

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 2004-2005



**PART I DUE MARCH 6, 2006
PART II DUE APRIL 14, 2006**

**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:

- o Title I, Part A - *Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies*
- o Title I, Part B, Subpart 3 - *William F. Goodling Even Start Family Literacy Programs*
- o Title I, Part C - *Education of Migratory Children*
- o Title I, Part D - *Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk*
- o Title I, Part F - *Comprehensive School Reform*
- o Title II, Part A - *Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund)*
- o Title II, Part D - *Enhancing Education through Technology*
- o Title III, Part A - *English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement Act*
- o Title IV, Part A, Subpart 1 - *Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities State Grants*
- o Title IV, Part A, Subpart 2 - *Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Activities (Community Service Grant Program)*
- o Title IV, Part B - *21st Century Community Learning Centers*
- o Title V, Part A - *Innovative Programs*
- o Title VI, Section 6111 - *Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities*
- o Title VI, Part B - *Rural Education Achievement Program*

The NCLB Consolidated State Performance Report for the 2004-2005 school year consists of two information collections. Part I of this report is due to the Department by March 6, 2006 . Part II is due to the Department by April 14, 2006.

PART I

Part I of the Consolidated State Report, which States must submit to the Department by **March 6, 2006** , 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 ESEA. The five ESEA Goals established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application are as follows:

- o **Performance goal 1:** By 2013-2014, all students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.

- o **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.
- o **Performance goal 3** : By 2004-2005, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.
- o **Performance goal 4** : All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free, and conducive to learning.
- o **Performance Goal 5** : All students will graduate from high school.

PART II

Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report consists of information related to State activities and outcomes of specific ESEA programs for the 2004-2005 school year. Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report is due to the Department by **April 14, 2006**. The information requested in Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report for the 2004-2005 school year necessarily varies from program to program. However, for all programs, 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.
3. The information will provide valid evidence of program outcomes or results.
4. The Consolidated State Performance Report is the best vehicle for collection of the data.

The Department is continuing to work with the Performance-Based Data Management Initiative (PBDMI) to streamline data collections for the 2004-2005 school year and beyond.

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the 2004-2005 school year must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **March 6, 2006**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **April 14, 2006**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the 2004-2005 school year, unless otherwise noted.

The format states will use to submit the Consolidated State Performance Report has changed to an online submission. 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 "2004-2005 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 2004-2005 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN website (<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: 07/31/2006

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

Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting:
 Part I, 2004-2005 Part II, 2004-2005

Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report:
Commonwealth of Virginia - Department of Education

Address:
P. O. Box 2120
Richmond, VA 23218-2120

Person to contact about this report:

Name: Ms. Roberta Schlicher, Director Office of Program Administration and Accountability
Telephone: (804) 225-2870
Fax: (804) 371-7347
e-mail: Roberta.Schlicher@doe.virginia.gov

Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Dr. Patricia I. Wright, Acting Superintendent of
Public Instruction

Signature

3/3/2006 10:08 AM EST

Date

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART I

For reporting on
School Year 2004-2005



PART I DUE MARCH 6, 2006

1.1. STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

Section 1111(b)(1) of ESEA requires States to adopt challenging academic content and achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science and to develop assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(3) in the required grade levels. In the following sections, States are asked to provide a detailed description of their progress in meeting the NCLB standards and assessments requirements.

1.1.1. Please provide a detailed description of the State's progress in adopting challenging academic content standards in science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(1).**STATE RESPONSE**

The Virginia Science Standards of Learning (SOL) were originally developed and approved by the Virginia Board of Education in June 1995. Following the schedule established by the Board of Education for revision of all content standards, the science standards were revised in 2003 to reflect updated information related to science as well as input from the field. In addition to the Standards, a companion curriculum framework document was developed to provide detailed guidance for school divisions in the implementation of the Science Standards of Learning. The Science Standards of Learning can be accessed via the Department of Education Web site at :

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

The Science Curriculum Framework can be accessed via the Department of Education Web site at:

<http://www.pen.k12.va.us/VDOE/Instruction/Science/sciCF.html>.

Student performance on the Science Standards of Learning is assessed through a statewide criterion-referenced, multiple choice assessment directly linked to the Standards. Students are assessed once in third, fifth, and eighth grades as well as at the end of high school science courses in Earth Science, Biology, and Chemistry. The third, fifth, and eighth grade assessments are cumulative.

1.1.2 Please provide a detailed description of the State's progress in developing and implementing, in consultation with LEAs, assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(3) in the required grade levels. Please provide in your response a description of the State's progress in developing alternate assessments for students with disabilities, including alternate assessments aligned to alternate achievement standards and those aligned to grade-level achievement standards.

STATE RESPONSE

For the 2004-2005 school year, Virginia administered reading/language arts, mathematics, and science Standards of Learning assessments in third, fifth, and eighth grades. End-of-course Standards of Learning assessments in these subject areas are administered at the high school level after completion of the corresponding content course. Additionally, new Standards of Learning reading/language arts and mathematics assessments for fourth, sixth, and seventh grades were field tested during the 2004-2005 school year with full implementation scheduled for 2005-2006. Local school divisions are involved in the development of the assessments through content review committees in each subject area. Selected teachers, principals, and curriculum specialists representing all regions of the state meet annually to assist the test publisher and the state assessment office in development of each test in each subject area.

Since the 2001-2002 school year, the Virginia Alternate Assessment Program (VAAP) has been the assessment that measures alternate achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities. The VAAP is aligned to alternate achievement standards. The Virginia Grade Level Alternative Assessment Program (VGLA) was administered for the first time in 2004-2005. The VGLA is available for students enrolled in grades 3-8 and uses a collection of evidence to demonstrate individual student achievement on grade-level Virginia Standards of Learning assessments for a given course or content area. The VGLA is aligned to grade-level achievement standards.

1.1.3 Please provide a detailed description of the State's progress in setting, in consultation with LEAs, academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(1). If applicable, please provide in your response a description of the State's progress in developing alternate achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.

STATE RESPONSE

The Virginia Board of Education has adopted challenging academic achievement standards called the Standards of Learning as the basis of a comprehensive reform effort begun in 1995. The Standards of Learning for reading/language arts, mathematics, and science can be assessed via the Virginia Department of Education's Web site at:

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

The Standards of Learning set forth minimum content standards for students in kindergarten through eighth grade as well as for high school level courses. The Standards of Learning set reasonable targets and expectations for what students should know and be able to do at each grade level or within each high school course.

The Board of Education has approved a seven-year schedule of evaluation and revision for all Standards of Learning. The Standards of Learning for Reading/Language Arts were most recently revised in 2002. The Standards of Learning for Mathematics were most recently revised in 2001. The Standards of Learning for Science were most recently revised in 2003. Additionally, a curriculum framework as well as an enhanced scope and sequence document have also been developed for the reading/language arts, mathematics, and science standards. These documents provide detailed guidance for school divisions in implementation of the standards. The documents are available on the Department of Education Web site at:

<http://www.pen.k12.va.us/VDOE/CurriculumFramework/>

<http://www.pen.k12.va.us/VDOE/EnhancedSandS/>.

Virginia has alternate achievement standards in place for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities. The standards were developed by standard-setting committees through established state procedures and approved by the Virginia Board of Education in October 2001.

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

Participation of All Students in 2004-2005 State Assessments

In the following tables, please provide the total number and percentage for each of the listed subgroups of students who participated in the State's 2004-2005 school year academic assessments.

The data provided below for students with disabilities should include participation results from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act and do not include results from students covered under Section 504 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 1973.

