facilities - Subpart I:

How is average length of stay calculated? The average length of stay should be weighted by number of students and should include the number of days, per visit, for each student enrolled during the reporting year, regardless of entry or exit date. Multiple visits for students who entered more than once during the reporting year can be included. The average length of stay in days should not exceed 365.

2.4.1.1.1 Programs and Facilities That Reported - Subpart 1

In the table below, provide the number of State agency programs/facilities that reported data on neglected and delinquent students.

The total row will be automatically calculated.

State Program/Facility Type	# Reporting Data
Neglected Programs	0
Juvenile Detention	24
Juvenile Corrections	8
Adult Corrections	0
Other	0
Total	2
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.4.1.2 Students Served – Subpart 1

In the tables below, provide the number of neglected and delinquent students served in State agency Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 programs and facilities. Report only students who received Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 services during the reporting year. In the first table, provide in row 1 the unduplicated number of students served by each program, and in row 2, the total number of students in row 1 that are long-term. In the subsequent tables provide the number of students served by race/ethnicity, by sex, and by age. The total number of students by race/ethnicity, by sex and by age will be automatically calculated.

# of Students Served	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Total Unduplicated Students Served	0	9,135	1,406	0	0
Long Term Students Served	0	998	1,406	0	0

Race/Ethnicity	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	13	0	0	0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	64	7	0	0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	4,849	1,027	0	0
Hispanic	0	1,202	77	0	0
White, non-Hispanic	0	3,007	295	0	0
Total	0	9,135	1,406	0	0

Sex	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Male	0	6,851	1,335	0	0
Female	0	2,284	71	0	0
Total	0	9,135	1,406	0	0

Age	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
3 through 5	0	0	0	0	0
6	0	0	0	0	0
7	0	0	0	0	0
8	0	0	0	0	0
9	0	5	0	0	0
10	0	7	0	0	0
11	0	21	0	0	0
12	0	115	0	0	0
13	0	411	14	0	0
14	0	1,017	42	0	0
15	0	1,874	168	0	0
16	0	2,595	337	0	0
17	0	3,065	492	0	0
18	0	25	253	0	0
19	0	0	80	0	0
20	0	0	20	0	0
21	0	0	0	0	0
Total	0	9,135	1,406	0	0

If the total number of students differs by demographics, please explain in comment box below.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Comments:

FAQ on Unduplicated Count:

What is an unduplicated count? An unduplicated count is one that counts students only once, even if they were admitted to a facility or program multiple times within the reporting year.

FAQ on long-term:

What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2008 through June 30, 2009.

2.4.1.3 Programs/Facilities Academic Offerings – Subpart 1

In the table below, provide the number of programs/facilities (not students) that received Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 funds and awarded at least one high school course credit, one high school diploma, and/or one GED within the reporting year. Include programs/facilities that directly awarded a credit, diploma, or GED, as well as programs/facilities that made awards through another agency. The numbers should not exceed those reported earlier in the facility counts.

# Programs That	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention Facilities	Adult Corrections Facilities	Other Programs
Awarded high school course credit(s)	0	32	0	0
Awarded high school diploma(s)	0	8	0	0
Awarded GED(s)	0	30	0	0
Comments:				

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

2.4.1.4 Academic Outcomes – Subpart 1

The following questions collect academic outcome data on students served through Title I, Part D, Subpart 1.

2.4.1.4.1 Academic Outcomes While in the State Agency Program/Facility

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of students who attained academic outcomes while in the State agency program/facility by type of program/facility.

# of Students Who	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention Facilities	Adult Corrections Facilities	Other Programs
Earned high school course credits	0	5,029	0	0
Enrolled in a GED program	0	853	0	0
Comments:				

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

2.4.1.4.2 Academic Outcomes While in the State Agency Program/Facility or Within 30 Calendar Days After Exit

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of students who attained academic outcomes while in the State agency program/facility or within 30 calendar days after exit, by type of program/facility.

# of Students Who	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention Facilities	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Enrolled in their local district school	0	7,024	0	0
Earned a GED	0	393	0	0
Obtained high school diploma	0	60	0	0
Were accepted into post-secondary education	0	85	0	0
Enrolled in post-secondary education	0	85	0	0
Comments:				

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

2.4.1.5 Vocational Outcomes – Subpart 1

The following questions collect data on vocational outcomes of students served through Title I, Part D, Subpart 1.

2.4.1.5.1 Vocational Outcomes While in the State Agency Program/Facility

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of students who attained vocational outcomes while in the State agency program by type of program/facility.

# of Students Who	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention Facilities	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Enrolled in elective job training courses/programs	0	1,775	0	0
Comments:				

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

2.4.1.5.2 Vocational Outcomes While in the State Agency Program/Facility or Within 30 Days After Exit

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of students who attained vocational outcomes while in the State agency program/facility or within 30 days after exit, by type of program/facility.

# of Students Who	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention Facilities	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Enrolled in external job training education	0	1,322	0	0
Obtained employment	0	0	0	0
Comments:				

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

2.4.1.6 Academic Performance – Subpart 1

The following questions collect data on the academic performance of neglected and delinquent students served by Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 in reading and mathematics.

