

# **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 is 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 - *21<sup>st</sup> 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 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, Chief Deputy  
Superintendent of Public Instruction

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

9/22/2006 2:00 PM EST  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

# CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART II

For reporting on  
**School Year 2004-2005**



PART II DUE APRIL 14, 2006

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

**2.1.1 Student Achievement and High-Poverty Schools**

**2.1.1.1** Please provide the number of public schools with poverty rates of 40% or greater reporting an increase in the number of students performing at the proficient or advanced levels of student achievement in **reading/language arts** as measured by State assessments administered in the 2004-2005 school year as compared to assessments administered in the 2003-2004 school year. 606

**2.1.1.2** Please provide the number of public schools with poverty rates of 40% or greater reporting an increase in the number of students performing at the proficient or advanced levels of student achievement in **mathematics** as measured by State assessments administered in the 2004-2005 school year as compared to assessments administered in the 2003-2004 school year. 615

**2.1.2 Title I, Part A Schools by Type of Program For the 2004-2005 school year, please provide the following:**

**2.1.2.1** Total Number of Title I schools in the State 787

**2.1.2.2** Total Number of Title I Targeted Assistance Schools in the State 470

**2.1.2.3** Total Number of Title I Schoolwide Program Schools in the State 317

**2.1.3 Title I, Part A Student Participation****Student Participation in Title I, Part A by Special Services/Programs and Racial/Ethnic Groups**

In the following tables, please provide the *unduplicated* number of children participating in Title I, Part A in the State by special services/programs and racial/ethnic groups during the 2004-2005 school year. Count a child only once (*unduplicated* count) in each category even if the child participated during more than one term or in more than one school or district in the State during the reporting period. Include students in both Title I schoolwide and targeted assistance programs.

**2.1.3.1.1 Student Participation in Title I, A by Special Services or Programs 2004-2005 School Year**

	Number of Students Served
Students with Disabilities	25497
Limited English Proficient	13103
Homeless	1508
Migrant	329

**2.1.3.1.2 Student Participation in Title I, A by Racial or Ethnic Group 2004-2005 School Year**

	Number of Students Served
American Indian/Alaskan Native	309
Asian/Pacific Islander	4096
Black, non-Hispanic	78184
Hispanic	14269
White, non-Hispanic	59444

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.

**2.1.3.2 Student Participation in Title I, Part A by Grade Level**

Title I, Part A student participation counts by grade and by public, private and local neglected should be reported as *unduplicated* counts. Please enter the number of participants by grade in Title I public targeted assistance programs (TAS), Title I schoolwide *programs* (SWP), private school students participating in Title I programs, and students served in Part A local neglected programs during the 2004-2005 school year.

<b>Student Participation in Title I, Part A by Grade Level 2004-2005 School Year</b>						
	<b>Public TAS</b>	<b>Public SWP</b>	<b>Private</b>	<b>Local Neglected</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Percent of Total</b>
<b>Age 0-2</b>	0	49		0	49	0.0
<b>Age 3-5</b>	37	2338		0	2375	1.5
<b>K</b>	3254	22934		4	26192	16.6
<b>1</b>	6263	18793		2	25058	15.9
<b>2</b>	5750	17565		1	23316	14.8
<b>3</b>	5412	17220		1	22633	14.3
<b>4</b>	4531	17184		3	21718	13.7
<b>5</b>	3680	16836		5	20521	13.0
<b>6</b>	475	6134		2	6611	4.2
<b>7</b>	339	4748		6	5093	3.2
<b>8</b>	402	3829		7	4238	2.7
<b>9</b>	0	107		0	107	0.1
<b>10</b>	0	59		0	59	0.0
<b>11</b>	0	49		0	49	0.0
<b>12</b>	0	16		0	16	0.0
<b>Ungraded</b>						
<b>TOTALS</b>	30143	127861		31	158035	100.0

Virginia is a bypass state. School divisions contact private schools to determine if Title I service is desired at the public school locations. No school division in Virginia has reported that services are desired at the public school locations. Private schools interested in receiving services with Title I funds are required to contact the bypass contractor by Virginia law.

### 2.1.3.3 Student Participation in Title I, Part A Targeted Assistance Programs by Instructional and Support Services - 2004-2005 School Year

In the following chart, please provide the number of students receiving instructional and support services funded by Title I, A in targeted assistance (TAS) programs during the 2004-2005 school year.

Instructional Services	
	Number of Students Served
Mathematics	3433
Reading/Language Arts	20968
Science	
Social Studies	
Vocational/Career	
Other (specify)	
Support Services	
Health, Dental, and Eye Care	2
Supporting Guidance/Advocacy	114
Other (specify)	

### 2.1.4 Staff Information for Title I, Part A Targeted Assistance Programs - 2004-2005 School Year

In the following chart, please provide the number of full-time equivalent (FTE) staff funded through Title I, A targeted assistance (TAS) programs during the 2004-2005 school year by job category. For administrators and supervisors who service both targeted assistance and schoolwide programs, report the FTE attributable to their TAS duties only.

	Number of Title I Targeted Assistance Program FTE Staff
Administrators (non-clerical)	42
Teachers	1627
Teacher Aides	680
Support Staff (clerical and non-clerical)	64
Other (specify)	45

Teacher Aide FTE data were not collected this year. The number represents a count of full-time and part-time teacher aides. Other:26.2 Parental Involvement Specialists,3.0 Staff Development/Parental Involvement,2.5 Tutoring, 3.8 Family Support Specialists,4.2 Home School Coordinators, 2.3 ESL Tutors, 1 Supervisor,.50 Reading Recovery Teacher Leader,0.50 County Literacy Specialists,.50 Early Childhood Intervention Lead Teacher

**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**

For the 2004-2005 school year, please provide the following information:

**2.2.1.1 Federally Funded Even Start Subgrants in the State**

1. Number of federally funded Even Start subgrants in the State	<u>19</u>
---	-----------

**2.2.1.2 Even Start Families Participating During the Year**

("Participating" means participating in all required core services and following any period of preparation.)

1. Total number of families participating	<u>442</u>
2. Total number of adults participating ("Adults" includes teen parents.)	<u>469</u>
3. Total number of adults participating who are limited English proficient	<u>144</u>
4. Total number of children participating	<u>591</u>

**2.2.1.3 Characteristics of newly enrolled families at the time of enrollment**

(A newly enrolled family means a family who is enrolled for the first time in Even Start at any time during the year.)

1. Number of newly enrolled families	<u>298</u>
2. Number of newly enrolled adult participants	<u>327</u>
3. Percent of newly enrolled families at or below the Federal poverty level	<u>87.0</u>
4. Percent of newly enrolled adult participants without a high school diploma or GED	<u>90.0</u>
5. Percent of newly enrolled adult participants who have not gone beyond the 9th grade	<u>44.0</u>

**2.2.1.4 Percent of families that have remained in the program**

(Include families that are newly enrolled and those that are continuing.)

1. From 0 to 3 months	<u>29.0</u>
2. From 4 to 6 months	<u>20.0</u>
3. From 7 to 12 months	<u>28.0</u>
4. More than 12 months	<u>23.0</u>

## 2.2.2 Federal Even Start Performance Indicators

Using the format of the table below, describe the State's progress in meeting the federal performance indicators listed for Even Start participants in your State. States should report data if local projects are using the indicated measures and the state collects the data.

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Measure Measurement tool used to assess progress for indicator</b>	<b>Cohort Number of participants to whom the indicator applies</b>	<b>Result Number of participants who met the achievement goal</b>	<b>Explanation of Progress</b>
1. Percentage if adults showing significant learning gains on measures of reading	TABE: Test of Adult Basic Education (TABE) Reading	TABE: 230.0	TABE: 120.0	TABE: Progress defined as an increase of one or more National Reporting System (NRS) levels or attained highest NRS level.
	CASAS: <i>Virginia does not use CASAS</i>	CASAS: 0.0	CASAS: 0.0	CASAS: <i>Virginia does not use CASAS</i>
2. Percentage of LEP adults showing significant learning gains on measures of English language acquisition	TABE: Virginia Does not use TABE for LEP adults.	TABE:	TABE:	TABE:
	CASAS: Virginia does not use CASAS.	CASAS:	CASAS:	CASAS:
3. Percentage of school age adults who earn a high school diploma or GED	GED	19.0	5.0	School-age adults are teenage parents up to 18 years old who are attempting to obtain a diploma or GED.
	GED *Please Indicate diploma or GED	GED *Please Indicate diploma or GED	GED *Please Indicate diploma or GED	GED *Please Indicate diploma or GED
4. Percentage of non-school age adults who earn a high school diploma or GED	GED	65.0	37.0	Non-school-age adults are over 18 years old and attempting to obtain a diploma or GED.
	GED *Please Indicate diploma or GED	GED *Please Indicate diploma or GED	GED *Please Indicate diploma or GED	*Please Indicate diploma or GED
5. Percentage of children entering kindergarten who are achieving significant learning gains on measures of language development	Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT) receptive:	Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT) receptive: 45.0	Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT) receptive: 23.0	Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT) receptive: Cohort represents children who were 4 years old during 2004-2005. Progress defined as an increase in standard scores of 4 or more points
6. The average number of letters children can identify measured by the PALS Pre-K Uppercase Letter Naming Subtask	PAL Pre-K Upper Case Letter Naming Subtask:	PAL Pre-K Upper Case Letter Naming Subtask:  N/A	PAL Pre-K Upper Case Letter Naming Subtask	PAL Pre-K Upper Case Letter Naming Subtask  Virginia uses the PALS Pre-K, but did not collect individual subtask scores in 2004-2005. These data will be reported next year.
7. Percentage of school-aged children	Information is provided through	92.0	77.0	

who are reading on grade level	local school division assessments.			
	Please indicate source.	Please indicate source.	Please indicate source.	Please indicate source.
8. Percentage of parents who show improvement on measures of parental support for children's learning in the home, school environment, and through interactive learning activities	Parent Education Profile (PEP)	Parent Education Profile (PEP)	Parent Education Profile (PEP)	Parent Education Profile (PEP) Virginia does not use the PEP. However, progress is recorded using a State designed Parent Education and PACT/ILA Progress Form, which includes 3 key areas and 13 sub-items related to home environment, parenting behaviors and parent-child activities.

## 2.3 EDUCATION OF MIGRATORY CHILDREN (TITLE I, PART C)

Please complete the following tables for the Title I, Part C, Migrant Education Program.

### General Data Reporting Information

1. The tables in this section contain annual performance report requirements for the **Title I, Part C, Migrant Education Program (MEP) for reporting year 2004-2005**.
2. Instructions for each table are provided just before the table.

#### **Table 2.3.1.1 Population Data**

Instructions: Table 2.3.1.1 (on the next page) requires you to report the statewide unduplicated number of *eligible* migrant children by age/grade according to several descriptive categories. Include only *eligible* migrant children in the cells in this table. Within each row, count a child only once statewide (*unduplicated* count). Include children who changed ages (e.g., from 2 years to 3 years of age) or grades during the 2004-2005 reporting period in only the higher age/grade cell. For example, a child who turns three during the reporting year would only be counted in the Ages 3 - 5 cell. In all cases, the Total is the sum of the cells in a row.

**2.3.1.1 Population Data**

		Ages	Ages																Un-grad-	Out-	Total
		0-2	3-5	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		ed	school		
<b>1. ELIGIBLE MIGRANT CHILDREN</b>																					
1.	All Migrant Children Eligible for the MEP	76	315	107	103	128	116	99	110	94	83	75	106	46	40	240			665	2187	
<b>2. PRIORITY FOR SERVICES</b>																					
1.	All Migrant Children Eligible for MEP classified as having "Priority for Services"		139	1	18	42	32	22	20	26	27	20	8	8	4	0			320	707	
<b>3. LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT (LEP)</b>																					
1.	Migrant Children who are LEP		8	87	100	83	84	78	66	50	52	54	69	43	32	270			0	833	
<b>4. CHILDREN ENROLLED IN SPECIAL EDUCATION</b>																					
1.	Migrant Children Enrolled in Special Education	0	2	8	8	6	8	7	5	4	4	5	4	2	2	5	0		0	70	
<b>5. MOBILITY</b>																					
1.	Migrant Children with a Last Qualifying Move within 12 Months (Counting back from the Last Day of the Reporting Period)	28	156	1	19	37	30	36	25	22	25	25	20	8	9	2	0		320	763	
2.	Migrant Children with a Last Qualifying Move within Previous 13 - 24 Months (Counting back from the Last Day of the Reporting Period)	31	114	8	32	46	38	36	34	37	28	20	41	9	9	8	0		280	771	
3.	Migrant Children with a Last Qualifying Move within Previous 25 - 36 Months (Counting back from the Last Day of the Reporting Period)	90	82	12	29	22	25	19	25	20	26	19	25	19	9	7	0		40	469	
4.	Migrant Children with any Qualifying Move within a Regular School Year (Count any Qualifying Move within the Previous 36 Months; counting back from the Last Day of the Reporting Period)	30	106	70	39	49	38	46	47	36	43	30	51	22	16	7	0		127	757	

**2.3.1.2 Academic Status**

Instructions: Table 2.3.1.2 asks for the statewide *unduplicated* number of *eligible* migrant children by age/grade according to several descriptive categories. Include only *eligible* migrant children in the cells in this table. Within each row, count a child only once statewide (*unduplicated* count).

