

# VIRGINIA

## CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART II

For reporting on  
**School Year 2003-2004**



**PART II DUE APRIL 15, 2005**

**I. Improving Basic Programs  
Operated by Local Educational Agencies (Title I, Part A)**

**A. Student Achievement and High-Poverty Schools**

1. Please provide the number of public schools with poverty rates of 40 percent 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 2003-2004 school year as compared to assessments administered in the 2002-2003 school year.

595

2. Please provide the number of public schools with poverty rates of 40 percent 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 2003-2004 school year as compared to assessments administered in the 2002-2003 school year.

423

**B. Title I, Part A, Schools by Type of Program**

For the 2003-2004 school year, please provide the following:

- |   |            |
|---|------------|
| 1. Total Number of Title I schools in the State                     | <u>830</u> |
| 2. Total Number of Title I Targeted Assistance Schools in the State | <u>512</u> |
| 3. Total Number of Title I Schoolwide Program Schools in the State  | <u>318</u> |

**C. Title I, Part A, Student Participation****1. 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 2003-2004 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.

<b>Student Participation in Title I, Part A, by Special Services or Programs 2003-2004 School Year</b>	
	Number of Students Served
Students with Disabilities	28,675
Limited English Proficient	13,651
Homeless	1,391
Migrant	420

<b>Student Participation in Title I, Part A, by Racial or Ethnic Group 2003-2004 School Year</b>	
	Number of Students Served
American Indian or Alaskan Native	360
Asian	4,728
Black or African American	92,520
Hispanic or Latino	15,540
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	40
White	64,775

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. 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, Part A, public targeted assistance programs (TAS), Title I, Part A, schoolwide programs (SWP), private school students participating in Title I, Part A, programs, and students served in Title I, Part A, local neglected programs during the 2003-2004 school year.

<b>Student Participation in Title I, Part A, by Grade Level 2003-2004 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	0		0	0	0.00%
<b>Age 3-5</b>	124	6,440		0	6,564	3.63%
<b>K</b>	4,224	21,104		1	25,329	13.99%
<b>1</b>	7,393	19,903		3	27,299	15.08%
<b>2</b>	6,501	19,358		1	25,860	14.29%
<b>3</b>	5,876	19,427		1	25,304	13.98%
<b>4</b>	4,709	19,551		2	24,262	13.40%
<b>5</b>	3,992	18,926		5	22,923	12.66%
<b>6</b>	659	6,533		6	7,198	3.98%
<b>7</b>	473	4,914		6	5,393	2.98%
<b>8</b>	472	4,231		71	4,774	2.64%
<b>9</b>	0	2,229		318	2,547	1.41%
<b>10</b>	0	1,320		220	1,540	0.85%
<b>11</b>	0	928		109	1,037	0.57%
<b>12</b>	0	920		61	981	0.54%
<b>Ungraded</b>	0	0		0	0	0.00%
<b>TOTALS</b>	34,423	145,784	*0	804	181,011	100.00%

\*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 location. Private schools interested in receiving direct services with Title I funds are required to contact the bypass contractor by Virginia law.

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

In the following chart, please provide the number of students receiving instructional and support services funded by Title I, Part A, in targeted assistance (TAS) programs during the 2003-2004 school year.

<b>Student Participation in Title I, Part A, Targeted Assistance (TAS) Programs by Instructional and Support Services 2003-2004 School Year</b>	
<b>Instructional Services</b>	
	Number of Students Served
Mathematics	9,897
Reading/Language Arts	29,959
Science	0
Social Studies	0
Vocational/Career	0
Other (specify)	0
<b>Support Services</b>	
Health, Dental, and Eye Care	5
Supporting Guidance/Advocacy	75
Other (specify)	0

### C. Staff Information for Title I, Part A, Targeted Assistance Programs

In the following chart, please provide the number of full-time equivalent (FTE) staff funded through Title I, Part A, targeted assistance (TAS) programs during the 2003-2004 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.

<b>Staff Information for Title I, Part A, Targeted Assistance Programs 2003-2004 School Year</b>	
	Number of Title I, Part A, Targeted Assistance Program FTE Staff
Administrators (non-clerical)	42.49
Teachers	1687.45
Teacher Aides	532*
Support Staff (clerical and non-clerical)	55.98
Other (specify)	25.91 Parent Involvement Coordinators 2.78 Reading Specialists 2.50 Extended Day Tutors 2.0 Pre-K Coordinators 1.25 Home School Coordinators 3.69 Unspecified

\*Teacher aides data (532) is a head count of TAS teacher aides; FTE is not available.

**II. William F. Goodling Even Start Family Literacy Programs  
(Title I, Part B, Subpart 3)**

**A. Subgrants and Even Start Program Participants**

For the 2003-2004 school year, please provide the following information:

**1. Federally Funded Even Start Subgrants in the State**

a. Number of federally funded Even Start subgrants in the State

18

**2. Even Start Families Participating**

**(Participating means families participating in all applicable core services.)**

a. Total number of families served

481

b. Total number of adults participating

(The total number of adults includes teen parents.)

523

c. Total number of adults who are English language learners

141

d. Total number of children participating

691

**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.)

a. Number of newly enrolled families

325

b. Number of newly enrolled adult participants

366

- c. Percent of newly enrolled families at or below the Federal Poverty level

85%

- d. Percent of newly enrolled adult participants without a high school diploma or General Education Development (GED) certificate

92%

- e. Percent of newly enrolled adult participants who have not gone beyond the 9th grade

57%

**4. Percent of families that have remained in the program**

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

- a. From 0 to 3 months

29%

- b. From 4 to 6 months

21%

- c. From 7 to 12 months

25%

- d. More than 12 months

25%

**B. State Even Start Performance Indicators**

Using the format of the table below, describe the State's progress in meeting its performance indicators developed under section 1240 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). Include all State indicators, as developed under section 1240, including both required and optional indicators. Provide any targets set, measures used and results for each indicator, as well as an assessment and explanation of progress. For targets with no set targets or standards, provide a descriptive assessment of progress. For indicators with more than one year of available data, please note the data in the results column and include trend information in the assessment of progress. Please indicate where data are not yet available.

<b>Indicator</b> <i>Name of required or optional indicator</i>	<b>Target or Standards</b> <i>Description of target or standard set by State of desired performance on indicator</i>	<b>Measure</b> <i>Measurement tool used to assess progress for indicator</i>	<b>Result</b> <i>Data for the current reporting year and trend data where available</i>	<b>Assessment of Progress</b> <i>Status of progress on indicator</i> (1) Target met (2) Target not met	<b>Explanation of Progress</b> <i>Description of why results were obtained</i>
<b>Virginia Indicators of Program Quality – Program Design &amp; Implementation Indicators</b>					
<b>Goal 1: Program staff will provide high quality, well-integrated services designed to meet the needs of participating families.</b>					
1.1: Programs will provide the four components of service in a well-integrated, intensive manner of substantial duration, which facilitates sustainable changes in families.	One hundred percent of the programs will provide adult education, early childhood education, parent education, parent-child interactive literacy activities, and conduct home-based education/home visits.	Program records (schedule and hours of services provided) and local evaluation reports	18 participants out of 18 participants = 100%	Target met	

<b>Indicator</b> <i>Name of required or optional indicator</i>	<b>Target or Standards</b> <i>Description of target or standard set by State of desired performance on indicator</i>	<b>Measure</b> <i>Measurement tool used to assess progress for indicator</i>	<b>Result</b> <i>Data for the current reporting year and trend data where available</i>	<b>Assessment of Progress</b> <i>Status of progress on indicator</i> (1) Target met (2) Target not met	<b>Explanation of Progress</b> <i>Description of why results were obtained</i>
1.2: Programs will offer year round services.	One hundred percent of the programs will provide year-round services.	Program records (schedule and hours of services provided) and local evaluation reports	16 participants out of 18 participants = 88%	Target not met by two programs	One program lost space and was forced to close May 2004. One program lacked funding to provide a full summer program.
1.3: Programs will collaborate with public schools and other educational and community programs.	One hundred percent of the programs will collaborate with public schools and other educational and community programs.	Program records and partnership agreements	18 participants out of 18 participants = 100%	Target met	
<b>Virginia Indicators of Program Quality – Performance Indicators</b>					
<b>Adult Education</b>					
<b>Goal 2: The literacy of adults will improve.</b>					
2.1: Adults/parents will achieve education goals as indicated during intake.	After 120 hours of participation, 50 percent of native speakers with basic literacy and numeracy skills will make progress on standardized tests.	Tests of Adult Basic Education (TABE) Reading and Mathematics	84 participants out of 152 participants = 55%	Target met	

<b>Indicator</b> <i>Name of required or optional indicator</i>	<b>Target or Standards</b> <i>Description of target or standard set by State of desired performance on indicator</i>	<b>Measure</b> <i>Measurement tool used to assess progress for indicator</i>	<b>Result</b> <i>Data for the current reporting year and trend data where available</i>	<b>Assessment of Progress</b> <i>Status of progress on indicator</i> (1) Target met (2) Target not met	<b>Explanation of Progress</b> <i>Description of why results were obtained</i>
	After 120 hours of participation, 50 percent of non-native speakers who need to improve English proficiency and literacy skills will make progress on standardized tests.	Basic English Skills Test (BEST) or BEST Plus	79 participants out of 141 participants = 56%	Target met	
	After 120 hours of participation, 50 percent of adults whose goal is to receive a high school credential will make progress toward that goal.	For parents enrolled in GED classes – passing GED subtests or obtaining GED certificate For teenage parents attending high school – passing grades in individual subjects, grade promotion, or obtaining diploma	54 participants out of 78 participants = 69%	Target met	Virginia’s indicator includes adults who obtained a GED certificate (33) and adults who passed one or more of the GED subtests (21).
<b>Goal 3: Families will become more self-sufficient.</b>					
3.1: Parents will achieve self-sufficiency goals as indicated in the goals information section of the intake form.	After 300 hours of participation, 100 percent of parents will achieve one or more self-sufficiency goals chosen during intake.	Self-assessment; program forms with checklist of life and educational goals (e.g., obtain job, obtain citizenship, vote)	147 participants out of 147 participants = 100%  (unemployed adults who obtained jobs)	Target met	Cohort number reflects only those adults who were looking for jobs, since that goal was tracked from intake to attainment by programs.

<b>Indicator</b> <i>Name of required or optional indicator</i>	<b>Target or Standards</b> <i>Description of target or standard set by State of desired performance on indicator</i>	<b>Measure</b> <i>Measurement tool used to assess progress for indicator</i>	<b>Result</b> <i>Data for the current reporting year and trend data where available</i>	<b>Assessment of Progress</b> <i>Status of progress on indicator</i> (1) Target met (2) Target not met	<b>Explanation of Progress</b> <i>Description of why results were obtained</i>
<b>Early Childhood Education</b>					
<b>Goal 4: Children will demonstrate success in school.</b>					
4.1: Children in primary grades will read on grade level or will demonstrate growth in literacy skills.	After 100 hours of participation, 80 percent of children age 5, if in kindergarten, through 8 <sup>th</sup> grade will read on grade level or improve reading skills.	Assessments used by local schools	121 participants out of 148 participants = 82%	Target met	All children who did not make progress were determined by their local school division to be eligible for special education services.
4.2: Preschool children will show progress in language development and reading readiness skills.	After 100 hours of participation, 75 percent of preschool children age 3 to 5, if not in kindergarten, will show progress in language and pre-reading skills.	Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT) III	177 participants out of 227 participants = 78%	Target met	
4.3: Children in primary grades will comply with compulsory attendance requirements.	After 100 hours of participation, 80 percent of children age 5, if in kindergarten, through 8 <sup>th</sup> grade will comply with compulsory attendance requirements.	School building attendance rates and student records	148 participants out of 148 participants = 100%	Target met	

<b>Indicator</b> <i>Name of required or optional indicator</i>	<b>Target or Standards</b> <i>Description of target or standard set by State of desired performance on indicator</i>	<b>Measure</b> <i>Measurement tool used to assess progress for indicator</i>	<b>Result</b> <i>Data for the current reporting year and trend data where available</i>	<b>Assessment of Progress</b> <i>Status of progress on indicator</i> (1) Target met (2) Target not met	<b>Explanation of Progress</b> <i>Description of why results were obtained</i>
4.4: Children in primary grades will be promoted to the next grade level.	After 100 hours of participation, 80 percent of children age 5, if in kindergarten through 8 <sup>th</sup> grade will be promoted to the next grade level.	School student records	119 participants out of 142 participants = 80%	Target met	All children who were not promoted were determined by their local school division to be eligible for special education services.
<b>Parent Education and Parent-Child Interactive Literacy Activities</b>					
<b>Goal 5: Parents will foster their children’s literacy development and success in school.</b>					
5.1: Parents will achieve goals related to supporting their children’s language and literacy development and success in school.	After 100 hours of participation, 100 percent of parents will achieve at least two goals in one or more of the following areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Creating a literacy-rich home environment;</li> <li>• Engaging in literacy-related and supportive family activities; or</li> <li>• Participating in and supporting school-related activities.</li> </ul>	Self-assessment and program forms used during Parent and Child Together/Integrated Literacy Activities (PACT/ILA); parenting education; and home visits	375 participants out of 375 participants = 100%	Target met	All parents who participated in the program 100 hours or more demonstrated improvements in these areas.

**C. 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>Target</b> <i>Baseline data will be set with the 2002-2003 data</i>	<b>Measure</b> <i>Measurement tool used to assess progress for indicator</i>	<b>Cohort</b> Number of participants to whom the indicator applies	<b>Result</b> <i>Number of participants who met the achievement goal</i>	<b>Assessment of Progress</b> <i>Status of progress on indicator: "Target met" or "Target not met"</i>	<b>Explanation of Progress</b> <i>Description of why results were obtained or not</i>
A. Percentage of adults showing significant learning gains on measures of reading	No target set by USED	Test of Adult Basic Education (TABE): All programs use TABE	152 participants	*TABE Reading: 79 participants (52%)	Cannot be determined; no target set by USED	
B. Percentage of adults showing significant learning gains on measures of mathematics	No target set by USED	TABE	152 participants	*TABE Math: 75 participants (49%)	Cannot be determined; no target set by USED	
C. Percentage of Limited English Proficient (LEP) adults showing significant learning gains on measures of English language acquisition	No target set by USED	Basic English Skills Test (BEST) or BEST Plus	141 participants	*79 participants (56%)	Cannot be determined; no target set by USED	

\*Although USED has not set federal performance targets, these figures reflect achievement of state performance targets.