2.4.1.6.1 Academic Performance in Reading – Subpart 1

In the format of the table below, provide the unduplicated number of long-term students served by Title I, Part D, Subpart 2, who participated in pre- and post-testing in reading. Report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Students who were pre-tested prior to July 1, 2008, may be included if their post-test was administered during the reporting year. Students who were post-tested after the reporting year ended should be counted in the following year. Throughout the table, report numbers for juvenile detention and correctional facilities together in a single column. Students should be reported in only one of the five change categories in the second table below. Below the table is an FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Long-term students who tested below grade level upon entry	0	744	0	0
Long-term students who have complete pre- and post-test results (data)	0	1,471	0	0

Of the students reported in the second row above, indicate the number who showed:

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams	0	185	0	0
No change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	0	135	0	0
Improvement of up to 1/2 grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	0	68	0	0
Improvement from 1/2 up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	0	658	0	0
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	0	425	0	0
Comments:				

FAQ on long-term students:

What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2008 through June 30, 2009.

2.4.1.6.2 Academic Performance in Mathematics – Subpart 1

This section is similar to 2.4.1.6.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on mathematics performance.

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Long-term students who tested below grade level upon entry	0	911	0	0
Long-term students who have complete pre- and post-test results (data)	0	1,476	0	0

Of the students reported in the second row above, indicate the number who showed:

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams	0	185	0	0
No change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	0	131	0	0
Improvement of up to 1/2 grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	0	75	0	0
Improvement from 1/2 up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	0	616	0	0
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	0	469	0	0
Comments:				

2.4.2 LEA Title I, Part D Programs and Facilities – Subpart 2

The following questions collect data on Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 programs and facilities.

2.4.2.1 Programs and Facilities – Subpart 2

In the table below, provide the number of LEA Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 programs and facilities that serve neglected and delinquent students and the yearly average length of stay by program/facility type for these students. Report only the programs and facilities that received Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 funding during the reporting year. Count a facility once if it offers only one type of program. If a facility offers more than one type of program (i.e., it is a multipurpose facility), then count each of the separate programs. Make sure to identify the number of multipurpose facilities that were included in the facility/program count in the second table. The total number of programs/ facilities will be automatically calculated. Below the table is an FAQ about the data collected in this table.

LEA Program/Facility Type	# Programs/Facilities	Average Length of Stay (# days)
At-risk programs	30	150
Neglected programs	20	139
Juvenile detention	2	32
Juvenile corrections	15	150
Other	0	0
Total	67	118

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

How many of the programs listed in the table above are in a multiple purpose facility?

	#
Programs in a multiple purpose facility	4
Comments:	

FAQ on average length of stay:

How is average length of stay calculated? The average length of stay should be weighted by number of students and should include the number of days, per visit for each student enrolled during the reporting year, regardless of entry or exit date. Multiple visits for students who entered more than once during the reporting year can be included. The average length of stay in days should not exceed 365.

2.4.2.1.1 Programs and Facilities That Reported - Subpart 2

In the table below, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on neglected and delinquent students.

The total row will be automatically calculated.

LEA Program/Facility Type	# Reporting Data
At-risk programs	6
Neglected programs	6
Juvenile detention	1
Juvenile corrections	3
Other	0
Total	16
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.4.2.2 Students Served – Subpart 2

In the tables below, provide the number of neglected and delinquent students served in LEA Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 programs and facilities. Report only students who received Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 services during the reporting year. In the first table, provide in row 1 the unduplicated number of students served by each program, and in row 2, the total number of students in row 1 who are long-term. In the subsequent tables, provide the number of students served by race/ethnicity, by sex, and by age. The total number of students by race/ethnicity, by sex, and by age will be automatically calculated.

# of Students Served	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Total Unduplicated Students Served	1,482	282	405	405	0
Total Long Term Students Served	1,038	195	38	114	0

Race/Ethnicity	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaska Native	4	1	1	4	0
Asian or Pacific Islander	70	2	6	19	0
Black, non-Hispanic	736	159	221	157	0
Hispanic	182	19	25	110	0
White, non-Hispanic	490	101	152	115	0
Total	1,482	282	405	405	0

Sex	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Male	944	184	318	258	0
Female	538	98	87	147	0
Total	1,482	282	405	405	0

Age	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
3-5	10	0	0	0	0
6	53	1	0	0	0
7	39	1	0	0	0
8	31	0	0	0	0
9	28	0	0	0	0
10	35	1	1	0	0
11	35	4	1	2	0
12	69	14	6	8	0
13	79	25	16	22	0
14	109	27	28	75	0
15	185	60	75	81	0
16	319	89	104	111	0
17	337	52	160	82	0
18	94	5	14	24	0
19	43	3	0	0	0
20	12	0	0	0	0
21	4	0	0	0	0
Total	1,482	282	405	405	0

If the total number of students differs by demographics, please explain. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Comments:

FAQ on Unduplicated Count:

What is an unduplicated count? An unduplicated count is one that counts students only once, even if they were admitted to a facility or program multiple times within the reporting year.

FAQ on long-term:

What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2008 through June 30, 2009.