1.2.1 Student Participation in 2004-2005 School Year Test Administration**1.2.1.1 2004-2005 School Year Mathematics Assessment**

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Tested
All Students	520516	99.1
American Indian/Alaska Native	1617	98.4
Asian/Pacific Islander	28102	99.5
Black, non-Hispanic	128612	98.5
Hispanic	33374	98.9
White, non-Hispanic	319470	99.3
Students with Disabilities	59681	98.2
Limited English Proficient	31319	99.0
Economically Disadvantaged	134138	98.6
Migrant	292	100.0
Male	259884	99.0
Female	260218	99.2

(1)Racial totals do not equal all students total, as the racial category was not specified on some student answer documents. (2)The actual percentage for the Migrant student subgroup is 105.4 due to demographic information discrepancies coded on student test answer documents. (3)Male and female totals do not equal the all students total, as the gender category was not specified on some student test answer documents.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.2.1.2 2004-2005 School Year Reading/Language Arts Assessment

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Tested
All Students	357681	99.4
American Indian/Alaska Native	1135	98.9
Asian/ Pacific Islander	17807	100.0
Black, non-Hispanic	92834	98.7
Hispanic	24243	100.0
White, non-Hispanic	215327	99.4
Students with Disabilities	49271	97.4
Limited English Proficient	23526	100.0
Economically Disadvantaged	104857	98.9
Migrant	247	100.0
Male	181527	99.0
Female	175705	99.4

(1)Racial totals do not equal all students total, as the racial category was not specified on some student answer documents. (2)The actual percentage for the LEP student subgroup is 101.5 and for the Migrant student subgroup is 130. The percentages are over 100 due to demographic information discrepancies coded on student test answer documents. (3)Male and female totals do not equal the all students total, as the gender category was not specified on some student test answer documents.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in State Assessment System

Students with disabilities (as defined under IDEA) participate in the State's assessment system either by taking the regular State assessment, with or without accommodations, by taking an alternate assessment aligned to grade-level standards, or by taking an alternate assessment aligned to alternate achievement standards. In the following table, please provide the total number and percentage of students with disabilities who participated in these various assessments.

The data provided below should include participation results from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act and do not include results from students covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

1.2.2.1 Participation of Students with Disabilities the in 2004-2005 School Year Test Administration - Math Assessment

	Total Number of Students with Disabilities Tested	Percent of Students with Disabilities Tested
Regular Assessment, with or without accommodations	55104	92.3
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards	734	1.2
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	3843	6.4

1.2.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities the in 2004-2005 School Year Test Administration - Reading/Language Arts Assessment

	Total Number of Students with Disabilities Tested	Percent of Students with Disabilities Tested
Regular Assessment, with or without accommodations	45510	90.3
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards	918	1.9
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	3843	7.8

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

In the following charts, please provide student achievement data from the 2004-2005 school year test administration. Charts have been provided for each of grades 3 through 8 and high school to accommodate the varied State assessment systems in mathematics and reading/language arts during the 2004-2005 school year. States should provide data on the total number of students tested as well as the percentage of students scoring at the proficient or advanced levels for those grades in which the State administered mathematics and reading/language arts assessments during the 2004-2005 school year.

The data for students with disabilities should include participation results from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, including results from alternate assessments, and do not include results from students covered under Section 504 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 1973.

1.3.1 Grade 3 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05
All Students	85758	87.8
American Indian/Alaska Native	266	87.6
Asian/Pacific Islander	4261	94.3
Black, non-Hispanic	21948	78.8
Hispanic	6516	81.9
White, non-Hispanic	51023	91.8
Students with Disabilities	12481	73.5
Limited English Proficient	7229	81.8
Economically Disadvantaged	29184	79.6
Migrant	49	79.6
Male	43727	88.0
Female	41945	87.8

(1)Racial totals do not equal all students total, as the racial category was not specified on some student answer documents.
(2)Male and female totals do not equal the all students total, as the gender category was not specified on some student test answer documents.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.2 Grade 3 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05
All Students	85919	76.8
American Indian/Alaska Native	266	76.3
Asian/Pacific Islander	4270	83.9
Black, non-Hispanic	21952	66.6
Hispanic	6611	67.8
White, non-Hispanic	51073	81.6
Students with Disabilities	12409	53.8
Limited English Proficient	7338	64.6
Economically Disadvantaged	29250	65.2
Migrant	65	64.6
Male	43753	73.3
Female	42023	80.5

(1)Racial totals do not equal all students total, as the racial category was not specified on some student answer documents.
(2)Male and female totals do not equal the all students total, as the gender category was not specified on some student test answer documents.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.3 Grade 4 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05
All Students	0	0
American Indian/Alaska Native		
Asian/Pacific Islander		
Black, non-Hispanic		
Hispanic		
White, non-Hispanic		
Students with Disabilities		
Limited English Proficient		
Economically Disadvantaged		
Migrant		
Male		
Female		

Virginia does not currently administer the Standards of Learning test at grade 4.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.4 Grade 4 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05
All Students	0	0
American Indian/Alaska Native		
Asian/Pacific Islander		
Black, non-Hispanic		
Hispanic		
White, non-Hispanic		
Students with Disabilities		
Limited English Proficient		
Economically Disadvantaged		
Migrant		
Male		
Female		

Virginia does not currently administer the Standards of Learning test at grade 4.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.5 Grade 5 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05
All Students	89244	80.7
American Indian/Alaska Native	281	81.1
Asian/Pacific Islander	4126	90.2
Black, non-Hispanic	24091	69.1
Hispanic	6094	71.7
White, non-Hispanic	53111	86.1
Students with Disabilities	13501	54.7
Limited English Proficient	6205	69.9
Economically Disadvantaged	30320	69.1
Migrant	42	59.5
Male	45808	79.0
Female	43382	82.4

(1)Racial totals do not equal all students total, as the racial category was not specified on some student answer documents.
(2)Male and female totals do not equal the all students total, as the gender category was not specified on some student test answer documents.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.6 Grade 5 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05
All Students	89260	85.3
American Indian/Alaska Native	286	90.2
Asian/Pacific Islander	4146	91.8
Black, non-Hispanic	23999	75.2
Hispanic	6174	80.6
White, non-Hispanic	53114	89.9
Students with Disabilities	13460	65.5
Limited English Proficient	6338	79.5
Economically Disadvantaged	30272	75.3
Migrant	52	65.4
Male	45805	82.9
Female	43379	88.0

(1)Racial totals do not equal all students total, as the racial category was not specified on some student answer documents.
(2)Male and female totals do not equal the all students total, as the gender category was not specified on some student test answer documents.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.7 Grade 6 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05
All Students	0	0
American Indian/Alaska Native		
Asian/Pacific Islander		
Black, non-Hispanic		
Hispanic		
White, non-Hispanic		
Students with Disabilities		
Limited English Proficient		
Economically Disadvantaged		
Migrant		
Male		
Female		

Virginia does not currently administer the Standards of Learning test at grade 6.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.8 Grade 6 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05
All Students	0	0
American Indian/Alaska Native		
Asian/Pacific Islander		
Black, non-Hispanic		
Hispanic		
White, non-Hispanic		
Students with Disabilities		
Limited English Proficient		
Economically Disadvantaged		
Migrant		
Male		
Female		

Virginia does not currently administer the Standards of Learning test at grade 6.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.9 Grade 7 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05
All Students	0	0
American Indian/Alaska Native		
Asian/Pacific Islander		
Black, non-Hispanic		
Hispanic		
White, non-Hispanic		
Students with Disabilities		
Limited English Proficient		
Economically Disadvantaged		
Migrant		
Male		
Female		

