

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: Parts I and II

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

For reporting on
School Year 2007-08

VIRGINIA



PART I DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 19, 2008
PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 2009

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202

INTRODUCTION

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

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

The *NCLB* Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2007-08 consists of two Parts, Part I and Part II.

PART I

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

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

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

PART II

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

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

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 2007-08 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, December 19, 2008**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 27, 2009**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2007-08, unless otherwise noted.

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

TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

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

Initially, a state user will log onto EDEN and be provided with an option that takes him or her to the "SY 2007-08 CSPR". The main CSPR screen will allow the user to select the section of the CSPR that he or she needs to either view or enter data. After selecting a section of the CSPR, the user will be presented with a screen or set of screens where the user can input the data for that section of the CSPR. A user can only select one section of the CSPR at a time. After a state has included all available data in the designated sections of a particular CSPR Part, a lead state user will certify that Part and transmit it to the Department. Once a Part has been transmitted, ED will have access to the data. States may still make changes or additions to the transmitted data, by creating an updated version of the CSPR. Detailed instructions for transmitting the SY 2007-08 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

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

		OMB Number: 1810-0614
		Expiration Date: 10/31/2010
<p>Consolidated State Performance Report For State Formula Grant Programs under the Elementary And Secondary Education Act as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001</p>		
Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2007-08 <input type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2007-08		
Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report: Virginia Department of Education		
Address: P. O. Box 2120 Richmond, VA 23218-2120		
Person to contact about this report:		
Name: Ms. Roberta Schlicher, Director of Program Administration and Accountability		
Telephone: (804) 225-2870		
Fax: (804) 371-7347		
e-mail: Roberta.Schlicher@doe.virginia.gov		
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Dr. Patricia I. Wright, Superintendent of Public Instruction		
		<u>Tuesday, December 16, 2008, 9:23:44 AM</u>
_____ Signature		_____ Date

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART I**

For reporting on
School Year 2007-08



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 19, 2008
5PM EST**

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

This section requests descriptions of the State's implementation of the *NCLB* academic content standards, academic achievement standards and assessments to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(1) of *ESEA*.

1.1.1 Academic Content Standards

In the space below, provide a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Responses should focus on actions taken or planned since the State's content standards were approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. Indicate specifically in what school year your State expects the changes to be implemented.

If the State has not made or is not planning to make revisions or changes, respond "No revisions or changes to content standards taken or planned."

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Virginia Standards of Learning (SOL) were originally developed and approved by the Virginia Board of Education in June 1995. Following the schedule established by the Board for revision of all content standards, the revised mathematics standards of learning are scheduled to be approved by the Board in winter 2009 and implemented beginning in fall 2009. The science standards and reading/language arts standards are scheduled to be revised in 2010.

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

1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts

In the space below, provide a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's assessments and/or academic achievement standards in mathematics or reading/language arts required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA. Responses should focus on actions taken or planned since the State's assessment system was approved through ED's peer review process. Responses also should indicate specifically in what school year your State expects the changes to be implemented.

As applicable, include any assessment (e.g., alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards, alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards, native language assessments, or others) implemented to meet the assessment requirements under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA as well as alternate achievement standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities and modified academic achievement standards for certain students with disabilities implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA. Indicate specifically in what year your state expects the changes to be implemented.

If the State has not made or is not planning to make revisions or changes, respond "No revisions or changes to assessments and/or academic achievement standards taken or planned."

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

In summer 2007, Virginia was awarded a United States Department of Education (USED) Enhanced Assessment grant to assist in the development of an alternate assessment based on modified achievement standards for students with disabilities. Virginia has launched an aggressive research agenda to develop this assessment which includes teacher focus groups, online surveys, and pilot studies. Discussions regarding a timeline for field testing and implementation are currently underway.

No other revisions or changes to assessments and/or academic achievement standards have been taken or are planned.

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

1.1.4 Assessments in Science

If your State's assessments and academic achievement standards in science required under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* have been approved through ED's peer review process, provide in the space below a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's assessments and/or academic achievement standards in science required under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*. Responses should focus on actions taken or planned since the State's assessment system was approved through ED's peer review process. Responses also should indicate specifically in what school year your State expects the changes to be implemented.

As applicable, include any assessment (e.g., alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards, alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards, native language assessments, or others) implemented to meet the assessment requirements under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* as well as alternate achievement standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities and modified academic achievement standards for certain students with disabilities implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*.

If the State has not made or is not planning to make revisions or changes, respond "No revisions or changes to assessments and/or academic achievement standards taken or planned."

If the State's assessments in science required under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* have not been approved through ED's peer review process, respond "State's assessments and academic achievement standards in science not yet approved."

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

State's assessments and academic achievement standards in science have not yet been approved.

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

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

This section collects data on the participation of students in the State *NCLB* assessments.