2.4.2.3 Programs/Facilities Academic Offerings – Subpart 2

In the table below, provide the number of programs/facilities (not students) that received Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 funds and awarded at least one high school course credit, one high school diploma, and/or one GED within the reporting year. Include programs/facilities that directly awarded a credit, diploma, or GED, as well as programs/facilities that made awards through another agency. The numbers should not exceed those reported earlier in the facility counts.

LEA Programs That	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention/ Corrections	Other Programs
Awarded high school course credit(s)	24	6	14	0
Awarded high school diploma(s)	23	5	13	0
Awarded GED(s)	11	1	7	0
Comments:				

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

2.4.2.4 Academic Outcomes – Subpart 2

The following questions collect academic outcome data on students served through Title I, Part D, Subpart 2.

2.4.2.4.1 Academic Outcomes While in the LEA Program/Facility

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of students who attained academic outcomes while in the LEA program/facility by type of program/facility.

# of Students Who	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Other Programs
Earned high school course credits	650	168	103	0
Enrolled in a GED program	252	16	72	0
Comments:				

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

2.4.2.4.2 Academic Outcomes While in the LEA Program/Facility or Within 30 Calendar Days After Exit

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of students who attained academic outcomes while in the LEA program/facility or within 30 calendar days after exit, by type of program/facility.

# of Students Who	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Other Programs
Enrolled in their local district school	920	151	355	0
Earned a GED	130	5	49	0
Obtained high school diploma	63	6	6	0
Were accepted into post-secondary education	76	4	9	0
Enrolled in post-secondary education	76	3	9	0
Comments:				

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

2.4.2.5 Vocational Outcomes – Subpart 2

The following questions collect data on vocational outcomes of students served through Title I, Part D, Subpart 2.

2.4.2.5.1 Vocational Outcomes While in the LEA Program/Facility

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of students who attained vocational outcomes while in the LEA program by type of program/facility.

# of Students Who	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Other Programs
Enrolled in elective job training courses/programs	311	5	111	0
Comments:				

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

2.4.2.5.2 Vocational Outcomes While in the LEA Program/Facility or Within 30 Days After Exit

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of students who attained vocational outcomes while in the LEA program/facility or within 30 days after exit, by type of program/facility.

# of Students Who	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Other Programs
Enrolled in external job training education	32	2	15	0
Obtained employment	32	9	17	0
Comments:				

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

2.4.2.6 Academic Performance – Subpart 2

The following questions collect data on the academic performance of neglected and delinquent students served by Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 in reading and mathematics.

2.4.2.6.1 Academic Performance in Reading – Subpart 2

In the format of the table below, provide the unduplicated number of long-term students served by Title I, Part D, Subpart 2, who participated in pre- and post-testing in reading. Report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Students who were pre-tested prior to July 1, 2008, may be included if their post-test was administered during the reporting year. Students who were post-tested after the reporting year ended should be counted in the following year. Throughout the table, report numbers for juvenile detention and correctional facilities together in a single column. Students should be reported in only one of the five change categories in the second table below. Below the table is an FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Other Programs
Long-term students who tested below grade level upon entry	66	56	19	0
Long-term students who have complete pre- and post-test results (data)	42	9	39	0

Of the students reported in the second row above, indicate the number who showed:

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Other Programs
Negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams	0	0	2	0
No change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	2	1	8	0
Improvement of up to 1/2 grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	14	1	9	0
Improvement from 1/2 up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	21	7	16	0
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	5	0	4	0
Comments:				

FAQ on long-term:

What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2008, through June 30, 2009.

2.4.2.6.2 Academic Performance in Mathematics – Subpart 2

This section is similar to 2.4.2.6.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on mathematics performance.

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Other Programs
Long-term students who tested below grade level upon entry	60	106	27	0
Long-term students who have complete pre- and post-test results (data)	42	120	39	0

Of the students reported in the second row above, indicate the number who showed:

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Other Programs
Negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams	1	43	0	0
No change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	7	40	9	0
Improvement of up to 1/2 grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	19	9	23	0
Improvement from 1/2 up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	11	8	4	0
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	4	20	3	0
Comments:				

2.7 SAFE AND DRUG FREE SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITIES ACT (TITLE IV, PART A)

This section collects data on student behaviors under the *Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act*.

2.7.1 Performance Measures

In the table below, provide actual performance data.

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
1. The percentage of students who carried a gun to school or school event during a given school year	Discipline Crime, and Violence Report	Annually	Year of most recent collection 2008-2009	2006-07: .01	2006-07: .00247%		2002-2003
				2007-08: .01	2007-08: .00154%		
				2008-09: .001	2008-09: .00129%		
				2009-10: .001			
				2010-11: .001			
Comments:							

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
2. The percentage of students who engaged in a physical fight on school property	Discipline Crime, and Violence Report	Annually	Year of most recent collection 2008-2009	2006-07: 1.5	2006-07: 1.59168%	2.456018%	2002-2003
				2007-08: 1.0	2007-08: 1.35683%		
				2008-09: 1.0	2008-09: 1.26413%		
				2009-10: 1.0			
				2010-11: 1.0			
Comments:							

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
3. The percentage of students offered, sold, or given an illegal drug on school property	Discipline Crime, and Violence Report	Annually	Year of most recent collection 2008-2009	2006-07: .15	2006-07: .10700%		2002-2003
				2007-08: .10	2007-08: .08872%		
				2008-09: .10	2008-09: .11334%		
				2009-10: .10			
				2010-11: .10			
Comments:							

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

2.7.2 Out-of-School Suspensions and Expulsions

The following questions collect data on the out-of-school suspension and expulsion of students by grade level (e.g., K through 5, 6 through 8, 9 through 12) and type of incident (e.g., violence, weapons possession, alcohol-related, illicit drug-related).