Virginia does not currently administer the Standards of Learning test at grade 7.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.10 Grade 7 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05
All Students	0	0
American Indian/Alaska Native		
Asian/Pacific Islander		
Black, non-Hispanic		
Hispanic		
White, non-Hispanic		
Students with Disabilities		
Limited English Proficient		
Economically Disadvantaged		
Migrant		
Male		
Female		

Virginia does not currently administer the Standards of Learning test at grade 7.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.11 Grade 8 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05
All Students	96361	80.6
American Indian/Alaska Native	298	78.5
Asian/Pacific Islander	4492	93.0
Black, non-Hispanic	25757	67.4
Hispanic	5836	72.6
White, non-Hispanic	58152	86.3
Students with Disabilities	14270	49.9
Limited English Proficient	4752	70.0
Economically Disadvantaged	28357	66.8
Migrant	49	65.3
Male	49327	78.8
Female	46927	82.6

(1)Racial totals do not equal all students total, as the racial category was not specified on some student answer documents.
(2)Male and female totals do not equal the all students total, as the gender category was not specified on some student test answer documents.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.12 Grade 8 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05
All Students	94001	76.5
American Indian/Alaska Native	304	73.0
Asian/Pacific Islander	4269	86.0
Black, non-Hispanic	25350	62.7
Hispanic	5729	65.8
White, non-Hispanic	56728	83.0
Students with Disabilities	14098	42.5
Limited English Proficient	4815	60.6
Economically Disadvantaged	28125	60.7
Migrant	59	39.0
Male	47968	72.9
Female	45932	80.2

(1)Racial totals do not equal all students total, as the racial category was not specified on some student answer documents.
(2)Male and female totals do not equal the all students total, as the gender category was not specified on some student test answer documents.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.13 High School - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05
All Students	238656	85.7
American Indian/Alaska Native	713	82.5
Asian/Pacific Islander	13872	92.7
Black, non-Hispanic	54630	74.8
Hispanic	13310	79.4
White, non-Hispanic	152366	89.6
Students with Disabilities	18695	64.9
Limited English Proficient	10788	80.9
Economically Disadvantaged	43637	77.7
Migrant	116	74.1
Male	115707	85.2
Female	122798	86.1

(1)Racial totals do not equal all students total, as the racial category was not specified on some student answer documents.
(2)Male and female totals do not equal the all students total, as the gender category was not specified on some student test answer documents.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.14 High School - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05
All Students	81667	88.0
American Indian/Alaska Native	245	89.8
Asian/Pacific Islander	4369	89.9
Black, non-Hispanic	19943	78.3
Hispanic	4345	80.7
White, non-Hispanic	51615	92.2
Students with Disabilities	8666	65.9
Limited English Proficient	3055	70.3
Economically Disadvantaged	15023	77.8
Migrant	37	59.5
Male	40495	86.5
Female	41114	89.5

(1)Racial totals do not equal all students total, as the racial category was not specified on some student answer documents.
(2)Male and female totals do not equal the all students total, as the gender category was not specified on some student test answer documents.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY

1.4.1 For all public elementary and secondary schools and districts in the State (Title I and non-Title I), please provide the total number and percentage of all schools and districts that made adequate yearly progress (AYP), based on data from the 2004-2005 school year.

School Accountability	Total number of public elementary and secondary schools (Title I and non-Title I) in State	Total number of public elementary and secondary schools (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP	Percentage of public elementary and secondary schools (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP
Based on 2004-2005 School Year Data	1828	1512	82.7

District Accountability	Total number of public elementary and secondary districts (Title I and non-Title I) in State	Total number of public elementary and secondary districts (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP	Percentage of public elementary and secondary districts (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP
Based on 2004-2005 School Year Data	132	67	50.7

1.4.2 For all Title I schools and districts in the State, please provide the total number and percentage of all Title I schools and districts that made AYP, based on data from the 2004-2005 school year.

Title I School Accountability	Total number of Title I schools in State	Total number of Title I schools in State that made AYP	Percentage of Title I schools in State that made AYP
Based on 2004-2005 School Year Data	769	627	82.1

Title I District Accountability	Total number of Title I districts in State	Total number of Title I districts in State that made AYP	Percentage of Title I districts in State that made AYP
Based on 2004-2005 School Year Data	132	67	50.7

1.4.3 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

- 1.4.3.1** In the following chart, please provide a list of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under section 1116 for the 2005-2006 school year, based upon data from the 2004-2005 school year. For each school listed, please provide the name of the school's district, the areas in which the school missed AYP (e.g., missing reading proficiency target, reading participation rate, other academic indicator), and the school improvement status for the 2005 - 2006 school year (e.g., school in need of improvement year 1, school in need of improvement year 2, corrective action, restructuring - planning, restructuring - implementation). Additionally, for any Title I school identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring for the 2005 - 2006 school year, that made AYP based upon data from the 2004-2005 school year, please add "Made AYP 2004-2005."

Title I Schools Identified for Improvement, Corrective Action, and Restructuring (in 2005 - 2006 based on the data from 2004-2005)

See attached file

1.4.3.1 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement, Corrective Action, and Restructuring (in 2005-06 based on the data from 2004-05)
As of February 6, 2006

Division Name	NCES Division Code	School Name	NCES School Code	Area(s) in which school missed AYP						School Improvement Status for SY 2005-2006
				Reading/Language Arts		Mathematics		Other Academic Indicator		
				Proficiency Target	Participation Rate	Proficiency Target	Participation Rate	Academic Indicator (elementary/m iddle schools)	Graduation Rate (high school)	
Northumberland County Public Schools	5102730	Northumberland Elementary *	1392							Year 1
Nottoway County Public Schools	5102790	Nottoway Intermediate	1165			X				Year 2
Orange County Public Schools	5102820	Orange Elementary	1175	X		X				Year 1
Page County Public Schools	5102850	Page County High	1181	X						Year 1
Pittsylvania County Public Schools	5102940	Gretna Middle *	1217							Year 1
Pittsylvania County Public Schools	5102940	Southside Elementary *	1224							Year 1
Pittsylvania County Public Schools	5102940	Kentuck Elementary *	1220							Year 1
Prince Edward County Public Schools	5103060	Prince Edward Middle	2130	X		X				Year 2
Prince William County Public Schools	5103130	Marumscos Hills Elementary *	1306							Year 1
Pulaski County Public Schools	5103150	Critzer Elementary *	1330	X						Year 1
Spotsylvania County Public Schools	5103640	Berkeley Elementary *	1586							Year 1
Stafford County Public Schools	5103660	Rocky Run Elementary	2547	X		X				Year 2
Surry County Public Schools	5103750	Luther P. Jackson Middle *	1201							Year 1
Sussex County Public Schools	5103780	Annie B. Jackson Elementary	2136	X		X				Corrective Action
Sussex County Public Schools	5103780	Ellen W. Chambliss Elementary	1640	X		X				Corrective Action
Tazewell County Public Schools	5103810	Raven Elementary *	1659							Year 1
Warren County Public Schools	5103870	Warren County Middle *	1734							Year 1
Westmoreland County Public Schools	5103980	Washington District Elementary *	1769							Year 1
Wythe County Public Schools	5104110	Jackson Memorial Elementary *	1799							Year 1
Alexandria City Public Schools	5100120	John Adams Elementary *	45				X			Year 2
Alexandria City Public Schools	5100120	Patrick Henry Elementary *	52							Year 1
Alexandria City Public Schools	5100120	Maury Elementary	48	X		X				Year 2
Alexandria City Public Schools	5100120	Jefferson-Houston Elementary	44	X		X				Year 2
Charlottesville City Public Schools	5100780	Clark Elementary	2110	X						Year 1
Danville City Public Schools	5101110	Glenwood Elementary *	2113							Year 1
Hampton City Public Schools	5101800	Cesar Tarrant Elementary *	736							Year 1
Hampton City Public Schools	5101800	Aberdeen Elementary	726	X		X				Year 1
Hampton City Public Schools	5101800	Jane H. Bryan Elementary *	743	X						Year 1
Hampton City Public Schools	5101800	Francis Mallory Elementary *	740							Year 1
Hampton City Public Schools	5101800	Hampton Harbour Academy *	997			X	X			Year 2