Include children who changed grades during the 2004-2005 reporting period in only the higher age/grade cell. In all cases, the Total is the sum of the cells in a row

	Ages 0-2	Ages 3-5	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Un- grad- ed	Out- of- school	Total
<b>1. HIGH SCHOOL COMPLETION</b> -- (Note: Data on the high school completion <u>rate</u> and school dropout <u>rate</u> has been collected through Part I of the Consolidated State Performance Report.)																		
1. <b><i>Dropped out of school</i></b>										0	2	3	4	2	6			17
2. Obtained GED																		
<b>2. ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT</b> -- (Note: The results of state assessments in mathematics and reading/language arts are collected in Part I of the Consolidated State Performance Report. However, information on the number of eligible migrant students who participated in the state assessment will be collected below.)																		
Number of Migrant Students Enrolled During State Testing Window (State Assessment - 1. Reading/Language Arts)						57	47			46				40				190
Number of Migrant Students Tested in Reading/Language Arts 2. (State Assessment)						77	62			68				40				247
Number of Migrant Students Enrolled During State Testing Window (State Assessment - 3. Mathematics)						57	46			49				126				278
Number of Migrant Students Tested in Mathematics (State 4. Assessment)						60	49			57				126				292

Left blank because assessments were not administered in these grade levels for the 2004-2005 school year. GED data not collected for 1.2.

**2.3.1.3.1 MEP Participation - Regular School Year**

Table 2.3.1.3.1 (on the next page) asks for the statewide, unduplicated number of children who were served by the MEP in the regular school year by age/grade according to several descriptive categories. Include children who changed ages, e.g., from 2 years to 3 years of age, or grades during the 2004-2005 reporting period in only the higher age/grade cell. Within each row, count a child only once statewide (*unduplicated count*). In all cases, the total is the sum of the cells in a row.

Participation information is required for children who received instructional or support services funded in whole or in part with MEP funds. *DO NOT count migrant children served through a schoolwide program (SWP) where MEP funds were combined, in any row of this table.*

Count only those children who were actually served; do not count unserved children. Include in this table all children who received a MEP-funded service, even those children continuing to receive services in the year after their eligibility ended, and those children previously eligible in secondary school and receiving credit-accrual services.

Served in a Regular School Year Project. Enter the number of *children who* participated in MEP-funded instructional or supportive service only. DO NOT include children who were served only by a "referred" service. Count a child only once statewide by age/grade in row 1 if he/she received any type of MEP-funded instructional or supportive service. Do not count the number of times an individual child received an instructional intervention.

Continuation of Services. In row 3, report only the numbers of children served under Sections 1304 (e) (2) - (3). Do not report in row 3 the children served in Sections 1304 (e) (1), children whose eligibility expired during the regular school year.

Instructional Services. For each listed instructional service, enter the number of *children who* participated in MEP-funded services. Count a child only once statewide by age/grade in row 4 if he/she received any type of MEP-funded instructional service (regardless whether provided by a teacher or paraprofessional). Count each child only once statewide in row 5, once in row 6, and once in row 7 if he/she received the MEP-funded instruction (and provided by a teacher) in the subject area noted. Do not count the number of times an individual child received an instructional intervention.

Support Services. For each listed support service, enter the number of children who participated in MEP-funded services. Count a child only once statewide by age/grade in row 8 if he/she received any type of MEP-funded supportive service. Count a child only once statewide in row 9 if he/she received the specific MEP supportive service noted (*i.e.*, do not count the number of service interventions per child).

Referred Services. Count a child only once statewide by age/grade in row 10 if he/she received a referred service. This is NOT a count of the referrals themselves, but instead represents the number of children who are placed in an educational or educationally-related service funded by another non-MEP program/organization that they would not have otherwise obtained without the efforts of MEP funds. (Do not count the number of service interventions per child).

**2.3.1.3.1 MEP Participation - Regular School Year**

	Ages 0-2	Ages 3-5	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Un- grad- ed	Out- of- school	Total
<b>PARTICIPATION - REGULAR SCHOOL YEAR</b>																		
1. Served in MEP (with an MEP-funded Instructional or Supportive Service Only -- do not include children served in a SWP where MEP funds are combined)	40	236	107	91	93	93	74	84	74	64	56	82	52	41	27	0	411	1641
2. Priority for Service		46	3	8	22	11	11	12	12	11	11	9	4	4	2	0	89	255
3. Continuation of Service		15	0	12	10	15	11	9	10	7	11	10	16	15	18	0	26	185
4. Any Instructional Service	40	236	16	91	93	93	74	84	74	64	56	82	52	41	27	0	78	1201
5. Reading Instruction	0	28	42	64	43	46	46	40	46	35	27	35	15	17	10	0	0	471
6. Mathematics Instruction	0	23	41	63	43	46	46	40	40	36	27	30	28	19	9	0	0	491
7. High School Credit Accrual														82	52	41	27	202
8. Any Support Service	40	45	33	40	42	41	37	34	30	26	32	27	20	11	0	0	341	799
9. Counseling Service	0	43	15	26	31	26	30	29	22	21	16	20	19	9	0	0	0	307
10. Any Referred Service																		

Virginia does not collect data for any referred services.

**2.3.1.3.2 MEP Participation -Summer/Intersession Term**

Instructions Table 2.3.1.3.2 (on the next page) asks for the statewide unduplicated number of children who were served by the MEP in a summer or intersession term by age/grade according to several descriptive categories. Include children who changed ages, e.g., from 2 years to 3 years of age in only in the higher age cell. Count summer/intersession students in the appropriate grade based on the promotion date definition used in your state. Within each row, count a child only once statewide (*unduplicated* count). In all cases, the Total is the sum of the cells in a row.

Participation information is required for children who received instructional or support services funded in whole or in part with MEP funds.

Count only those children who were actually served; do not count unserved children. Include in this table all children who received a MEP funded service, even children continuing to receive services in the year after their eligibility ended, and those children previously eligible in secondary school and receiving credit-accrual services.

Served in a Summer or Intersession Project. Enter the number of *children who* participated in MEP-funded instructional or supportive service only. DO NOT include children who were served only by a "referred" service. Count a child only once statewide by age/grade in row 1 if he/she received any type of MEP-funded instructional or supportive service. Do not count the number of times an individual child received an instructional intervention.

Continuation of Services . In row 3, report only the numbers of children served under Sections 1304 (e) (2) - (3). Do not report in row 3 the children served in Sections 1304 (e) (1), children whose eligibility expired during the summer term.

Instructional Services . For each listed instructional service, enter the number of *children who* participated in MEP-funded services. Count a child only once statewide by age/grade in row 4 if he/she received any type of MEP-funded instructional service (regardless whether provided by a teacher or paraprofessional). Count each child only once statewide in row 5, once in row 6, and once in row 7 if he/she received the MEP-funded instruction (and provided by a teacher) in the subject area noted. Do not count the number of times an individual child received an instructional intervention.

Support Services . For each listed support service, enter the number of children who participated in MEP-funded services. Count a child only once statewide by age/grade in row 8 if he/she received any type of MEP-funded supportive service. Count a child only once statewide in row 9 if he/she received the specific MEP supportive service noted (*i.e.*, do not count the number of service interventions per child).

Referred Services . Count a child only once statewide by age/grade in row 10 if he/she received a referred service. This is NOT a count of the referrals themselves, but instead represents the number of children who are placed in an educational or educationally-related service funded by another non-MEP program/organization that they would not have otherwise obtained without the efforts of MEP funds (*i.e.*, do not count the number of service interventions per child).

**2.3.1.3.2 MEP Participation-Summer/Intersession Term**

		Ages																	Un-grad- ed	Out- of- school	Total		
		0-2	3-5	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12							
<b>PARTICIPATION-SUMMER TERM OR INTERSESSION</b>																							
1.	Served in MEP Summer or Intersession Project (with an Instructional or Supportive Service Only)	51	173	135	67	89	89	72	89	71	64	61	77	48	41	50	0	0	581	1758			
2.	Priority for Service		54	1	5	13	15	6	6	7	8	3	1	1	0	0	0	206	331				
3.	Continuation of Service		61	20	14	24	15	20	22	12	5	20	19	15	20	30	0	41	338				
4.	Any Instructional Service	0	119	92	37	64	57	55	70	51	41	35	49	33	30	28	0	0	761				
5.	Reading Instruction	0	30	25	28	18	16	25	15	18	19	16	11	8	7	1	0	0	237				
6.	Mathematics Instruction	0	28	26	28	17	16	24	15	17	17	14	11	8	4	0	0	0	225				
7.	High School Credit Accrual														7	2	4	3	39	30	0	0	184
8.	Any Support Service	51	30	35	19	25	12	17	19	20	23	6	13	9	9	22	0	581	891				
9.	Counseling Service	0	15	12	14	11	5	17	8	10	9	5	4	7	3	0	0	0	120				
10.	Any Referred Service																						

Virginia does not collect data for any referred services.

**2.3.1.4 SCHOOL DATA**

Table 2.3.1.4 asks for information on the number of schools and number of *eligible* migrant children who were enrolled in those schools.

In the first column of Table 2.3.1.4, enter the number of schools that enroll *eligible* migrant children during the regular school year. Schools include public schools, alternative schools, and private schools (that serve school-age children, i.e., grades K-12). In the second column, enter the number of *eligible* migrant children who were enrolled in these schools. In the second column, since more than one school in a State may enroll the same migrant child, the count of eligible children enrolled will be duplicated statewide

<b>2.3.1.4. STUDENT ENROLLMENT</b>	NUMBER OF SCHOOLS	NUMBER OF MIGRANT CHILDREN ENROLLED
1. Schools Enrolling Migrant Children	a. 174	b. 1234
2. Schools in Which MEP Funds are Combined in SWP	a. 0	b. 0

**2.3.1.5 MEP Project Data**

**2.3.1.5.1 Type Of MEP Project**

Enter 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 *schoolwide* programs in which MEP were combined in any row of this table.

<b>2.3.1.5.1. TYPE OF MEP PROJECT</b>	NUMBER OF MEP PROJECTS	NUMBER OF MIGRANT CHILDREN ENROLLED
1. MEP Projects: Regular School Year (All MEP Services Provided During the School Day Only)	a. 3	b. 155
2. MEP Projects: Regular School Year (Some or All MEP Services Provided During an Extended Day/Week)	a. 0	b. 0
3. MEP Projects: Summer/Intersession Only	a. 0	b. 0
4. MEP Projects: Year Round (All MEP Services Provided throughout the Regular School Year and Summer/Intersession Terms)	a. 7	b. 1754

**2.3.1.5.2 KEY MEP PERSONNEL**

For each school term, enter both the actual number and *full-time-equivalent* number of staff that are paid by the MEP. Report both the actual number and FTE number by job classification. For actual numbers, enter the total number of individuals who were employed in the appropriate job classification, regardless of the percentage of time the person was employed. For the FTE number, define how many full-time days constitute one *FTE* for each term in your state. (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, and one *intersession* FTE may equal 45 full-time work days split between three 15-day non-contiguous blocks throughout the year .) **Use only the percentage of an FTE paid by the MEP in calculating the total FTE numbers to be reported below for each job classification.**

**DO NOT include staff employed in *schoolwide* programs where MEP funds are combined with those of other programs.**

	NUMBER OF MEP FUNDED STAFF IN REGULAR SCHOOL YEAR (a)	FTE IN REGULAR SCHOOL YEAR 1 FTE = $\frac{180}{\text{Days}}$ (b)	NUMBER OF MEP FUNDED STAFF IN SUMMER-TERM/ INTERSESSION (c)	FTE IN SUMMER-TERM/ INTERSESSION 1 FTE = $\frac{60}{\text{Days}}$ (d)
<b>2.3.1.5.2. KEY MEP PERSONNEL</b>				
1. State Director	0	0	0	0
2. Teachers	11	7	39	39
3. Counselors	0	0	1	
4. All Paraprofessionals	4	4	19	13
5. "Qualified" Paraprofessionals	2	0	19	13
6. Recruiters	2	0	6	3
7. Records Transfer Staff	0	0		

Blank cells represent an FTE less than 1.

**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)**

**2.4.1 General Data Reporting Form - Subpart 1**

The tables in this section contain annual performance report requirements for the Title I, Part D, Subpart 1, N or D Education Program for school year 2004-2005, defined as July 1, 2004, through June 30, 2005.

**General Instructions for Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 Tables:**

Specific instructions are provided before each table.

For items that request information on the **number of facilities/programs**, report **only** on facilities or programs that received Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 funding during the reporting year.

For items that request information on the **number of students**, report **only** on, neglected or delinquent students who received Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 services during the reporting year.

**Instructions: State Agency Title I, Part D, Facilities and Students**

Include the aggregate number of facilities/programs and/or students for all State Agencies that received Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 funds.

In the first column, report the number of facilities/programs that received Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 funding. Indicate the total number of facilities/programs by type, including neglected programs, detention facilities, juvenile correction facilities, and adult correction centers.

In the second column, indicate the duplicated number of neglected or delinquent students who were admitted to each type of facility/program. A duplicated count is one that counts students *more than* once if they were admitted to a facility or program multiple times in the reporting year.

In the third column, enter the average length of stay (in days) for students in each type of facility/program. The average should include multiple visits for students who entered a facility or program more than once during the reporting year.

In the fourth column, indicate the unduplicated number of students who were admitted to each type of facility/program. 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.

**Note:** Throughout Table I, count facilities based on how the facility/program was classified for funding purposes. If a facility served as a multipurpose institution (e.g., a facility that served as both a corrections and a neglected facility) and received funding for both areas, then count the facility under both categories in Table I and enter how many facilities were double-counted in item 3. If a facility was multipurpose, but received Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 funds for only one area, count it only once.