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Target</b> <i>Baseline data will be set with the 2002-2003 data</i>	<b>Measure</b> <i>Measurement tool used to assess progress for indicator</i>	<b>Cohort</b> Number of participants to whom the indicator applies	<b>Result</b> <i>Number of participants who met the achievement goal</i>	<b>Assessment of Progress</b> <i>Status of progress on indicator: "Target met" or "Target not met"</i>	<b>Explanation of Progress</b> <i>Description of why results were obtained or not</i>
D. Percentage of school age adults who earn a high school diploma or GED certificate	No target set by USED	Received Diploma or GED certificate	0	0	Cannot be determined; no target set by USED	Not applicable; no participants in cohort
E. Percentage of non-school age adults who earn a high school diploma or GED certificate	No target set by USED	Received GED certificate	78 participants	*33 participants (42%)	Cannot be determined; no target set by USED	
F. Percentage of children entering kindergarten who are achieving significant learning gains on measures of language development	No target set by USED	Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT) receptive	177 participants	*227 participants (78%)	Cannot be determined; no target set by USED	Virginia programs use PPVT receptive, but not Expressive Vocabulary Test (EVT).
G. Percentage of children entering kindergarten who are achieving significant learning gains on measures of reading readiness	No target set by USED	Individual Growth Development Indicator (IGDI)  Head Start Family and Child Experiences Survey (FACES) Letter Naming Task	Individual Growth Development Indicator (IGDI)  Head Start FACES Letter Naming Task	Individual Growth Development Indicator (IGDI)  Head Start FACES Letter Naming Task	NA	Virginia does not use the IGDI.  Virginia does not have Even Start children served by Head Start. Therefore, Head Start FACES is not applicable.

\*Although USED has not set federal performance targets, these figures reflect achievement of state performance targets.

Indicator	Target <i>Baseline data will be set with the 2002-2003 data</i>	Measure <i>Measurement tool used to assess progress for indicator</i>	Cohort <i>Number of participants to whom the indicator applies</i>	Result <i>Number of participants who met the achievement goal</i>	Assessment of Progress <i>Status of progress on indicator: "Target met" or "Target not met"</i>	Explanation of Progress <i>Description of why results were obtained or not</i>
H. Percentage of school-aged children who are reading on grade level	No target set by USED	Information provided by the schools	148 participants	*121participants(82%)	Cannot be determined; no target set by USED	
I. 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	No target set by USED	Parent Education Profile (PEP)	Parent Education Profile (PEP)	Parent Education Profile (PEP)	Cannot be determined; no target set by USED	Virginia does not use the PEP.  Programs are encouraged to use multiple sources of information, including staff observation, to determine parent's progress. Virginia recently developed the Parent and Child Together/Integrated Learning Activities (PACT/ILA) Family Record Progress Form. Data will be available next year.

\*Although USED has not set federal performance targets, these figures reflect achievement of state performance targets.

**III. 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 2003-2004.
2. Instructions for each table are provided just before the table.

**INSTRUCTIONS: TABLE I. POPULATION DATA**

Table I 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 2003-2004 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.

<b>TABLE I. POPULATION DATA</b>	Age 0-2	Age 3-5	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Un-grad-ed	Out-of-school	Total
<b>A. ELIGIBLE MIGRANT CHILDREN</b>																		
1. All Migrant Children Eligible for the MEP	103	395	133	136	172	152	105	126	125	89	108	83	54	30	21	0	630	2462
<b>B. PRIORITY FOR SERVICES</b>																		
1. All Migrant Children Eligible for MEP classified as having "Priority for Services"			3	25	32	39	22	27	27	12	23	25	11	8	2	85		341

<b>TABLE I. POPULATION DATA</b>		Age 0-2	Age 3-5	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Un- grad -ed	Out- of- school	Total
<b>C. LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT (LEP)</b>																			
1.	Migrant Children that are LEP		17	146	203	171	157	137	136	104	114	118	113	93	67	45	0	0	1621
<b>D. CHILDREN ENROLLED IN SPECIAL EDUCATION</b>																			
1.	Migrant Children Enrolled in Special Education	*	1	7	16	15	8	12	7	6	10	10	6	3	6	5	0	0	112
<b>E. MOBILITY</b>																			
1.	Migrant Children with a Last Qualifying Move within 12 Months (Counting back from the Last Day of the Reporting Period)	58	95	68	89	72	69	60	42	50	35	33	39	19	15	6	2	322	1074
2.	Migrant Children with a Last Qualifying Move within Previous 13 – 24 Months (Counting back from the Last Day of the Reporting Period)	59	109	66	71	80	60	58	58	41	41	28	28	17	7	3	1	336	1063
3.	Migrant Children with a Last Qualifying Move within Previous 25 – 36 Months (Counting back from the Last Day of the Reporting Period)	90	84	77	106	90	54	65	62	44	45	45	33	28	15	11	3	362	1214
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)	88	109	111	88	79	79	74	83	50	40	42	27	27	17	12	4	426	1356

\*Virginia does not collect these data.

**INSTRUCTIONS: TABLE II. ACADEMIC STATUS**

Table II 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 2003-2004 reporting period in only the higher age/grade cell. In all cases, the Total is the sum of the cells in a row.

<b>TABLE II. ACADEMIC STATUS</b>		Age 0-2	Age 3-5	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Un-grad-ed	Out-of-school	Total
<b>F. 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.	Dropped out of school										2	1	6	4	7	4	0		24
2.	Obtained GED																		1
<b>G. 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.)																			
1.	Number of Migrant Students Enrolled During State Testing Window (State Assessment – Reading/Language Arts)						72	*	49	*	*	49		*	39	*	*		209
2.	Number of Migrant Students Tested in Reading/Language Arts (State Assessment)						58	*	36	*	*	49		*	21	*	*		164
3.	Number of Migrant Students Enrolled During State Testing Window (State Assessment – Mathematics)						71	*	46	*	*	52		*	62	*	*		231
4.	Number of Migrant Students Tested in Mathematics (State Assessment)						60	*	37	*	*	51		*	55	*	*		203

\*Virginia does not currently administer Standards of Learning Tests at grades 4, 6, 7, 10, 12, and for ungraded students.

**INSTRUCTION: TABLE III. H. MEP PARTICIPATION – REGULAR SCHOOL YEAR**

Table III H. 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 2003-2004 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).

<b>TABLE III. MEP PARTICIPATION</b>																	Age 0-2	Age 3-5	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Un- grad- ed	Out- of- school	Total
<b>H. 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)	105	183	401	187	277	264	194	212	171	178	190	156	114	89	73	3	669	3466																
2. Priority for Service			56	27	31	20	15	26	16	11	18	12	19	4	2	0		257																
3. Continuation of Service		52	11	22	25	29	25	21	10	16	17	14	12	21	15	0	0	290																
4. Any Instructional Service	0	183	401	187	277	264	194	212	171	178	190	156	114	89	73	3	60	2752																
5. Reading Instruction	0	52	91	90	91	81	58	58	45	30	48	27	18	16	8	0	0	713																
6. Mathematics Instruction	0	48	87	81	81	81	58	60	46	31	51	26	20	18	8	0	0	696																
7. High School Credit Accrual												156	114	89	12	0	0	371																
8. Any Support Service	67	67	66	60	48	62	46	44	47	36	48	36	20	19	10	1	262	939																
9. Counseling Service	0	38	57	52	51	48	34	42	45	29	45	31	15	25	9	0	16	537																
10. Any Referred Service	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*																

\*Virginia does not collect these data.

**INSTRUCTIONS: TABLE III. I. MEP PARTICIPATION –SUMMER/INTERSESSION TERM**

Table III I. 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).

<b>TABLE III. MEP PARTICIPATION</b>		Age 0-2	Age 3-5	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Un- grad- ed	Out- of- school	Total
<b>I. PARTICIPATION—SUMMER TERM OR INTERSESSION</b>																			
1.	Served in MEP Summer or Intersession Project (with an Instructional or Supportive Service Only)	51	27	127	67	156	132	83	90	92	84	77	70	63	40	33	3	534	1973
2.	Priority for Service			1	10	24	22	10	16	16	10	3	9	1	0	0	201		323
3.	Continuation of Service		33	0	10	24	18	15	12	11	15	14	10	9	12	19	24	1	227
4.	Any Instructional Service	0	273	127	67	156	132	83	90	92	84	77	70	63	40	33	3	40	1430
5.	Reading Instruction	0	79	52	46	45	50	33	29	32	19	15	14	9	4	2	0	0	429
6.	Mathematics Instruction	0	74	50	44	48	49	31	28	32	19	16	11	8	2	0	0	0	412
7.	High School Credit Accrual												70	63	40	33	3	0	206
8.	Any Support Service	0	273	127	67	156	132	83	90	92	84	77	70	63	40	33	3	534	1924
9.	Counseling Service	0	33	24	15	13	21	14	10	19	9	8	6	3	2	6	0	5	188
10.	Any Referred Service	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*

\*Virginia does not collect these data.

**INSTRUCTIONS: TABLE IV. SCHOOL DATA**

Table IV 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 IV, 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>TABLE IV. SCHOOL DATA</b>		
<b>J. STUDENT ENROLLMENT</b>	NUMBER OF SCHOOLS	NUMBER OF MIGRANT CHILDREN ENROLLED
1. Schools Enrolling Migrant Children	a. 181	b. 1526
2. Schools in Which MEP Funds are Combined in SWP	a. 0	b. 0

**INSTRUCTIONS: TABLE V. K. MEP PROJECT DATA – 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>TABLE V. MEP PROJECT DATA</b>		
<b>K. TYPE OF MEP PROJECT</b>	<b>NUMBER OF MEP PROJECTS</b>	<b>NUMBER OF MIGRANT CHILDREN ENROLLED</b>
1. MEP Projects: Regular School Year (All MEP Services Provided During the School Day Only)	a. 3	b. 193
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. 1288

**INSTRUCTIONS: TABLE V. L. MEP PROJECT DATA – 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.

TABLE V. MEP PROJECT DATA				
L. KEY MEP PERSONNEL	NUMBER OF MEP FUNDED STAFF IN REGULAR SCHOOL YEAR	FTE IN REGULAR SCHOOL YEAR 1 FTE = <u>180</u> Days	NUMBER OF MEP FUNDED STAFF IN SUMMER-TERM/ INTERSESSION	FTE IN SUMMER-TERM/ INTERSESSION 1 FTE = <u>60</u> Days
1. State Director	a. 0	b. 0	c. 0	d. 0
2. Teachers	a. 11	b. 7.64	c. 38	d. 27.9
3. Counselors	a. 0	b. 0	c. 1	d. .34
4. All Paraprofessionals	a. 4	b. 4	c. 19	d. 13
5. "Qualified" Paraprofessionals	a. 2	b. .1	c. 19	d. 14.1
6. Recruiters	a. 2	b. 0	c. 6.5	d. 3.5
7. Records Transfer Staff	a. 0	b. 0	c. .25	d. .81

**IV. Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth  
Who Are Neglected, Delinquent or At-Risk (Title I, Part D)**

**A. Student Participation in Title I, Part D, by Racial/Ethnic Groups and Gender**

In the following table, please provide the unduplicated number of children participating in Title I, Part D, by racial/ethnic groups and gender during the 2003-2004 school year.

<b>Student Participation in Title I, Part D, by Racial or Ethnic Group 2003-2004 School Year</b>	
	Number of Students
American Indian/Alaskan Native	0
Asian/Pacific Islander	9
Black, non-Hispanic	805
Hispanic	29
White, non-Hispanic	450

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.

<b>Student Participation in Title I, Part D, by Gender 2003-2004 School Year</b>	
	Number of Students
Male	1,081
Female	217

**B. Program Results**

The first year for which States are asked to submit data on program results is the 2004-2005 school year. These data will be available for the first time for the 2004-2005 school year and will be requested for the next Consolidated State Performance Report that will cover the results of school year 2004-2005 activities.

Note: Racial/ethnic total does not equal male/female total as the racial/ethnic category was not specified on some student answer documents.

**V. Comprehensive School Reform  
(Title I, Part F)**

- A. 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 2003-2004 school year.

72%

- B. 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 2003-2004 school year.

84%

- C. How many schools in the State have or have been awarded a CSR grant since 1998?

159

**VI. Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Teacher and Principal and Recruiting Fund) (Title II, Part A)**

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.

**VII. Enhancing Education through Technology  
(Title II, Part D)**

**Funding Year: FY 2002**  
**School Years: 2002 – 2003 AND 2003 – 2004**

<b>FY 2002 Program Information</b>	
State (Approved) Technology Plan (YES/NO)	_____ <u>Yes</u> _____
Year last updated:	_____ <u>2004</u> _____
Date of State Approval:	_____ <u>May 2003</u> _____
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 Enhanced Education Through Technology (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. To 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 you define the following:

1. **Curriculum Integration:** The use of specific technologies that support state Standards of Learning (SOL) and curriculum content as highly effective tools in facilitating learning across all levels of cognitive inquiry and development.
  
2. **Technology Literacy:** The possession of technology skills that support learning, personal productivity, decision-making, and daily life.