1.4.3.1 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement, Corrective Action, and Restructuring (in 2005-06 based on the data from 2004-05)
As of February 6, 2006

Division Name	NCES Division Code	School Name	NCES School Code	Area(s) in which school missed AYP						School Improvement Status for SY 2005-2006
				Reading/Language Arts		Mathematics		Other Academic Indicator		
				Proficiency Target	Participation Rate	Proficiency Target	Participation Rate	Academic Indicator (elementary/m iddle schools)	Graduation Rate (high school)	
Richmond City Public Schools	5103240	Martin Luther King Jr. Middle	1385	X						Year 2
Richmond City Public Schools	5103240	Patrick Henry Elementary *	1391							Year 1
Richmond City Public Schools	5103240	Henderson Middle *	1374							Year 1
Richmond City Public Schools	5103240	Thomas C. Boushall Middle	2078	X	X		X			Corrective Action
Richmond City Public Schools	5103240	Summer Hill/Ruffin Road *	1401							Year 2
Richmond City Public Schools	5103240	Woodville Elementary *	1407							Corrective Action
Richmond City Public Schools	5103240	George Mason Elementary *	1370							Corrective Action
Richmond City Public Schools	5103240	Chandler Middle *	654	X						Restructuring
Richmond City Public Schools	5103240	Lucille M. Brown Middle	1894	X						Year 2
Richmond City Public Schools	5103240	Miles Jones Elementary	1928	X						Year 1
Roanoke City Public Schools	5103300	Oakland Intermediate	2217	X		X				Year 2
Roanoke City Public Schools	5103300	Garden City Elementary *	1419							Year 1
Roanoke City Public Schools	5103300	Preston Park Primary	1431	X		X				Year 2
Roanoke City Public Schools	5103300	Lincoln Terrace Saturn Network	1425		X	X				Year 2
Roanoke City Public Schools	5103300	Westside Elementary *	1437							Year 1
Roanoke City Public Schools	5103300	Hurt Park Elementary *	1423			X				Year 2
Roanoke City Public Schools	5103300	Forest Park Magnet *	1418	X						Year 2
Roanoke City Public Schools	5103300	Fallon Park Elementary	1416	X	X		X			Year 1
Winchester City Public Schools	5104050	Garland R. Quarles Elementary *	1779			X				Year 1

*Denotes Title I schools that made AYP in 2004-2005 in the same subject area that caused the school to enter or advance into School Improvement.

- 1.4.3.2** Briefly describe the measures being taken to address the achievement problems of **schools** identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring.

Virginia provides a Statewide System of Support as required under section 1117(a) of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001(NCLB). The statewide system increases the opportunity for all students served by these divisions and schools to meet the state's academic content standards and student academic achievement standards.

Virginia has taken a comprehensive approach to meeting this requirement. Virginia's approach is best described as a toolkit that provides school divisions and schools with the opportunity to select the option(s) that best fits their needs. The toolkit model allows the state to match resources to school divisions and schools based on student achievement analysis and other analyses known to contribute to quality educational programs.

The toolkit is organized into six strands: 1) standards and instructional resources; 2) assessments and data-driven decision making; 3) instructional support, interventions, and acceleration; 4) teacher quality and leadership development; 5) partnerships and support networks; and 6) accountability for results and informed parents. A description of the components available within each strand and how this approach meets requirements in NCLB is located at:

<http://www.doe.virginia.gov/VDOE/nclb/statewidesupport.pdf>.

Examples of these categories are listed below with representative technical assistance examples.

- Standards and Instructional Resources
 - o Standards of Learning (SOL) Curriculum Frameworks/Enhanced Scope and Sequence/Pacing Guides
 - o SOL Instructional Modules/LEP and Special Education Differentiation Strategies
- Assessment and Data-Driven Decision Making
 - o SOL Assessments
 - o Electronic Practice Assessment Tools
- Instructional Support, Interventions, and Acceleration
 - o Project Graduation
 - o The PASS Initiative (Partnership of Achieving Successful Schools)
- Teacher Quality and Leadership Development
 - o Guidelines for High Quality Professional Development
 - o Teacher Recruitment in Hard-to-Staff Schools
- Partnerships and Support Networks
 - o Mathematics and Science Partnerships
 - o School/University Partnerships
- Accountability and Results and Informed Parents
 - o School Accreditation
 - o School, Division, and State Report Cards

Technical Assistance for Title I Schools in School Improvement

Under the third strand of the statewide system of support, the Virginia Department of Education provides technical assistance to schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring through a school-level academic review process designed to provide individualized assistance to schools considered to have the greatest need. Schools in greatest need have failed to meet both the adequate yearly progress (AYP) targets and state accreditation requirements.

A school-level academic review and follow up school support teams are the primary vehicle for helping schools identify and analyze instructional and organizational factors affecting student achievement. The review process focuses on the systems, processes, and practices implemented at the school and division. Specifically, information is gathered that relates to the following areas: 1) local curriculum alignment to the state learning standards; 2) use of time and school scheduling practices; 3) use of data to make instructional and planning decisions; 4) professional development opportunities provided for staff; 5) school improvement planning; 6) implementation of an instructional method or model/program for schools previously warned in English or Mathematics; 7) organizational systems and processes; and 8) school culture.

Within each of these areas, indicators reflecting effective practices have been identified. These indicators are based on state laws, Virginia Board of Education regulations, and on research-based practices known to improve student achievement. On-site review teams collect and analyze data and provide the school with evidence regarding its ability to implement these practices. After the review, follow-up reports are given to the school and division. This report includes recommendations in developing, revising, and implementing the school's three-year improvement plan. Follow-up technical assistance is also provided.

A detailed description of the school-level academic review process and related technical assistance provided by the Virginia Department of Education can be found at <http://www.doe.virginia.gov/VDOE/Accountability/accreditation.htm> .

1.4.4 Title I Districts Identified for Improvement.

1.4.4.1 In the following chart, please provide a list of Title I districts identified for improvement or corrective action under section 1116 for the 2005 - 2006 school year, based upon data from the 2004-2005 school year. For each district listed, please provide the areas in which the district missed AYP (e.g., missing reading proficiency target, reading participation rate, other academic indicator), and the district improvement status for the 2005 - 2006 school year (e.g., district in need of improvement year 1, district in need of improvement year 2, corrective action). Additionally for any Title I district identified for improvement or corrective action for the 2005 - 2006 school year that made AYP based on data from the 2004-2005 school year, please add "Made AYP for 2004-2005."