**2.4.1.1 State Agency Title I, Part D, Facilities**

<b>Facility/Program type</b>	<b>Number of facilities/ programs</b>	<b>Number of N or D students (Duplicated)</b>	<b>Average length of stay (days)</b>	<b>Number of N or D students (Unduplicated)</b>
1. Neglected Programs				
2. Delinquent (Total)	33		NA	1239
2.1. Juvenile Detention	24		110	474
2.2. Juvenile Corrections	9			765
2.3. Adult Corrections				
<b>3. Number of facilities that served more than one purpose: <u>  1  </u></b>				

**2.4.1.2 Student Demographics**

Report demographic data on neglected or delinquent students who were served under Title I, Part D, Subpart 1. Report the number of students by race/ethnicity, gender, and age.

	<b>Number in neglected programs</b>	<b>Number in juvenile detention</b>	<b>Number in juvenile correction</b>	<b>Number in adult correction</b>
All Students		592	765	
<b>Race/ethnicity</b>				
American Indian or Native Alaskan		0	2	
Asian or Pacific Islander		25	9	
Black, non-Hispanic		341	565	
Hispanic		73	34	
White, non-Hispanic		153	155	
<b>Gender</b>				
Male		461	714	
Female		131	51	
<b>Age</b>				
5-10 years old		24		
11-15 years old		365	98	
16-18 years old		106	590	
19 years and older		97	77	

Blank cells indicate information was not collected for the 2004-2005 school year.

**Instructions: Academic/Vocational Outcomes**

The number of facilities or programs with specific academic offerings, and the numbers of students who attained specific academic or vocational outcomes. The reported numbers should represent unduplicated counts of students; report only information on a student's most recent enrollment (e.g. do not double-count a student that earned credits on two separate enrollments). However, students may be counted in more than one outcome category within the same enrollment period (e.g., returned to school and earned high school credits). As the table indicates, combine reporting numbers for juvenile corrections and detention facilities.

For Section 1 of this table items 1-3, report the number of neglected programs, juvenile corrections and detention facilities, and adult correction facilities 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.

For Section 2.1 of this table, items 1 and 2, enter the number of students who attained the following academic outcomes *during their time in the facility/program*: earned high school course credits and/or were enrolled in a GED program. Report the numbers by program type (e.g., Neglected, Juvenile Corrections and/or Detention, or Adult Corrections).

For Section 2.1 of this table, items 3-7, enter the number of students who attained the following academic outcomes *while in a facility/program OR within 30 days after exit*: enrolled in a district school, earned a GED, obtained a high school diploma, were accepted into postsecondary education, and/or enrolled in post-secondary education. Report the numbers by program type (e.g., Neglected, Juvenile Corrections and/or Detention, or Adult Corrections).

For Section 2.2 of this table, item 1, enter the number of students who attained the following vocational outcome *during their time in a facility/program*: enrolled in elective job training courses. Report the numbers by program type (e.g., Neglected, Juvenile Corrections and/or Detention, or Adult Corrections).

For Section 2.2 of this table, items 2 and 3, enter the number of students who attained the following vocational outcomes *while in a facility/program OR within 30 days after exit*: enrolled in external job training education, and/or obtained employment. Report the numbers by program type (e.g., Neglected, Juvenile Corrections and/or Detention, or Adult Corrections).

**2.4.1.3 Academic/Vocational Outcomes**

<b>1. Facility Academic Offerings</b>	<b>Number of Facilities/Programs</b>		
	Number of Neglected Programs (a)	Number of Juvenile Corrections and/or Detention Facilities (b)	Number of Adult Corrections Facilities (c)
1. Awarded high school course credit(s)		32	
2. Awarded high school diploma(s)		8	
3. Awarded GED(s)		24	
<b>2. Academic &amp; Vocational Outcomes</b>	<b>Number of Students</b>		
	Number in Neglected Programs	Number in Juvenile Corrections and/or Detention	Number in Adult Corrections
<b>1. Academic</b>			
<i><b>While in the facility, the number of students who...</b></i>			
1. Earned high school course credits		332	
2. Were enrolled in a GED program		28	
<i><b>While in the facility or within 30 calendar days after exit, the number of students who...</b></i>			
3. Enrolled in their local district school		445	
4. Earned a GED		28	
5. Obtained high school diploma		0	
6. Were accepted into post-secondary education		0	
7. Enrolled in post-secondary education		1	
<b>2. Vocational</b>			
<i><b>While in the facility, the number of students who...</b></i>			
1. Enrolled in elective job training courses/programs		0	
<i><b>While in the facility or within 30 calendar days after exit, the number of students who...</b></i>			
2. Enrolled in external job training education		0	
3. Obtained employment		0	

Blank cells indicate information was not collected for the 2004-2005 school year.

**Instructions: Academic Performance Tables**

Report the number of long-term Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 students in neglected programs, juvenile corrections/detention, or adult corrections who participated in pre- and post-testing in reading and math. Long-term refers to students who were incarcerated for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2004 , to June 30, 2005

The reported numbers should represent unduplicated counts of students; report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Count each student in only one length of stay category. For each length of stay category, report the data by the following facility or program type: students in neglected programs (**N**), students in juvenile corrections or detention (**JC**), and students in adult corrections (**AC**). As the table indicates, combine reporting numbers for juvenile corrections and detention facilities.

For item 1, enter the number of students who were in placement during the reporting year for either 90-179 days, 180-270 days, or more than 270 days, by type of facility/ program.

For item 2, enter the number of students reported in item 1 who tested below grade level when they entered the facility or program.

For item 3, enter the number of students reported in item 1 who have data available for both the pre and the post test exams.

For items 4-8, indicate the number of students reported in item 3 who showed either negative change, no change, up to 1/2 grade level change, up to one grade level change, or more than one grade level change on the pre-post test exam. Students reported in item 3 should not appear in more the one of these change categories

**2.4.1.4 Academic Performance in Reading**

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	Number of long-term students								
	In placement for 90-179 consecutive calendar days			In placement for 180-270 consecutive calendar days			In placement for more than 270 consecutive calendar days		
	N	JC	AC	N	JC	AC	N	JC	AC
1. # students who were in placement from July 1, 2004, to June 30, 2005 (in each length-of-stay category)		474							
2. # students from row 1 who tested below grade level upon entry.		166							
3. # students from row 1 who took both the pre- and post-test reading exams		166							
4. # students from row 3 who showed <u>negative</u> grade level change from the pre- to post-test reading exams		8							
5. # students from row 3 who showed <u>no change</u> in grade level from the pre- to post-test reading exams		33							
6. # students from row 3 who showed improvement of <u>up to 1/2 grade level</u> from the pre- to post-test reading exams		58							
7. # students from row 3 who showed improvement of <u>up to one full grade level</u> from the pre- to post-test reading exams		33							
8. # students from row 3 who showed improvement of <u>more than one full grade level</u> from the pre- to post-test reading exams		33							

Blank cells indicate information was not collected for the 2004-2005 school year.

**2.4.1.5 Academic Performance in Math**

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	Number of long-term students								
	In placement for 90-179 consecutive calendar days			In placement for 180-270 consecutive calendar days			In placement for more than 270 consecutive calendar days		
	N	JC	AC	N	JC	AC	N	JC	AC
1. # students who were in placement from July 1, 2004, to June 30, 2005 (in each length-of-stay category)									
2. # students from row 1 who tested below grade level upon entry.									
3. # students from row 1 who took both the pre- and post-test math exams									
4. # students from row 3 who showed <u>negative</u> grade level change from the pre- to post-test math exams									
5. # students from row 3 who showed <u>no change</u> in grade level from the pre- to post-test math exams									
6. # students from row 3 who showed improvement of <u>up to 1/2 grade level</u> from the pre- to post-test math exams									
7. # students from row 3 who showed improvement of <u>up to one full grade level</u> from the pre- to post-test math exams									
8. # students from row 3 who showed improvement of <u>more than one full grade level</u> from the pre- to post-test math exams									

Blank cells indicate information was not collected for the 2004-2005 school year.

## 2.4.2 General Data Reporting Form - Subpart 2

The tables in this section contain annual performance report requirements for the Title I, Part D, Subpart 2, N or D Education Program for school year 2004-2005, **defined as July 1, 2004, through June 30, 2005.**

### General Instructions For Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 Tables:

Specific instructions are provided before each table.

For items that request information on the **number of facilities/programs**, report **only** on facilities or programs that received Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 funding during the reporting year.

For items that request information on the **number of students**, report **only** on at-risk, neglected or delinquent students who received Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 services during the reporting year.

**At-risk students** are reported only in the facility/program and demographic counts. They are **not** reported in the outcome or academic performance tables.

**Instructions: Local Education Agency Title I, Part D, Facilities And Students**

Include the aggregate number of facilities/programs and/or students for all Local Education Agencies that received Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 funds.

In the first column, report the number of facilities/programs that received Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 funding. Indicate the total number of facilities/programs by type, including at-risk programs, neglected programs, detention facilities, and juvenile correction facilities.

In the second column, indicate the duplicated number of at-risk, neglected, or delinquent students who were admitted to each type of facility/program. A duplicated count is one that counts students more than once if they were admitted to a facility or program multiple times in the reporting year.

In the third column, enter the average length of stay (in days) for students in each type of facility/program. The average should include multiple visits for students who entered a facility or program *more than once* during the reporting year.

In the fourth column, indicate the unduplicated number of students who were admitted to each type of facility/program. 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.

**Note:** Throughout this table, count facilities based on how the facility/program was classified for funding purposes. If a facility served as a multipurpose institution (e.g., a facility that served as both a corrections and a neglected facility) and received funding for both areas, then count the facility under both categories in Table I and enter how many facilities were double-counted in item 4. If a facility was multipurpose, but received Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 funds for only one area, count it only once.

**2.4.2.1 Local Education Agency Title I, Part D, Facilities and Students**

<b>Facility/Program type</b>	<b>Number of facilities/ programs</b>	<b>Number of at-risk or N or D Students (Duplicated)</b>	<b>Average length of stay (days)</b>	<b>Number of at-risk or N or D students (Unduplicated)</b>
1. At-Risk Programs			NA	
2. Neglected Programs				
3. Delinquent (Total)			NA	
4. Juvenile Detention				
5. Juvenile Corrections				
<b>6. Number of facilities that served more than one purpose:</b>				<u>  0  </u>

Blank cells indicate information was not collected for the 2004-2005 school year.

**Instructions: Student Demographics**

Report demographic data on at-risk, neglected or delinquent students who were served under Title I, Part D, Subpart 2. Report the number of students by race/ethnicity, gender, and age.

**2.4.2.2 STUDENT DEMOGRAPHICS**

	Number in at-risk programs	Number in neglected programs	Number in juvenile detention	Number in juvenile correction
All Students	31			
<b>Race/ethnicity</b>				
American Indian or Native Alaskan	0			
Asian or Pacific Islander	0			
Black, non-Hispanic	13			
Hispanic	0			
<i>White, non-Hispanic</i>	18			
<b>Gender</b>				
<i>Male</i>	16			
<i>Female</i>	15			
<b>Age</b>				
5-10 years old	10			
11-15 years old	20			
16-18 years old	1			
19 years and older	0			

Blank cells indicate information was not collected for the 2004-2005 school year.

**Instructions: Academic/Vocational Outcomes**

The number of facilities or programs with specific academic offerings, and the numbers of students who attained specific academic or vocational outcomes. The reported numbers should represent unduplicated counts of students; report only information on a student's most recent enrollment (e.g. do not double-count a student that earned credits on two separate enrollments). However, students may be counted in more than one outcome category within the same enrollment period (e.g., returned to school and earned high school credits). As the table indicates, combine reporting numbers for juvenile corrections and detention facilities.

For Section 1 of this table, items 1-3, report the number of neglected programs, and juvenile corrections and detention facilities 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.

For Section 2.1 of this table, items 1 and 2, enter the number of students who attained the following academic outcomes *during their time in the facility/program*: earned high school course credits and/or were enrolled in a GED program. Report the numbers by program type (e.g., Neglected Programs or Juvenile Corrections and/or Detention).

For Section 2.1 of this table, items 3-7, enter the number of students who attained the following academic outcomes *while in a facility/program OR within 30 days after exit*: enrolled in a district school, earned a GED, obtained a high school diploma, were accepted into postsecondary education, and/or enrolled in post-secondary education. Report the numbers by program type (e.g., Neglected Programs or Juvenile Corrections and/or Detention).

For Section 2.2 of this table, item 1, enter the number of students who attained the following vocational outcome *during their time in a facility/program*: enrolled in elective job training courses. Report the numbers by program type (e.g., Neglected Programs or Juvenile Corrections and/or Detention).

For Section 2.2 of this table, items 2 and 3, enter the number of students who attained the following vocational outcomes *while in a facility/program OR within 30 days after exit*: enrolled in external job training education, and/or obtained employment. Report the numbers by program type (e.g., Neglected Programs or Juvenile Corrections and/or Detention).

**2.4.2.3 Academic/Vocational Outcomes**

<b>1. Facility Academic Offerings</b>	<b>Number of Facilities</b>	
	<b>Number of Neglected Programs</b>	<b>Number of Juvenile Corrections and/or Detention Facilities</b>
1. Awarded high school course credit(s)		
2. Awarded high school diploma(s)		
3. Awarded GED(s)		
<b>2. Academic &amp; Vocational Outcomes</b>	<b>Number of Students</b>	
	<b>Number in Neglected Programs</b>	<b>Number in Juvenile Corrections and/or Detention</b>
<b>1. Academic</b>		
<i>While in the facility, the number of students who...</i>		
1. Earned high school course credits		
2. Were enrolled in a GED program		
<i>While in the facility or within 30 calendar days after exit, the number of students who...</i>		
3. Enrolled in their local district school		
4. Earned a GED		
5. Obtained high school diploma		
6. Were accepted into post-secondary education		
7. Enrolled in post-secondary education		
<b>2. Vocational</b>		
<i>While in the facility, the number of students who...</i>		
1. Enrolled in elective job training courses/programs		
<i>While in the facility or within 30 calendar days after exit, the number of students who...</i>		
2. Enrolled in external job training education		
3. Obtained employment		

Blank cells indicate information was not collected for the 2004-2005 school year.