2.7.2.1 State Definitions

In the spaces below, provide the State definitions for each type of incident.

Incident Type	State Definition
Alcohol related	Violation of laws or ordinances prohibiting the manufacture, sale, purchase, transportation, possession or consumption of intoxicating alcoholic beverages or substances represented as alcohol. Suspicion of being under the influence of alcohol may be included if it results in disciplinary action.
Illicit drug related	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Schedule I or II drug or marijuana or anabolic steroid. b. Unlawful use, cultivation, manufacture, purchase, possession, transportation, or importation of any inhalants or substances represented as drug look-alikes. c. Unlawful taking or attempted taking of drugs prescribed to another. d. Unlawful possession with intent to distribute, sell or solicit any Schedule I or II drug, or marijuana, or anabolic steroid. e. Unlawful use, possession, with intent to distribute, sell or solicit any controlled drug or narcotic substance not specified in previous drug categories.
Violent incident without physical injury	Mutual participation in a fight with no or minor injury; assault/battery without the use of a firearm or other weapon.
Violent incident with physical injury	Mutual participation in a fight with serious injury; physical assault/battery with a firearm or other weapon; malicious wounding without a weapon; physical threat/intimidation and sexual offenses such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. forcible assault b. attempted forcible assault c. aggravated sexual battery
Weapons possession	Weapons possession includes the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Possessing or bringing a handgun or pistol to school or to a school event will result in automatic expulsion that may be modified upon an appeal. b. Possessing or bringing a rifle/shotgun to school or a school event will result in automatic expulsion that may be modified by the chief executive officer. c. Possessing or bringing to school or a school-sponsored event any weapon that is designed to expel a projectile or may readily be converted to expel a projectile by the action of an explosive, including live ammunition. d. Possession or representation of any weapon that explodes, or is designed to, or may readily be converted to explode. This includes ammunition. e. Use of any weapon that is designed to explode with the use of a triggering device and is used as a destructive bomb. f. Possessing or bringing any other weapon that will, is designed to, or may readily be converted to expel a projectile by the action of an explosive to school or school event. g. Possessing or bringing to school or a school event any sharp-edged instrument that is classified as a knife with a blade of more than three inches. h. Possessing or bringing to school or a school event any pneumatic gun or rifle which includes BB gun, paint ball, or pellet gun. i. Possessing or bringing to school or a school event a possible weapon of razor blades, box cutters, fireworks, firecrackers, or stink bombs. j. Possessing or bringing to school or a school event ammunition. k. Possessing or bringing any mechanism that is designed to emit an electronic, magnetic, or other charge, or shock through the use of a projectile, or other charge that exceeds the equivalency of 5 milliamp 60 hertz shock. l. Possessing or bringing to school or a school-sponsored event any substance used as a weapon. The substance would include mace, tear gas, or pepper spray.
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

2.7.2.2 Out-of-School Suspensions and Expulsions for Violent Incident Without Physical Injury

The following questions collect data on violent incident without physical injury.

2.7.2.2.1 Out-of-School Suspensions for Violent Incident Without Physical Injury

In the table below, provide the number of out-of-school suspensions for violent incident without physical injury by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on violent incident without physical injury, including LEAs that report no incidents.

Grades	# Suspensions for Violent Incident Without Physical Injury	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	3,058	132
6 through 8	8,720	132
9 through 12	7,665	131

Comments: Only 131 of 132 school divisions reported for grades 9 through 12. Lexington City Public Schools secondary students attend Rockbridge County Public Schools.

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

2.7.2.2.2 Out-of-School Expulsions for Violent Incident Without Physical Injury

In the table below, provide the number of out-of school expulsions for violent incident without physical injury by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on violent incident without physical injury, including LEAs that report no incidents.

Grades	# Expulsions for Violent Incident Without Physical Injury	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	0	132
6 through 8	10	132
9 through 12	62	131

Comments: Only 131 of 132 school divisions reported for grades 9 through 12. Lexington City Public Schools secondary students attend Rockbridge County Public Schools.

The number reported for 2008-2009 is a decrease in the number that was reported in 2007-2008, due to fewer incidents of expulsion reported by the school divisions.

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

2.7.2.3 Out-of-School Suspensions and Expulsions for Violent Incident with Physical Injury

The following questions collect data on violent incident with physical injury.

2.7.2.3.1 Out-of-School Suspensions for Violent Incident with Physical Injury

In the table below, provide the number of out-of-school suspensions for violent incident with physical injury by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on violent incident with physical injury, including LEAs that report no incidents.