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><b>Goal 1</b> - Ensure that all public schools have access to integrated instructional and administrative services across interoperable high-speed networks.  <b>Goal 2</b> - Ensure sufficient support for ongoing, reliable network operations.  <b>Goal 3</b> - Provide leadership and resources to promote efficient procurement of infrastructure including the identification and procurement of emerging technologies.  <b>Goal 4</b> - Ensure that school divisions have in place network security, filtering, and disaster recovery plans.            (Virginia’s Consolidated State Application, May 2002, pages 71-72)</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>See Goals 1, 2, and 3 above.</p>
<p><b>Program Objective</b> (Indicate page number and item label as designated in the State Consolidated Application or restate goal)</p>	<p><b>Performance Objective 1:</b> Every instructional and administrative area in each school has a sufficient number of network connections to support the high bandwidth requirements of current and future instructional and administrative applications.  <b>Performance Objective 2:</b> Adequate support personnel are in place to operate and support K-12 school technology infrastructure.  <b>Performance Objective 3:</b> K-12 school technology procurement process is efficient and cost effective.  <b>Performance Objective 4:</b> Policies, procedures, and technologies are in place to ensure the security and recoverability of K-12 computing resources.            (Virginia’s Consolidated State Application, May 2002, pages 71-72)</p>
<p><b>Indicator</b> (Indicate page number and item label as designated in the State Consolidated Application or restate indicator)</p>	<p><b>Performance Indicator 1:</b> The percentage of schools reporting that every instructional and administrative area has sufficient connections to a local area network (LAN) with adequate bandwidth to support current and future instructional and administrative applications.            (Relates to Targets 1 and 3 for Goal 1)  <b>Performance Indicator 2:</b> The percentage of school divisions reporting they have an adequate number of support personnel (using recommended "business models" for support personnel) to efficiently operate and maintain their technology infrastructure.            (Relates to Targets 1 and 2 for Goal 2)  <b>Performance Indicator 3:</b> The number of resources (i.e., templates and guidelines) that schools may use in the technology procurement process that have been identified or developed and publicized.            (Relates to Target 1 for Goal 3)</p>

Goals, Objectives, Targets	Narrative
	<p><b>Performance Indicator 4:</b> The percent of school divisions reporting they have developed and implemented security policies for their school networks.                      (Relates to Targets 1-3 for Goal 4)                      (Virginia’s Consolidated State Application, May 2002, pages 71-72)</p>
<p><b>Target</b>  <i>Indicate status of data in 2002-2003 school year (SY)</i>  <b>BASELINE DATA</b></p>	<p><b>Targets For Goal 1</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Every instructional and administrative area in every school has a sufficient number of network connections to support the high bandwidth requirements of current and future instructional and administrative applications.                      (Relates to Performance Indicator 1)                      Status of data in 2002-2003 SY: Sixty-six (66) percent of high schools reported that every instructional and administrative area has sufficient connections to a local area network (LAN) with adequate bandwidth to support current and future instructional and administrative applications (Electronic SOL [eSOL] data). In 2002-2003 the Web-based Standards of Learning Technology Initiative was focused on high schools. We collected data to support that effort.</li> <li>• Each school division connects all school facilities through a wide area network with sufficient bandwidth to accommodate instructional and administrative needs.                      (Relates to Performance Indicator 1)                      Status of data in 2002-2003 SY: Zero (0) percent of school divisions connect all school facilities through a wide area network with sufficient bandwidth to accommodate instructional and administrative needs.</li> <li>• Each school division local area network has reliable high-speed access to the Internet capable of supporting instructional and administrative applications and initiatives.                      (Relates to Performance Indicator 1)                      Status of data in 2002-2003 SY: Sixty-six (66) percent of high schools reported that every instructional and administrative area has sufficient connections to a local area network (LAN) with adequate bandwidth to support current and future instructional and administrative applications (eSOL data). In 2002-2003 the Web-based Standards of Learning Technology Initiative was focused on high schools. We collected data to support that effort.</li> <li>• An integrated suite of instructional and administrative applications supported by standards-based enterprise architecture for K-12 schools is in place.                      (Relates to Performance Indicator 1)                      Status of data in 2002-2003 SY: Zero (0) percent of schools have an integrated suite of instructional and administrative applications supported by standards-based enterprise architecture for K-12 schools in place.</li> </ul>

Goals, Objectives, Targets	Narrative
	<p><b>Targets For Goal 2</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adequate support personnel are in place to operate and support K-12 school technology infrastructure. (Relates to Performance Indicator 2) Status of data in 2002-2003 SY: Sixty-six (66) percent of high schools reported they have an adequate number of support personnel (using recommended "business models" for support personnel) to efficiently operate and maintain their technology infrastructure (eSOL data). In 2002-2003 the Web-based Standards of Learning Technology Initiative was focused on high schools. We collected data to support that effort.</li> <li>• Support personnel for K-12 school infrastructure have appropriate technical skills. (Relates to Performance Indicator 2) Status of data in 2002-2003 SY: Sixty-six (66) percent of high schools reported they have an adequate number of support personnel (using recommended "business models" for support personnel) to efficiently operate and maintain their technology infrastructure (eSOL data). In 2002-2003 the Web-based Standards of Learning Technology Initiative was focused on high schools. We collected data to support that effort.</li> <li>• School systems have customer support systems in place to address technical problems in a timely and efficient manner. (Relates to Performance Indicator 2) Status of data in 2002-2003 SY: Zero (0) percent of school systems have customer support systems in place to address technical problems in a timely and efficient manner.</li> <li>• School divisions plan for the Total Cost of Ownership (TCO) associated with K-12 technology. (Relates to Performance Indicator 2) Status of data in 2002-2003 SY: Zero (0) percent of school divisions plan for the TCO associated with K-12 technology.</li> </ul> <p><b>Targets For Goal 3</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• School technology procurement process for K-12 is efficient and cost effective. (Relates to Performance Indicator 3) Status of data in 2002-2003 SY: One hundred (100) percent of K-12 schools have access to resources as part of the technology procurement process.</li> <li>• School divisions are regularly informed about emerging technologies for instruction and administration.</li> </ul>

Goals, Objectives, Targets	Narrative
	<p>(Relates to Performance Indicator 3)            Status of data in 2002-2003 SY: Zero (0) percent of school divisions are regularly informed about emerging technologies for instruction and administration. All zero (0) percents are to be used for baseline data. Efforts do exist, but we do not have data to support any percentage. New instruments will collect this data.</p> <p><b>Targets For Goal 4</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policies, procedures, and technologies are in place to ensure that computing resources are secure and recoverable. (Relates to Performance Indicator 4).                Status of data in 2002-2003 SY: Sixty-six (66) percent of schools reported they have developed and implemented security policies for their school networks (eSOL data).</li> <li>• School divisions maintain an up-to-date Acceptable Use Policy (AUP) and effectively use network-filtering solutions. (Relates to Performance Indicator 4)                Status of data in 2002-2003 SY: Sixty-six (66) percent of schools reported they have developed and implemented security policies for their school networks (eSOL data).</li> <li>• School divisions have appropriate and effective network and data security policies and systems. (Relates to Performance Indicator 4)                Status of data in 2002-2003 SY: Sixty-six (66) percent of schools reported they have developed and implemented security policies for their school networks (eSOL data).</li> </ul>
<p><b>Target</b>  <i>Indicate status of data in 2003-2004 school year</i></p>	<p><b>Targets For Goal 1</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Every instructional and administrative area in every school division has a sufficient number of network connections to support the high bandwidth requirements of current and future instructional and administrative applications. (Relates to Performance Indicator 1)                Status of data in 2003-2004 SY: One hundred (100) percent of high schools reported that every instructional and administrative area has sufficient connections to a local area network (LAN) with adequate bandwidth to support current and future instructional and administrative applications (eSOL data). In 2002-2003 the Web-based Standards of Learning Technology Initiative was focused on high schools. We collected data to support that effort.</li> <li>• Each school division local area network has reliable high-speed access to the Internet capable of supporting instructional and administrative applications and initiatives. (Relates to Performance Indicator 1)                Status of data in 2003-2004 SY: One hundred (100) percent of high schools reported that every instructional and administrative area has sufficient connections to a local area network (LAN)</li> </ul>

Goals, Objectives, Targets	Narrative
	<p>with adequate bandwidth to support current and future instructional and administrative applications (eSOL data). In 2002-2003 the Web-based Standards of Learning Technology Initiative was focused on high schools. We collected data to support that effort.</p> <p><b>Targets For Goal 2</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adequate support personnel are in place to operate and support K-12 school division technology infrastructure. (Relates to Performance Indicator 2) Status of data in 2003-2004 SY: One hundred (100) percent of high schools reported they have an adequate number of support personnel (using recommended "business models" for support personnel) to efficiently operate and maintain their technology infrastructure (eSOL data). In 2002-2003 the Web-based Standards of Learning Technology Initiative was focused on high schools. We collected data to support that effort.</li> <li>• Support personnel for K-12 school division infrastructure have appropriate technical skills. (Relates to Performance Indicator 2) Status of data in 2003-2004 SY: One hundred (100) percent of high schools reported they have an adequate number of support personnel (using recommended "business models" for support personnel) to efficiently operate and maintain their technology infrastructure (eSOL data). In 2002-2003 the Web-based Standards of Learning Technology Initiative was focused on high schools. We collected data to support that effort.</li> </ul> <p><b>Target For Goal 3</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• School technology procurement process for K-12 is efficient and cost effective. (Relates to Performance Indicator 3) Status of data in 2003-2004 SY: Five basic resources that schools may use in the technology procurement process have been identified or developed and publicized on the VDOE website. They are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ School Division Procurement Guidelines,</li> <li>○ Handbook of Evaluation &amp; Selection of Software for Instructional Remediation (eSOL web page),</li> <li>○ Division Software Evaluations submitted (eSOL web page),</li> <li>○ Software Review Template (eSOL web page), and</li> <li>○ Virginia government contracts.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>Targets For Goal 4</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policies, procedures, and technologies are in place to ensure that computing resources are secure and recoverable.</li> </ul>

Goals, Objectives, Targets	Narrative
	<p>(Relates to Performance Indicator 4)                      Status of data in 2003-2004 SY: One hundred (100) percent of schools reported they have developed and implemented security policies for their school networks (eSOL data).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>School divisions maintain an up-to-date Acceptable Use Policy (AUP) and effectively use network-filtering solutions.</li> </ul> <p>(Relates to Performance Indicator 4)                      Status of data in 2003-2004 SY: One hundred (100) percent of school divisions reported they have developed and implemented security policies for their school networks (eSOL data).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>School divisions have appropriate and effective network and data security policies and systems.</li> </ul> <p>(Relates to Performance Indicator 4)                      Status of data in 2003-2004 SY: One hundred (100) percent of school divisions reported they have developed and implemented security policies for their school networks (eSOL data).</p>
<p><b>Target</b>  <i>Set target for 2004-2005 school year</i></p>	<p><b>Targets For Goal 1</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Every instructional and administrative area in every school has a sufficient number of network connections to support the high bandwidth requirements of current and future instructional and administrative applications.</li> <li>Each school division connects all school facilities through a wide area network with sufficient bandwidth to accommodate instructional and administrative needs.</li> <li>Each school local area network has reliable high-speed access to the Internet, capable of supporting instructional and administrative applications and initiatives.</li> <li>An integrated suite of instructional and administrative applications supported by standards-based enterprise architecture for K-12 schools is in place.</li> </ul> <p><b>Targets For Goal 2</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adequate support personnel are in place to operate and support K-12 school technology infrastructure.</li> <li>Support personnel for K-12 school infrastructure have appropriate technical skills.</li> <li>School systems have customer support systems in place to address technical problems in a timely and efficient manner.</li> <li>School divisions plan for the Total Cost of Ownership (TCO) associated with K-12 technology.</li> </ul> <p><b>Targets For Goal 3</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>School technology procurement process for K-12 is efficient and cost effective.</li> <li>School divisions are regularly informed about emerging technologies for instruction and administration.</li> </ul>

Goals, Objectives, Targets	Narrative
	<p><b>Targets For Goal 4</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policies, procedures, and technologies are in place to ensure that computing resources are secure and recoverable.</li> <li>• School divisions maintain an up-to-date Acceptable Use Policy (AUP) and effectively use network-filtering solutions.</li> <li>• School divisions have appropriate and effective network and data security policies and systems.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Target</b> <i>Set target for 2005-2006 school year</i></p>	<p><b>Targets For Goal 1</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Every instructional and administrative area in every school has a sufficient number of network connections to support the high bandwidth requirements of current and future instructional and administrative applications.</li> <li>• Each school division connects all school facilities through a wide area network with sufficient bandwidth to accommodate instructional and administrative needs.</li> <li>• Each school local area network has reliable high-speed access to the Internet, capable of supporting instructional and administrative applications and initiatives.</li> <li>• An integrated suite of instructional and administrative applications supported by standards-based enterprise architecture for K-12 schools is in place.</li> </ul> <p><b>Targets For Goal 2</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adequate support personnel are in place to operate and support K-12 school technology infrastructure.</li> <li>• Support personnel for K-12 school infrastructure have appropriate technical skills.</li> <li>• School systems have customer support systems in place to address technical problems in a timely and efficient manner.</li> <li>• School divisions plan for the Total Cost of Ownership (TCO) associated with K-12 technology.</li> </ul> <p><b>Targets For Goal 3</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• School technology procurement process for K-12 is efficient and cost effective.</li> <li>• School divisions are regularly informed about emerging technologies for instruction and administration.</li> </ul> <p><b>Targets For Goal 4</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policies, procedures, and technologies are in place to ensure that computing resources are secure and recoverable.</li> <li>• School divisions maintain an up-to-date Acceptable Use Policy (AUP) and effectively use network-filtering solutions.</li> <li>• School divisions have appropriate and effective network and data security policies and systems.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Target</b> <i>Set target for 2006-2007 school year</i></p>	<p>The target is not set because the grant does not include funding for the 2006-2007 school year.</p>