**Instructions: Academic Performance Tables**

Report the number of long-term Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 students in neglected programs or juvenile corrections/detention who participated in pre- and post-testing in reading and math. Long-term refers to students who were incarcerated for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2004, to June 30, 2005.

The reported numbers should represent unduplicated counts of students; report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Count each student in only one length of stay category. For each length of stay category, report the data by the following facility or program type: students in neglected programs (**N**) and students in juvenile corrections or detention (**JC**). As the table indicates, combine reporting numbers for juvenile corrections and detention facilities.

For item 1, enter the number of students who were in placement during the reporting year for either 90-179 days, 180-270 days, or more than 270 days, by type of facility/ program.

For item 2, enter the number of students reported in item 1 who tested below grade level when they entered the facility or program.

For item 3, enter the number of students reported in item 1 who have data available for both the pre and the post test exams.

For items 4-8, indicate the number of students reported in item 3 who showed either negative change, no change, up to 1/2 grade level change, up to one grade level change, or more than one grade level change on the pre-post test exam. Students reported in item 3 should not appear in more than one of these change categories.

2.4.2.4 Academic Performance In Reading

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	Number of long-term students					
	In placement for 90-179 consecutive calendar days		In placement for 180-270 consecutive calendar days		In placement for more than 270 consecutive calendar days	
	N	JC	N	JC	N	JC
1. # students who were in placement from July 1, 2004, to June 30, 2005 (in each length-of-stay category)						
2. # students from row 1 who tested below grade level upon entry.						
3. # students from row 1 who took both the pre- and post-test reading exams						
4. # students from row 3 who showed <u>negative</u> grade level change from the pre- to post-test reading exams						
5. # students from row 3 who showed <u>no change</u> in grade level from the pre- to post-test reading exams						
6. # students from row 3 who showed improvement of <u>up to 1/2 grade level</u> from the pre- to post-test reading exams						
7. # students from row 3 who showed improvement of <u>up to one full grade level</u> from the pre- to post-test reading exams						
8. # students from row 3 who showed improvement of <u>more than one full grade level</u> from the pre- to post-test reading exams						

Blank cells indicate information was not collected for the 2004-2005 school year.

**2.4.2.5 Academic Performance In Math**

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	Number of long-term students					
	In placement for 90-179 consecutive calendar days		In placement for 180-270 consecutive calendar days		In placement for more than 270 consecutive calendar days	
	N	JC	N	JC	N	JC
1. # students who were in placement from July 1, 2004, to June 30, 2005 (in each length-of-stay category)						
2. # students from row 1 who tested below grade level upon entry.						
3. # students from row 1 who took both the pre- and post-test math exams						
4. # students from row 3 who showed <u>negative</u> grade level change from the pre- to post-test math exams						
5. # students from row 3 who showed <u>no change</u> in grade level from the pre- to post-test math exams						
6. # students from row 3 who showed improvement of <u>up to 1/2 grade level</u> from the pre- to post-test math exams						
7. # students from row 3 who showed improvement of <u>up to one full grade level</u> from the pre- to post-test math exams						
8. # students from row 3 who showed improvement of <u>more than one full grade level</u> from the pre- to post-test math exams						

Blank cells indicate information was not collected for the 2004-2005 school year.

**2.5 COMPREHENSIVE SCHOOL REFORM (TITLE I, PART F)**

2.5.1 Please provide the percentage of Comprehensive School Reform (CSR) schools that have or have had a CSR grant and made AYP in reading/language arts based on data from the 2004-2005 school year. 70.0

2.5.2 Please provide the percentage of CSR schools that have or have had a CSR grant and made AYP in mathematics based on data from the 2004-2005 school year. 86.0

2.5.3 How many schools in the State have or have been awarded a CSR grant since 1998? 167

**2.6 ENHANCING EDUCATION THROUGH TECHNOLOGY (TITLE II, PART D)**

**Funding Year: FY 2003**

**School Years: 2003-2004 AND 2004-2005**

**2.6.1 FY 2003 Program Information**

State (Approved) Technology Plan (YES/NO)	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> (circle one)
Year last updated:	<u>2004</u> (year)
Date of State Approval:	<u>05/01/03</u> MM/DD/YY
Web Site Location/URL: <u>http://www.doe.virginia.gov/VDOE/Technology/plan2003-09.pdf</u>	

**State Program Goals, Objectives and Performance Indicators**

Using the format of the table below, describe the State's progress in meeting its EETT performance indicators based on data sources that the State established for its use in assessing the effectiveness of the program in improving access to and use of educational technology by students and teachers in support of academic achievement, as submitted in the Consolidated State Application. Indicate which of the three or combination of the three Title II, Part D goals relates to your State goals.

Title II, Part D -- Enhanced Education Through Technology Goals:

1. Improve student academic achievement through the use of technology in elementary schools and secondary schools.
2. To assist every student in crossing the digital divide by ensuring that every student is technologically literate by the time the student finishes the eighth grade, regardless of the student's race, ethnicity, gender, family income, geographic location, or disability.
3. To encourage the effective integration of technology resources and systems with teacher training and curriculum development to establish research-based instructional methods that can be widely implemented as best practices by State educational agencies and local educational agencies.

Provide results for each indicator, as well as an assessment and explanation of progress. For targets with no set targets, provide a descriptive assessment of progress. Please indicate where data are not yet available.

For the purpose of completing the table below, please explain how your State defines the following:

**2.6.2.1.1 Curriculum Integration**

The use of specific technologies, that support state Standards of Learning and curriculum content, as highly effective tools in facilitating learning across all levels of cognitive inquiry and development.

**2.6.2.1.2 Technology literacy**

The possession and use of technology skills to communicate, solve problems, and access, create, integrate, evaluate, and manage information to improve the learning of state content standards in all subject areas and to acquire lifelong knowledge and skills.

**2.6.2.2 Goals, Objectives, Targets**

<b>Goals, Objectives, Targets</b>	<b>Narrative</b>
<p><b>Program Goal</b> (Indicate page number and item label as designated in the State Consolidated Application or restate goal.)</p>	<p>Connectivity Goal 1 - Ensure that public schools provide access to integrated instructional and administrative services across interoperable high-speed networks that are supported in compliance with state standards.  Goal 2 - Ensure that public schools have security, filtering, and disaster recovery plans in place.</p>
<p><b>Statutory Goal</b> Indicate Statutory Goal number 1, 2, and/or 3. This Statutory Goal(s) relates to the Goal(s) submitted in your State Consolidated Application.</p>	<p>Statutory Goal 1</p>
<p><b>Program Objective</b> (Indicate page number and item label as designated in the State Consolidated Application or restate objective.)</p>	<p>Program Objective 1: By 2009 every instructional and administrative area in 95 percent of public school divisions' elementary, middle, and high schools will have network connections that meet or exceed the established Architectural Guidelines for current and future instructional and administrative applications used by school leaders, teachers, and students.  Program Objective 2: By 2009, 95 percent of school divisions' elementary, middle, and high schools will comply with the Standards of Quality for technology support personnel to operate and support a K-12 school technology infrastructure for current and future instructional and administrative applications used by school leaders, teachers, and students.  Program Objective 3: By 2009, 100 percent of school divisions' elementary, middle, and high schools will have policies, procedures, and technologies in place to ensure the security and recoverability of K-12 computing resources used by school leaders, teachers, and students.</p>
<p><b>Indicator</b> (Indicate page number and item label as designated in the State Consolidated Application or restate indicator.)</p>	<p>Performance Indicator 1: The percentage of public school divisions' elementary, middle, and high school networks with connections that meet or exceed the established Architectural Guidelines for instructional and administrative applications used by school leaders, teachers, and students.  Performance Indicator 2: The percentage of school divisions' elementary, middle, and high schools that comply with the Standards of Quality for technology support personnel to operate and support a K-12 school technology infrastructure.  Performance Indicator 3: The percentage of school divisions' elementary, middle, and high schools with policies, procedures, and technologies in place to ensure the security and recoverability of K-12 computing resources.</p>
<p><b>Target</b> <i>Indicate status of data in 2002-03 school year (SY).</i> <b>BASELINE DATA</b></p>	<p>Targets For Goal 1 Sixty-six percent of school divisions' high schools, 0 percent of school divisions' middle schools, and 0 percent of school divisions' elementary schools have networks with connections that meet or exceed the established Architectural Guidelines for instructional and administrative applications used by school leaders, teachers, and students. (eSOL data)  Sixty-six percent of school divisions' high schools, 0 percent of school divisions'</p>

	<p>middle schools, and 0 percent of school divisions' elementary schools have support personnel to comply with the Standards of Quality for technology support personnel to operate and support a K-12 school technology infrastructure. (eSOL data)</p> <p>Target For Goal 2 Sixty-six percent of school divisions' high schools, 0 percent of school divisions' middle schools, and 0 percent of school divisions' elementary schools have policies, procedures, and technologies in place to ensure the security and recoverability of K-12 computing resources.</p>
<p><b>Target</b> <i>Indicate status of data in 2003-04 school year</i></p>	<p>Targets For Goal 1 One hundred percent of school divisions' high schools, 16 percent of school divisions' middle schools, and 7 percent of school divisions' elementary schools have networks with connections that meet or exceed the established Architectural Guidelines for instructional and administrative applications used by school leaders, teachers, and students. (eSOL data)</p> <p>One hundred percent of school divisions' high schools, 16 percent of school divisions' middle schools, and 7 percent of school divisions' elementary schools have support personnel to comply with the Standards of Quality for technology support personnel to operate and support a K-12 school technology infrastructure. (eSOL data)</p> <p>Targets For Goal 2 One hundred percent of school divisions' high schools, 16 percent of school divisions' middle schools, and 7 percent of school divisions' elementary schools have policies, procedures, and technologies in place to ensure the security and recoverability of K-12 computing resources.</p>
<p><b>Target</b> <i>Indicate status of data in 2004-05 school year.</i></p>	<p>Targets For Goal 1 One hundred percent of school divisions' high schools, 31 percent of school divisions' middle schools, and 22 percent of school divisions' elementary schools have networks with connections that meet or exceed the established Architectural Guidelines for instructional and administrative applications used by school leaders, teachers, and students. (eSOL data)</p> <p>One hundred percent of school divisions' high schools, 31 percent of school divisions' middle schools, and 22 percent of school divisions' elementary schools have support personnel to comply with the Standards of Quality for technology support personnel to operate and support a K-12 school technology infrastructure. (eSOL data)</p> <p>Targets For Goal 2 One hundred percent of school divisions' high schools, 31 percent of school divisions' middle schools, and 22 percent of school divisions' elementary schools have policies, procedures, and technologies in place to ensure the security and recoverability of K-12 computing resources.</p>
<p><b>Target</b> <i>Target for 2005-06 school year</i></p>	<p>Targets For Goal 1 One hundred percent of school divisions' high schools, 50 percent of school divisions' middle schools, and 40 percent of school divisions' elementary schools will have schools networks with connections that meet or exceed the established Architectural Guidelines for instructional and administrative applications used by school leaders, teachers, and students. (eSOL data)</p> <p>One hundred percent of school divisions' high schools, 50 percent of school divisions' middle schools, and 40 percent of school divisions' elementary schools will have support personnel to comply with the Standards of Quality for technology support personnel to operate and support a K-12 school technology infrastructure.</p>

	<p>(eSOL data)</p> <p>Targets For Goal 2  One hundred percent of school divisions' high schools, 50 percent of school divisions' middle schools, and 40 percent of school divisions' elementary schools will have policies, procedures, and technologies in place to ensure the security and recoverability of K-12 computing resources.</p>
<p><b>Target</b>  <i>Target for 2006-07 school year.</i></p>	<p>Targets For Goal 1  One hundred percent of high schools, 80 percent of middle schools, and 70 percent of elementary schools will have schools networks with connections that meet or exceed the established Architectural Guidelines for instructional and administrative applications used by school leaders, teachers, and students. (eSOL data)</p> <p>One hundred percent of high schools, 80 percent of middle schools, and 70 percent of elementary schools will have support personnel to comply with the Standards of Quality for technology support personnel to operate and support a K-12 school technology infrastructure. (eSOL data)</p> <p>Targets For Goal 2  One hundred percent of high schools, 80 percent of middle schools, and 70 percent of elementary schools will have policies, procedures, and technologies in place to ensure the security and recoverability of K-12 computing resources.</p>
<p><b>Target</b>  <i>Target for 2007-08 school</i></p>	<p>Targets For Goal 1  One hundred percent of high schools, 95 percent of middle schools, and 95 percent of elementary schools will have schools networks with connections that meet or exceed the established Architectural Guidelines for instructional and administrative applications used by school leaders, teachers, and students. (eSOL data)</p> <p>One hundred percent of high schools, 95 percent of middle schools, and 95 percent of elementary schools will have support personnel to comply with the Standards of Quality for technology support personnel to operate and support a K-12 school technology infrastructure. (eSOL data)</p> <p>Targets For Goal 2  One hundred percent of high schools, 100 percent of middle schools, and 100 percent of elementary schools will have policies, procedures, and technologies in place to ensure the security and recoverability of K-12 computing resources.</p>
<p><b>Assessment of Progress</b>  <i>Status of progress on indicator</i></p> <p>(1) Target met  (2) Target not met</p>	<p>Performance Indicator 1: (1)  Performance Indicator 2: (1)  Performance Indicator 3: (1)</p>
<p><b>Measurement tool(s) used to assess progress of indicators.</b></p>	<p>eSOL School Certification standards, school capacity survey submitted by school divisions, Virginia Standards of Quality, alignment requirements of local division technology plans with the Virginia Comprehensive Plan for Educational Technology, school division procurement guidelines, Handbook of Evaluation &amp; Selection of Software for Instructional Remediation Guidelines (eSOL web page), Software Review Template (eSOL web page), and Educational Technology Competitive Grant Performance Reports.</p>