1.2.1 Participation of All Students in Mathematics Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of students enrolled during the State's testing window for *NCLB* mathematics assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* (regardless of whether the students were present for a full academic year) and the number of students who participated in the mathematics assessment in accordance with *NCLB*. The percentage of students who were tested for mathematics will be calculated automatically.

The student group "children with disabilities (*IDEA*)" includes children who participated in the regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments.

The student group "limited English proficient (LEP) students" includes recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months. Do not include former LEP students.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	779,616	775,754	99.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,481	2,459	99.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	44,061	43,970	99.8
Black, non-Hispanic	201,066	199,275	99.1
Hispanic	63,006	62,639	99.4
White, non-Hispanic	451,034	449,536	99.7
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	97,397	96,526	99.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	59,622	59,398	99.6
Economically disadvantaged students	234,129	232,223	99.2
Migratory students	581	580	99.8
Male	395,603	393,340	99.4
Female	384,013	382,414	99.6
Comments:			

Source – The table above is produced through *EDFacts*. The SEA submits the data in file N/X081 that includes data group 588, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F, and subtotal 1. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Mathematics Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of children with disabilities (*IDEA*) participating during the State's testing window in mathematics assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* (regardless of whether the children were present for a full academic year) by the type of assessment. The percentage of children with disabilities (*IDEA*) who participated in the mathematics assessment for each assessment option will be calculated automatically. The total number of children with disabilities (*IDEA*) participating will also be calculated automatically.

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	77,006	79.8
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	227	0.2
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	11,952	12.4
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	7,341	7.6
Total	96,526	
Comments: The 99.16 percent variance reflects procedures that are applied for certain students based on the approved Virginia Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook amended June 2008.		

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

1.2.3 Participation of All Students in the Reading/Language Arts Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.1 and collects data on the State's *NCLB* reading/language arts assessment.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	634,209	632,170	99.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,000	1,993	99.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	34,795	34,745	99.9
Black, non-Hispanic	163,669	162,651	99.4
Hispanic	51,385	51,229	99.7
White, non-Hispanic	367,136	366,376	99.8
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	86,207	85,554	99.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	48,385	48,284	99.8
Economically disadvantaged students	198,561	197,439	99.4
Migratory students	479	478	99.8
Male	324,380	323,085	99.6
Female	309,829	309,085	99.8
Comments:			

Source – The same file specification as 1.2.1 is used, but with data group 589 instead of 588.

1.2.4 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Reading/Language Arts Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.2 and collects data on the State's *NCLB* reading/language arts assessment.

The data provided should include reading/language arts participation data from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. Do not include results from students covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	65,717	76.8
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	127	0.1
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	12,385	14.5
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	7,325	8.6
Total	85,554	
Comments: The 99.23 percent variance reflects procedures that are applied for certain students based on the approved Virginia Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook amended June 2008.		

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

1.2.5 Participation of All Students in the Science Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.1 and collects data on the State's *NCLB* science assessment.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	514,653	506,865	98.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,554	1,530	98.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	29,017	28,488	98.2
Black, non-Hispanic	131,871	128,922	97.8
Hispanic	40,431	38,536	95.3
White, non-Hispanic	300,486	298,281	99.3
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	60,440	57,379	94.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	36,283	33,837	93.3
Economically disadvantaged students	147,808	143,333	97.0
Migratory students	363	338	93.1
Male	259,257	254,734	98.3
Female	255,396	252,131	98.7
Comments:			

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

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.2.6 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Science Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.2 and collects data on the State's *NCLB* science assessment.

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	52,325	91.2
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	214	0.4
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	1,013	1.8
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	3,827	6.7
Total	57,379	
Comments: The 99.47 percent variance reflects procedures that are applied for certain students based on the approved Virginia Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook amended June 2008.		

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

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

This section collects data on student academic achievement on the State *NCLB* assessments.

1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics

In the format of the table below, provide the number of students who completed the State *NCLB* assessment(s) in mathematics implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA (regardless of whether the students were present for a full academic year) and for whom a proficiency level was assigned, and the number of these students who scored at or above proficient, in grades 3 through 8 and high school. The percentage of students who scored at or above proficient is calculated automatically.

The student group "children with disabilities (*IDEA*)" includes children who participated in the regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments.

The student group "limited English proficient (LEP) students" does include recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months. Do not include former LEP students.

1.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts

This section is similar to 1.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State's *NCLB* reading/language arts assessment.

The student group "limited English proficient (LEP) students" does not include recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months. Do not include former LEP students.

1.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science

This section is similar to 1.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State's *NCLB* science assessment administered at least one in each of the following grade spans 3 through 5, 6 through 9, and 10 through 12.

Limited English Proficiency (LEP) students includes recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months. Do not include former LEP students.