Goals, Objectives, Targets	Narrative
<p align="center"><b>Target</b></p> <p><i>Set target for 2007-2008 school year</i></p>	<p>The target is not set because the grant does not include funding for the 2007-2008 school year.</p>
<p><b>Assessment of Progress</b></p> <p><i>Status of progress on indicator</i></p> <p><i>(1) Target met</i></p> <p><i>(2) Target not met</i></p>	<p><b>Performance Indicator 1:</b> One hundred (100) percent of the targets related to this Performance Indicator were met.</p> <p><b>Performance Indicator 2:</b> One hundred (100) percent of the targets related to this Performance Indicator were met.</p> <p><b>Performance Indicator 3:</b> One hundred (100) percent of the targets related to this Performance Indicator were met.</p> <p><b>Performance Indicator 4:</b> One hundred (100) percent of the targets related to this Performance Indicator were met.</p>
<p><b>Measurement tool(s)</b></p> <p>used to assess progress of indicators</p>	<p>The Virginia State Technology Plan, which documents the performance indicators submitted in the Virginia Consolidated State Application, was the measurement tool.</p>
<p><b>Explanation for not making progress -</b></p> <p><i>Description of why target(s) was not met for 2003-2004 SY, and steps that will be taken to ensure progress</i></p>	<p>All targets set for 2003-2004 SY were met.</p>
<p><b>Program Goal</b></p>	<p><b>Goal 1</b> - Continue to develop and expand state operated and/or sponsored Web-based applications, services, and resources.</p> <p><b>Goal 2</b> - Improve teaching and learning through the appropriate use of networked educational applications.</p> <p><b>Goal 3</b> - Provide leadership in the utilization of up-to-date distance/distributed learning technologies and encourage utilization in schools and regional educational consortiums.</p> <p>(Virginia's Consolidated State Application, May 2002, pages 72-73)</p>
<p><b>Statutory Goal</b></p> <p><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</b></p>	<p>See Goals 1, 2, and 3 above.</p>
<p><b>Program Objective</b></p>	<p><b>Performance Objective 1:</b> All schools have a robust infrastructure capable of supporting Internet based applications for testing and instructional activities.</p> <p><b>Performance Objective 2:</b> Teaching and learning resources that effectively support the Virginia SOL have been identified, communicated, and implemented.</p> <p><b>Performance Objective 3:</b> Up-to-date distance/distributed learning technologies for delivery of student courses and staff development are</p>

Goals, Objectives, Targets	Narrative
	in common use by educational technology stakeholders. (Virginia's Consolidated State Application, May 2002, pages 72-73)
<p><b>Indicator</b> (Indicate page number and item label as designated in the State Consolidated Application or restate indicator)</p>	<p><b>Performance Indicator 1:</b> The percentage of schools where the network infrastructure is in place to support applications of the Virginia Web-based SOL Technology Initiative. (Relates to Targets 1, 2, and 4 for Goal 1)</p> <p><b>Performance Indicator 2:</b> The percentage of school-based performance evaluations that indicate teachers are significantly integrating technology-based resources to support the Virginia SOL. (Relates to Target 1 for Goal 2)</p> <p><b>Performance Indicator 3:</b> The variety of K-12 staff development activities delivered via satellite, Web-based digital content, public television, and two-way interactive video using state and/or educational technology stakeholder facilities. (Relates to Target 1 for Goal 3) (Virginia's Consolidated State Application, May 2002, pages 72-73)</p>
<p><b>Target</b> <i>Indicate status of data in 2002-2003 school year</i> <b>BASELINE DATA</b></p>	<p><b>Targets For Goal 1</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All schools are participating successfully in the Virginia Web-based SOL Technology Initiative. (Relates to Performance Indicator 1) Status of data in 2002-2003 SY: Sixty-six (66) percent of schools had network infrastructure in place to support applications of the Virginia Web-based SOL Technology Initiative (eSOL data).</li> <li>• School divisions use Web-based applications for state data collection, warehousing, and reporting. (Relates to Performance Indicator 1) Status of data in 2002-2003 SY: One hundred (100) percent of school divisions can use the agency's Web-based File Submission Process to add to agency data collections.</li> <li>• The use of a common set of data definitions allows for standardized communication and interpretation of student information. (Relates to Performance Indicator 1) Status of data in 2002-2003 SY: Zero (0) percent of schools use a common set of data definitions that allow standard communication and interpretation of student information.</li> <li>• Every school has an efficient automated library media center connected to the Internet and networked to appropriate learning areas. (Relates to Performance Indicator 1) Status of data in 2002-2003 SY: Sixty-six (66) of schools had network infrastructure in place to support applications of the Virginia Web-based SOL Technology Initiative (eSOL data).</li> <li>• School divisions have strategies for providing community access to school-based technology and applications.</li> </ul>

Goals, Objectives, Targets	Narrative
	<p>(Relates to Performance Indicator 1)                      Status of data in 2002-2003 SY: Zero (0) percent of school divisions have strategies for providing community access to school-based technology and applications.</p> <p><b>Target For Goal 2</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Teaching and learning resources that effectively support the Virginia SOL have been identified, communicated, and developed.</li> </ul> <p>(Relates to Performance Indicator 2)                      Status of data in 2002-2003 SY: Forty-one (41) percent of schools performance evaluations indicate that teachers are significantly integrating technology-based resources to support the Virginia SOL.</p> <p><b>Targets For Goal 3</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Web-based courses and staff development activities are provided.</li> </ul> <p>(Relates to Performance Indicator 3)                      Status of data in 2002-2003 SY: One hundred (100) percent of school divisions have access to staff development in Ed Tech Leaders Online to produce online course facilitators. Online courses were provided through various local school divisions. Online Course Management and digital imaging training were also provided. <li>Schools are able to receive digital television broadcast signals and effectively utilize the enhanced capabilities.</li> <p>(Relates to Performance Indicator 3)                      Status of data in 2002-2003 SY: Zero (0) percent of schools were able to receive digital television broadcast signals and effectively utilize the enhanced capabilities.</p> </p>
<p><b>Target</b>                      Indicate status of data in 2003-2004 school year</p>	<p><b>Targets For Goal 1</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All schools are participating successfully in the Virginia Web-based SOL Technology Initiative.</li> </ul> <p>(Relates to Performance Indicator 1)                      Status of data in 2003-2004 SY: One hundred (100) percent of schools had network infrastructure in place to support applications of the Virginia Web-based SOL Technology Initiative (eSOL data). <li>School divisions use Web-based applications for state data collection, warehousing, and reporting.</li> <p>(Relates to Performance Indicator 1)                      Status of data in 2003-2004 SY: One hundred (100) percent of school divisions were able to use the agency's Web-based File Submission Process to add to agency data collections.</p> </p>

Goals, Objectives, Targets	Narrative
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Every school has an efficient automated library media center connected to the Internet and networked to appropriate learning areas. (Relates to Performance Indicator 1) Status of data in 2003-2004 SY: One hundred (100) percent of schools had network infrastructure in place to support applications of the Virginia Web-based Standard of Learning Technology Initiative (eSOL data).</li> </ul> <p><b>Target For Goal 2</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teaching and learning resources that effectively support the Virginia SOL have been identified, communicated, and developed. (Relates to Performance Indicator 2) Status of data in 2003-2004 SY: Forty-one (41) percent of the schools' performance evaluations indicate that teachers were significantly integrating technology-based resources to support the Virginia SOL.</li> </ul> <p><b>Target For Goal 3</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Web-based courses and staff development activities are provided. (Relates to Performance Indicator 3) Status of data in 2003-2004 SY: One hundred (100) percent of school divisions have access to staff development in Ed Tech Leaders Online to produce online course facilitators. Online courses were provided through various local school divisions. Online Course Management and digital imaging training were also provided.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Target</b> <i>Set target for 2004-2005 school year</i></p>	<p><b>Targets For Goal 1</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All schools are participating successfully in the Virginia Web-based SOL Technology Initiative.</li> <li>• School divisions use Web-based applications for state data collection, warehousing, and reporting.</li> <li>• The use of a common set of data definitions allows for standardized communication and interpretation of student information.</li> <li>• Every school has an efficient automated library media center connected to the Internet and networked to appropriate learning areas.</li> <li>• School divisions have strategies for providing community access to school-based technology and applications.</li> </ul> <p><b>Target For Goal 2</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teaching and learning resources that effectively support the Virginia SOL have been identified, communicated, and developed.</li> </ul>

Goals, Objectives, Targets	Narrative
	<p><b>Targets For Goal 3</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Web-based courses and staff development activities are provided.</li> <li>• Schools are able to receive digital television broadcast signals and effectively utilize the enhanced capabilities.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Target</b>  <i>Set target for 2005-2006 school year</i></p>	<p><b>Targets For Goal 1</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All schools are participating successfully in the Virginia Web-based SOL Technology Initiative.</li> <li>• School divisions use Web-based applications for state data collection, warehousing, and reporting.</li> <li>• The use of a common set of data definitions allows for standardized communication and interpretation of student information.</li> <li>• Every school has an efficient automated library media center connected to the Internet and networked to appropriate learning areas.</li> <li>• School divisions have strategies for providing community access to school-based technology and applications.</li> </ul> <p><b>Target For Goal 2</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teaching and learning resources that effectively support the Virginia SOL have been identified, communicated, and developed.</li> </ul> <p><b>Targets For Goal 3</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Web-based courses and staff development activities are provided.</li> <li>• Schools are able to receive digital television broadcast signals and effectively utilize the enhanced capabilities.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Target</b>  <i>Set target for 2006-07 school year</i></p>	<p>The target is not set because the grant does not include funding for the 2006-2007 school year.</p>
<p><b>Target</b>  <i>Set target for 2007-08 school year</i></p>	<p>The target is not set because the grant does not include funding for the 2007-2008 school year.</p>
<p><b>Assessment of Progress</b>  <i>Status of progress on indicator</i>  <i>(1) Target met</i>  <i>(2) Target not met</i></p>	<p><b>Performance Indicator 1:</b> One hundred (100) percent of the targets related to this Performance Indicator were met.  <b>Performance Indicator 2:</b> One hundred (100) percent of the targets related to this Performance Indicator were met.  <b>Performance Indicator 3:</b> One hundred (100) percent of the targets related to this Performance Indicator were met.</p>
<p><b>Measurement tool(s)</b>  used to assess progress of indicators</p>	<p>The Virginia State Technology Plan, which documents the performance indicators submitted in the Virginia Consolidated State Application is the measurement tool.</p>

Goals, Objectives, Targets	Narrative
<p><b>Explanation for not making progress -</b>  <i>Description of why target(s) was not met for 2003-2004 SY, and steps that will be taken to ensure progress</i></p>	<p>All targets set for 2003-2004 SY were met.</p>
<p><b>Program Goal</b></p>	<p><b>Goal 1</b> - Establish partnerships in identifying and delivering effective technology training to assist teachers in helping students achieve high academic standards.  <b>Goal 2</b> - Provide coordination for grant programs and financial assistance initiatives that support educational technology implementation.  <b>Goal 3</b> - Assist school divisions to help teachers use technology to help students achieve high academic standards by the establishment and maintenance of site-based technology utilization support systems.  (Virginia's Consolidated State Application, May 2002, pages 73-74)</p>
<p><b>Statutory Goal</b>  <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</b></p>	<p>See Goal 3, above.</p>
<p><b>Program Objective</b></p>	<p><b>Performance Objective 1:</b> Teacher training programs reflect coursework and pre-service experiences that include the effective integration of technology in K-12 education.  <b>Performance Objective 2:</b> Grant programs and alternative sources of funding which support educational technology are coordinated and/or identified and publicized.  <b>Performance Objective 3:</b> Site-based technology utilization support systems are available to all schools.  (Virginia's Consolidated State Application, May 2002, pages 73-74)</p>
<p><b>Indicator</b></p>	<p><b>Performance Indicator 1:</b> Percentage of graduates of teacher education programs who meet the Virginia Technology Standards for Instructional Personnel.  (Relates to Targets 1-4 for Goal 1)  <b>Performance Indicator 2:</b> Number of school divisions that participate in grant programs and/or take advantage of alternative sources of funding.  (Relates to Target 1 for Goal 2)  <b>Performance Indicator 3:</b> Number of school divisions that have implemented site-based technology utilization support to all schools.  (Relates to Targets 1 and 2 for Goal 3)  (Virginia's Consolidated State Application, May 2002, pages 73-74)</p>

Goals, Objectives, Targets	Narrative
<p align="center"><b>Target</b></p> <p align="center"><i>Indicate status of data in 2002-03 school year</i></p> <p align="center"><b>BASELINE DATA</b></p>	<p><b>Targets For Goal 1</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Educator training programs reflect coursework and experiences that include effective approaches to integrating technology into K-12 education. (Relates to Performance Indicator 1) Status of data in 2002-2003 SY: One hundred (100) percent of graduates of teacher education programs met the Virginia Technology Standards for Instructional Personnel.</li> <li>• A variety of classes, training, and resources pertaining to integrating technology effectively are available for staff development. (Relates to Performance Indicator 1) Status of data in 2002-2003 SY: One hundred (100) percent of school divisions had access to staff development in Ed Tech Leaders Online to produce online course facilitators. Online courses were provided through various local school divisions. Online Course Management and digital imaging training were provided.</li> <li>• Technology-related staff development offered by various entities is provided in a wide variety of topics and delivery methods. (Relates to Performance Indicator 1) Status of data in 2002-2003 SY: One hundred (100) percent of school divisions had access to staff development in Ed Tech Leaders Online to produce online course facilitators. Online courses were provided through various local school divisions. Online Course Management and digital imaging training were also provided. Additional technology-related staff development offered by National Teacher Training Institute and public television stations around the state of Virginia on various topics either by online courses or in-person classes was provided.</li> <li>• Technology leadership activities are provided to K-12 educational technology stakeholders. (Relates to Performance Indicator 1) Status of data in 2002-2003 SY: More than 100 sessions for technology stakeholders were offered at the Virginia Department of Education’s Educational Technology Leadership Conference. Nine hundred (900) administrators received training through the Virginia Initiative for Technology and Administrative Leadership (VITAL) project. VITAL receives funding from the Virginia Department of Education.</li> </ul> <p><b>Targets For Goal 2</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grant programs and alternative sources of funding that support educational technology are administered. (Relates to Performance Indicator 2) Status of data in 2002-2003 SY: One hundred (100) percent of schools participated in grant programs and/or took advantage of alternative sources of funding.</li> </ul>