<b>Goals, Objectives, Targets</b>	<b>Narrative</b>
<p><b>Program Goal</b> (Indicate page number and item label as designated in the State Consolidated Application or restate goal.)</p>	<p>Educational Applications</p> <p>Goal 1 – Develop and expand state operated and/or sponsored Web-based and networked applications, services and resources that improve teaching and learning when used appropriately.</p> <p>Goal 2 – Develop and expand distance/distributed learning technologies as well as encourage utilization in schools and regional educational consortiums.</p>
<p><b>Statutory Goal</b> Indicate Statutory Goal number 1, 2, and/or 3. This Statutory Goal(s) relates to the Goal(s) submitted in your State Consolidated Application.</p>	<p>Statutory Goals #1 and #3.</p>
<p><b>Program Objective</b> (Indicate page number and item label as designated in the State Consolidated Application or restate objective.)</p>	<p>Program Objective 1: By 2009, 95 percent of schools will have an infrastructure capable of supporting Internet based applications for testing as defined by established Architectural Guidelines by 2009.</p> <p>Program Objective 2: By 2009, five or more Web-based and/or networked applications, services and resources that effectively support the Virginia Standards of Learning (SOL's) will be available for public school divisions.</p> <p>Program Objective 3: By 2009, two or more distance/distributed learning technologies for delivery of student courses and staff development will be available to schools and regional educational consortiums.</p>
<p><b>Indicator</b> (Indicate page number and item label as designated in the State Consolidated Application or restate indicator.)</p>	<p>Performance Indicator 1: Percentage of schools that have an infrastructure capable of supporting applications of the Virginia Web-based SOL Technology Initiative as defined by established Architectural Guidelines.</p> <p>Performance Indicator 2: The number of Web-based and/or networked applications, services and resources that effectively support the Virginia Standards of Learning (SOL's), available to public school divisions.</p> <p>Performance Indicator 3: The number of distance/distributed learning technologies for delivery of student courses and staff development available to schools and regional educational consortiums.</p>
<p><b>Target</b> <i>Indicate status of data in 2002-03 school year (SY).</i> <b>BASELINE DATA</b></p>	<p>Targets For Goal 1</p> <p>Sixty-six percent of high schools, 0 percent of middle schools, and 0 percent of elementary schools have an infrastructure capable of supporting applications of the Virginia Web-based SOL Technology Initiative as defined by established Architectural Guidelines. (eSOL data)</p> <p>One Web-based and/or networked application, service and resource that effectively supports the Virginia Standards of Learning (SOL's) was available to public school divisions.</p> <p>Targets For Goal 2</p> <p>No distance/distributed learning technologies for delivery of student courses and staff development were available to schools and regional educational consortiums.</p>
<p><b>Target</b> <i>Indicate status of data in 2003-04 school year</i></p>	<p>Targets For Goal 1</p> <p>One hundred percent of school divisions' high schools, 16 percent of school divisions' middle schools, and 7 percent of school divisions' elementary schools have</p>

	<p>an infrastructure capable of supporting applications of the Virginia Web-based SOL Technology Initiative as defined by established Architectural Guidelines. (eSOL data)</p> <p>Three Web-based and/or networked application, services and resources that effectively support the Virginia Standards of Learning (SOL's) were available to public school divisions.</p> <p>Targets For Goal 2 Two distance/distributed learning technologies for delivery of student courses and staff development were available to schools and regional educational consortiums.</p>
<p><b>Target</b> <i>Indicate status of data in 2004-05 school year.</i></p>	<p>Targets For Goal 1 One hundred percent of school divisions' high schools, 31 percent of school divisions' middle schools, and 22 percent of school divisions' elementary schools have an infrastructure capable of supporting applications of the Virginia Web-based SOL Technology Initiative as defined by established Architectural Guidelines. (eSOL data)</p> <p>Five Web-based and/or networked application, services and resources that effectively support the Virginia Standards of Learning (SOL's) were available to public school divisions.</p> <p>Targets For Goal 2 Two distance/distributed learning technologies for delivery of student courses and staff development were available to schools and regional educational consortiums.</p>
<p><b>Target</b> <i>Target for 2005-06 school year</i></p>	<p>Targets For Goal 1 One hundred percent of school divisions' high schools, 40 percent of school divisions' middle schools, and 30 percent of school divisions' elementary schools will have an infrastructure capable of supporting applications of the Virginia Web-based SOL Technology Initiative as defined by established Architectural Guidelines. (eSOL data)</p> <p>Four or more Web-based and/or networked applications, services and resources that effectively support the Virginia Standards of Learning (SOL's) will be available for public school divisions.</p> <p>Targets For Goal 2 Two or more distance/distributed learning technologies for delivery of student courses and staff development will be available to schools and regional educational consortiums.</p>
<p><b>Target</b> <i>Target for 2006-07 school year.</i></p>	<p>Targets For Goal 1 One hundred percent of school divisions' high schools, 60 percent of school divisions' middle schools, and 50 percent of school divisions' elementary schools will have an infrastructure capable of supporting applications of the Virginia Web-based SOL Technology Initiative as defined by established Architectural Guidelines. (eSOL data)</p> <p>Four or more Web-based and/or networked applications, services and resources that effectively support the Virginia Standards of Learning (SOL's) will be available for public school divisions.</p> <p>Targets For Goal 2 Two or more distance/distributed learning technologies for delivery of student courses and staff development will be available to schools and regional educational consortiums.</p>
<p><b>Target</b></p>	<p>Targets For Goal 1</p>

<p><i>Target for 2007-08 school</i></p>	<p>One hundred percent of school divisions' high schools, 95 percent of school divisions' middle schools, and 95 percent of school divisions' elementary schools will have an infrastructure capable of supporting applications of the Virginia Web-based SOL Technology Initiative as defined by established Architectural Guidelines. (eSOL data)</p> <p>Five or more Web-based and/or networked applications, services and resources that effectively support the Virginia Standards of Learning (SOL's) will be available for public school divisions.</p> <p>Targets For Goal 2 Two or more distance/distributed learning technologies for delivery of student courses and staff development will be available to schools and regional educational consortiums.</p>
<p><b>Assessment of Progress</b> <i>Status of progress on indicator</i></p> <p>(1) <i>Target met</i> (2) <i>Target not met</i></p>	<p>Performance Indicator 1: (1) Performance Indicator 2: (1) Performance Indicator 3: (1)</p>
<p><b>Measurement tool(s) used to assess progress of indicators.</b></p>	<p>eSOL School Certification standards, ongoing school capacity reports, Data Component of Educational Technology Competitive Grant Performance Reports</p>

<b>Goals, Objectives, Targets</b>	<b>Narrative</b>
<p><b>Program Goal</b> (Indicate page number and item label as designated in the State Consolidated Application or restate goal.)</p>	<p>Integration Goal 1 - Improve teaching and learning through the appropriate use of technology. Goal 2 - Improve statewide equity in the implementation of technology-enhanced teaching and learning.</p>
<p><b>Statutory Goal</b> Indicate Statutory Goal number 1, 2, and/or 3. This Statutory Goal(s) relates to the Goal(s) submitted in your State Consolidated Application.</p>	<p>Statutory Goals 1, 2, and 3.</p>
<p><b>Program Objective</b> (Indicate page number and item label as designated in the State Consolidated Application or restate objective.)</p>	<p>Program Objective 1: By 2009, 95 percent of school divisions will provide students and teachers opportunities through training, hardware, and software purchases to improve teaching and learning through the appropriate use of technology.</p> <p>Program Objective 2: By 2009, 95 percent of school divisions will ensure that students and teachers are provided hardware and software that will enhance teaching and learning.</p>
<p><b>Indicator</b> (Indicate page number and item label as designated in the State Consolidated Application or restate indicator.)</p>	<p>Performance Indicator 1: Percentage of school divisions with lesson plans that show teachers are integrating technology into all curriculum areas and that plans have been implemented to ensure students meet the objectives outlined in the computer/technology standards of learning.</p> <p>Performance Indicator 2: The percentage of school divisions reporting the number of technology integration training opportunities provided to staff.</p> <p>Performance Indicator 3: The percentage of school divisions with staff that meets or exceeds the Technology Standards for Instructional Personnel.</p> <p>Performance Indicator 4: The percentage of school divisions that have instructional technology resource personnel to support instruction and training needs.</p> <p>Performance Indicator 5: Percentage of school divisions reporting the number of classrooms with multimedia computers and printers for use in instruction and learning by teachers and students.</p> <p>Performance Indicator 6: Percentage of school divisions with a variety of hardware that has been purchased for teacher and student use including: digital cameras, scanners, graphing calculators, video recorders, portable keyboard devices, and projection devices etc.</p>
<p><b>Target</b> <i>Indicate status of data in 2002-03 school year (SY).</i> <b>BASELINE DATA</b></p>	<p>Targets For Goal 1</p> <p>Sixty percent of school divisions report that lesson plans show teachers are integrating technology into all curriculum areas and that plans have been implemented to ensure students meet the objectives outlined in the computer/technology standards of learning.</p> <p>Sixty percent of school divisions report the number of technology integration training opportunities provided to staff.</p> <p>Sixty percent of school divisions report that their staff meets or exceeds the Technology Standards for Instructional Personnel</p> <p>Sixty percent of school divisions report that they have instructional technology resource personnel to support instruction and training needs.</p>

	<p><b>Targets For Goal 2</b> Sixty percent of school divisions report the number of classrooms with multimedia computers and printers for use in instruction and learning by teachers and students.</p> <p>Sixty percent of school divisions report that a variety of hardware has been purchased for teacher and student use including: digital cameras, scanners, graphing calculators, video recorders, portable keyboard devices, and projection devices etc.</p>
<p><b>Target</b> <i>Indicate status of data in 2003-04 school year</i></p>	<p><b>Targets For Goal 1</b> Seventy-five percent of school divisions report that lesson plans show teachers are integrating technology into all curriculum areas and that plans have been implemented to ensure students meet the objectives outlined in the computer/technology standards of learning.</p> <p>Sixty percent of school divisions report the number of technology integration training opportunities provided to staff.</p> <p>Sixty percent of school divisions report that their staff meets or exceeds the Technology Standards for Instructional Personnel.</p> <p>Sixty percent of school divisions report that they have instructional technology resource personnel to support instruction and training needs.</p> <p><b>Targets For Goal 2</b> Sixty percent of school divisions report the number of classrooms with multimedia computers and printers for use in instruction and learning by teachers and students.</p> <p>Sixty percent of school divisions report that a variety of hardware has been purchased for teacher and student use including: digital cameras, scanners, graphing calculators, video recorders, portable keyboard devices, and projection devices etc.</p>
<p><b>Target</b> <i>Indicate status of data in 2004-05 school year.</i></p>	<p><b>Targets For Goal 1</b> Eighty percent of school divisions report that lesson plans show teachers are integrating technology into all curriculum areas and that plans have been implemented to ensure students meet the objectives outlined in the computer/technology standards of learning.</p> <p>Eighty percent of school divisions report the number of technology integration training opportunities provided to staff.</p> <p>Eighty percent of school divisions report that their staff meets or exceeds the Technology Standards for Instructional Personnel.</p> <p>Eighty percent of school divisions report that they have instructional technology resource personnel to support instruction and training needs.</p> <p><b>Targets For Goal 2</b> Eighty percent of school divisions report the number of classrooms with multimedia computers and printers for use in instruction and learning by teachers and students.</p> <p>Seventy-five percent of school divisions report that a variety of hardware has been purchased for teacher and student use including: digital cameras, scanners, graphing calculators, video recorders, portable keyboard devices, and projection devices etc.</p>
<p><b>Target</b> <i>Target for 2005-06 school year</i></p>	<p><b>Targets For Goal 1</b> Ninety percent of school divisions will report that lesson plans show teachers are integrating technology into all curriculum areas and that plans have been</p>

implemented to ensure students meet the objectives outlined in the computer/technology standards of learning.

Ninety percent of school divisions will report the number of technology integration training opportunities provided to staff.

Ninety percent of school divisions will report that their staff meets or exceeds the Technology Standards for Instructional Personnel.

Ninety percent of school divisions will report that they have instructional technology resource personnel to support instruction and training needs.

**Targets For Goal 2**

Ninety percent of school divisions will report the number of classrooms with multimedia computers and printers for use in instruction and learning by teachers and students.

Eighty-five percent of school divisions will report that a variety of hardware has been purchased for teacher and student use including: digital cameras, scanners, graphing calculators, video recorders, portable keyboard devices, and projection devices etc.

**Target**

*Target for 2006-07 school year.*

**Targets For Goal 1**

Ninety-five percent of school divisions will report that lesson plans show teachers are integrating technology into all curriculum areas and that plans have been implemented to ensure students meet the objectives outlined in the computer/technology standards of learning.