1.3.1.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	89,656	79,886	89.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	275	246	89.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	5,054	4,786	94.7
Black, non-Hispanic	22,605	18,247	80.7
Hispanic	8,015	6,566	81.9
White, non-Hispanic	50,707	47,344	93.4
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	12,253	9,029	73.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	9,230	7,597	82.3
Economically disadvantaged students	31,472	25,612	81.4
Migratory students	86	68	79.1
Male	45,958	40,796	88.8
Female	43,698	39,090	89.5
Comments:			

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.2.1 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	89,432	75,167	84.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	273	228	83.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,952	4,483	90.5
Black, non-Hispanic	22,619	16,799	74.3
Hispanic	7,932	6,262	78.9
White, non-Hispanic	50,677	44,847	88.5
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	12,249	8,234	67.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	8,966	7,076	78.9
Economically disadvantaged students	31,358	23,540	75.1
Migratory students	82	57	69.5
Male	45,803	37,220	81.3
Female	43,629	37,947	87.0
Comments:			

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	87,114	76,804	88.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	271	243	89.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,705	4,390	93.3
Black, non-Hispanic	22,122	17,211	77.8
Hispanic	6,835	5,484	80.2
White, non-Hispanic	50,265	46,852	93.2
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	11,301	8,300	73.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	7,441	5,924	79.6
Economically disadvantaged students	29,791	23,587	79.2
Migratory students	67	56	83.6
Male	44,556	39,065	87.7
Female	42,558	37,739	88.7
Comments:			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

1.3.1.2 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	89,512	75,317	84.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	281	240	85.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	5,197	4,830	92.9
Black, non-Hispanic	22,898	16,836	73.5
Hispanic	7,680	5,837	76.0
White, non-Hispanic	50,809	45,314	89.2
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	12,385	8,546	69.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	8,658	6,651	76.8
Economically disadvantaged students	30,526	22,572	73.9
Migratory students	87	72	82.8
Male	46,126	38,782	84.1
Female	43,386	36,535	84.2
Comments:			

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.2.2 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	89,427	79,063	88.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	284	254	89.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	5,068	4,747	93.7
Black, non-Hispanic	22,905	18,445	80.5
Hispanic	7,634	6,413	84.0
White, non-Hispanic	50,883	46,814	92.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	12,364	9,030	73.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	8,421	7,044	83.6
Economically disadvantaged students	30,451	24,531	80.6
Migratory students	83	71	85.5
Male	46,043	39,893	86.6
Female	43,384	39,170	90.3
Comments:			

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	0	0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	0	0	0.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.0
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	0	0	0.0
Female	0	0	0.0
Comments: Virginia does not currently administer the Standards of Learning assessments in science at grade 4.			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

1.3.1.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	84,713	74,681	88.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	254	221	87.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,456	4,198	94.2
Black, non-Hispanic	21,743	17,660	81.2
Hispanic	7,518	6,101	81.2
White, non-Hispanic	48,708	44,679	91.7
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	12,125	8,824	72.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	7,825	6,256	79.9
Economically disadvantaged students	28,997	23,353	80.5
Migratory students	67	59	88.1
Male	43,427	37,797	87.0
Female	41,286	36,884	89.3
Comments:			

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.2.3 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	87,978	78,562	89.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	261	237	90.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,978	4,702	94.5
Black, non-Hispanic	22,039	18,091	82.1
Hispanic	7,586	6,364	83.9
White, non-Hispanic	50,910	47,156	92.6
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	12,265	8,996	73.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	7,824	6,481	82.8
Economically disadvantaged students	29,163	23,785	81.6
Migratory students	67	54	80.6
Male	45,182	39,582	87.6
Female	42,796	38,980	91.1
Comments:			

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	87,010	76,840	88.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	259	238	91.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	5,032	4,579	91.0
Black, non-Hispanic	21,466	17,142	79.9
Hispanic	7,494	5,742	76.6
White, non-Hispanic	50,574	47,158	93.2
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	11,236	8,020	71.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	7,861	5,695	72.4
Economically disadvantaged students	28,481	22,418	78.7
Migratory students	62	51	82.3
Male	44,564	39,700	89.1
Female	42,446	37,140	87.5
Comments:			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

1.3.1.4 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	80,934	54,796	67.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	274	184	67.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,063	3,374	83.0
Black, non-Hispanic	21,735	11,423	52.6
Hispanic	7,023	3,945	56.2
White, non-Hispanic	45,914	34,488	75.1
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	11,856	5,790	48.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,777	3,767	55.6
Economically disadvantaged students	27,945	14,837	53.1
Migratory students	69	40	58.0
Male	41,404	27,645	66.8
Female	39,530	27,151	68.7
Comments:			

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.2.4 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	89,139	75,828	85.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	293	254	86.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,955	4,602	92.9
Black, non-Hispanic	22,595	16,771	74.2
Hispanic	7,406	5,809	78.4
White, non-Hispanic	51,875	46,634	89.9
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	12,050	7,683	63.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	7,014	5,341	76.1
Economically disadvantaged students	28,828	21,367	74.1
Migratory students	67	48	71.6
Male	45,584	37,924	83.2
Female	43,555	37,904	87.0
Comments:			