Goals, Objectives, Targets	Narrative
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teacher education institutions, businesses, organizations, and private entities become a partner in the implementation of technology-related grants focusing on technology integration. (Relates to Performance Indicator 2) Status of data in 2002-2003 SY: One hundred (100) percent of schools participated in grant programs and/or take advantage of alternative sources of funding.</li> </ul> <p><b>Targets For Goal 3</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site-based instructional technologists are available to all schools. (Relates to Performance Indicator 3) Status of data in 2002-2003 SY: Fifty (50) percent of schools had implemented site-based technology utilization support to all schools. Forty-nine and one-half percent of technology-related support offered to teachers was instructional support instead of technical support.</li> <li>• Staff development models and activities that are specifically designed for site-based instructional technologists are available for all K-12 schools. (Relates to Performance Indicator 3) Status of data in 2002-2003 SY: Fifty (50) percent of schools had implemented site-based technology utilization support to all schools.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Target</b> <i>Indicate status of data in 2003-2004 school year</i></p>	<p><b>Targets For Goal 1</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Educator training programs reflect coursework and experiences that include effective approaches to integrating technology into K-12 education. (Relates to Performance Indicator 1) Status of data in 2003-2004 SY: One hundred (100) percent of graduates of teacher education programs met the Virginia Technology Standards for Instructional Personnel.</li> <li>• A variety of classes, training, and resources pertaining to integrating technology effectively are available for staff development. (Relates to Performance Indicator 1) Status of data in 2003-2004 SY: One hundred (100) percent of school divisions have access to staff development in Ed Tech Leaders Online to produce online course facilitators. Online courses were provided through various local school divisions. Online Course Management and digital imaging training were also provided.</li> <li>• Technology-related staff development offered by various entities is provided in a wide variety of topics and delivery methods. (Relates to Performance Indicator 1) Status of data in 2003-2004 SY: One hundred (100) percent of school divisions had access to staff development in Ed Tech Leaders Online to produce online course facilitators. Online</li> </ul>

Goals, Objectives, Targets	Narrative
	<p>courses were provided through various local school divisions. Online Course Management and digital imaging training were provided. Additional technology-related staff development offered by National Teacher Training Institute and public television stations around the state of Virginia on various topics either by online courses or in-person classes were provided.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Technology leadership activities are provided to K-12 educational technology stakeholders. (Relates to Performance Indicator 1) Status of data in 2003-2004 SY: One hundred eighty-four (184) sessions for technology stakeholders were offered at the Virginia Department of Education's Educational Technology Leadership Conference. Nine hundred administrators received training through the VITAL project. VITAL receives funding from the Virginia Department of Education.</li> </ul> <p><b>Targets For Goal 2</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grant programs and alternative sources of funding that support educational technology are administered. (Relates to Performance Indicator 2) Status of data in 2003-2004 SY: One hundred (100) percent of schools participated in grant programs and/or take advantage of alternative sources of funding.</li> <li>• Teacher education institutions, businesses, organizations, and private entities become a partner in the implementation of technology-related grants focusing on technology integration. (Relates to Performance Indicator 2) Status of data in 2002-2003 SY: One hundred (100) percent of schools participated in grant programs and/or take advantage of alternative sources of funding.</li> </ul> <p><b>Targets For Goal 3</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site-based instructional technologists are available to all schools. (Relates to Performance Indicator 3) Status of data in 2003-2004 SY: Fifty (50) percent of schools have implemented site-based technology utilization support to all schools. Forty-nine and one-half (49.5) percent of technology-related support offered to teachers was instructional support instead of technical support.</li> <li>• Staff development models and activities that are specifically designed for site-based instructional technologists were available for all K-12 schools. (Relates to Performance Indicator 3) Status of data in 2003-2004 SY: Fifty (50) percent of schools had implemented site-based technology utilization support to all schools.</li> </ul>

Goals, Objectives, Targets	Narrative
<p><b>Target</b>  <i>Set target for 2004-2005 school year</i></p>	<p><b>Targets For Goal 1</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Educator training programs reflect coursework and experiences that include effective approaches to integrating technology into K-12 education.</li> <li>• A variety of classes, training, and resources pertaining to integrating technology effectively are available for staff development.</li> <li>• Technology-related staff development offered by various entities is provided in a wide variety of topics and delivery methods.</li> <li>• Technology leadership activities are provided to K-12 educational technology stakeholders.</li> </ul> <p><b>Targets For Goal 2</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grant programs and alternative sources of funding that support educational technology are administered.</li> <li>• Teacher education institutions, businesses, organizations, and private entities become a partner in the implementation of technology-related grants focusing on technology integration.</li> </ul> <p><b>Targets For Goal 3</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site-based instructional technologists are available to all schools.</li> <li>• Staff development models and activities that are specifically designed for site-based instructional technologists are available for all K-12 schools.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Target</b>  <i>Set target for 2005-2006 school year</i></p>	<p><b>Targets For Goal 1</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Educator training programs reflect coursework and experiences that include effective approaches to integrating technology into K-12 education.</li> <li>• A variety of classes, training, and resources pertaining to integrating technology effectively are available for staff development.</li> <li>• Technology-related staff development offered by various entities is provided in a wide variety of topics and delivery methods.</li> <li>• Technology leadership activities are provided to K-12 educational technology stakeholders.</li> </ul> <p><b>Targets For Goal 2</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grant programs and alternative sources of funding that support educational technology are administered.</li> <li>• Teacher education institutions, businesses, organizations, and private entities become a partner in the implementation of technology-related grants focusing on technology integration.</li> </ul> <p><b>Targets For Goal 3</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site-based instructional technologists are available to all schools.</li> </ul>

Goals, Objectives, Targets	Narrative
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Staff development models and activities that are specifically designed for site-based instructional technologists are available for all K-12 schools.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Target</b> <i>Set target for 2006-2007 school year</i></p>	The target is not set because the grant does not include funding for the 2006-2007 school year.
<p><b>Target</b> <i>Set target for 2007-08 school year</i></p>	The target is not set because the grant does not include funding for the 2007-2008 school year.
<p><b>Assessment of Progress</b> <i>Status of progress on indicator</i> <i>(1) Target met</i> <i>(2) Target not met</i></p>	<p><b>Performance Indicator 1:</b> One hundred (100) percent of the targets related to this Performance Indicator were met.  <b>Performance Indicator 2:</b> One hundred (100) percent of the targets related to this Performance Indicator were met.  <b>Performance Indicator 3:</b> One hundred (100) percent of the targets related to this Performance Indicator were met.</p>
<p><b>Measurement tool(s)</b> used to assess progress of indicators</p>	The Virginia State Technology Plan, which documents the performance indicators submitted in the Virginia Consolidated State Application, was the measurement tool.
<p><b>Explanation for not making progress -</b> <i>Description of why target(s) was not met for 2003 –2004 SY and the steps that will be taken to ensure progress</i></p>	All targets set for 2003-2004 SY were met.
<p><b>Program Goal</b></p>	<p><b>Goal 1:</b> Improve teaching and learning through the appropriate use of technology.  <b>Goal 2:</b> Improve statewide equity in the implementation of technology enhanced teaching and learning.  (Virginia’s Consolidated State Application, May 2002, page 74)</p>
<p><b>Statutory Goal</b> <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</b></p>	See Goals 1, 2, and 3 above.
<p><b>Program Objective</b></p>	<p><b>Performance Objective 1:</b> Computer/Technology Standards of Learning (C/T SOL) are fully integrated across all curriculum areas.  <b>Performance Objective 2:</b> Teachers and students have access to sufficient numbers of computers, software, and video resources as well as other technology related teaching and learning devices.  <b>Performance Objective 3:</b> Up-to-date distance/distributed learning technologies for delivery of student courses and staff development are in common use by educational technology stakeholders.  (Virginia’s Consolidated State Application, May 2002, page 74)</p>

Goals, Objectives, Targets	Narrative
<p align="center"><b>Indicator</b></p>	<p><b>Performance Indicator 1:</b> The percentage of principals reporting that observations and teachers' lesson plans show that computer/ Technology SOL are being significantly integrated into all curricular areas. (Relates to Targets 1 - 15 for Goal 1)</p> <p><b>Performance Indicator 2:</b> The percentage of teachers reporting an up-to-date multimedia computer and printer for classroom instruction. (Relates to Target 1 for Goal 2)</p> <p><b>Performance Indicator 3:</b> The percentage of schools reporting sufficient numbers of electronic teaching/learning devices such as classroom TV/VCRs (or central media distribution), digital cameras, digital scanners, video recorders, portable keyboarding devices, graphing calculators, computer projection devices, and scientific probes/sensors as computer interfaces. (Relates to Target 1 for Goal 2)</p> <p><b>Performance Indicator 4:</b> The percentage of schools reporting they have sufficient quantity and overall quality of instructional software and video resources across all grade levels and subject areas. (Relates to Target 1 for Goal 2) (Virginia's Consolidated State Application, May 2002, page 74)</p>
<p align="center"><b>Target</b></p> <p align="center"><i>Indicate status of data in the 2002-2003 school year</i></p> <p align="center"><b>BASELINE DATA</b></p>	<p><b>Targets For Goal 1</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administrators have a vision and plan for technology use and integration. (Relates to Performance Indicator 1) Status of data in 2002-2003 SY: Fifty (50) percent of schools have implemented site-based technology utilization support to all schools. In a survey of administrators, 63 percent responded that they have a plan that articulates their vision for technology use and integration.</li> <li>• School leaders provide support for integration of technology into instruction. (Relates to Performance Indicator 1) Status of data 2002-2003 SY: Fifty (50) percent of schools have implemented site-based technology utilization support to all schools.</li> <li>• Leaders can effectively evaluate instructional uses of educational technology. (Relates to Performance Indicator 1) Status of data in 2002-2003 SY: Fifty (50) percent of schools have implemented site-based technology utilization support to all schools. In a survey of administrators, 80 percent responded they have a plan for assessing and evaluating educational technology.</li> </ul>

Goals, Objectives, Targets	Narrative
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Technology integration partnerships are established among educational technology stakeholders. (Relates to Performance Indicator 1) Status of data in 2002-2003 SY: One hundred (100) percent of schools have technology integration partnerships established among educational technology stakeholders.</li> <li>• Teachers effectively integrate instructional technology. (Relates to Performance Indicator 1) Status of data in 2002-2003 SY: Ninety-four (94) percent of teachers surveyed integrate instructional technology and use technology-based intervention strategies to improve student achievement.</li> <li>• Teachers collaborate to improve and enrich instruction by using technology. (Relates to Performance Indicator 1) Status of data in 2002-2003 SY: Forty-four (44) percent of teachers surveyed either collaborate for lesson development or for teaching using technology.</li> <li>• Teachers use technology-based intervention strategies to improve student achievement. (Relates to Performance Indicator 1) Status of data in 2002-2003 SY: Ninety-four (94) percent of teachers surveyed integrate instructional technology and use technology-based intervention strategies to improve student achievement.</li> <li>• Teachers understand and model the acceptable use of technology in teaching and learning. (Relates to Performance Indicator 1) Status of data in 2002-2003 SY: Eighty-two (82) percent of teachers responded to a survey and indicated the use the basic tools of technology (spreadsheet, word processors, and databases) to model the acceptable use of technology in teaching and learning.</li> <li>• Students routinely use technology in a variety of learning activities across the curriculum. (Relates to Performance Indicator 1) Status of data in 2002-2003 SY: Eighty-four (84) percent of students use technology for research and problem solving across the curriculum. Forty-seven percent of the 84 percent use technology more than once a week.</li> <li>• Students will have information literacy skills. (Relates to Performance Indicator 1) Status of data in 2002-2003 SY: Various databases of lesson plans that integrate technology and address the Computer/Technology have been created as a result of training conducted using technology grant funds.</li> </ul>

Goals, Objectives, Targets	Narrative
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Student learning and achievement will be enhanced through the effective integration of technology. (Relates to Performance Indicator 1) Status of data in 2002-2003 SY: Fifty (50) percent of students' learning and achievement is enhanced through the effective integration of technology.</li> <li>• Student learning and achievement will be enhanced through the use of advanced technologies. (Relates to Performance Indicator 1) Status of data in 2002-2003 SY: Fifty percent (50) of students' learning and achievement is enhanced through the use of advanced technologies.</li> <li>• Computer/Technology Standards of Learning (C/T SOL) are fully integrated across all curriculum areas. (Relates to Performance Indicator 1) Status of data in 2002-2003 SY: Various databases of lesson plans that integrate technology and address the C/T SOL have been created as a result of training conducted using technology grant funds.</li> <li>• Instructional personnel meet Technology Standards for Instructional Personnel (TSIP). (Relates to Performance Indicator 1) Status of data in 2002-2003 SY: Fifty (50) percent of instructional personnel meet TSIP.</li> <li>• Students meet C/T SOL (Relates to Performance Indicator 1) Status of data in 2002-2003 SY: Various databases of lesson plans that integrate technology and address the Standards of C/TSOL have been created as a result of training conducted using technology grant funds.</li> </ul> <p><b>Targets For Goal 2</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Educators and students have access to technology to support instructional goals. (Relates to Performance Indicators 2 and 4) Status of data in 2002-2003 SY: Eighty-two (82) percent of teachers have an up-to-date multimedia computer and printer for classroom instruction. Seventy-five (75) percent of teachers surveyed stated their access to technology (hardware and software) to support instructional goals ranged from appropriate to ideal. Fifty percent of schools report sufficient numbers of electronic teaching/learning devices such as classroom TV/VCRs (or central media distribution), digital cameras, digital scanners, video recorders, portable keyboarding devices, graphing calculators, computer projection devices, and scientific probes/sensors as computer interfaces.</li> </ul>

Goals, Objectives, Targets	Narrative
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Appropriate technology-based instructional strategies are used for students with unique needs. (Relates to Performance Indicator 2) Status of data in 2002-2003 SY: Zero (0) percent of schools use appropriate technology-based instructional strategies for students with unique needs. All zero (0) percents are to be used for baseline data. Efforts do exist, but we do not have data to support any percentage. New instruments will collect this data.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Target</b> <i>Indicate status of data in 2003-2004 school year</i></p>	<p><b>Targets For Goal 1</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Administrators have a vision and plan for technology use and integration. (Relates to Performance Indicator 1) Status of data in 2003-2004 SY: Fifty (50) percent of schools have implemented site-based technology utilization support to all schools. In a survey of administrators, sixty-three (63) percent responded that they have a plan that articulates their vision for technology use and integration.</li> <li>School leaders provide support for integration of technology into instruction. (Relates to Performance Indicator 1) Status of data in 2002-2003 SY: Fifty (50) percent of schools have implemented site-based technology utilization support to all schools. In a survey of administrators, 84 percent responded that 88 percent of technology-related expenditures were used for professional development.</li> <li>Leaders can effectively evaluate instructional uses of educational technology. (Relates to Performance Indicator 1) Status of data in 2002-2003 SY: Fifty (50) percent of schools have implemented site-based technology utilization support to all schools. In a survey of administrators, 80 percent responded they have a plan for assessing and evaluating educational technology.</li> <li>Technology integration partnerships are established among educational technology stakeholders. (Relates to Performance Indicator 1) Status of data in 2002-2003 SY: One hundred (100) percent of schools have technology integration partnerships established among educational technology stakeholders. Nine hundred seventy-three administrators received training through the Virginia Initiative for Technology and Administrative Leadership (VITAL) project. VITAL receives funding from the Virginia Department of Education.</li> </ul>