Grades	# Suspensions for Violent Incident with Physical Injury	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	865	132
6 through 8	1,277	132
9 through 12	1,105	131
Comments: Only 131 of 132 school divisions reported for grades 9 through 12. Lexington City Public Schools secondary students attend Rockbridge County Public Schools.		

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

2.7.2.3.2 Out-of-School Expulsions for Violent Incident with Physical Injury

In the table below, provide the number of out-of school expulsions for violent incident with physical injury by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on violent incident with physical injury, including LEAs that report no incidents.

Grades	# Expulsions for Violent Incident with Physical Injury	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	1	132
6 through 8	13	132
9 through 12	17	131
Comments: Only 131 of 132 school divisions reported for grades 9 through 12. Lexington City Public Schools secondary students attend Rockbridge County Public Schools.		

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

2.7.2.4 Out-of-School Suspensions and Expulsions for Weapons Possession

The following sections collect data on weapons possession.

2.7.2.4.1 Out-of-School Suspensions for Weapons Possession

In the table below, provide the number of out-of-school suspensions for weapons possession by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on weapons possession, including LEAs that report no incidents.

Grades	# Suspensions for Weapons Possession	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	556	132
6 through 8	855	132
9 through 12	829	131
Comments: Only 131 of 132 school divisions reported for grades 9 through 12. Lexington City Public Schools secondary students attend Rockbridge County Public Schools.		

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

2.7.2.4.2 Out-of-School Expulsions for Weapons Possession

In the table below, provide the number of out-of-school expulsions for weapons possession by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on weapons possession, including LEAs that report no incidents.

Grades	# Expulsion for Weapons Possession	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	4	132
6 through 8	34	132
9 through 12	108	131
Comments: Only 131 of 132 school divisions reported for grades 9 through 12. Lexington City Public Schools secondary students attend Rockbridge County Public Schools.		

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

2.7.2.5 Out-of-School Suspensions and Expulsions for Alcohol-Related Incidents

The following questions collect data on alcohol-related incidents.

2.7.2.5.1 Out-of-School Suspensions for Alcohol-Related Incidents

In the table below, provide the number of out-of-school suspensions for alcohol-related incidents by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on alcohol-related incidents, including LEAs that report no incidents.

Grades	# Suspensions for Alcohol-Related Incidents	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	8	132
6 through 8	229	132
9 through 12	832	131
Comments: Only 131 of 132 school divisions reported for grades 9 through 12. Lexington City Public Schools secondary students attend Rockbridge County Public Schools.		

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

2.7.2.5.2 Out-of-School Expulsions for Alcohol-Related Incidents

In the table below, provide the number of out-of-school expulsions for alcohol-related incidents by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on alcohol-related incidents, including LEAs that report no incidents.

Grades	# Expulsion for Alcohol-Related Incidents	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	0	132
6 through 8	4	132
9 through 12	32	131
Comments: Only 131 of 132 school divisions reported for grades 9 through 12. Lexington City Public Schools secondary students attend Rockbridge County Public Schools.		
The number reported for 2008-2009 is an increase over the number reported in 2007-2008, due to more incidents of expulsion reported by the divisions than the previous year.		

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

2.7.2.6 Out-of-School Suspensions and Expulsions for Illicit Drug-Related Incidents

The following questions collect data on illicit drug-related incidents.

2.7.2.6.1 Out-of-School Suspensions for Illicit Drug-Related Incidents

In the table below, provide the number of out-of-school suspensions for illicit drug-related incidents by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on illicit drug-related incidents, including LEAs that report no incidents.

Grades	# Suspensions for Illicit Drug-Related Incidents	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	23	132
6 through 8	336	132
9 through 12	602	131
Comments: Only 131 of 132 school divisions reported for grades 9 through 12. Lexington City Public Schools secondary students attend Rockbridge County Public Schools.		

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

2.7.2.6.2 Out-of-School Expulsions for Illicit Drug-Related Incidents

In the table below, provide the number of out-of-school expulsions for illicit drug-related incidents by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on illicit drug-related incidents, including LEAs that report no incidents.

Grades	# Expulsion for Illicit Drug-Related Incidents	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	0	132
6 through 8	109	132
9 through 12	331	131
Comments: Only 131 of 132 school divisions reported for grades 9 through 12. Lexington City Public Schools secondary students attend Rockbridge County Public Schools.		

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

2.7.3 Parent Involvement

In the table below, provide the types of efforts your State uses to inform parents of, and include parents in, drug and violence prevention efforts. Place a check mark next to the five most common efforts underway in your State. If there are other efforts underway in your State not captured on the list, add those in the other specify section.