Title I Districts Identified for Improvement and Corrective Action (in 2005 - 2006 based on the data from 2004-2005)

See attached file

1.4.4.1

Title I District Identified for Improvemet and Corrective Action (in 2005-06 based on the data from 2004-05)

As of February 6, 2006

District Name (School Divisions)	NCES Division No.	Area(s) in which district missed AYP						District Improvement Status for SY 2004-2005
		Reading/Language Arts		Mathematics		Other Academic Indicator		
		Missed Proficiency Target	Missed Participation Rate	Missed Proficiency Target	Missed Participation Rate	Missed Attendance or Science (elementary or middle schools)	Missed Graduation Rate (high school)	
Lunenburg County Public Schools	5102310	X		X				Year 1
Lynchburg City Public Schools *	5102340							Year 1
Madison County Public Schools	5102370	X			X			Year 1
Manassas City Public Schools *	5102360							Year 1
Manassas Park City Public Schools	5102390	X						Year 1
Martinsville City Public Schools	5102400	X		X				Year 1
Mathews County Public Schools *	5102430							Year 1
Mecklenburg County Public Schools *	5102460							Year 1
Montgomery County Public Schools	5102520	X						Year 1
Nelson County Public Schools *	5102580							Year 1
Newport News City Public Schools *	5102640							Year 1
Norfolk City Public Schools	5102670	X			X			Year 1
Northampton County Public Schools *	5102710							Year 1
Northumberland County Public Schools *	5102730							Year 1
Nottoway County Public Schools *	5102790							Year 1
Orange County Public Schools	5102820	X		X				Year 1
Patrick County Public Schools *	5102880							Year 1
Petersburg City Public Schools	5102910	X	X	X	X			Year 1
Pittsylvania County Public Schools *	5102940							Year 1
Poquoson City Public Schools *	5102980							Year 1
Portsmouth City Public Schools *	5103000							Year 1
Prince Edward County Public Schools *	5103060							Year 1
Pulaski County Public Schools	5103150	X						Year 1
Radford City Public Schools	5103180	X		X				Year 1
Rappahannock County Public Schools *	5103210							Year 1
Richmond City Public Schools	5103240		X					Year 1
Roanoke City Public Schools	5103300	X	X	X	X			Year 1
Rockbridge County Public Schools	5103370	X		X				Year 1
Rockingham County Public Schools	5103390	X						Year 1
Russell County Public Schools *	5103420							Year 1
Southampton County Public Schools *	5103600							Year 1
Spotsylvania County Public Schools	5103640	X						Year 1
Stafford County Public Schools	5103660	X						Year 1
Suffolk City Public Schools	5103710	X		X				Year 1
Sussex County Public Schools	5103780		X	X	X	X		Year 1
Tazewell County Public Schools	5103810	X		X				Year 1

1.4.4.1

Title I District Identified for Improvemet and Corrective Action (in 2005-06 based on the data from 2004-05)

As of February 6, 2006

District Name (School Divisions)	NCES Division No.	Area(s) in which district missed AYP						District Improvement Status for SY 2004-2005
		Reading/Language Arts		Mathematics		Other Academic Indicator		
		Missed Proficiency Target	Missed Participation Rate	Missed Proficiency Target	Missed Participation Rate	Missed Attendance or Science (elementary or middle schools)	Missed Graduation Rate (high school)	
Virginia Beach City Public Schools *	5103840							Year 1
Washington County Public Schools *	5103900							Year 1
Waynesboro City Public Schools	5103930							Year 1
Williamsburg-James City County Public Schools	5104020	X						Year 1
Winchester City Public Schools	5104050	X						Year 1
Wythe County Public Schools	5104110	X		X				Year 1
York County Public Schools *	5104150							Year 1

*Denotes school divisions that made AYP in 2004-2005.

1.4.4.2 Briefly describe the measures being taken to address the achievement problems of districts identified for improvement and corrective action.

Virginia provides a Statewide System of Support as required under section 1117(a) of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001(NCLB). The statewide system increases the opportunity for all students served by these divisions and schools to meet the state's academic content standards and student academic achievement standards.

Virginia has taken a comprehensive approach to meeting this requirement. Virginia's approach is best described as a toolkit that provides school divisions and schools with the opportunity to select the option(s) that best fits their needs. The toolkit model allows the state to match resources to school divisions and schools based on student achievement analysis and other analyses known to contribute to quality educational programs.

The toolkit is organized into six strands: 1) standards and instructional resources; 2) assessments and data-driven decision making; 3) instructional support, interventions, and acceleration; 4) teacher quality and leadership development; 5) partnerships and support networks; and 6) accountability for results and informed parents. A description of the components available within each strand and how this approach meets requirements in NCLB is located at: <http://www.doe.virginia.gov/VDOE/nclb/statewidesupport.pdf>.

Examples of these categories are listed below with representative technical assistance examples.

- Standards and Instructional Resources
 - o Standards of Learning (SOL) Curriculum Frameworks/Enhanced Scope and Sequence/Pacing Guides
 - o SOL Instructional Modules/LEP and Special Education Differentiation Strategies
- Assessment and Data-Driven Decision Making
 - o SOL Assessments
 - o Electronic Practice Assessment Tools
 - o Benchmark Assessments
- Instructional Support, Interventions, and Acceleration
 - o Project Graduation
 - o The PASS Initiative (Partnership of Achieving Successful Schools)
 - o Virginia's Preschool Initiative
 - o Turnaround Specialist Program
- Teacher Quality and Leadership Development
 - o Guidelines for High Quality Professional Development
 - o Teacher Recruitment in Hard-to-Staff Schools
 - o Teacher Quality Enhancement
- Partnerships and Support Networks
 - o Mathematics and Science Partnerships
 - o School/University Partnerships
 - o Professional Organizations Partnerships
 - o Regional Education Laboratory
- Accountability and Results and Informed Parents
 - o School Accreditation
 - o Division Efficiency Reviews
 - o Federal Program Monitoring
 - o School, Division, and State Report Cards

1.4.5 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

1.4.5.1 Public School Choice

1. Please provide the number of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring from which students transferred under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2004-2005 school year. 63

2. Please provide the number of public schools to which students transferred under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2004-2005 school year. 101 How many of these schools were charter schools? 0

3. Please provide the number of students who transferred to another public school under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2004-2005 school year. 1111

4. Please provide the number of students who were eligible to transfer to another public school under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2004-2005 school year. 52351

Optional Information :

5. If the State has the following data, the Department would be interested in knowing the following:

6. The number of students who applied to transfer to another public school under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2004-2005 school year. 1204

7. The number of students, among those who applied to transfer to another public school under the Title I public school choice provisions, who were actually offered the opportunity to transfer by their LEAs, during the 2004-2005 school year. 52351

Note: Optional second question: All students were offered the choice option. This number represents students that were eligible, applied and offered the choice option, but data are not available for the number who declined.

1.4.5.2 Supplemental Educational Services

1. Please provide the number of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring whose students received supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2004-2005 school year. 34

2. Please provide the number of students who received supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2004-2005 school year. 2112

3. Please provide the number of students who were eligible to receive supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2004-2005 school year. 9702

Optional Information :

If the State has the following data, the Department would be interested in knowing the following:

4. The number of students who applied to receive supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2004-2005 school year. _____

For optional question number 4, - Data will be available for the 2005-06 school year.

1.5 TEACHER AND PARAPROFESIONAL QUALITY

1.5.1 In the following table, please provide data from the 2004-2005 school year for classes in the core academic subjects being taught by "highly qualified" teachers (as the term is defined in Section 9101(23) of the ESEA), in the aggregate for all schools and in "high-poverty" and "low-poverty" elementary schools (as the terms are defined in Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) of the ESEA). Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "high-poverty" schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State and "low-poverty" schools as schools in the bottom quartile of poverty in the State. Additionally, please provide information on classes being taught by highly qualified teachers by the elementary and secondary school level.