Ninety-five percent of school divisions will report the number of technology integration training opportunities provided to staff.

Ninety-five percent of school divisions will report that their staff meets or exceeds the Technology Standards for Instructional Personnel.

Ninety-five percent of school divisions will report that they have instructional technology resource personnel to support instruction and training needs.

**Targets For Goal 2**

Ninety-five percent of school divisions will report the number of classrooms with multimedia computers and printers for use in instruction and learning by teachers and students.

Ninety-five percent of school divisions will report that a variety of hardware has been purchased for teacher and student use including: digital cameras, scanners, graphing calculators, video recorders, portable keyboard devices, and projection devices etc.

**Target**

*Target for 2007-08 school*

**Targets For Goal 1**

One hundred percent of school divisions will report that lesson plans show teachers are integrating technology into all curriculum areas and that plans have been implemented to ensure students meet the objectives outlined in the computer/technology standards of learning.

One hundred percent of school divisions will report the number of technology integration training opportunities provided to staff.

One hundred percent of school divisions will report that their staff meets or exceeds the Technology Standards for Instructional Personnel.

One hundred percent of school divisions will report that they have instructional technology resource personnel to support instruction and training needs.

	<p>Targets For Goal 2</p> <p>One hundred percent of school divisions will report the number of classrooms with multimedia computers and printers for use in instruction and learning by teachers and students.</p> <p>One hundred percent of school divisions will report that a variety of hardware has been purchased for teacher and student use including: digital cameras, scanners, graphing calculators, video recorders, portable keyboard devices, and projection devices etc.</p>
<p><b>Assessment of Progress</b>  <i>Status of progress on indicator</i></p> <p>(1) <i>Target met</i>  (2) <i>Target not met</i></p>	<p>Performance Indicator 1: (1)  Performance Indicator 2: (1)  Performance Indicator 3: (1)  Performance Indicator 4: (1)  Performance Indicator 5: (1)  Performance Indicator 6: (1)</p>
<p><b>Measurement tool(s) used to assess progress of indicators.</b></p>	<p>Educational Technology Competitive Grant Performance Report, Virginia Department of Education Office of Teacher Education and Licensure, Virginia Standards of Accreditation, Virginia Standards of Quality, and local division technology plans.</p>

<b>Goals, Objectives, Targets</b>	<b>Narrative</b>
<p><b>Program Goal</b> (Indicate page number and item label as designated in the State Consolidated Application or restate goal.)</p>	<p>Accountability</p> <p>Goal 1 - Assess the value that Information Technology adds to teaching and learning environments and decision support.</p> <p>Goal 2 - Assess Information Technology fluency among students.</p> <p>Goal 3 – Improve the accountability and systemic aspects of technology planning for educational technology stakeholders.</p>
<p><b>Statutory Goal</b> Indicate Statutory Goal number 1, 2, and/or 3. This Statutory Goal(s) relates to the Goal(s) submitted in your State Consolidated Application.</p>	<p>N/A – Indirect relationship to Statutory Goals</p>
<p><b>Program Objective</b> (Indicate page number and item label as designated in the State Consolidated Application or restate objective.)</p>	<p>Program Objective 1 - By 2009, all school public school divisions will be provided training for assessing the presence of the elements of technology integration that benefit the teaching and learning environment.</p> <p>Program Objective 2 – By 2009, all public school divisions will receive collected information on school-site readiness and best practices to integrate technology into teaching and learning for each K-12 school.</p> <p>Program Objective 3 – By 2009, all public school divisions will have access to models of gathering, reporting, and analyzing comprehensive information about student learning progress.</p> <p>Program Objective 4 – By 2009, all public school divisions will have access to models for interfacing systems to gather, report, and analyze information to make instructional decisions.</p> <p>Program Objective 5 - By 2004, standards for measuring instructional personnel Information Technology literacy will be established and implemented.</p> <p>Program Objective 6 – By 2005, established standards for assessing student technology competency will be updated.</p> <p>Program Objective 7 – By 2009, all public school divisions will have technology plans that are determined to be consistent with the state technology plan.</p>
<p><b>Indicator</b> (Indicate page number and item label as designated in the State Consolidated Application or restate indicator.)</p>	<p>Performance Indicator 1 – The percentage of public school divisions that were provided training for assessing the presence of the elements of technology integration that benefit the teaching and learning environment.</p> <p>Performance Indicator 2 - The percentage of public school divisions receiving collected information on school-site readiness and best practices to integrate technology into teaching and learning for each K-12 school.</p> <p>Performance Indicator 3 - The percentage of public school divisions with access to models of gathering, reporting, and analyzing comprehensive information about student learning progress.</p> <p>Performance Indicator 4 - The percentage of public school divisions with access to models for interfacing systems to gather, report, and analyze information to make instructional decisions.</p> <p>Performance Indicator 5 – Work toward the establishment and implementation of standards for measuring instructional personnel Information Technology literacy.</p>

	<p>Performance Indicator 6 – Work toward the updating of establishment standards for assessing student technology competency.</p> <p>Performance Indicator 7 – The percentage of public school divisions with technology plans that are determined to be consistent with the state technology plan.</p>
<p><b>Target</b>  <i>Indicate status of data in 2002-03 school year (SY).</i>  <b>BASELINE DATA</b></p>	<p><b>Targets for Goal 1</b>  Fifty percent of public school divisions were provided training for assessing the presence of the elements of technology integration that benefit the teaching and learning environment.</p> <p>Fifty percent of public school divisions received collected information on school-site readiness and best practices to integrate technology into teaching and learning for each K-12 school.</p> <p>Fifty percent of public school divisions have access to models of gathering, reporting, and analyzing comprehensive information about student learning progress.</p> <p>Fifty percent of public school divisions have access to models for interfacing systems to gather, report, and analyze information to make instructional decisions.</p> <p><b>Targets for Goal 2</b>  Standards for measuring instructional personnel Information Technology literacy were reviewed by Virginia Board of Education and revised as necessary.</p> <p>Standards for assessing student technology competency were reviewed by Virginia Board of Education and revised as necessary.</p> <p><b>Targets for Goal 3</b>  Fifty percent of public school divisions had technology plans that are determined to be consistent with the state technology plan.</p>
<p><b>Target</b>  <i>Indicate status of data in 2003-04 school year</i></p>	<p><b>Targets for Goal 1</b>  Sixty percent of public school divisions were provided training for assessing the presence of the elements of technology integration that benefit the teaching and learning environment.</p> <p>Sixty percent of public school divisions received collected information on school-site readiness and best practices to integrate technology into teaching and learning for each K-12 school.</p> <p>Sixty percent of public school divisions have access to models of gathering, reporting, and analyzing comprehensive information about student learning progress.</p> <p>Sixty percent of public school divisions have access to models for interfacing systems to gather, report, and analyze information to make instructional decisions.</p> <p><b>Targets for Goal 2</b>  Standards for measuring instructional personnel Information Technology literacy were reviewed by Virginia Board of Education and revised as necessary.</p> <p>Standards for assessing student technology competency were reviewed by Virginia Board of Education and revised as necessary.</p> <p><b>Targets for Goal 3</b>  Sixty percent of public school divisions had technology plans that are determined to be consistent with the state technology plan.</p>
<p><b>Target</b></p>	<p>Targets for Goal 3</p>

<p><i>Indicate status of data in 2004-05 school year.</i></p>	<p>Seventy percent of public school divisions were provided training for assessing the presence of the elements of technology integration that benefit the teaching and learning environment.</p> <p>Seventy percent of public school divisions received collected information on school-site readiness and best practices to integrate technology into teaching and learning for each K-12 school.</p> <p>Seventy percent of public school divisions have access to models of gathering, reporting, and analyzing comprehensive information about student learning progress.</p> <p>Seventy percent of public school divisions have access to models for interfacing systems to gather, report, and analyze information to make instructional decisions.</p> <p>Targets for Goal 2 Standards for assessing student technology competency were reviewed by Virginia Board of Education and revised as necessary.</p> <p>Targets for Goal 3 Seventy percent of public school divisions have technology plans that are determined to be consistent with the state technology plan.</p>
<p><b>Target</b> <i>Target for 2005-06 school year</i></p>	<p>Targets for Goal 1 Eighty percent of public school divisions will be provided training for assessing the presence of the elements of technology integration that benefit the teaching and learning environment.</p> <p>Eighty percent of public school divisions will be receiving collected information on school-site readiness and best practices to integrate technology into teaching and learning for each K-12 school.</p> <p>Eighty percent of public school divisions will have access to models of gathering, reporting, and analyzing comprehensive information about student learning progress.</p> <p>Eighty percent of public school divisions will have access to models for interfacing systems to gather, report, and analyze information to make instructional decisions.</p> <p>Targets for Goal 2 Standards for assessing student technology competency will be approved by Virginia Board of Education and implemented.</p> <p>Targets for Goal 3 Eighty percent of public school divisions will have technology plans that are determined to be consistent with the state technology plan.</p>
<p><b>Target</b> <i>Target for 2006-07 school year.</i></p>	<p>Targets for Goal 1 Ninety percent of public school divisions will be provided training for assessing the presence of the elements of technology integration that benefit the teaching and learning environment.</p> <p>Ninety percent of public school divisions will be receiving collected information on school-site readiness and best practices to integrate technology into teaching and learning for each K-12 school.</p> <p>Ninety percent of public school divisions will have access to models of gathering, reporting, and analyzing comprehensive information about student learning progress.</p> <p>Ninety percent of public school divisions will have access to models for interfacing systems to gather, report, and analyze information to make instructional decisions.</p> <p>Ninety percent of public school divisions will have technology plans that are determined to be consistent with the state technology plan.</p>

<p><b>Target</b> <i>Target for 2007-08 school</i></p>	<p>Targets for Goal 1</p> <p>One hundred percent of public school divisions will be provided training for assessing the presence of the elements of technology integration that benefit the teaching and learning environment.</p> <p>One hundred percent of public school divisions will be receiving collected information on school-site readiness and best practices to integrate technology into teaching and learning for each K-12 school.</p> <p>One hundred percent of public school divisions will have access to models of gathering, reporting, and analyzing comprehensive information about student learning progress.</p> <p>One hundred percent of public school divisions will have access to models for interfacing systems to gather, report, and analyze information to make instructional decisions.</p> <p>One hundred percent of public school divisions will have technology plans that are determined to be consistent with the state technology plan.</p>
<p><b>Assessment of Progress</b> <i>Status of progress on indicator</i></p> <p>(1) <i>Target met</i> (2) <i>Target not met</i></p>	<p>Performance Indicator 1: (1) Performance Indicator 2: (1) Performance Indicator 3: (1) Performance Indicator 4: (1) Performance Indicator 5: (1) Performance Indicator 6: (1) Performance Indicator 7: (1)</p>
<p><b>Measurement tool(s) used to assess progress of indicators.</b></p>	<p>Competitive Grant Performance Reports Professional Development Evaluations</p>

Goals, Objectives, Targets	Narrative
<p><b>Program Goal</b> (Indicate page number and item label as designated in the State Consolidated Application or restate goal.)</p>	<p>Professional Development Provide pre-service and in-service professional development opportunities that promote and advance the implementation and support of effective and seamless technology integration best practices in K-12 core curriculum instruction.</p>
<p><b>Statutory Goal</b> Indicate Statutory Goal number 1, 2, and/or 3. This Statutory Goal(s) relates to the Goal(s) submitted in your State Consolidated Application.</p>	<p>Statutory Goal 3.</p>
<p><b>Program Objective</b> (Indicate page number and item label as designated in the State Consolidated Application or restate objective.)</p>	<p>Program Objective 1 - By 2009, 95 percent of local school divisions and other educational entities will develop partnerships that will identify and support through training efforts best practices in the integration of instructional technology into the K-12 core curriculum.</p> <p>Program Objective 2 - By 2009, 95 percent of Virginia institutions of higher education pre-service teacher preparation and in-service graduate programs will reflect course work and experiences in effective integration of technology in core curriculum K-12 classroom instruction.</p> <p>Program Objective 3 - By 2009, 95 percent of school divisions will participate in state level coordination and administration efforts for grant programs and alternative sources of funding, which support the implementation of educational technology and include information dissemination, review and critique of division grant related plans, budget, progress reports, and professional development opportunities.</p> <p>Program Objective 4 - By 2009, 95 percent of the school divisions will establish site-based technology utilization support systems based upon Virginia Standards of Quality for all classroom teachers in order to effectively integrate educational technology in the K-12 curriculum and instruction, and will participate in state level assistance programs offering technical assistance, consultation, and professional development opportunities.</p>
<p><b>Indicator</b> (Indicate page number and item label as designated in the State Consolidated Application or restate indicator.)</p>	<p>Performance Indicator 1 - The percentage of school division formula grant participants and NCLB Competitive grant consortium reporting partnerships in division and consortium NCLB Title II, Part D reports to the state</p> <p>Performance Indicator 2 - The percentage of graduates of Virginia institutions of higher education teacher preparation and graduate programs meeting the Virginia Technology Standards for Instructional Personnel.</p> <p>Performance Indicator 3 - The percentage of school divisions participating in grant programs and/or financial assistance initiatives that support division implementation of educational technology and curriculum integration and related professional development, and reporting meeting division objectives as stated in division NCLB Title II, Part D progress reports to the state.</p> <p>Performance Indicator 4 - The percentage of divisions with site-based utilization systems in place according to the Virginia Standards of Quality and participating in state level technical assistance.</p>
<p><b>Target</b> <i>Indicate status of data in 2002-03 school year (SY).</i> <b>BASELINE DATA</b></p>	<p>Target for Goal 1 Eighty percent of local school divisions and other educational entities have developed partnerships that identify and support through training efforts best practices in the integration of instructional technology into the K-12 core curriculum.</p>