Yes/No	Parental Involvement Activities
<u>Yes</u>	Information dissemination on Web sites and in publications, including newsletters, guides, brochures, and "report cards" on school performance
<u>No</u>	Training and technical assistance to LEAs on recruiting and involving parents
<u>Yes</u>	State requirement that parents must be included on LEA advisory councils
<u>No</u>	State and local parent training, meetings, conferences, and workshops
<u>Yes</u>	Parent involvement in State-level advisory groups
<u>Yes</u>	Parent involvement in school-based teams or community coalitions
<u>No</u>	Parent surveys, focus groups, and/or other assessments of parent needs and program effectiveness
<u>Yes</u>	Media and other campaigns (Public service announcements, red ribbon campaigns, kick-off events, parenting awareness month, safe schools week, family day, etc.) to raise parental awareness of drug and alcohol or safety issues
<u>No</u>	Other Specify 1
<u>No</u>	Other Specify 2

In the space below, specify 'other' parental activities.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Parent Involvement in LEA Programs
 As part of the Title IV application for federal funds, each school division is required to describe the process used to include parents in the development of the application and in the ongoing administration of the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Community Act (SDFSCA) Program. Additionally, school divisions are required in annual SDFSCA progress reports to provide a description of the specific strategies they have used. Virginia school divisions use a variety of methods to involve parents, such as parent representation on local Health Advisory Councils, School Safety Teams, and Community Prevention Councils. Annual SDFSCA progress reports document use of parent education/involvement related to drug and violence prevention efforts, most frequently in the form of training/educational activities.

Student Assistance Programming Workshops
 In fall 2009, three regional workshops were held across Virginia for local homeless education liaisons and core team members from Student Assistance Programs (SAP) to explore how the student assistance process can be used to serve students who may need additional supports, especially students experiencing homelessness. Each day-long workshop included an overview of SAP and the McKinney-Vento Education of Homeless Children and Youth Programs followed by opportunities for teams to explore ways to work together more effectively. These workshops were aimed at helping schools understand how their Student Assistance process can address the varied needs of students and their families.

Online Resources for Parents
 Since 2007, parents have had online access to information on school discipline and crime data for every public school in Virginia through the School Safety Information Resource (SSIR).
 A parent guide to school discipline is available online. This resource was developed with advisory assistance from the Virginia Congress of Parent Teacher Associations (PTAs) and is designed to promote understanding of basic disciplinary processes and improve parent-school communication.

The Virginia School Performance Report Card has been a key parent information resource since 1998. These report cards provide information on student achievement, accreditation, safety, attendance, dropout rates, graduation rates, and professional qualifications of teachers for the state as a whole and for individual schools. School safety incident data is posted for every school in Virginia.

Another online resource for parents is a guide for planning all-night alcohol/drug-free celebrations for teens after prom and graduation. One statewide workshop for parents was held in 2009 to inform parents about using the resource guide.

KIDsafe Parent Guides
 The KIDsafe Virginia Initiative coordinated by the Governor's Office for Substance Abuse Prevention with support from the Virginia Department of Education resulted in the KIDsafe Virginia Parent Guides. Nearly 400,000 Virginia parents have received copies of these guides and others have downloaded them from the Web site of the Governor's Office for Substance Abuse

Prevention. The Parent Guide to Personal Safety for Children provides parents of elementary age students with tips on discussing safety issues with children, strategies for helping children stay safe, information about what children can do to stay safe, what to do in an emergency, and additional related resources for parents. The Parent Guide to Personal Safety for Children complements a 10-lesson personal safety curriculum for students in grades K-4 that is designed to be taught by a law enforcement or public safety professional. The Parent Guide to Crime Prevention for Teens provides parents with approaches to communicate effectively with teens, crime prevention tips, strategies for teens to use to avoid alcohol and other drugs and related risks, and additional related resources for parents of teens. The Parent Guide to Crime Prevention for Teens complements a 6-lesson crime prevention curriculum for high school students designed to be taught by a school resource officer.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.8 INNOVATIVE PROGRAMS (TITLE V, PART A)

This section collects information pursuant to Title V, Part A of *ESEA*.

2.8.1 Annual Statewide Summary

Section 5122 of *ESEA*, as amended, requires States to provide an annual Statewide summary of how Title V, Part A funds contribute to the improvement of student academic performance and the quality of education for students. In addition, these summaries must be based on evaluations provided to the State by LEAs receiving program funds.

Please attach your statewide summary. You can upload file by entering the file name and location in the box below or use the browse button to search for the file as you would when attaching a file to an e-mail. The maximum file size for this upload is 4MB.

Title V, Part A

2.8.1 Annual Statewide Summary

Section 5122 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as amended, requires States to provide an annual statewide summary of how Title V, Part A, funds are contributing to improving student academic performance and the quality of education for students. The statute further requires that those summaries be based on evaluations provided to the State by local educational agencies (LEAs) receiving program funds.

Statewide Summary:

The 132 school divisions in Virginia provided information to the state education agency (SEA) regarding the evaluation of their Title V, Part A, programs. The state distributed by formula \$1,948,803.50 to the school divisions to implement programs. Data provided indicate that 793,956 students were served in Title V, Part A, programs with FY 2007 funds.

Program evaluation results support the purposes of Title V, Part A, which are to: a) support local and statewide education reform efforts; b) provide funding to implement promising reform programs; c) provide innovation and educational improvement, including support for library services and instructional and media materials; d) meet the special educational needs of at-risk and high-cost students; and e) develop and implement education programs to improve school, student, and teacher performance.

Activities supported by Title V, Part A, local-level funds to improve student achievement and the quality of education for students have been broad-based. The program supported schools across the Commonwealth in helping them to meet requirements under the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001(NCLB)*. Virginia has set annual measurable objectives of proficiency in reading and mathematics, participation in testing, and graduation and attendance. Schools and school divisions that met the annual objectives required by the NCLB were considered to have made adequately yearly progress (AYP). The chart below provides the state summary of AYP results for the 2008-2009 school year.