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	0	0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	0	0	0.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.0
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	0	0	0.0
Female	0	0	0.0
Comments: Virginia does not currently administer the Standards of Learning assessments in science at grade 6.			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

1.3.1.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	74,013	48,303	65.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	237	154	65.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,338	2,690	80.6
Black, non-Hispanic	20,148	9,985	49.6
Hispanic	6,271	3,147	50.2
White, non-Hispanic	42,478	31,325	73.7
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	11,639	5,800	49.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,748	2,788	48.5
Economically disadvantaged students	25,675	12,978	50.5
Migratory students	63	37	58.7
Male	38,186	24,513	64.2
Female	35,827	23,790	66.4
Comments:			

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.2.5 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	90,698	78,207	86.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	322	277	86.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,771	4,465	93.6
Black, non-Hispanic	23,485	17,962	76.5
Hispanic	7,259	5,683	78.3
White, non-Hispanic	52,941	48,126	90.9
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	12,457	7,976	64.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,252	4,676	74.8
Economically disadvantaged students	28,687	21,650	75.5
Migratory students	61	46	75.4
Male	46,567	39,359	84.5
Female	44,131	38,848	88.0
Comments:			

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	0	0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	0	0	0.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.0
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	0	0	0.0
Female	0	0	0.0
Comments: Virginia does not currently administer the Standards of Learning assessments in science at grade 7.			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

1.3.1.6 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	91,864	76,183	82.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	314	277	88.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,695	4,397	93.7
Black, non-Hispanic	25,439	18,285	71.9
Hispanic	7,225	5,364	74.2
White, non-Hispanic	52,407	46,415	88.6
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	14,228	8,253	58.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,843	4,232	72.4
Economically disadvantaged students	28,955	20,792	71.8
Migratory students	57	48	84.2
Male	47,751	38,613	80.9
Female	44,113	37,570	85.2
Comments:			

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.2.6 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	93,034	77,644	83.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	282	252	89.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,869	4,465	91.7
Black, non-Hispanic	24,957	17,843	71.5
Hispanic	7,165	5,367	74.9
White, non-Hispanic	53,983	48,208	89.3
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	13,696	7,859	57.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,614	3,896	69.4
Economically disadvantaged students	28,613	20,174	70.5
Migratory students	53	40	75.5
Male	47,956	39,159	81.7
Female	45,078	38,485	85.4
Comments:			

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.3.6 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	91,051	81,905	90.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	266	254	95.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,968	4,684	94.3
Black, non-Hispanic	23,773	19,505	82.0
Hispanic	7,103	5,659	79.7
White, non-Hispanic	53,217	50,208	94.3
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	11,326	7,746	68.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,793	4,221	72.9
Economically disadvantaged students	27,513	21,993	79.9
Migratory students	53	39	73.6
Male	46,463	41,801	90.0
Female	44,588	40,104	89.9
Comments:			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

1.3.1.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - High School

High School	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	259,955	234,473	90.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	799	712	89.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	16,782	16,090	95.9
Black, non-Hispanic	62,950	51,680	82.1
Hispanic	17,613	15,207	86.3
White, non-Hispanic	157,020	146,401	93.2
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	21,227	15,611	73.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	13,605	11,866	87.2
Economically disadvantaged students	56,345	47,172	83.7
Migratory students	135	123	91.1
Male	127,804	114,819	89.8
Female	132,151	119,654	90.5
Comments:			

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.2.7 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - High School

High School	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	90,053	84,988	94.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	268	259	96.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	5,045	4,878	96.7
Black, non-Hispanic	23,060	20,508	88.9
Hispanic	5,817	5,303	91.2
White, non-Hispanic	54,320	52,570	96.8
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	9,810	7,458	76.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,765	3,274	87.0
Economically disadvantaged students	19,127	16,928	88.5
Migratory students	53	44	83.0
Male	44,545	41,683	93.6
Female	45,508	43,305	95.2
Comments:			

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Science - High School

High School	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	239,656	211,005	88.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	729	666	91.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	13,630	12,579	92.3
Black, non-Hispanic	60,630	46,756	77.1
Hispanic	16,726	13,035	77.9
White, non-Hispanic	143,719	134,212	93.4
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	23,113	15,112	65.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	12,300	8,831	71.8
Economically disadvantaged students	56,694	43,282	76.3
Migratory students	149	108	72.5
Male	118,118	104,957	88.9
Female	121,538	106,048	87.3
Comments:			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY

This section collects data on the Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) status of schools and districts.

1.4.1 All Schools and Districts Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of schools and districts and the total number of those schools and districts that made AYP based on data for the SY 2007-08. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2007-08	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2007-08
Schools	1,844	1,377	74.7
Districts	132	57	43.2
Comments:			

Source – The table above is produced through *EDFacts*. The SEA submits the data in N/X103 for data group 32.