	<p>Target for Goal 2 Seventy-five percent of graduates of Virginia institutions of higher education teacher preparation and graduate programs meet the Virginia Technology Standards for Instructional Personnel.</p> <p>Target for Goal 3 Seventy-five percent of school divisions participate in state level coordination and administration efforts for grant programs and alternative sources of funding, which support the implementation of educational technology and include information dissemination, review, and critique of division grant related plans, budgets, progress reports, and professional development opportunities.</p> <p>Target for Goal 4 Fifty percent of the school divisions have established site-based technology utilization support systems based upon Virginia Standards of Quality for all classroom teachers in order to effectively integrate educational technology in the K-12 curriculum and instruction, and participated in state level assistance programs offering technical assistance, consultation, and professional development opportunities.</p>
<p><b>Target</b> <i>Indicate status of data in 2003-04 school year</i></p>	<p>Target for Goal 1 Ninety percent of local school divisions and other educational entities have developed partnerships that identify and support through training efforts best practices in the integration of instructional technology into the K-12 core curriculum.</p> <p>Target for Goal 2 Eighty-five percent of graduates of Virginia institutions of higher education teacher preparation and graduate programs meet the Virginia Technology Standards for Instructional Personnel.</p> <p>Target for Goal 3 Eighty percent of school divisions participate in state level coordination and administration efforts for grant programs and alternative sources of funding, which support the implementation of educational technology and include information dissemination, review, and critique of division grant related plans, budgets, progress reports, and professional development opportunities.</p> <p>Target for Goal 4 Sixty percent of the school divisions have established site-based technology utilization support systems based upon Virginia Standards of Quality for all classroom teachers in order to effectively integrate educational technology in the K-12 curriculum and instruction, and participated in state level assistance programs offering technical assistance, consultation, and professional development opportunities.</p>
<p><b>Target</b> <i>Indicate status of data in 2004-05 school year.</i></p>	<p>Target for Goal 1 Ninety percent of local school divisions and other educational entities have developed partnerships that identify and support through training efforts best practices in the integration of instructional technology into the K-12 core curriculum.</p> <p>Target for Goal 2 Ninety percent of graduates of Virginia institutions of higher education teacher preparation and graduate programs meet the Virginia Technology Standards for Instructional Personnel.</p> <p>Target for Goal 3 Ninety percent of school divisions participate in state level coordination and administration efforts for grant programs and alternative sources of funding, which support the implementation of educational technology and include information dissemination, review, and critique of division grant related plans, budgets, progress reports, and professional development opportunities.</p>

	<p>Target for Goal 4 Seventy percent of the school divisions have established site-based technology utilization support systems based upon Virginia Standards of Quality for all classroom teachers in order to effectively integrate educational technology in the K-12 curriculum and instruction, and participated in state level assistance programs offering technical assistance, consultation, and professional development opportunities.</p>
<p><b>Target</b> <i>Target for 2005-06 school year</i></p>	<p>Target for Goal 1 Ninety-two percent of local school divisions and other educational entities will have developed partnerships that will identify and support through training efforts best practices in the integration of instructional technology into the K-12 core curriculum.</p> <p>Target for Goal 2 Ninety percent of graduates of Virginia institutions of higher education teacher preparation and graduate programs will meet the Virginia Technology Standards for Instructional Personnel.</p> <p>Target for Goal 3 Ninety-two percent of school divisions will participate in state level coordination and administration efforts for grant programs and alternative sources of funding, which support the implementation of educational technology and include information dissemination, review, and critique of division grant related plans, budgets, progress reports, and professional development opportunities.</p> <p>Target for Goal 4 Eighty-five percent of the school divisions will have established site-based technology utilization support systems based upon Virginia Standards of Quality for all classroom teachers in order to effectively integrate educational technology in the K-12 curriculum and instruction, and will participate in state level assistance programs offering technical assistance, consultation, and professional development opportunities.</p>
<p><b>Target</b> <i>Target for 2006-07 school year.</i></p>	<p>Target for Goal 1 Ninety-four percent of local school divisions and other educational entities will have developed partnerships that will identify and support through training efforts best practices in the integration of instructional technology into the K-12 core curriculum.</p> <p>Target for Goal 2 Ninety-four percent of graduates of Virginia institutions of higher education teacher preparation and graduate programs will meet the Virginia Technology Standards for Instructional Personnel.</p> <p>Target for Goal 3 Ninety-four percent of school divisions will participate in state level coordination and administration efforts for grant programs and alternative sources of funding, which support the implementation of educational technology and include information dissemination, review, and critique of division grant related plans, budgets, progress reports, and professional development opportunities.</p> <p>Target for Goal 4 Ninety percent of the school divisions will have established site-based technology utilization support systems based upon Virginia Standards of Quality for all classroom teachers in order to effectively integrate educational technology in the K-12 curriculum and instruction, and will participate in state level assistance programs offering technical assistance, consultation, and professional development opportunities.</p>
<p><b>Target</b> <i>Target for 2007-08 school</i></p>	<p>Target for Goal 1 Ninety-five percent of local school divisions and other educational entities will have</p>

	<p>developed partnerships that will identify and support through training efforts best practices in the integration of instructional technology into the K-12 core curriculum.</p> <p>Target for Goal 2 Ninety-five percent of graduates of Virginia institutions of higher education teacher preparation and graduate programs will meet the Virginia Technology Standards for Instructional Personnel.</p> <p>Target for Goal 3 Ninety-five percent of school divisions will participate in state level coordination and administration efforts for grant programs and alternative sources of funding, which support the implementation of educational technology and include information dissemination, review, and critique of division grant related plans, budgets, progress reports, and professional development opportunities.</p> <p>Target for Goal 4 Ninety-five percent of the school divisions will have established site-based technology utilization support systems based upon Virginia Standards of Quality for all classroom teachers in order to effectively integrate educational technology in the K-12 curriculum and instruction, and will participate in state level assistance programs offering technical assistance, consultation, and professional development opportunities.</p>
<p><b>Assessment of Progress</b> <i>Status of progress on indicator</i></p> <p>(1) <i>Target met</i> (2) <i>Target not met</i></p>	<p>Performance Indicator 1: (1) Performance Indicator 2: (1) Performance Indicator 3: (1) Performance Indicator 4: (1)</p>
<p><b>Measurement tool(s) used to assess progress of indicators.</b></p>	<p>Competitive Grant Performance Reports, Formula Grant Performance Reports, Competitive and Formula Grant Applications, ongoing School Capacity Survey, and Virginia Standards of Quality.</p>

**If for any reason you have modified or added Goal(s), objectives, indicators, and/or targets since submitting the State Consolidated Application, please indicate in the chart below.**

<b>Original Goal(s), objectives, indicators, and/or targets</b> (Indicate page number and item label as designated in the State Consolidated Application or restate goal.)	<b>Modification or Additions</b>

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

**2.7.1 Performance Measures**

Instructions: In the following chart, please identify:

- o Each of your State indicators as submitted in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application;
- o The instrument or data source used to measure the indicator;
- o The frequency with which the data are collected (annually, semi-annually, biennially) and year of the most recent collection;
- o The baseline data and year the baseline was established; and
- o Targets for the years in which your State has established targets.

**2.7.1 Performance Measures**

Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of collection	Targets	Actual Performance
1. The percentage of students who carried a gun to school or school event during a given school year	Discipline, Crime, and Violence report for the state	Frequency: <u>Annually</u>  Year of most recent collection: <u>2004-05</u>	2003-2004 <u>N/A</u> 2004-2005 <u>.01</u> 2005-2006 <u>.01</u> 2006-2007 <u>.01</u> 2007-2008 <u>.01</u>	2003- 2004 <u>.01451%</u> 2004- 2005 <u>.00182%</u>  Baseline: <u>.0441%</u> Year established: <u>2002-2003</u>
2. The percentage of students who engaged in a physical fight on school property	Discipline, Crime, and Violence report for the state	Frequency: <u>Annually</u>  Year of most recent collection: <u>2004-05</u>	2003-2004 <u>N/A</u> 2004-2005 <u>2.0</u> 2005-2006 <u>1.7</u> 2006-2007 <u>1.5</u> 2007-2008 <u>1.0</u>	2003- 2004 <u>2.22284%</u> 2004- 2005 <u>1.7381%</u>  Baseline: <u>2.456018%</u> Year established: <u>2002-2003</u>
3. The percentage of students offered, sold, or given an illegal drug on school property	Discipline, Crime, and Violence report for the state	Frequency: <u>Annually</u>  Year of most recent collection: <u>2004-05</u>	2003-2004 <u>N/A</u> 2004-2005 <u>.20</u> 2005-2006 <u>.17</u> 2006-2007 <u>.15</u> 2007-2008 <u>.10</u>	2003- 2004 <u>0.20367%</u> 2004- 2005 <u>.10424%</u>  Baseline: <u>0.24345%</u> Year established: <u>2002-2003</u>

**2.7.2 Suspension and Expulsion Data**

Instructions: In the following charts, indicate the number of out-of-school suspensions and expulsions for elementary, middle, and high school students for each of the underlined incidents.

Please also provide the State's definition of an elementary, middle, and high school, as well as the State's definition of each of the incidents underlined below.

(If your State does not collect data in the same format as requested by this form, the State may provide data from a similar question, provided the State includes a footnote explaining the differences between the data requested and the data the State is able to supply.)

School Type	State Definition
Elementary School	Grades PK-5
Middle School	Grades 6-8
High School	Grades 9-12

**2.7.2.2 The number of out-of-school suspensions and expulsions for physical fighting.**

State definition of physical fighting: Mutual participation in an incident involving physical violence.

SUSPENSIONS	Number for 2004-2005 school year	Number of LEAs reporting
Elementary	3000	132
Middle	11095	132
High School	6801	131

EXPULSIONS	Number for 2004-2005 school year	Number of LEAs reporting
Elementary	0	132
Middle	15	132
High School	25	131

Only 131 of 132 divisions reported.

**2.7.2.3 The number of out-of-school suspensions and expulsions for weapons possession**State definition of weapons: \_\_

Weapons possession includes the following: 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.

—

<b>SUSPENSIONS</b>	<b>Number for 2004-2005 school year</b>	<b>Number of LEAs reporting</b>
Elementary	445	132
Middle	857	132
High School	779	131

<b>EXPULSIONS</b>	<b>Number for 2004-2005 school year</b>	<b>Number of LEAs reporting</b>
Elementary	3	132
Middle	73	132
High School	90	131

Only 131 of 132 divisions reported.

**2.7.2.4 The number of alcohol-related out-of-school suspensions and expulsions.**

State definition of 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.

<b>SUSPENSIONS</b>	<b>Number for 2004-2005 school year</b>	<b>Number of LEAs reporting</b>
Elementary	7	132
Middle	265	132
High School	747	131

<b>EXPULSIONS</b>	<b>Number for 2004-2005 school year</b>	<b>Number of LEAs reporting</b>
Elementary	0	132
Middle	15	132
High School	14	131

Only 131 of 132 divisions reported.

### 2.7.2.5 The number of illicit drug-related out-of-school suspensions and expulsions.

State definition of illicit-drug related: a. Unlawful use, possession, transportation, or importation of any 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.

SUSPENSIONS	Number for 2004-2005	
	school year	Number of LEAs reporting
Elementary	30	132
Middle	298	132
High School	472	131

EXPULSIONS	Number for 2004-2005	
	school year	Number of LEAs reporting
Elementary	1	132
Middle	113	132
High School	341	131

Only 131 of 132 divisions with reported.

### 2.7.3 Parent Involvement

Instructions: Section 4116 of ESEA requires that each State provide information pertaining to the State's efforts to inform parents of and include parents in drug and violence prevention efforts. Please describe your State's efforts to include parents in these activities.

#### Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Program

Each LEA, as part of the Title IV, SDFSCA Application, is required to describe the process used to include parents in the development of the application and in the ongoing administration of the SDFSCA Program. Virginia LEAs use a variety of methods to fulfill this requirement including parent representation on local Health Advisory Councils, School Safety Teams, and Community Prevention Councils. Additionally, annual performance reports from LEAs document widespread use of parent education/involvement related to drug and violence prevention efforts, most frequently in the form of training/educational activities.

Two new resources have been developed to assist school divisions in more effectively involving parents in their drug and violence prevention efforts. First, materials designed to assist school administrators in communicating more effectively about school crime and violence have been developed as part of a SDFSCA State Data Grant. The materials on communicating effectively emphasize building understanding and engaging parents others in school drug and violence prevention efforts. The second resource is a Parent Guide to School Discipline that is under development and expected to be released in late spring 2006. This resource, being developed with advisory assistance from the Virginia Congress of PTAs, will promote understand of basic disciplinary processes and improved parent-school communication.

A source of information for Virginia parents since 1998 has been School Performance Report Cards. 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 posted for every school in Virginia include the following:

- Fights (without and with injury)
- Firearm Violations
- Other Weapons

School Performance Report Cards are available on the Virginia Department of Education website at <http://www.pen.k12.va.us/VDOE/src/>.

The Virginia Department of Education continues to make available its publication Collaborative Family-School Relationships for Children's Learning. The publication provides an overview of how educators can develop productive family-school relationships that promote student learning. The publication, based on sound research, includes comprehensive lists of strategies for involving parents and for reaching uninvolved families.