Statewide AYP Results for 2008-2009				
	Made AYP	Did Not Make AYP	To Be Determined	Total
Schools	1,355 (74%)	479 (26%)	3 (<1%)	1,837 (100%)
Divisions	54 (41%)	78 (59%)	0 (0%)	132 (100%)

Another objective of the the Title V, Part A, program was to improve student performance on Virginia's Standards of Learning (SOL) assessments. A variety of local efforts were implemented to achieve the objective. These included: 1) supporting the use of technology; 2) aligning the curriculum; 3) targeting the special needs of at-risk and high need students; 4) creating literacy initiatives; 5) increasing graduation rates and preventing dropouts; 6) maintaining safe schools, and 6) improving English language learner's English proficiency.

School accreditation ratings reflect student achievement on Standards of Learning (SOL) assessments in English, history/social science, mathematics, and science. The chart below provides a summary of schools that were accredited for 2008-2009.

Statewide Accreditation Results for 2008-2009		
Accreditation Rating	Number of Schools	Percent of All Schools
Fully Accredited	1,765	95
Accredited with Warning	54	3
Accreditation Denied	5	<1
Conditionally Accredited (New Schools)	23	1
Conditionally Accredited	13	<1
Total Schools	1,860	100

2.8.2 Needs Assessments

In the table below, provide the number of LEAs that completed a Title V, Part A needs assessment that the State determined to be credible and the total number of LEAs that received Title V, Part A funds. The percentage column is automatically calculated.

	# LEAs	%
Completed credible Title V, Part A needs assessments	132	100.0
Total received Title V, Part A funds	132	
Comments:		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.8.3 LEA Expenditures

In the table below, provide the amount of Title V, Part A funds expended by the LEAs. The percentage column will be automatically calculated.

The **4 strategic priorities** are: (1) support student achievement, enhance reading and mathematics, (2) improve the quality of teachers, (3) ensure that schools are safe and drug free, and (4) promote access for all students to a quality education.

Activities authorized under Section 5131 of the *ESEA* that are included in the four strategic priorities are 1-5, 7-9, 12, 14-17, 19-20, 22, and 25-27. Authorized activities that are not included in the four strategic priorities are 6, 10-11, 13, 18, 21, and 23-24.

	\$ Amount	%
Title V, Part A funds expended by LEAs for the four strategic priorities	1,929,181	99.0
Total Title V, Part A funds expended by LEAs	1,948,803	
Comments:		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.8.4 LEA Uses of Funds for the Four Strategic Priorities and AYP

In the table below, provide the number of LEAs:

1. That used **at least 85 percent** of their Title V, Part A funds for the four strategic priorities above and the number of these LEAs that met their State's definition of adequate yearly progress (AYP).
2. That did not use **at least 85 percent** of their Title V, Part A funds for the four strategic priorities and the number of these LEAs that met their State's definition of AYP.
3. For which you **do not know** whether they used at least 85 percent of their Title V, Part A funds for the four strategic priorities and the number of these LEAs that met their State's definition of AYP.

The total LEAs receiving Title V, Part A funds will be automatically calculated.

	# LEAs	# LEAs Met AYP
<u>Used</u> at least 85 percent of their Title V, Part A funds for the four strategic priorities	127	55
Did <u>not</u> use at least 85 percent of their Title V, Part A funds for the four strategic priorities	5	2
Not known whether they used at least 85 percent of their Title V, Part A funds for the four strategic priorities	0	0
Total LEAs receiving Title V, Part A funds	132	57
Comments:		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.9 RURAL EDUCATION ACHIEVEMENT PROGRAM (REAP) (TITLE VI, PART B, SUBPARTS 1 AND 2)

This section collects data on the Rural Education Achievement Program (REAP) Title VI, Part B, Subparts 1 and 2.

2.9.1 LEA Use of Alternative Funding Authority Under the Small Rural Achievement (SRSA) Program (Title VI, Part B, Subpart 1)

In the table below, provide the number of LEAs that notified the State of their intent to use the alternative uses funding authority under Section 6211.

	# LEAs
# LEA's using SRSA alternative uses of funding authority	0
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.9.2 LEA Use of Rural Low-Income Schools Program (RLIS) (Title VI, Part B, Subpart 2) Grant Funds

In the table below, provide the number of eligible LEAs that used RLIS funds for each of the listed purposes.

Purpose	# LEAs
Teacher recruitment and retention, including the use of signing bonuses and other financial incentives	8
Teacher professional development, including programs that train teachers to utilize technology to improve teaching and to train special needs teachers	13
Educational technology, including software and hardware as described in Title II, Part D	5
Parental involvement activities	13
Activities authorized under the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program (Title IV, Part A)	6
Activities authorized under Title I, Part A	6
Activities authorized under Title III (Language instruction for LEP and immigrant students)	15
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.9.2.1 Goals and Objectives

In the space below, describe the progress the State has made in meeting the goals and objectives for the Rural Low-Income Schools (RLIS) Program as described in its June 2002 Consolidated State application. Provide quantitative data where available.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Twenty five (25) school divisions received 2008-2009 Title VI, Part B, Subpart 2, Rural and Low-Income School (RLIS) Program funds. Fourteen of the twenty-five school divisions made Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP). However, none of these school divisions were in division improvement.