1.4.2 Title I School Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public Title I schools by type and the total number of those schools that made AYP based on data for the SY 2007-08 school year. Include only public Title I schools. Do not include Title I programs operated by local educational agencies in private schools. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2007-08	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2007-08
All Title I schools	720	538	74.7
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	358	257	71.8
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	362	281	77.6
Comments:			

Source – The table above is produced through *EDFacts*. The SEA submits the data in N/X129 for data group 22 and N/X103 for data group 32.

1.4.3 Accountability of Districts That Received Title I Funds

In the table below, provide the total number of districts that received Title I funds and the total number of those districts that made AYP based on data for SY 2007-08. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2007-08	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2007-08
132	57	43.2
Comments:		

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk.

Note: DG 582 is not collected from the SEA, rather it comes from the Title I funding data.

1.4.4 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

1.4.4.1 List of Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

In the following table, provide a list of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 for the SY 2008-09 based on the data from SY 2007-08. For each school on the list, provide the following:

- District Name and NCES ID Code
- School Name and NCES ID Code
- Whether the school missed the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the school missed the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the school missed the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school missed the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2008-09 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: School Improvement – Year 1, School Improvement – Year 2, Corrective Action, Restructuring Year 1 (planning), or Restructuring Year 2 (implementing))¹
- Whether (yes or no) the school is or is not a Title I school (*This column **must be completed** by States that choose to list all schools in improvement. Column is optional for States that list only Title I schools.*)
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003(a).
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003 (g).

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter school data.

Download template: [Question 1.4.4.1 \(Get MS Excel Viewer\)](#)

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

¹ The school improvement statuses are defined in *LEA and School Improvement Non-Regulatory Guidance*. This document may be found on the Department's Web page at <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/schoolimprovementguid.doc>.

				Area in Which School Missed AYP										
District Name	NCES/CCD ID Code	School Name	NCES/CCD ID Code	Reading/Language Arts		Mathematics		Other Academic Indicator		School Improvement Status for SY2008-09	Title I School (Yes/No)	Provided assistance by LEA through 1003(a) (Yes/No)	Provided assistance by LEA through 1003(g) (Yes/No)	
				Proficiency Target Met (Yes/No)	Participation Rate Target Met (Yes/No)	Proficiency Target Met (Yes/No)	Participation Rate Target Met (Yes/No)	Academic Indicator Met (Yes/No) (elementary/middle schools)	Graduation Rate Met (Yes/No) (high school)					
ALBEMARLE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	5100090	MARY CARR GREER ELEMENTARY	27	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N		1	Y	Yes	No
ALEXANDRIA CITY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	5100120	PATRICK HENRY ELEMENTARY	52	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N		1	Y	Yes	No
ALEXANDRIA CITY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	5100120	MOUNT VERNON ELEMENTARY	50	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N		1	Y	Yes	No
ALEXANDRIA CITY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	5100120	JEFFERSON-HOUSTON ELEMENTARY	44	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		3	Y	Yes	No
ALEXANDRIA CITY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	5100120	CORA KELLY MAGNET ELEMENTARY	1826	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		1	Y	Yes	No
AMHERST COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	5100210	CENTRAL ELEMENTARY	68	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		1	Y	Yes	No
ARLINGTON COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	5100270	BARCROFT ELEMENTARY	83	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N		3	Y	Yes	No
ARLINGTON COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	5100270	DREW MODEL ELEMENTARY	87	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N		1	Y	Yes	No
ARLINGTON COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	5100270	HOFFMAN-BOSTON ELEMENTARY	1900	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N		5	Y	Yes	No