Goals, Objectives, Targets	Narrative
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teachers effectively integrate instructional technology. (Relates to Performance Indicator 1) Ninety four (94) percent of teachers surveyed integrate instructional technology and use technology-based intervention strategies to improve student achievement.</li> <li>• Teachers collaborate to improve and enrich instruction by using technology. (Relates to Performance Indicator 1) Status of data in 2002-2003 SY: Forty-four (44) percent of teachers surveyed either collaborate for lesson development or for teaching using technology.</li> <li>• Teachers use technology-based intervention strategies to improve student achievement. (Relates to Performance Indicator 1) Status of data in 2002-2003 SY: Ninety-four (94) percent of teachers surveyed integrate instructional technology and use technology-based intervention strategies to improve student achievement.</li> <li>• Teachers understand and model the acceptable use of technology in teaching and learning. (Relates to Performance Indicator 1) Status of data in 2002-2003 SY: Eighty-two (82) percent of teachers responded to a survey and indicated they use the basic tools of technology (spreadsheet, word processors, and databases) to model the acceptable use of technology in teaching and learning.</li> <li>• Students routinely use technology in a variety of learning activities across the curriculum. (Relates to Performance Indicator 1) Status of data in 2002-2003 SY: Eighty-four (84) percent of students use technology for research and problem solving across the curriculum. Forty-seven percent of the 84 percent use technology more than once a week.</li> <li>• Students will have information literacy skills. (Relates to Performance Indicator 1) Status of data in 2002-2003 SY: There was a four (4) percent increase (82% to 86%) in the pass rates of fifth grade students on technology-related Standards of Learning assessment tests.</li> <li>• Student learning and achievement will be enhanced through the effective integration of technology. (Relates to Performance Indicator 1) Status of data in 2002-2003 SY: Eighty-four (84) percent of students use technology for research and problem solving across the curriculum. Forty-seven (47) percent of the 84 percent use technology more than once a week.</li> </ul>

Goals, Objectives, Targets	Narrative
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Student learning and achievement will be enhanced through the use of advanced technologies. (Relates to Performance Indicator 1) Status of data in 2002-2003 SY: Fifty (50) percent of students' learning and achievement is enhanced through the use of advanced technologies.</li> <li>• Computer/Technology Standards of Learning (C/TSOL) are fully integrated across all curriculum areas. (Relates to Performance Indicator 1) Status of data in 2002-2003 SY: There was a four (4) percent increase (82% to 86%) in the pass rates of fifth grade students on technology-related Standards of Learning assessment tests.</li> <li>• The instructional personnel will meet Technology Standards for Instructional Personnel (TSIP). (Relates to Performance Indicator 1) Status of data in 2002-2003 SY: Fifty (50) percent of instructional personnel met TSIP.</li> <li>• Students meet C/T SOL. (Relates to Performance Indicator 1) Status of data in 2002-2003 SY: There was a four (4) percent increase (82% to 86%) in the pass rates of fifth grade students on technology-related Standards of Learning assessment tests.</li> </ul> <p><b>Target For Goal 2</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Educators and students have access to technology to support instructional goals. (Relates to Performance Indicator 2) Status of data in 2003-2004 SY: Eighty-two (82) percent of teachers have an up-to-date multimedia computer and printer for classroom instruction. Seventy-five (75) percent of teachers have access to technology (hardware and software) to support instructional goals ranged from appropriate to ideal.</li> <li>• Fifty (50) percent of schools have sufficient numbers of electronic teaching/learning devices such as classroom TV/VCRs (or central media distribution), digital cameras, digital scanners, video recorders, portable keyboarding devices, graphing calculators, computer projection devices, and scientific probes/sensors as computer interfaces.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Target</b> <i>Set target for the 2004-2005 school year</i></p>	<p><b>Targets For Goal 1</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administrators have a vision and plan for technology use and integration.</li> <li>• School leaders provide support for integration of technology into instruction.</li> <li>• Leaders can effectively evaluate instructional uses of educational technology.</li> <li>• Technology integration partnerships are established among educational technology stakeholders.</li> <li>• Teachers effectively integrate instructional technology.</li> </ul>

Goals, Objectives, Targets	Narrative
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teachers collaborate to improve and enrich instruction by using technology.</li> <li>• Teachers use technology-based intervention strategies to improve student achievement.</li> <li>• Teachers understand and model the acceptable use of technology in teaching and learning.</li> <li>• Students routinely use technology in a variety of learning activities across the curriculum.</li> <li>• Students will have information literacy skills.</li> <li>• Student learning and achievement will be enhanced through the effective integration of technology.</li> <li>• Student learning and achievement will be enhanced through the use of advanced technologies.</li> <li>• Computer/Technology Standards of Learning (C/T SOL) are fully integrated across all curriculum areas.</li> <li>• Instructional personnel meet Technology Standards for Instructional Personnel (TSIP).</li> <li>• Students meet C/T SOL.</li> </ul> <p><b>Targets For Goal 2</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Educators and students have access to technology to support instructional goals. Appropriate technology-based instructional strategies are used for students with unique needs.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Target</b> <i>Set target for the 2005-2006 school year</i></p>	<p><b>Targets For Goal 1</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administrators have a vision and plan for technology use and integration.</li> <li>• School leaders provide support for integration of technology into instruction.</li> <li>• Leaders can effectively evaluate instructional uses of educational technology.</li> <li>• Technology integration partnerships are established among educational technology stakeholders.</li> <li>• Teachers effectively integrate instructional technology.</li> <li>• Teachers collaborate to improve and enrich instruction by using technology.</li> <li>• Teachers use technology-based intervention strategies to improve student achievement.</li> <li>• Teachers understand and model the acceptable use of technology in teaching and learning.</li> <li>• Students routinely use technology.</li> <li>• Students will have information literacy skills.</li> <li>• Student learning and achievement will be enhanced through the effective integration of technology.</li> <li>• Student learning and achievement will be enhanced through the use of advanced technologies.</li> </ul>

Goals, Objectives, Targets	Narrative
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Computer/Technology Standards of Learning (C/TSOL) are fully integrated across all curriculum areas.</li> <li>• Instructional personnel meet Technology Standards for Instructional Personnel (TSIP).</li> <li>• Students meet C/T SOL.</li> </ul> <p><b>Targets For Goal 2</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Educators and students have access to technology to support instructional goals.</li> <li>• Appropriate technology-based instructional strategies are used for students with unique needs.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Target</b> <i>Set target for the 2006-2007 school year</i></p>	<p>The target is not set because the grant does not include funding for the 2006-2007 school year.</p>
<p><b>Target</b> <i>Set target for the 2007-2008 school year</i></p>	<p>The target is not set because the grant does not include funding for the 2007-2008 school year.</p>
<p><b>Assessment of Progress</b> <i>Status of progress on indicator</i> <i>(1) Target met</i> <i>(2) Target not met</i></p>	<p><b>Performance Indicator 1:</b> One hundred (100) percent of the targets related to this Performance Indicator were met.  <b>Performance Indicator 2:</b> One hundred (100) percent of the targets related to this Performance Indicator were met.  <b>Performance Indicator 3:</b> One hundred (100) percent of the targets related to this Performance Indicator were met.</p>
<p><b>Measurement tool(s)</b> used to assess progress of indicators</p>	<p>The Virginia State Technology Plan, which documents the performance indicators submitted in the Virginia Consolidated State Application is the measurement tool.</p>
<p><b>Explanation for not making progress -</b> <i>Description of why target(s) was not met for the 2003 –2004 school year and steps that will be taken to ensure progress</i></p>	<p>All targets set for 2003-2004 SY were met.</p>
<p><b>Program Goal</b></p>	<p><b>Goal 1:</b> Assess the value that Information Technology (IT) adds to teaching and learning environments.  <b>Goal 2:</b> Assess the value that Information Technology (IT) adds to decision support.  <b>Goal 3:</b> Assess Information Technology (IT) fluency among students.  <b>Goal 4:</b> Improve the accountability and systemic aspects of technology planning for educational technology stakeholders.  (Virginia’s Consolidated State Application, May 2002, page 74)</p>

Goals, Objectives, Targets	Narrative
<p><b>Statutory Goal</b>  <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</b></p>	<p>See Goals 1, 2, and 3 above.</p>
<p><b>Program Objective</b></p>	<p><b>Program Objective 1:</b> Readiness to integrate technology into teaching and learning has been assessed for each K-12 school.  <b>Program Objective 2:</b> Information Technology (IT) provides current, in-depth information about student learning progress to appropriate educational stakeholders in all school divisions.  <b>Program Objective 3:</b> All eligible students are proficient in Computer/Technology Standard of Learning (C/T SOL).  <b>Program Objective 4:</b> Technology plans for K-12 grades include the following: an accurate description of current technology resources (using standard technology issue descriptors); a technology needs assessment which is related to the targeted visions (objectives) of the Educational Technology Plan for Virginia; and a systematic plan for the timely assessment of progress made toward meeting both state and local planning objectives.  (Virginia's Consolidated State Application, May 2002, page 75)</p>
<p><b>Indicator</b></p>	<p><b>Performance Indicator 1:</b> The percentage of school divisions conducting an assessment of school readiness to integrate technology into teaching and learning assessment.  (Relates to Target 2 for Goal 1)  <b>Performance Indicator 2:</b> The percentage of school divisions reporting that Information Technology (IT) provides timely and in-depth information about student learning progress to appropriate educational stakeholders.  (Relates to Target 1 for Goal 2)  <b>Performance Indicator 3:</b> The percentage of principals reporting that observations and teachers' lesson plans indicate C/T SOL are being seamlessly integrated into appropriate curriculum areas.  (Relates to Targets 1 and 2 for Goal 3)  <b>Performance Indicator 4:</b> Number of school divisions and school technology plans that contain accurate information that may be aggregated on the current status of technology and a needs assessment that is related to statewide target visions (objectives) as well as a systematic assessment plan to gauge the progress made toward meeting technology planning objectives.  (Relates to Target 1 for Goal 4)  (Virginia's Consolidated State Application, May 2002, page 75)</p>

Goals, Objectives, Targets	Narrative
<p align="center"><b>Target</b></p> <p align="center"><i>Indicate status of data in the 2002-2003 school year</i></p> <p align="center"><b>BASELINE DATA</b></p>	<p><b>Targets for Goal 1</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identify elements of technology integration that benefit the teaching and learning environment. (Relates to Performance Indicator 1) Status of data in 2002-2003 SY: Fifty (50) percent of schools identify elements of technology integration that benefit the teaching and learning environment.</li> <li>• Readiness to integrate technology into teaching and learning has been assessed for each school. (Relates to Performance Indicator 1) Status of data in 2002-2003 SY: Thirty (30) percent of school divisions conducted an assessment of school readiness to integrate technology into teaching and learning assessment.</li> <li>• Instructional technology integration has been assessed in schools and classrooms. (Relates to Performance Indicator 1) Status of data in 2002-2003 SY: Fifty (50) percent of schools assessed instructional technology integration.</li> <li>• Technology-rich environments and effective technology-based instructional strategies support student learning. (Relates to Performance Indicator 1) Status of data in 2002-2003 SY: Fifty (50) percent of schools have technology-rich environments and effective technology-based instructional strategies that support student learning.</li> </ul> <p><b>Targets for Goal 2</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Information Technology (IT) provides comprehensive information about student learning progress. (Relates to Performance Indicator 2) Status of data in 2002-2003 SY: One hundred (100) percent of school divisions are provided standardized test results through the agency's Assessment and Reporting Division.</li> <li>• Information systems interface to provide staff the ability to use appropriate and effective data to make decisions. (Relates to Performance Indicator 2) Status of data in 2002-2003 SY: Fifty (50) percent of schools have information systems interface to provide staff the ability to use appropriate and effective data to make decisions.</li> </ul> <p><b>Targets for Goal 3</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All students are Information Technology literate. (Relates to Performance Indicator 3) Status of data in 2002-2003 SY: Various databases of lesson plans that integrate technology have been created as a result of training conducted using technology grant funds.</li> <li>• All instructional personnel are Information Technology literate. (Relates to Performance Indicator 3) Status of data in 2002-2003 SY: One hundred (100) percent of</li> </ul>

Goals, Objectives, Targets	Narrative
	<p>instructional personnel are accountable to Technology Standards for Instructional Personnel established by agency.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All paraprofessionals and support staff are Information Technology literate. (Relates to Performance Indicator 3) Status of data in 2002-2003 SY: Fifty (50) percent of schools paraprofessionals and support staff are Information Technology literate.</li> <li>• Students meet expectations for technology utilization pertaining to their subject and grade level as described by school division technology plans. (Relates to Performance Indicator 4) Status of data in 2002-2003 SY: Fifty (50) percent of students meet expectations for technology utilization pertaining to their subject and grade level, as described by school division technology plans.</li> </ul> <p><b>Targets for Goal 4</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• School divisions will have technology plans that are consistent with the components of the state technology plan. All schools will have technology plans that are consistent with the components of their division technology plan. (Relates to Performance Indicator 4) Status of data in 2002-2003 SY: Eighty-nine (89) percent of school divisions and school technology plans contain accurate and information that may be aggregated on the current status of technology and a needs assessment that is related to statewide target visions (objectives) as well as a systematic assessment plan to gauge the progress made toward meeting technology planning objectives.</li> <li>• All schools and school divisions will evaluate annually the progress and effectiveness of their technology plans. (Relates to Performance Indicator 4) Status of data in 2002-2003 SY: Fifty (50) percent of all schools and school divisions were evaluated on the progress and effectiveness of their technology plans.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Target</b> <i>Indicate status of data in the 2003-04 school year</i></p>	<p><b>Target for Goal 1</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Readiness to integrate technology into teaching and learning has been assessed for each school. (Relates to Performance Indicator 1) Status of data in 2003-2004 SY: Thirty (30) percent of school divisions conducted an assessment of school readiness to integrate technology into teaching and learning assessment.</li> </ul>