School Type	Total Number of Core Academic Classes	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers
All Schools in State	183151	175029	95.6
Elementary Level			
High-Poverty Schools	10677	10109	94.7
Low-Poverty Schools	12107	11859	98.0
All Elementary Schools	48544	46853	96.5
Secondary Level			
High-Poverty Schools	14224	13232	93.0
Low-Poverty Schools	46554	45238	97.2
All Secondary Schools	134607	128176	95.2

Definitions and Instructions

What are the core academic subjects?

English, reading or language arts, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, and geography [*Title IX*, Section 9101(11)]. While the statute includes the arts in the core academic subjects, it does not specify which of the arts are core academic subjects; therefore, States must make this determination.

How is a teacher defined?

An individual who provides instruction in the core academic areas to kindergarten, grades 1 through 12, or un-graded classes; or individuals who teach in an environment other than a classroom setting (and who maintain daily student attendance records) [from NCES, CCD, 2001-02]

How is a class defined?

A class is a setting in which organized instruction of core academic course content is provided to one or more students (including cross-age groupings) for a given period of time. (A course may be offered to more than one class). Instruction, provided by one or more teachers or other staff members, may be delivered in person or via a different medium. Classes that share space should be considered as separate classes if they function as separate units for more than 50 percent of the time [from NCES Non-fiscal Data Handbook for Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education, 2003.

Should 6th, 7th, and 8th grade classes be reported in the elementary or secondary category?

States are responsible for determining whether the content taught at the middle school level meets the competency requirements for elementary or secondary instruction. See Question A-14 in the August 3, 2005, Non-Regulatory Guidance for additional information. Report classes in grade 6 through 8 consistent with how teachers have been classified to determine their highly qualified status, regardless if their schools are configured as elementary or middle schools.

How should States count teachers (including specialists or resource teachers) in elementary classes?

States that count self-contained classrooms as one class should, to avoid over-representation, also count subject-area specialists (e.g., mathematics or music teachers) or resource teachers as teaching one class.

On the other hand, States using a departmentalized approach to instruction where a self-contained classroom is counted multiple times (once for each subject taught) should also count subject-area specialists or resource teachers as teaching multiple classes.

How should States count teachers in self-contained multiple subject secondary classes?

Each core academic subject taught for which students are receiving credit toward graduation should be counted in the numerator and the denominator. For example, if English, calculus, history, and science are being taught in a self-contained classroom by the same teacher, count these as four classes in the denominator. If the teacher is Highly Qualified in English and history, he/she would be counted as Highly Qualified in two of the four subjects in the numerator.

1.5.2 For those classes in core academic subjects being taught by teachers who are **not highly qualified** as reported in Question 1.5.1, estimate the percentages of those classes in the following categories (note: percentages should add to 100 percent of the classes taught by not highly qualified teachers).

Reason For Being Classified as Not Highly Qualified	Percentage
a) Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	20.1
b) Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	
c) Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	0.6
d) Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	76.5
e) Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	
f) Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	2.8
g) Other (please explain)	

1.5.2 (b)and (e) This data will be collected beginning with the 2005-2006 school year.

1.5.3 Please report the State poverty quartile breaks for high- and low-poverty *elementary and secondary* schools used in the table in Question 1.5.1.

	High-Poverty Schools	Low-Poverty Schools
Elementary Schools	More than <u>56.0%</u>	Less than <u>20.5%</u>
Poverty Metric Used	Percentage of students receiving free and reduced lunch.	
Secondary Schools	More than <u>56.0%</u>	Less than <u>20.5%</u>
Poverty Metric Used	Percentage of students receiving free and reduced lunch.	

Definitions and Instructions

How are the poverty quartiles determined?

Separately rank order elementary and secondary schools from highest to lowest on your percent poverty measure. Divide the list into 4 equal groups. Schools in the first (highest group) are high-poverty schools. Schools in the last group (lowest group) are the low-poverty schools. Generally, states use the percentage of students who qualify for the free or reduced price lunch program for this calculation.

Since the poverty data are collected at the school and not classroom level, how do we classify schools as either elementary or secondary for this purpose?

States may include as elementary schools all schools that serve children in grades K-5 (including K-8 or K-12 schools) and would therefore include as secondary schools those that exclusively serve children in grades 6 and higher.

1.5.4 PARAPROFESSIONAL QUALITY. NCLB defines a qualified paraprofessional as an employee who provides instructional support in a program supported by Title I, Part A funds who has (1) completed two years of study at an institution of higher education; (2) obtained an associate's (or higher) degree; or (3) met a rigorous standard of quality and be able to demonstrate, through a formal State or local academic assessment, knowledge of and the ability to assist in instructing reading, writing, and mathematics (or, as appropriate, reading readiness, writing readiness, and mathematics readiness) (Section 1119(c) and (d).) For more information on qualified paraprofessionals, please refer to the Title I paraprofessionals Guidance, available at:

<http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/paraguidance.doc>

In the following chart, please provide data from the 2004-2005 school year for the percentage of Title I paraprofessionals (excluding those with sole duties as translators and parental involvement assistants) who are qualified.

School Year	Percentage of Qualified Title I Paraprofessionals
2004-2005 School Year	75.5

1.6 English Language Proficiency**1.6.1.1 English Language Proficiency (ELP) Standards**

Has the State developed ELP standards (k-12) as required under Section 3113(b)(2) and are these ELP standards fully approved, adopted, or sanctioned by the State governing body?

Developed Yes No

Approved, adopted, sanctioned Yes No

Operationalized Yes No (e.g., Are standards being used by district and school teachers?)

Please provide a detailed description of the State's progress in establishing, implementing, and operationalizing English Language Proficiency (ELP) standards for raising the level of ELP, that are derived from the four domains of speaking, listening, reading, and writing, and that are aligned with achievement of the challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards described in section 1111(b)(1).

STATE RESPONSE

English Language Proficiency (ELP) Standards

English Language Proficiency (ELP) Standards of Learning for limited English proficient (LEP) students were adopted by the Virginia Board of Education in November 2002. The standards are derived from the four domains of speaking, listening, reading and writing and include four levels of English language proficiency. The four levels of proficiency defined in the standards provide the framework for initial placement of LEP students in instructional programs. Student progress on the standards is measured annually through an English language proficiency assessment. The results of the annual assessment are used to measure progress and proficiency in English language acquisition as well as place students in the appropriate instructional level.

1.6.1.2 Alignment of Standards

Please provide a detailed description of the State's progress for linking/aligning the State English Proficiency Standards to the State academic content and student academic achievement standards in English language arts/reading and mathematics.