There were 90 schools receiving Title I, Part A, funds in the 25 school divisions receiving Title VI, Part B, Subpart 2, RLSI funds. Of these 90 schools, 75 or 83.3 percent made AYP.

A list of all school divisions receiving a Title VI, Part B, subpart 2, RLIS grant for 2008-2009 school year and the AYP status for each division and its respective school recipients of Title I, Part A, funds, is presented below.

*Accomack County School Division made AYP. Four eligible schools received Title I, Part A, funds, and two (50 percent) of the schools made AYP.

*Brunswick County School Division did not make AYP. Three eligible schools received Title I, Part A, funds, but they did not make AYP.

*Buchanan County School Division made AYP. Six eligible schools received Title I, Part A, funds, and all six schools (100 percent) made AYP.

*Buckingham County School Division made AYP. Three school received Title I, Part A, funds, and all three schools (100 percent) made AYP.

*Charlotte County School Division made AYP. One school received Title I, Part A, funds, and one school (100 percent) made AYP.

*Colonial Beach (Town of) School Division did not make AYP. One school received Title I, Part A, funds, and one school (100 percent) made AYP.

*Cumberland County School Division made AYP. One school received Title I, Part A, funds, and one school (100 percent) made AYP.

*Dickenson County School Division made AYP. Five schools received Title 1, Part A funds and four schools (80 percent) made AYP.

*Franklin City School Division did not make AYP. Two school received Title I, Part A funds and two schools (100 percent) made AYP.

*Galax City School Division made AYP. One school received Title I, Part A, funds, and one school (100 percent) made AYP.

*Grayson County School Division did not make AYP. Five schools received Title I, Part A, funds and four (80 percent) made AYP.

*Lancaster County School Division did not make AYP. One school received Title I, Part A, funds, and one school (100 percent) made AYP.

*Lee County School Division made AYP. Eleven schools received Title I, Part A, funds, and eleven schools (100 percent) made AYP.

*Lunenburg County School Division did not make AYP. Two schools received Title I, Part A, funds, and two schools (100 percent) made AYP.

*Martinsville City School Division did not make AYP. Two schools received Title I, Part A, funds, and two schools (100 percent) made AYP.

*Mecklenburg County School Division made AYP. Five schools received Title I, Part A, funds, and five schools (100 percent) made AYP.

*Northampton County School Division did not make AYP. Two schools received Title I, Part A, funds, and zero schools (0

percent) made AYP.

*Norton City School Division made AYP. One school received Title I, Part A, funds, and one school (100 percent) made AYP.

*Nottoway County School Division made AYP. Four schools received Title I, Part A, funds, and four schools (100 percent) made AYP.

*Prince Edward County School Division made AYP. Two schools received Title I, Part A, funds, and one school (50 percent) made AYP.

*Russell County School Division made AYP. Nine schools received Title I, Part A, funds and five schools (56 percent) made AYP.

*Sussex County School Division did not make AYP. Three schools received Title I, Part A, funds, and two schools (67 percent) made AYP.

Tazewell County School Division did not make AYP. Nine schools received Title I, Part A, funds and nine schools (100 percent) made AYP.

*Waynesboro City School Division did not make AYP. Two schools received Title I, Part A, funds, and two schools (100 percent) made AYP.

*Wise County School Division made AYP. Six schools received Title I, Part A, funds, and six schools (100 percent) made AYP.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.10 FUNDING TRANSFERABILITY FOR STATE AND LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES (TITLE VI, PART A, SUBPART 2)**2.10.1 State Transferability of Funds**

Did the State transfer funds under the State Transferability authority of Section 6123(a) during SY 2008-09?	Yes
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.10.2 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Transferability of Funds

	#
LEAs that notified the State that they were transferring funds under the LEA Transferability authority of Section 6123(b).	3
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.10.2.1 LEA Funds Transfers

In the table below, provide the total number of LEAs that transferred funds from an eligible program to another eligible program.

Program	# LEAs Transferring Funds FROM Eligible Program	# LEAs Transferring Funds TO Eligible Program
Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Section 2121)	2	
Educational Technology State Grants (Section 2412(a)(2)(A))		
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (Section 4112(b)(1))	1	
State Grants for Innovative Programs (Section 5112(a))		2
Title I, Part A, Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs		1

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

In the table below provide the total amount of FY 2009 appropriated funds transferred from and to each eligible program.

Program	Total Amount of Funds Transferred FROM Eligible Program	Total Amount of Funds Transferred TO Eligible Program
Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Section 2121)	43,557.70	
Educational Technology State Grants (Section 2412(a)(2)(A))		
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (Section 4112(b)(1))	740.40	
State Grants for Innovative Programs (Section 5112(a))		43,557.70
Title I, Part A, Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs		740.40
Total	44,298.10	44,298.10
Comments:		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

The Department plans to obtain information on the use of funds under both the State and LEA Transferability Authority through evaluation studies.