Goals, Objectives, Targets	Narrative
	<p><b>Target for Goal 2</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Information Technology (IT) provides comprehensive information about student learning progress. (Relates to Performance Indicator 2) Status of data in 2003-2004 SY: One hundred (100) percent of school divisions were provided standardized test results through the agency's Assessment and Reporting Division.</li> </ul> <p><b>Targets for Goal 3</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All students are Information Technology literate. (Relates to Performance Indicator 3) Status of data in 2002-2003 SY: Various databases of lesson plans that integrate technology have been created as a result of training conducted using technology grant funds.</li> <li>All instructional personnel are Information Technology literate. (Relates to Performance Indicator 3) Status of data in 2003-2004 SY: One hundred (100) percent of instructional personnel are accountable to Technology Standards for Instructional Personnel established by agency.</li> </ul> <p><b>Targets for Goal 4</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>School divisions will have technology plans that are consistent with the components of the state technology plan. All schools will have technology plans that are consistent with the components of their division technology plan. (Relates to Performance Indicator 4) Status of data in 2003-2004 SY: Eighty-nine (89) percent of school divisions and school technology plans contain accurate and information that may be aggregated on the current status of technology and a needs assessment that is related to statewide target visions (objectives) as well as a systematic assessment plan to gauge the progress made toward meeting technology planning objectives.</li> <li>All schools and school divisions will evaluate annually the progress and effectiveness of their technology plans. (Relates to Performance Indicator 4) Status of data in 2002-2003 SY: Fifty (50) percent of all schools and school divisions were evaluated on the progress and effectiveness of their technology plans.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Target</b> <i>Set target for the 2004-2005 school year</i></p>	<p><b>Targets for Goal 1</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identify elements of technology integration that benefit the teaching and learning environment.</li> <li>Readiness to integrate technology into teaching and learning has been assessed for each school.</li> <li>Instructional technology integration has been assessed in schools and classrooms.</li> <li>Technology-rich environments and effective technology-based instructional strategies support student learning.</li> </ul>

Goals, Objectives, Targets	Narrative
	<p><b>Targets for Goal 2</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Information Technology (IT) provides comprehensive information about student learning progress.</li> <li>• Information systems interface to provide staff the ability to use appropriate and effective data to make decisions.</li> </ul> <p><b>Targets for Goal 3</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All students are Information Technology literate.</li> <li>• All instructional personnel are Information Technology literate.</li> <li>• All paraprofessionals and support staff are Information Technology literate.</li> <li>• Students meet expectations for technology utilization pertaining to their subject and grade level as described by school division technology plans.</li> </ul> <p><b>Targets for Goal 4</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• School divisions will have technology plans that are consistent with the components of the state technology plan. All schools will have technology plans that are consistent with the components of their division technology plan.</li> <li>• All schools and school divisions will evaluate annually the progress and effectiveness of their technology plans.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Target</b>  <i>Set target for the 2005-2006 school year</i></p>	<p><b>Targets for Goal 1</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identify elements of technology integration that benefit the teaching and learning environment.</li> <li>• Readiness to integrate technology into teaching and learning has been assessed for each school.</li> <li>• Instructional technology integration has been assessed in schools and classrooms.</li> <li>• Technology-rich environments and effective technology-based instructional strategies support student learning.</li> </ul> <p><b>Targets for Goal 2</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Information Technology (IT) provides comprehensive information about student learning progress.</li> <li>• Information systems interface to provide staff the ability to use appropriate and effective data to make decisions.</li> </ul> <p><b>Targets for Goal 3</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All students are Information Technology literate.</li> <li>• All instructional personnel are Information Technology literate.</li> <li>• All paraprofessionals and support staff are Information Technology literate.</li> <li>• Students meet expectations for technology utilization pertaining to their subject and grade level as described by school division technology plans.</li> </ul>

<b>Goals, Objectives, Targets</b>	<b>Narrative</b>
	<p><b>Targets for Goal 4</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• School divisions will have technology plans that are consistent with the components of the state technology plan. All schools will have technology plans that are consistent with the components of their division technology plan.</li> <li>• All schools and school divisions will evaluate annually the progress and effectiveness of their technology plans.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Target</b> <i>Set target for the 2006-2007 school year</i></p>	<p>The target is not set because the grant does not include funding for the 2006-2007 school year.</p>
<p><b>Target</b> <i>Set target for the 2007-2008 school year</i></p>	<p>The target is not set because the grant does not include funding for the 2007-2008 school year.</p>
<p><b>Assessment of Progress</b> <i>Status of progress on indicator</i> <i>(1) Target met</i> <i>(2) Target not met</i></p>	<p><b>Performance Indicator 1:</b> One hundred (100) percent of the targets related to this Performance Indicator were met.  <b>Performance Indicator 2:</b> One hundred (100) percent of the targets related to this Performance Indicator were met.  <b>Performance Indicator 3:</b> One hundred (100) percent of the targets related to this Performance Indicator were met.  <b>Performance Indicator 4:</b> One hundred (100) percent of the targets related to this Performance Indicator were met.</p>
<p><b>Measurement tool(s)</b> used to assess progress of indicators</p>	<p>The Virginia State Technology Plan, which documents the performance indicators submitted in the Virginia Consolidated State Application, was the measure.</p>
<p><b>Explanation for not making progress -</b> <i>Description of why target(s) was not met for 2003-2004 SY and the steps that will be taken to ensure progress</i></p>	<p>All targets set for 2003-2004 SY were met.</p>

**IX. Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act  
(Title IV, Part A)**

**A. Performance Measures**

Instructions: In the following chart, please identify:

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

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>2003-04</u>	<table border="0"> <tr><td>2002-2003</td><td><u>N/A</u></td></tr> <tr><td>2003-2004</td><td><u>N/A</u></td></tr> <tr><td>2004-2005</td><td><u>.01</u></td></tr> <tr><td>2005-2006</td><td><u>.01</u></td></tr> <tr><td>2006-2007</td><td><u>.01</u></td></tr> <tr><td>2007-2008</td><td><u>.01</u></td></tr> </table>	2002-2003	<u>N/A</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>	<table border="0"> <tr><td>2002-2003</td><td><u>0.0441%</u></td></tr> <tr><td>2003-2004</td><td><u>0.01451%</u></td></tr> <tr><td>Baseline</td><td><u>.0441%</u></td></tr> <tr><td>Year established:</td><td><u>2002-03</u></td></tr> </table>	2002-2003	<u>0.0441%</u>	2003-2004	<u>0.01451%</u>	Baseline	<u>.0441%</u>	Year established:	<u>2002-03</u>
2002-2003	<u>N/A</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>																							
2002-2003	<u>0.0441%</u>																							
2003-2004	<u>0.01451%</u>																							
Baseline	<u>.0441%</u>																							
Year established:	<u>2002-03</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>2003-04</u>	<table border="0"> <tr><td>2002-2003</td><td><u>N/A</u></td></tr> <tr><td>2003-2004</td><td><u>N/A</u></td></tr> <tr><td>2004-2005</td><td><u>2.0</u></td></tr> <tr><td>2005-2006</td><td><u>1.7</u></td></tr> <tr><td>2006-2007</td><td><u>1.5</u></td></tr> <tr><td>2007-2008</td><td><u>1.0</u></td></tr> </table>	2002-2003	<u>N/A</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>	<table border="0"> <tr><td>2002-2003</td><td><u>2.46018</u></td></tr> <tr><td>2003-2004</td><td><u>2.22284%</u></td></tr> <tr><td>Baseline</td><td><u>2.46018%</u></td></tr> <tr><td>Year established:</td><td><u>2002-03</u></td></tr> </table>	2002-2003	<u>2.46018</u>	2003-2004	<u>2.22284%</u>	Baseline	<u>2.46018%</u>	Year established:	<u>2002-03</u>
2002-2003	<u>N/A</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>																							
2002-2003	<u>2.46018</u>																							
2003-2004	<u>2.22284%</u>																							
Baseline	<u>2.46018%</u>																							
Year established:	<u>2002-03</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>2003-04</u>	<table border="0"> <tr><td>2002-2003</td><td><u>N/A</u></td></tr> <tr><td>2003-2004</td><td><u>N/A</u></td></tr> <tr><td>2004-2005</td><td><u>.20</u></td></tr> <tr><td>2005-2006</td><td><u>.17</u></td></tr> <tr><td>2006-2007</td><td><u>.15</u></td></tr> <tr><td>2007-2008</td><td><u>.10</u></td></tr> </table>	2002-2003	<u>N/A</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>	<table border="0"> <tr><td>2002-2003</td><td><u>0.24345%</u></td></tr> <tr><td>2003-2004</td><td><u>0.20367%</u></td></tr> <tr><td>Baseline:</td><td><u>0.24345%</u></td></tr> <tr><td>Year established:</td><td><u>2002-03</u></td></tr> </table>	2002-2003	<u>0.24345%</u>	2003-2004	<u>0.20367%</u>	Baseline:	<u>0.24345%</u>	Year established:	<u>2002-03</u>
2002-2003	<u>N/A</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>																							
2002-2003	<u>0.24345%</u>																							
2003-2004	<u>0.20367%</u>																							
Baseline:	<u>0.24345%</u>																							
Year established:	<u>2002-03</u>																							

**B. 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

**1. 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 2003-2004 school year	Number of LEAs reporting
Elementary	4,710	132
Middle	12,220	132
High School	7,654	131

EXPULSIONS	Number for 2003-2004 school year	Number of LEAs reporting
Elementary	1	132
Middle	17	132
High School	32	131

Note: Only 131 of the 132 school divisions reported the number of out-of-school suspensions and expulsions for physical fighting at the high school level because students of high school age in one school division, Lexington City Public Schools, attend high school in another school division, Rockbridge County Public Schools.

**2. The number of out-of-school suspensions and expulsions for weapons possession.**

State definition of weapons: Weapons possession include 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. Includes firearms not mentioned previously (operable or inoperable, loaded or unloaded) such as, but not limited to, zip, starter gun, BB gun, and flare gun.

<b>SUSPENSIONS</b>	<b>Number for 2003-2004 school year</b>	<b>Number of LEAs reporting</b>
Elementary	418	132
Middle	669	132
High School	569	131

<b>EXPULSIONS</b>	<b>Number for 2003-2004 school year</b>	<b>Number of LEAs reporting</b>
Elementary	11	132
Middle	44	132
High School	47	131

Note: Only 131 of the 132 school divisions reported out-of-school suspensions and expulsions for weapons possessions at the high school level because students of high school age in one school division, Lexington City Public Schools, attend high school in another school division, Rockbridge County Public Schools.

### 3. 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.

SUSPENSIONS	Number for 2003-2004 school year	Number of LEAs reporting
Elementary	8	132
Middle	223	132
High School	727	131

EXPULSIONS	Number for 2003-2004 school year	Number of LEAs reporting
Elementary	0	132
Middle	2	132
High School	18	131

Note: Only 131 or the 132 school divisions reported out-of-school suspensions and expulsions for alcohol-related violations at the high school level because students of high school age in one school division, Lexington City Public Schools, attend high school in another school division, Rockbridge County Public Schools.

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

State definition of illicit-drug related:

- Unlawful use, possession, transportation, or importation of any schedule I or II drug or marijuana or anabolic steroid.
- Unlawful use, cultivation, manufacture, purchase, possession, transportation, or importation of any inhalants or substances represented as drug look-alikes.
- Unlawful taking or attempted taking of drugs prescribed to another.
- Unlawful possession with intent to distribute, sell or solicit any Schedule I or II drug, or Marijuana, or anabolic steroid.
- Unlawful use, possession, with intent to distribute, sell or solicit any controlled drug or narcotic substance not specified in previous drug categories.

<b>SUSPENSIONS</b>	<b>Number for 2003-2004 school year</b>	<b>Number of LEAs reporting</b>
Elementary	56	132
Middle	818	132
High School	1,717	131

<b>EXPULSIONS</b>	<b>Number for 2003-2004 school year</b>	<b>Number of LEAs reporting</b>
Elementary	0	132
Middle	59	132
High School	237	131

Note: Only 131 of the 132 school divisions reported out-of-school suspensions and expulsions for illicit drug-related at the high school level because students of high school age in one school division, Lexington City Public Schools, attend high school in another school division, Rockbridge County Public Schools.

### **C. Parent Involvement**

Instructions: Section 4116 of the No Child Left Behind Act 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.

#### State and Local School Division Activities

Each local school division, as part of the Title IV, Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act (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. Additionally, annual progress reports require local school divisions to report on strategies used for consultation and input. For 2003-2004, all 132 of Virginia's school divisions, the Virginia Schools for the Deaf and the Blind, and the Department of Correctional Education, reported being in compliance with requirements for meaningful and ongoing consultation with and input from parents and listed specific strategies used for such consultation and input. Among strategies employed by local school divisions were consultation with advisory councils with parent representation, Parent Teacher Organizations/Associations (PTO/PTA), and local coalitions. In several localities, parents were invited to take part in one-on-one and small focus groups, to complete surveys, or to attend other presentations at parents' night, open houses, and conference days where information on SDFSCA program activities was disseminated and parental views solicited. Parents provided input for prevention needs assessments including perceived needs and views on school performance and safety. Many localities reported that they disseminated the SDFSCA application, curricula, and/or information on program activities to parents, indirectly through newsletters or directly through telephone calls or in person, and requested feedback and suggestions.

Seventy-two (72) percent of Virginia's 132 school divisions, the Virginia Schools for the Deaf and the Blind, and the Department of Correctional Education, reported parent or citizen group involvement in their SDFSCA-funded drug and violence prevention activities in 2003-2004.