STATE RESPONSE

The ELP Standards are linked to the Reading/Language Arts Standards of Learning, which is demonstrated through their publication as an integrated section of the Reading/Language Arts Standards of Learning. The domain descriptors for both the Reading/Language Arts Standards of Learning and the ELP Standards are the same and serve as the linking strands between the two groups of Standards. The ELP Standards can be accessed via the link below:

<http://www.pen.k12.va.us/VDOE/Superintendent/Sols/EnglishSOL02.html>

An additional linkage between the Reading/Language Arts Standards of Learning and the ELP Standards has been created via a resource document entitled, "Strategies for Teaching Limited English Proficient Students - A Supplemental Resource Guide to the K-12 English Standards of Learning Enhanced Scope and Sequence". The document serves as a supplement to the K-12 English Standards of Learning Enhanced Scope and Sequence, which assists teachers with aligning their instruction with the English Standards of Learning. This document is intended to provide classroom teachers with effective strategies for differentiating instruction for LEP students. This document can be accessed via the link below:

<http://www.pen.k12.va.us/VDOE/Instruction/ESL/LEPenglishResource.pdf>

The linkage between the ELP Standards and the Mathematics Standards of Learning has been accomplished via a resource document entitled, "Mathematics: Strategies for Teaching Limited English Proficient (LEP) Students – A Supplemental Resource to the K-12 Mathematics Standards of Learning Enhanced Scope and Sequence." The document serves as a supplement to the K-12 Mathematics Standards of Learning Enhanced Scope and Sequence, which assists teachers with aligning their instruction with the Mathematics Standards of Learning. This document is intended to provide classroom teachers with effective strategies for differentiating instruction for LEP students. The document can be accessed via the link below:

<http://www.doe.virginia.gov/VDOE/EnhancedSandS/mathematics.shtml>

1.6.2 English Language Proficiency (ELP) Assessments

1. **The expectation for the full administration of the new or enhanced ELP assessment(s) that are aligned with the State's English language proficiency (ELP) standards as required under Section 3113(b)(2) is spring 2006 . Please indicate if the State has conducted any of the following:**
 - **An independent alignment study _____**
 - **Other evidence of alignment _____**

2. **Provide an updated description of the State's progress in developing and implementing the new or enhanced ELP assessments. Specifically describe how the State ensures:**
 - **The annual assessment of all LEP students in the State in grades k-12;**
 - **The ELP assessment(s) which address the five domains of listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension;**
 - **ELP assessments are based on ELP standards;**
 - **Technical quality (validity, reliability, etc.)**

STATE RESPONSE

English Language Proficiency Assessments

The State ensures that all local school divisions in the state annually administer an English language proficiency (ELP) assessment to all K-12 LEP students in the state in the following ways. The information is announced annually via Superintendents' memoranda that remind school divisions of the requirement. Follow-up Superintendents' memoranda are issued that describe regional trainings that are held regarding the administration of the ELP assessment. Additionally, Title III Coordinators and Division Directors of Testing (DDOTs) receive technical assistance through a series of meetings in the fall and spring of each year. These meetings, which are sponsored by the Virginia Department of Education, include formal presentations that address assessment requirements for LEP students.

For 2004-2005, school divisions in Virginia used an augmented version of the Stanford English Language Proficiency (SELP) test. The Stanford English Language Proficiency (ELP) test has been developed by Harcourt Educational Measurement Company. A separate form of the test has been developed for each of the four grade clusters defined in Virginia's English Language Proficiency Standards of Learning: K-2, 3-5, 6-8, and 9-12. Additionally, each form of the Stanford ELP contains four components: 1) speaking, 2) listening, 3) reading, and 4) writing as required in Section 1111(b)(7) of the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001*. The Stanford ELP yields a score for each of these four components as well as a composite score. The augmented version included: 1) a revised writing rubric designed by Virginia educators; 2) a closer alignment with Virginia ELP standards; 3) additional reading passages designed to discriminate at the upper proficiency levels; and 4) a separate form designed to address the needs of K-1 students. Each form of the Stanford ELP contains four components: 1) speaking, 2) listening, 3) reading, and 4) writing as required in Section 1111(b)(7) of the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001*. The Stanford ELP yields a score for each of these four components as well as a composite score. Additionally, as required only for Title III sub-grantees in Section 3121(d) of the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001*, the listening and reading components of the Stanford ELP are combined to yield a comprehension score.

The SELP test reflects all aspects necessary for comprehensive, standards-based assessment of English language proficiency. Developed by ESL experts, this research-based test evaluates the listening, reading, comprehension, writing, and speaking skills of K-12 English language learners. The SELP is based on Teachers of English to Speakers of other Languages (TESOL) and Virginia's English Language Proficiency Standards of Learning. It offers a variety of assessment formats, multiple-choice and performance-based, with student-motivating materials. It aligns with the Stanford Scale for consistent information across assessment programs. The SELP tests supports the validity-related standards set forth in the current edition of the Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing. The SELP test has been evaluated in order to determine its validity by assessing the test content, its internal structure, and its relationship to other variables. The

reliability of the SELP was examined to ensure that the SELP yields consistent results from year to year. The results indicated that the SELP is a valid and reliable measure of English language proficiency for LEP students in grades K-12. For detailed information relating to the technical quality of the SELP test, please access the link below. <http://harcourtassessment.com/haiweb/Cultures/en-US/dotCom/SELP/Stanford+English+Language+Proficiency+Test.htm>

1.6.3 English Language Proficiency Data

In the following tables, please provide English language proficiency (ELP) data from the **2004-2005** school year test administration. The ELP data should be aggregated at the State level.

States may use the sample format below or another format to report the requested information. The information following the chart is meant to explain what is being requested under each column.

1.6.3.1 English Language Proficiency (ELP) Assessment Data

2004-2005 Data for ALL LEP Students in the State											
Name of ELP Assessment (s) (1)	Total number of ALL Students assessed for ELP (2)	Total number and percentage of ALL students identified as LEP		Total number and percentage of ALL students identified as LEP at each level of English language proficiency							
		Number and Percentage at Level 1 (3)	Number and Percentage at Level 2 (4)	Number and Percentage at Level 2 (5)	Number and Percentage at Level 3 (6)	Number and Percentage at Level 4 (7)					
SELP	73459	67933	5.6	9707	14.0	19062	28.0	12022	18.0	8739	13.0

(2)As of spring 2004 SELP administration. (3)As of September 30, 2004,fall membership report. The number includes students who exit from direct language instruction and are placed on monitor 1 or monitor 2 status. Number of students on monitor 1 and monitor 2 status = 18,260 Percentage = 27%.

- (1) In column one, provide the name(s) of the English Language Proficiency Assessment(s) used by the State.
- (2) In column two, provide the total number of **all** students assessed for limited English proficiency ("assessed" refers to the number of students evaluated using State-selected ELP assessment(s)).
- (3) In column three, provide the total number and percentage of **all** students identified as LEP by each State-selected ELP assessment(s) ("identified" refers to the number of students determined to be LEP on State-selected ELP assessments).
- (4-7) In columns four-seven, provide the total number and percentage of **all** students identified as LEP at each level of English language proficiency as defined by State-selected ELP assessment(s). The number (#) and percentage (%) of columns 4-7 should equate to the number (#) and percentage (%) of **all** students identified as limited English proficient in column 3.

1.6.3.2 Data Reflecting the Most Common Languages Spoken in the State

2004-2005 Data of the Most Common Languages Spoken by LEPs		
Language	Number and Percentage of ALL LEP Students in the State	
1. Spanish	38415	57.0
2. Korean	3678	5.0
3. Vietnamese	2692	4.0
4. Urdu	2335	3.0
5. Arabic	2227	3.0
6. Chinese/Mandarin	1347	2.0
7. Farsi	1331	2.0
8. Tagalog	949	1.0
9. Russian	789	1.0
10. Amharic	768	1.0

- In the above chart, list the ten most commonly spoken languages in your State. Indicate the number and percentage of LEP students that speak each of the languages listed in table 1.6.4.1.