ARLINGTON COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	5100270	RANDOLPH ELEMENTARY	13	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N		4	Y	Yes	No
ARLINGTON COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	5100270	CARLIN SPRINGS ELEMENTARY	93	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		3	Y	Yes	No
BEDFORD COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	5100360	BEDFORD PRIMARY	144	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N		1	Y	Yes	No
BEDFORD COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	5100360	BEDFORD ELEMENTARY	2141	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N		1	Y	Yes	No
CHARLES CITY COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	5100720	CHARLES CITY COUNTY ELEMENTARY	260	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N		3	Y	Yes	Yes
COLONIAL BEACH PUBLIC SCHOOLS	5100930	COLONIAL BEACH ELEMENTARY	1956	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		1	Y	Yes	No
CRAIG COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	5101020	MCCLEARY ELEMENTARY	372	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N		1	Y	Yes	No
CULPEPER COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	5101050	SYCAMORE PARK ELEMENTARY	382	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N		1	Y	Yes	No
CULPEPER COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	5101050	PEARL SAMPLE ELEMENTARY	380	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N		2	Y	Yes	Yes
DICKENSON COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	5101140	ERVINTON ELEMENTARY	404	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		1	Y	Yes	No
ESSEX COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	5101200	TAPPAHANNOCK ELEMENTARY	421	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N		5	Y	Yes	No
ESSEX COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	5101200	ESSEX INTERMEDIATE	420	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N		4	Y	Yes	No
FAIRFAX COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	5101260	HYBLA VALLEY ELEMENTARY	503	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N		2	Y	Yes	No
FAIRFAX COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	5101260	MOUNT VERNON WOODS ELEMENTARY	543	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N		3	Y	Yes	No
FAIRFAX COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	5101260	MCNAIR ELEMENTARY	2272	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N		3	Y	Yes	No
FAIRFAX COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	5101260	DOGWOOD ELEMENTARY	458	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N		3	Y	Yes	No
FAIRFAX COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	5101260	HOLLIN MEADOWS ELEMENTARY	499	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N		1	Y	Yes	No
FAIRFAX COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	5101260	WASHINGTON MILL ELEMENTARY	582	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N		1	Y	Yes	No
FAIRFAX COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	5101260	RIVERSIDE ELEMENTARY	560	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		1	Y	Yes	No
FAUQUIER COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	5101320	GRACE MILLER ELEMENTARY	2184	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N		1	Y	Yes	No
FAUQUIER COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	5101320	JAMES G. BRUMFIELD ELEMENTARY	2533	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N		2	Y	Yes	No
FLUVANNA COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	5101380	CENTRAL ELEMENTARY	622	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N		1	Y	Yes	No
FLUVANNA COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	5101380	CUNNINGHAM DISTRICT ELEMENTARY	624	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N		1	Y	Yes	No
FLUVANNA COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	5101380	COLUMBIA DISTRICT ELEMENTARY	623	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N		1	Y	Yes	No
FRANKLIN CITY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	5101410	JOSEPH P. KING JR. MIDDLE	2431	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		1	Y	Yes	No
FREDERICKSBURG CITY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	5101510	LAFAYETTE UPPER ELEMENTARY	2468	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N		1	Y	Yes	No
FREDERICKSBURG CITY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	5101510	HUGH MERCER ELEMENTARY	660	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N		1	Y	Yes	No
HAMPTON CITY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	5101800	CAPTAIN JOHN SMITH ELEMENTARY	735	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N		1	Y	Yes	No
HAMPTON CITY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	5101800	FRANCIS MALLORY ELEMENTARY	740	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N		3	Y	Yes	No
HAMPTON CITY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	5101800	HAMPTON HARBOUR ACADEMY	997	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N		3	Y	Yes	No