Numerous LEAs reported use of parent programs based on scientifically-based research that are for parents. These programs include:

- Parenting Wisely
- Active Parenting
- Strengthening Families
- Guiding Good Choices
- Here, Now and Down the Road
- Parenting for the Drug-Free Years
- Creating Lasting Family Connections
- Parents Who Care
- Life Skills Parent Program

Additional parent-focused activities reported but not funded by SDFSCA included Systematic Training for Effective Parenting (STEP) for parents, Parenting Techniques That Work, Drug Abuse Resistance Education (DARE) parent training, Project Home Team, Resolving Family Conflict, Parenting Teens, parent drug/violence prevention awareness activities, Drug-Free Prom/Graduation parties, parent education workshops, and dissemination of print and video resources on warning signs of substance abuse, parenting teens, resolving conflict, and setting limits.

When asked about their need for technical assistance in selected SDFSCA issues, 50 percent of Virginia LEAs reported either a priority or moderate need for assistance with parent consultation/input efforts.

#### Governor's Office Activities

A significant component 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. Over 245,000 Virginia parents have received these Guides. 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 six-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.state.va.us/kidsafeva.htm/>

Feedback from parents, although limited, has been strongly positive and has provided evidence of increased knowledge of strategies parents can use to reduce the likelihood of their children being injured or becoming victims of crime.

The Governor's Office has collaborated with the Virginia Congress of PTAs in the dissemination of the Parent Guides and demand has consistently outstripped the supply of print copies available. To date, over print 150,000 copies of each guide have been disseminated.

Additional components of the KIDsafe Virginia initiative that engaged parents in drug and violence prevention efforts were as follows:

KIDsafe Virginia Mailbox - An online "suggestion box" that can be used by students, parents and other citizens to recommend strategies for enhancing safety and security of youth in schools and communities throughout Virginia. The mailbox is at [www.vasafeschools.com](http://www.vasafeschools.com)

Make-the-Call Hotline - Using a toll-free number, students (as well as parents and other citizens) can anonymously report conditions that they believe could potentially threaten the safety and security of their schools and communities. The number is 1-866-SAFE-VA-1 or 1-866-723-3821.

KIDsafe Virginia Identification Kits - DNA kits have been distributed to parents who will voluntarily gather DNA for use in the event a child is missing. Parents maintain custody of the DNA to help investigators if the need arises. Over 100,000 kits have been disseminated through a partnership with the Virginia Automobile Dealers Association and through law enforcement agencies and public events.

Internet Safety Awareness Lessons - Parent-oriented Internet safety sessions are taught as a component of the I-Safe America curriculum for students in grades 5 through 8. The program teaches students to safely and responsibly take control of their Internet experience, to recognize and avoid dangers, and to respond appropriately.

**X. 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.

<b>XI. Innovative Programs (Title V, Part A)</b>
--

**A.** 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. These activities focused on various grade levels of Virginia's students and include Phonological Awareness Literacy Screening for Preschool-PreK (PALS-PreK), Virginia Preschool Initiative Curriculum Pilot Project, Reading Camps, KidBiz3000, Electronic Practices Assessment Tools (ePAT), and Online Algebra Tutorial. A description and results (if available) of the activities are provided below.

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

PALS-PreK materials for the 2004-2005 and 2005-2006 school years were printed in late summer 2004. This screening 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. Seven hundred seventeen (717) complimentary sets of PALS-PreK materials were provided free of charge to Virginia Preschool Initiative (VPI) programs in fall 2004.

The online data entry window for PALS-PreK was from October 11 through November 5, 2004. During this time, scores for 12,875 Virginia preschool students were entered into the PALS online score entry and reporting system. Of these, 6,581 were male and 6,294 were female. The race/ethnicity breakdown was as follows:

African American	6,313
Caucasian	4,824
Hispanic	999
Native American	18
Asian or Pacific Islander	219
Other (includes combinations of the above)	502

Quantitative data are not available due to spring administration analysis.

### **Virginia Preschool Initiative Curriculum Pilot Project**

In September of 2004, Wythe County piloted a new preschool curriculum developed by Pearson Learning for possible use by Virginia Preschool Initiative (VPI) programs. The Pearson Learning curriculum, Opening the World of Learning, was selected for the pilot

because it was the only comprehensive preschool curriculum aligned with Virginia's Foundation Blocks for Early Learning and based on scientifically-based research. Assessments will be completed in late spring of 2005. Results will be analyzed in early fall of 2005. Students will be tracked in October 2005 to see how well they performed on the PreK Phonological Awareness and Literacy Screening.

Wythe County has six preschool teachers and six instructional assistants. The staff serves a total of 91 preschool students. The staff received initial professional development training from Pearson Learning on use of the curriculum. Pearson Learning has provided on-going support for this pilot project. The final impact will be assessed next school year when the students complete the first quarter of the kindergarten curriculum. Based on the findings, the Virginia Department of Education will make a decision regarding further expansion of the curriculum in other programs.

### **Reading Camps**

The Department of Education plans to fund nine reading camps, ideally one in each of the school divisions that participated in the Reading Leadership Institute in February 2005. These schools were chosen because their pass rate on the 2004 English SOL assessment for eighth grade ranged between 48 percent and 66 percent. The purpose of this grant is to encourage local summer reading programs for rising seventh and/or eighth grade students during the summer of 2005. This grant is designed to serve students who do not choose to read voluntarily, especially during the summer months.

Since it is essential that middle grade students read, comprehend, and respond to content, the reading camps should be connected with a setting and content of interest to middle grade students. This connection may necessitate that school divisions work closely with museums, libraries, historical sites, parks and recreation departments, or other reputable public and private entities with a K-12 educational mission. The camps' curricula, developed and enriched with school divisions' and the collaborators' resources, should have a direct connection to the middle-level SOL content in history, science, and/or mathematics as well as English.

The reading camps must include a daily focus on reading comprehension instruction (at least 50 percent of the contact time) with direct connection to SOL content for middle grades history and social sciences, science, mathematics, and/or English with an overlay of fine and practical arts, international education, and/or physical education.

Divisions to which the grant application will be sent include:

Division	School	Percentage Passing on 8 <sup>th</sup> grade English SOL
Petersburg City Public Schools	Peabody Middle School	48
	Vernon Johns Middle School	50
Montgomery County Public Schools	Shawsville Middle School	51
Portsmouth City Public Schools	W. E. Waters Middle School	51
	Craddock Middle School	55
	Churchland Middle School	62
Sussex County Public Schools	Sussex Central Middle School	54
Norfolk City Public Schools	Lake Taylor Middle School	57
Newport News City Public Schools	Huntington Middle School	60
	Mary Passage Middle School	61
	Homer Hines Middle School	66
Northampton County Public Schools	Northampton Middle School	61
Charles City County Public Schools	Charles City Middle School	62
Tazewell County Public Schools	Tazewell Middle School	63
	Richlands Middle School	64

### **KidBiz3000**

The Office of Middle Instructional Services received a \$50,000 grant from the Annenberg Foundation to support the KidBiz3000 online reading and writing program in four Virginia middle schools. The grant money was supplemented with Title V funds. Four schools were chosen, three of which have English pass rates below 70 percent. The fourth school was chosen for geographic diversity. Staff trained in the KidBiz3000 could provide training to other divisions.

KidBiz3000 delivers current news daily via a subscription Web-based service and is in use at Prince Edward Middle School in Prince Edward County, Gretna Middle School in Pittsylvania County, Wallace Middle School in Washington County, and Homer Hines Middle School in Newport News City. The news is delivered on the instructional reading level of each student and is preceded by an introductory e-mail message designed to activate background knowledge and motivate the students to read. The news is further scaffolded by an interactive glossary, which defines and pronounces unfamiliar words for readers. Quizzes that follow are designed to resemble SOL assessment items, and writing assignments are scaffolded with graphic organizers. Students may choose to participate in opinion surveys and stock market simulations as a part of the program.

All schools report a positive attitude toward the program and an engagement level among the students at nearly 100 percent. At Wallace Middle School the students with disabilities won the KidBiz3000 participation award recently and received a “party in a box” from KidBiz3000. At Hines Middle School the reported average gain in reading was 16 points in six weeks based on the KidBiz3000 measurements. Furthermore, 35 percent of the Newport News students are spending time with the program after school hours, thus increasing their reading time.

School and Division	SOL pass rate in English	Number of teachers involved	Number of students involved
Prince Edward Middle School, Prince Edward County Public Schools	65%	88 6 <sup>th</sup> – 8 <sup>th</sup> grade	Approximately 720 students
Gretna Middle School, Pittsylvania County Public Schools	67%	24 6 <sup>th</sup> – 8 <sup>th</sup> grade	Approximately 575 students
Homer Hines Middle School, Newport News City Public Schools	66%	28 6 <sup>th</sup> and 8 <sup>th</sup> grade	Approximately 230 students
Wallace Middle School, Washington County Public Schools	80%	15 6 <sup>th</sup> – 8 <sup>th</sup> grade	Approximately 300 students
Totals		155 6 <sup>th</sup> – 8 <sup>th</sup> grade	Approximately 1825 students

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

The Electronic Practice Assessment Tools (ePAT) for Earth science, biology, and chemistry students includes six tools (two for each subject) supports and enhances preparation for the End-of-Course (EOC) Science SOL assessments as a direct resource for students. The ePATs will provide practice assessment items acclimating students to the question format and structure of the EOC Science SOL Assessment (Earth science, biology, and chemistry). The ePAT tutorial for EOC science will also provide direct feedback for each question the student answers. Annotations are provided for each incorrect option as well as the correct option for each item on the released SOL assessment. These tools provide information for students, parents, and practitioners, allowing students to interact with the released EOC SOL assessments in a downloadable tool.

This project adds the 2002 and 2003 EOC Science released SOL Assessments to the existing ePAT for English and mathematics. The ePAT project is partially completed. The chemistry and biology ePAT were deployed in March 2005, and the Earth science ePAT should be completed by the end of March 2005. The number of assessments administered in the 2004 assessment cycle for the EOC Science SOL Assessments will determine the predicted usage for these tools.

Number of predicted uses for each ePAT:

Earth science	100,000
Biology	104,000
Chemistry	55,000

### **Online Algebra Tutorial**

The Online Algebra Tutorial is based on the highly successful English Online Tutorial. (The English Tutorial enrolled over 6,000 students during the past year with a success rate of 93 percent.) The tutorials are designed to provide assessment and targeted remediation for students that have either failed the SOL tests or are at-risk for failure.

There are currently 930 students enrolled in the Online Algebra Tutorial. There are also 132 teachers participating in the tutorial as mentors and facilitators at local schools. Teachers were trained to use the tutorial in regional training sessions in the fall and winter of 2004.

**B.** The table below requests data on student achievement outcomes of **Title V, Part A, - funded** LEAs that use **20** percent 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; and **(4)** access for all students to a quality education. Complete the table below using aggregated data from all LEA evaluations of school year 2003-2004 activities funded in whole or in part from Title V, Part A - Innovative Programs funds.

Priority Activity/Area <sup>1</sup>	Number of LEAs that used <b>20</b> percent 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>	102	22	624,173
Area 2: <b>Teacher Quality</b>	19	7	202,179
Area 3: <b>Safe and Drug Free Schools</b>	8	3	12,089
Area 4: <b>Increase Access for all Students</b>	36	7	95,418
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).			

**B.1 Indicate** the number of Title V, Part A, funded LEAs that did not use, in school year 2003-2004, 20 percent 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                     0                     under B above.

**B.2 Indicate** the number of LEAs shown in B.1 that met AYP in school year 2003-2004.                     n/a                    

<sup>1</sup> 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)

**XII. Rural Education Achievement Program (REAP)  
(Title VI, Part B)**

**A. 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 2003-2004 school year.

3

**B. Rural and Low-Income School Program (Title VI, Part B, Subpart 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 2003-2004 school year.

Purpose	Number of LEAs
Teacher recruitment and retention, including the use of signing bonuses and other financial incentives	3
Teacher professional development, including programs that train teachers to utilize technology to improve teaching and to train special needs teachers	6
Educational technology, including software and hardware as described in Title II, Part D	4
Parental involvement activities	2
Activities authorized under the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program (Title IV, Part A)	4
Activities authorized under Title I, Part A	13
Activities authorized under Title III (Language instruction for LEP and immigrant students)	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 2003-2004 school year, 74 percent (1,344) of Virginia's schools made adequate yearly progress (AYP), and 23 percent (30) school divisions made AYP. Only seventeen school divisions received Title VI, Part B, Subpart 2, funds in 2003-2004, as compared to 43 school divisions being recipients of these funds in 2002-2003.

The following chart reflects the division recipients, their AYP status, the number of Title I schools operating in each division, and the number and percentage of Title I schools making AYP in each division.

<b>XII. Rural Education Achievement Program (REAP) Title VI, Part B Subpart 2 Rural and Low-income School Program 2003-2004</b>				
<b>School Divisions</b>	<b>Did School Division Make AYP?</b>	<b>Number of Title I Schools in Division</b>	<b>Number of Title I Schools In Division Making AYP</b>	<b>Percent of Title I Schools in Division Making AYP</b>
Accomack County Public Schools	NO	4	2	50
Brunswick County Public Schools	NO	5	3	60
Buchanan County Public Schools	NO	6	3	50
Charlotte County Public Schools	NO	1	0	0
Dickenson County Public Schools	YES	5	4	80
Lee County Public Schools	NO	11	10	91
Lunenburg County Public Schools	NO	3	0	0
Northampton County Public Schools	NO	2	1	50
Nottoway County Public Schools	NO	4	3	75
Prince Edward County Public Schools	NO	2	1	50

**XII. Rural Education Achievement Program (REAP)  
Title VI, Part B  
Subpart 2  
Rural and Low-Income School Program  
2003-2004**

<b>School Divisions</b>	<b>Did School Division Make AYP?</b>	<b>Number of Title I Schools in Division</b>	<b>Number of Title I Schools In Division Making AYP</b>	<b>Percent of Title I Schools in Division Making AYP</b>
Russell County Pubic Schools	NO	9	8	89
Sussex County Public Schools	NO	3	1	33
Wise County Public Schools	NO	6	5	83
Franklin City Public Schools	YES	1	1	100
Galax City Public Schools	NO	1	1	100
Martinsville City Public Schools	NO	3	0	0
Norton City Public Schools	YES	1	0	0