1.6.3.3 English Language Proficiency (ELP) Assessment Data

2004-2005 Data for LEP Students in the State Served under Title III												
Name of ELP Assessment(s) (1)	Total number and percentage of students identified as LEP who participated in Title III programs (2)		Total number and percentage of Title III students identified at each level of English language proficiency								Total number and percentage of Title III LEP students transitioned for 2 year monitoring (7)	
			Number and Percentage at Basic or Level 1 (3)		Number and Percentage at Intermediate or Level 2 (4)		Number and Percentage at Advanced or Level 3 (5)		Number and Percentage at Proficient or Level 4 (6)			
SELP	67176	98.9	14520	21.6	14098	21.0	12377	18.4	8611	12.7	17974	27.0

(2)As of September 30, 2004, fall membership report. Number of students who exited = 7,752 Percentage = 11.5%

- (1) In column one, provide the name of the English Language Proficiency Assessment used by the State.
- (2) In column two, provide the total number and percentage of LEP students who participated in a Title III language instruction educational program during the 2004-2005 school year.
- (3-6) In columns three-six, provide the total number and percentage of LEP students at each level of English language proficiency who received Title III services during the 2004-2005 school year. The number (#) and percentage (%) of columns 3-6 should equate to the number (#) and percentage (%) of all students identified as limited English proficient in column 2.
- (7) In column seven, provide the total number and percentage of LEP students who participated in a Title III language instruction educational program during the 2004-2005 school year and who were transitioned into a classroom not tailored for LEP children and are no longer receiving services under Title III.

1.6.4 Immigrant Children and Youth Data

Please provide the following information required under Section 3111©:

1.6.4.1	Number of immigrant children and youth reported in 2004-2005	<u>23232</u>
1.6.4.2	Number of immigrant children and youth served in 2004-2005	<u>15658</u>
1.6.4.3	Number of subgrants awarded to LEAs for immigrant children and youth programs for 2004-2005	<u>31</u>

1.6.5 Definition of Proficient

If the State has made changes since the last Consolidated State Performance Report submission (for school year 2003-2004), please provide the State's definition of "proficient" in English as defined by the State's English language proficiency standards and assessments under Section 3122(a)(3). Please include the following in your response:

- 1. The test score range or cut scores for each of the State's ELP assessments;**
- 2. A description of how the five domains of listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension are incorporated or weighted in the State's definition of "proficient" in English;**
- 3. Other criteria used to determine attaining proficiency in English.**

STATE RESPONSE

There have been no changes to the state's definition of proficient since the Consolidated State Performance Report Submission for school year 2003-2004.

1.6.6 Definition of Making Progress

If the State has made changes since the last Consolidated State Performance Report submission (for school year 2003-2004), please provide the State's definition of "making progress" in learning English as defined by the State's English language proficiency standards and assessment(s) in Section 3122(a)(3). Please include the following in your response:

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

STATE RESPONSE

There have been no changes to the state's definition of making process since the Consolidated State Performance Report Submission for school year 2003-2004.

1.6.7 Definition of Cohort

If the State has made changes since the last Consolidated State Performance Report submission (for school year 2003-2004), please provide the State's definition of "cohort." Include a description of the specific characteristics of the cohort(s) in the State, e.g., grade/grade span or other characteristics.

STATE RESPONSE

There have been no changes to the state's definition of cohort since the Consolidated State Performance Report Submission for school year 2003-2004.

1.6.8 Information on the Acquisition of English Language Proficiency for ALL Limited English Proficient Students in the State.

Please provide information on the progress made by **ALL LEP students in your State** in learning English and attaining English language proficiency.

Did your State apply the Title III English language proficiency annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) to **ALL LEP** students in the State?

Yes No

If **yes**, you may use the format provided below to report the requested information.

English Language Proficiency	Percent and Number of ALL LEP Students in the State Who Made Progress in Learning English		Percent and Number of ALL LEP Students in the State Who Attained English Proficiency	
	Projected AMAO Target	Actual	Projected AMAO Target	Actual
2004-2005 School Year	25.0	74.0 55100	15.0	31.0 23929

Only percentages are projected.

If **no**, please describe the different evaluation mechanism used by the State to measure both the progress of ALL LEP students in learning English and in attaining English language proficiency and provide the data from that evaluation.

1.6.9 Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs) for English Language Proficiency for Title III Participants

Please provide the State's progress in meeting performance targets/annual measurable achievement objectives in LEAs served by Title III.

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

English Language Proficiency	Percent and Number of Title III LEP Students in the State Who Made Progress in Learning English			Percent and Number of Title III LEP Students in the State Who Attained English Proficiency		
	Projected AMAO Target	Actual		Projected AMAO Target	Actual	
2004-2005 School Year	25.0	74.0	53344	15.0	31.0	23604

Only percentages were projected.

1.6.10 Please provide the following data on Title III Programs for the 2004-2005 School Year

	Number:
Number of Title III subgrantees	78
Number of Title III subgrantees that met all three components of Title III annual measurable achievement objectives (making progress, attainment, and AYP)	15
Number of Title III subgrantees that did not meet all three components of Title III annual measurable achievement objectives	63

1.6.11 On the following tables for 2004-2005, please provide data regarding the academic achievement of monitored LEP students who transitioned into classrooms not designated for LEP students and who are no longer receiving services under Title III. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned in 2004-2005 school year.

1.6.11.1 Number and percent of former Title III served, monitored LEP students scoring at the proficient and advanced levels on the State reading language arts assessments

Grade/Grade Span	Students Proficient & Advanced	
	#	%
3	575	84.0
4		
5	897	91.0
6		
7		
8	899	79.0
H.S.	657	79.0

Assessments are not administered in grades 4, 6, and 7.

1.6.11.2 Number and percent of former Title III served, monitored LEP students scoring at the proficient and advanced levels on the State mathematics assessments

Grade/Grade Span	Students Proficient & Advanced	
	#	%
3	608	94.0
4		
5	902	91.0
6		
7		
8	977	85.0
H.S.	2357	87.0

Assessments are not administered in grades 4, 6, and 7.

1.7 Persistently Dangerous Schools

In the following chart, please provide data for the number of schools identified as persistently dangerous as determined by the State by the start of the 2005 - 2006 school year. For further guidance on persistently dangerous schools, please refer to the Unsafe School Choice Option Non-Regulatory Guidance, available at:

	Number of Persistently Dangerous Schools
2005-2006 School Year	0

1.8 Graduation and Dropout Rates

1.8.1 Graduation Rates

Section 200.19 of the Title I regulations issued under the No Child Left Behind Act on December 2, 2002, defines graduation rate to mean:

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

1. The Secretary approved each State's definition of the graduation rate, consistent with section 200.19 of the Title I regulations, as part of each State's accountability plan. Using the definition of the graduation rate that was approved as part of your State's accountability plan, in the following chart please provide graduation rate data for the 2003-2004 school year.

2. For those States that are reporting transitional graduation rate data and are working to put into place data collection systems that will allow the State to calculate the graduation rate in accordance with Section 200.19 for all the required subgroups, please provide a detailed progress report on the status of those efforts.

High School Graduates	Graduation Rate
Student Group	03-04 School Year
All Students	79.9
American Indian/Alaska Native	76.0
Asian/Pacific Islander	88.4
Black, non-Hispanic	71.3
Hispanic	68.0
White, non-Hispanic	83.5
Students with Disabilities	
Limited English Proficient	
Economically Disadvantaged	
Migrant	
Male	76.2
Female	83.7

In 2003-2004, we did not track the graduation rate of students with disabilities, limited english proficient, economically disadvantaged, and migrant.

Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.8.2 Dropout Rate

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

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

In the following chart, please provide data for the 2003-2004 school year for the percentage of students who drop out of high school, disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged.

Dropouts	Dropout Rate
Student Group	03-04 School Year
All Students	2.1
American Indian/Alaska Native	1.8
Asian/Pacific Islander	1.6
Black, non-Hispanic	3.2
Hispanic	5.9
White, non-Hispanic	1.3
Students with Disabilities	2.2
Limited English Proficient	3.9
Economically Disadvantaged	2.0
Migrant	6.0
Male	2.4
Female	1.7

Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.