HAMPTON CITY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	5101800	ROBERT E. LEE ELEMENTARY	756	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	1	Y	Yes	No
HENRICO COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	5101890	NEW BRIDGE SCHOOL	1909	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	2	Y	Yes	No
HENRICO COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	5101890	LAKESIDE ELEMENTARY	815	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	1	Y	Yes	No
KING AND QUEEN COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	5102070	KING & QUEEN ELEMENTARY	879	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	1	Y	Yes	No
KING GEORGE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	5102100	POTOMAC ELEMENTARY	884	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	2	Y	Yes	No
KING GEORGE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	5102100	KING GEORGE ELEMENTARY	881	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	1	Y	Yes	Yes
LANCASTER COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	5102160	LANCASTER PRIMARY	889	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	1	Y	Yes	No
LOUISA COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	5102280	TREVILIANS ELEMENTARY	2066	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	3	Y	Yes	No
LUNENBURG COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	5102310	VICTORIA ELEMENTARY	949	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	1	Y	Yes	No
MONTGOMERY COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	5102520	SHAWSVILLE ELEMENTARY	1028	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	2	Y	Yes	No
NEWPORT NEWS CITY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	5102640	SEDFIELD ELEMENTARY	1073	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	2	Y	Yes	Yes
NEWPORT NEWS CITY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	5102640	L.F. PALMER ELEMENTARY	1060	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	3	Y	Yes	Yes
NORTHAMPTON COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	5102710	KIPTOPEKE ELEMENTARY	555	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	1	Y	Yes	No
NORTHAMPTON COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	5102710	OCCOHANNOCK ELEMENTARY	554	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	1	Y	Yes	No
ORANGE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	5102820	ORANGE ELEMENTARY	1175	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	3	Y	Yes	Yes
ORANGE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	5102820	GORDON BARBOUR ELEMENTARY	1172	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	1	Y	Yes	No
ORANGE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	5102820	LIGHTFOOT ELEMENTARY	1173	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	1	Y	Yes	No
ORANGE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	5102820	UNIONVILLE ELEMENTARY	1177	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	1	Y	Yes	No
PETERSBURG CITY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	5102910	PEABODY MIDDLE	2794	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	5	Y	Yes	No
PETERSBURG CITY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	5102910	J.E.B. STUART ELEMENTARY	1196	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	5	Y	Yes	No
PETERSBURG CITY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	5102910	VERNON JOHNS JR. HIGH	2795	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	7	Y	Yes	No
PETERSBURG CITY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	5102910	A.P. HILL ELEMENTARY	1202	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	2	Y	Yes	No
PITTSYLVANIA COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	5102940	GRETNA MIDDLE	1217	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	1	Y	Yes	No
PITTSYLVANIA COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	5102940	DAN RIVER MIDDLE	1213	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	2	Y	Yes	No
PITTSYLVANIA COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	5102940	KENTUCK ELEMENTARY	1220	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	1	Y	Yes	No
PORTSMOUTH CITY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	5103000	BRIGHTON ELEMENTARY	2472	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	1	Y	Yes	No
PORTSMOUTH CITY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	5103000	CHURCHLAND ACADEMY ELEMENTARY	2069	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	1	Y	Yes	No
PRINCE EDWARD COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	5103060	PRINCE EDWARD MIDDLE	2130	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	4	Y	Yes	No
PRINCE WILLIAM COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	5103130	BELMONT ELEMENTARY	1286	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	1	Y	Yes	No
PULASKI COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	5103150	DUBLIN ELEMENTARY	1332	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	1	Y	Yes	No
PULASKI COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	5103150	PULASKI ELEMENTARY	2460	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	1	Y	Yes	No
RICHMOND CITY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	5103240	HANDLER MIDDLE	654	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	6	Y	Yes	No
RICHMOND CITY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	5103240	THOMAS C. BOUSHALL MIDDLE	2078	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	4	Y	Yes	No
RICHMOND CITY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	5103240	BLACKWELL ELEMENTARY	1357	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	1	Y	Yes	No
RICHMOND CITY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	5103240	RICHMOND ALTERNATIVE	2307	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	2	Y	Yes	No
RICHMOND CITY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	5103240	LUCILLE M. BROWN MIDDLE	1894	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	3	Y	Yes	No
RICHMOND CITY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	5103240	ELKHARDT MIDDLE	1364	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	5	Y	Yes	No
ROANOKE CITY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	5103300	HURT PARK ELEMENTARY	1423	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	3	Y	Yes	Yes
ROANOKE CITY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	5103300	ADDISON AEROSPACE MAGNET MIDDLE	1412	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	1	Y	Yes	Yes
ROANOKE CITY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	5103300	HUFF LANE INTERMEDIATE	1422	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	1	Y	Yes	No
ROANOKE CITY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	5103300	ROUND HILL MONTESSORI PRIMARY	1433	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	1	Y	Yes	No
ROCKBRIDGE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	5103370	FAIRFIELD ELEMENTARY	1481	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	1	Y	Yes	No
SHENANDOAH COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	5103510	ASHBY LEE ELEMENTARY	1542	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	1	Y	Yes	No
STAFFORD COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	5103660	FALMOUTH ELEMENTARY	1596	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	1	Y	Yes	No
STAFFORD COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	5103660	KATE WALLER BARRETT ELEMENTARY	2320	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	1	Y	Yes	No
STAFFORD COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	5103660	ROCKY RUN ELEMENTARY	2547	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	3	Y	Yes	No
SUFFOLK CITY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	5103710	ELEPHANT'S FORK ELEMENTARY	1876	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	2	Y	Yes	Yes
SUSSEX COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	5103780	ANNIE B. JACKSON ELEMENTARY	2136	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	3	Y	Yes	No
WARREN COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	5103870	WARREN COUNTYUNTY MIDDLE	1734	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	1	Y	Yes	No