### **Governor's Office SDFSCA Efforts**

A centerpiece of Virginia's efforts to inform and include parents in drug and violence prevention efforts has been the KIDsafe Virginia initiative, and specifically the KIDsafe Virginia Parent Guides. Nearly 300,000 Virginia parents have received print copies of these Guides and countless 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 is keyed to and 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 is keyed to and complements a 6-lesson crime prevention curriculum for high school students that is designed to be taught by a school resource officer. Both of these Parent Guides and the related curricula can be downloaded from <http://www.gosap.governor.virginia.gov/kidsafeva.htm/>.

## 2.8 INNOVATIVE PROGRAMS(TITLE V, PART A)

- 2.8.1 Please describe **major** results to date of State-level Title V, Part A funded activities to improve student achievement and the quality of education for students. Please use quantitative data if available (e.g., increases in the number of highly qualified teachers).

Activities supported by Title V, Part A, state-level funds to improve student achievement and the quality of education for students have been broad-based and reflective of state initiatives and need. The activities focused on various grade levels of Virginia's students and include Electronic Practice Assessment (ePat) for Mathematics and Earth Science, Biology and Chemistry; Phonological Awareness Literacy Screening for Preschool (PALS-PreK); Reading Camps Summer 2005; Limited English Proficient Summer Academy; and Algebra and Reading Tutorials. A description and results (if available) of the activities are provided below.

### **Electronic Practice Assessment Tools (ePAT)—Mathematics**

The Electronic Practice Assessment Tools (ePAT) for mathematics provides annotations to the answer options for Virginia released tests in Algebra I, Geometry, and Algebra II. Title V funds were used for training and included: teachers in the secondary (grades 6—12) mathematics and special strands at the James Madison University Content Teaching Academy (approximately 200 teachers); teachers at schools in academic review (approximately 60 teachers); pre-service teachers at Longwood University (approximately 40 teacher candidates); and Virginia Council of Supervisors of Mathematics (73 mathematics supervisors in 72 school divisions with approximate 45,000 middle and high school students).

### **Electronic Practice Assessment Tools (ePAT)—Earth Science, Biology, and Chemistry**

Title V funds were used to develop the Electronic Practice Assessment Tools (ePAT) for earth science, biology, and chemistry students. The development of ePAT supports and enhances preparation for the end-of-course (EOC) Science Standards of Learning (SOL) assessments as a direct resource for students. The following is the number of predicted uses for each ePAT for 2004-2005: 1) earth science, 80,000, 2) biology, 85,000, and 3) chemistry, 52,000. Teacher training included: 1) *Content Teaching Academies*, June 2005, 42 teachers directly trained and 2) *Virginia SOL Content Review Committees*, June and July 2005, 30 teachers directly trained.

### **Phonological Awareness Literacy Screening for Preschool (PALS-PreK)**

PALS-PreK is a measure of young children's knowledge of important emergent literacy fundamentals. PALS-PreK provides a direct means for matching early literacy instruction to specific literacy needs and a means of monitoring a child's emerging control in these literacy areas. Title V funding allowed PALS-PreK materials to be provided free of charge to Virginia Preschool Initiative (VPI) and Early Childhood Special Education programs during the 2004- 2005 school year. These complimentary materials included 774 complete teacher sets and 210 assessment training videos.

### **Reading Camps Summer 2005**

The Department of Education funded nine reading camps in school divisions that had participated in the Reading Leadership Institute in February 2005 and had a pass rate on the 2004 English Standards of Learning Assessment below 66 percent. Students in sixth, seventh, and eighth grades attended the camps which ranged in duration from ten to fifty days. Approximately 653 students participated in the 2005 summer reading camps. Teachers and administrators reported that most students' abilities and attitudes improved during the short time period. Teachers reported positive experiences while collaborating with colleagues and local experts.

### **Limited English Proficient Summer Academy**

As part of the Virginia Department of Education's ongoing effort to meet the state professional development requirements for Title III, Part A, Language Instruction for Limited English Proficient (LEP)

and Immigrant Students, under the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001*, a summer professional development academy for all K-12 teachers of LEP students was offered in collaboration with George Mason University during the week of July 11-15, 2005. The graduate-level course entitled, Reading and Writing Strategies for LEP Students, focused on effective reading and writing teaching strategies for use with LEP students. Approximately 70 teachers successfully completed the course and received three hours of graduate-level credit through George Mason University. Course evaluations indicated a high level of satisfaction with all aspects of the professional development opportunity.

### **Algebra and Reading Tutorials**

The Department of Education, through the state initiative Project Graduation program, provided online tutorials in Algebra I and English Reading to students who had passed the courses but failed the SOL test. The online tutorials were designed to assess student weaknesses with an initial assessment and target lessons only to student needs. For the period September 7, 2004, through August 8, 2005, 152 schools registered 7989 students in the Reading Tutorial. Students completed 11,549 lessons and benchmark tests. Of the students who completed the tutorial and all assigned lessons, over 80 percent passed the SOL test. For the period December 17, 2004, the inception of the Algebra tutorial, through August 8, 2005, 82 schools registered 3,505 students in the Algebra Tutorial. Students completed 3,476 lessons and benchmark tests.

---

**2.8.2** The table below requests data on student achievement outcomes of **Title V, Part A - funded** LEAs that use **20%** or more of Title V, Part A funds and funds transferred from other programs for **strategic priorities including: (1)** student achievement in reading and math, **(2)** teacher quality, **(3)** safe and drug free schools, **(4)** access for all students to a quality education. Complete the table below using aggregated data from all LEA evaluations of school year 2004-2005 activities funded in whole or in part from Title V, Part A - Innovative Programs funds.

Priority Activity/Area [1]	Number of LEAs that used <b>20%</b> or more Title V, Part A, including funds transferred into Title V, Part A (see Note) for:	Number of these LEAs that met AYP	Total Number of Students Served
Area 1: <b>Student Achievement in Reading and Math</b>	99	14	611474
Area 2: <b>Teacher Quality</b>	16	2	179045
Area 3: <b>Safe and Drug Free Schools</b>	5	1	10510
Area 4: <b>Increase Access for all Students</b>	33	10	66483
Note: Funds from REAP and Local Flex (Section 6152) that are used for Title V, Part A purposes and funds transferred into Title V, Part A under the transferability option under section 6132(b).			

**2.8.3** Indicate the number of Title V, Part A funded LEAs that did not use, in school year 2004-2005, 20% or more of Title V, Part A funds including funds transferred from other programs into Title V, Part A, for any of the priority activities/areas listed in the table under B above.   2  

**2.8.4** Indicate the number of LEAs shown in B.1 that met AYP in school year 2004-2005.   1  

**2.8.5** Indicate the percentage of Title V funds, including funds transferred from other programs into Title V that LEAs used for the four strategic priorities.   95.0  

[1] In completing this table, States should include activities described in Section 5131 of the ESEA as follows: Area 1 (activities 3, 9,12,16,19,20,22,26,27), Area 2 (activity 1,2), Area 3 (activity 14,25), Area 4 (activities 4,5,7,8,15,17)

- 2.8.6** Indicate the percentage of LEAs that completed needs assessments that the State determined to be meaningful and credible. 100.0
- 2.8.7** Describe how decisions were made regarding the local uses of funds.

Decisions were made regarding the local uses of Title V, Part A, funds based on local needs assessments, examining state and local priorities, meeting the No Child Left Behind goals, and meetings with various internal and external groups. The local needs assessments were used to evaluate and determine the focused core needs of schools and how Title V funds could be best used. Through analyzing and disaggregating data of the Virginia Standards of Learning (SOL) assessments, uses for Title V funds for staffing and staff development were determined in order to provide support and guidance to school staff in making informed instructional decisions. Assessment data also determined local decisions in the use of Title V funding to improve instructional programs. Because of the flexibility that Title V allows, needs assessments guided local decisions on uses of funds in the 27 authorized areas of the program.

**2.9 RURAL EDUCATION ACHIEVEMENT PROGRAM (REAP) (TITLE VI, PART B)****2.9.1 Small Rural School Achievement Program (Title VI, Part B, Subpart 1)**

Please indicate the number of eligible LEAs that notified the State of the LEA's intention to use the Alternative Uses of Funding authority under section 6211 during the 2004-2005 school year.   2  

**2.9.2 Rural and Low-Income School Program (Title VI, Part B, Subpart 2)**

**2.9.2.1** LEAs that receive Rural and Low-Income School (RLIS) Program grants may use these funds for any of the purposes listed in the following table. Please indicate in the table the total number of eligible LEAs that used funds for each of the listed purposes during the 2004-2005 school year.

Purpose	Number of LEAs
Teacher recruitment and retention, including the use of signing bonuses and other financial incentives	2
Teacher professional development, including programs that train teachers to utilize technology to improve teaching and to train special needs teachers	2
Educational technology, including software and hardware as described in Title II, Part D	3
Parental involvement activities	2
Activities authorized under the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program (Title IV, Part A)	3
Activities authorized under Title I, Part A	10
Activities authorized under Title III (Language instruction for LEP and immigrant students)	2

- 2.9.2.2** Describe the progress the State has made in meeting the goals and objectives for the Rural Low-Income Schools Program as described in its June 2002 Consolidated State application. Provide quantitative data where available.

Virginia maintains one statewide accountability system. Schools and school divisions that meet the annual measurable objectives required by the No Child Left Behind legislation are considered to have made adequate yearly progress (AYP) toward the goal of 100 percent proficiency of all students in reading and mathematics by 2013-2014. During the 2004-2005 school year, 83 percent (1,507) of Virginia's schools made adequate yearly progress (AYP), and 52 percent (68) of the school divisions made AYP. Only 13 school divisions received Title VI, Part B, Subpart 2, funds in 2004-2005, as compared to 17 school divisions being recipients of these funds in 2003-2004. These 13 school divisions operated a total of 48 Title I schools. Of these 48 Title I schools, 69 percent (33) made AYP. Of these 13 divisions, 31 percent (4) made AYP.

The following 13 divisions were funded in 2004-2005:

- Accomack County Public Schools did not make AYP. They had four schools that were Title I. Of the Title I schools two made AYP. In Accomack, 50 percent of the Title I schools made AYP.
- Buchanan County Public Schools did not make AYP. They had six schools that were Title I. Of the Title I schools three made AYP. In Buchanan, 50 percent of the Title I schools made AYP.
- Dickerson County Public Schools made AYP. They had five schools that were Title I. Of the Title I schools four made AYP. In Dickerson, 80 percent of the Title I schools made AYP.
- Lee County Public Schools did not make AYP. They had 11 schools that were Title I. Of the Title I schools 10 made AYP. In Lee, 91 percent of the Title I schools made AYP.
- Northampton County Public Schools did not make AYP. They had two schools that were Title I. Of the Title I schools one made AYP. In Northampton, 50 percent of the Title I schools made AYP.
- Nottoway County Public Schools did not make AYP. They had four schools that were Title I. Of the Title I schools three made AYP. In Nottoway, 75 percent of the Title I schools made AYP.
- Prince Edward County Public Schools did not make AYP. They had two schools that were Title I. Of the Title I schools one made AYP. In Prince Edward, 50 percent of the Title I schools made AYP.
- Wise County Public Schools did not make AYP. They have six schools that are Title I. Of the Title I schools five made AYP. In Wise, 83 percent of the Title I schools made AYP.
- Franklin City Public Schools made AYP. They had two schools that were Title I. Of the Title I schools two made AYP. In Franklin, 100 percent of the Title I schools made AYP.
- Galax County Public Schools did not make AYP. They had one Title I school. The Title I school made AYP. In Galax, 100 percent of the Title I schools made AYP.
- Martinsville City Public Schools did not make AYP. They had three schools that were Title I. Of the Title I schools zero made AYP. In Martinsville, zero percent of the Title I schools made AYP.
- Norton City Public Schools made AYP. They had one Title I school. Of the Title I school zero made AYP. In Norton, zero percent of the Title I schools made AYP.
- Colonial Beach Public Schools made AYP. They had one Title I school. The Title I school made AYP. In Colonial Beach, 100 percent of the Title I schools made AYP.

**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 the 2004-2005 school year? No

**2.10.2 Local Educational Agency Transferability of Funds**

**2.10.2.1** Please indicate the total number of LEAs that notified the State that they were transferring funds under the LEA Transferability authority of section 6123(b) during the 2004-2005 school year. 15

**2.10.2.2** In the charts below, please indicate below the total number of LEAs that transferred funds TO and FROM each eligible program and the total amount of funds transferred TO and FROM each eligible program.

<b>Program</b>	<b>Total Number of LEAs transferring funds <u>TO</u> eligible program</b>	<b>Total amount of funds transferred <u>TO</u> eligible program</b>
Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (section 2121)	0	0
Educational Technology State Grants (section 2412(a)(2)(A))	2	119118
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (section 4112(b)(1))	0	0
State Grants for Innovative Programs (section 5112(a))	9	137967
Title I, Part A, Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs	8	168240

<b>Program</b>	<b>Total Number of LEAs transferring funds FROM eligible program</b>	<b>Total amount of funds transferred FROM eligible program</b>
Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (section 2121)	6	278504
Educational Technology State Grants (section 2412(a)(2)(A))	2	24472
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (section 4112(b)(1))	10	60534
State Grants for Innovative Programs (section 5112(a))	1	61816

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

**2.11 21ST CENTURY COMMUNITY LEARNING CENTERS(TITLE IV, PART B)**

Performance data needed for this program will be available from another source. The Department will implement a national evaluation and data reporting system to provide essential data needed to measure program performance. States will be notified and are requested to participate in these activities once they are implemented.