1.4.4.1

Title I Schools for Improvement , Correction Action, and Restructing (in 2008-2009 based on data from 2007-2008)
As of November 19, 2008

WESTMORELAND COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOO	5103980	WASHINGTON DISTRICT ELEMENTARY	1769	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	1	Y	Yes	No
WILLIAMSBURG-JAMES CITY PUBLIC SCHO	5104020	D.J. MONTAGUE ELEMENTARY	2171	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	1	Y	Yes	No

1.4.4.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for schools in corrective action, provide the number of schools for which the listed corrective actions under *NCLB* were implemented in SY 2007-08 (based on SY 2006-07 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2007-08
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	8
Extension of the school year or school day	2
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	8
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	1
Replacement of the principal	0
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	8
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	11
Comments: For school year 2007-2008, 16 schools were required to implement the corrective action sanction. Some schools implemented more than one corrective action in the 2007-2008 school year.	

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

1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2

In the table below, for schools in restructuring – year 2 (implementation year), provide the number of schools for which the listed restructuring actions under *NCLB* were implemented in SY 2007-08 (based on SY 2006-07 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Restructuring Action	# of Title I Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	0
Reopening the school as a public charter school	0
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	0
Take over the school by the State	0
Other major restructuring of the school governance	2
Comments:	

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

In the space below, list specifically the "other major restructuring of the school governance" action(s) that were implemented.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The activities conducted by schools in their second year of restructuring under "other major restructuring of the school governance," are listed below.

Received bi-weekly or monthly assistance from alternative governance committees.

Received the assistance of on-site administrative and/or core academic coaches.*

Focused targeted attention on data use and analysis via a required Restructuring Quarterly Report that can be found on the Office of School Improvement Web site at: <http://www.doe.virginia.gov/VDOE/SchoolImprovement/>.

Focused targeted attention on central office/division-level assistance to schools in restructuring through the Center on Innovation and Improvement's online school improvement planning tool. Information can be found at the following Web site:

<http://www.centerii.org/aboutus/>.

Received technical assistance for administrators and teachers from the Virginia Department of Education upon request.

Appointed a new school administration.

Revised/aligned the division/school curriculum pacing guides and conducted trainings.

Increased classroom monitoring strategies.

Implemented school reform strategies proven successful in Virginia's Partnership for Achieving Successful Schools (PASS) initiative.

Information about the PASS initiative can be found at the following Web site:

<http://www.doe.virginia.gov/VDOE/SchoolImprovement/pass.html>.

*Emphasis has been placed on the selection of outside experts with expertise in core subject areas, especially reading and mathematics, and school reform or school leadership experience. Certain schools in Year 2 of restructuring receive academic coaches in addition to the alternative governance experts on the committees as a result of blended restructuring requirements under the Standards of Accreditation and alternative governance restructuring requirements under the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001.

1.4.5 Districts That Received Title I Funds Identified for Improvement

1.4.5.1 List of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Were Identified for Improvement

In the following table, provide a list of districts that received Title I funds and were identified for improvement or corrective action under Section 1116 for the SY 2008-09 based on the data from SY 2007-08. For each district on the list, provide the following:

- District Name and NCES ID Code
- Whether the district missed the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the district missed the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the district met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2008-09 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: Improvement or Corrective Action²)
- Whether the district is a district that received Title I funds. Indicate "Yes" if the district received Title I funds and "No" if the district did not receive Title I funds. (**This column must be completed by States that choose to list all districts or all districts in improvement.** This column is optional for States that list only districts in improvement that receive Title I funds.)

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter district data.

Download template: [Question 1.4.5.1 \(Get MS Excel Viewer\)](#)

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

² The district improvement statuses are defined in *LEA and School Improvement Non-Regulatory Guidance*. This document may be found on the Department's Web page at <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/schoolimprovementguid.doc>.

1.4.5.2 Actions Taken for Districts That Received Title I Funds and Were Identified for Improvement

In the space below, briefly describe the measures being taken to address the achievement problems of districts identified for improvement or corrective action. Include a discussion of the technical assistance provided by the State (e.g., the number of districts served, the nature and duration of assistance provided, etc.).

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Virginia had no divisions identified as in improvement or corrective action. The Virginia Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook amended June 2008 states:
Virginia will identify divisions for improvement only when they do not make AYP in the "same subject area or both other academic indicators" and all grade spans for two consecutive years. (p. 25) This identification process resulted in no divisions being identified as in improvement for 2008-2009.

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

1.4.5.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for districts in corrective action, provide the number of districts in corrective action in which the listed corrective actions under *NCLB* were implemented in SY 2007-08 (based on SY 2006-07 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Corrective Action	# of Districts receiving Title I funds in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2007-08
Implementing a new curriculum based on State standards	0
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	0
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	0
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	0
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	0
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	0
Restructured the district	0
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2006-07 and beginning of SY 2007-08 as a corrective action)	0
Comments:	

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

1.4.7 Appeal of AYP and Identification Determinations

In the table below, provide the number of districts and schools that appealed their AYP designations based on 2007-08 data and the results of those appeals.

	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts	2	2
Schools	20	13
Comments:		

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

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2007-08 data was complete	10/10/08
---	----------

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

1.4.8 School Improvement Status

In the section below, "Schools in Improvement" means Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of *ESEA* for SY 2007-08.

1.4.8.1 Student Proficiency for Schools Receiving Assistance Through Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Funds

The table below pertains only to schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08.

- In the **SY 2007-08 column**, provide the total number and percentage of students in schools receiving School Improvement funds in SY 2007-08 who were:
 - Proficient in mathematics as measured by your State's assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* in SY 2007-08.
 - Proficient in reading/language arts as measured by your State's assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* in SY 2007-08.
 - Total number of schools for which the data in this table are reported. This should be the total number of schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08.
- In the **SY 2006-07 column**, provide the requested data for the same schools whose student proficiency data are reported for SY 2007-08. No total is requested for schools in SY 2006-07.

Category	SY 2007-08	SY 2006-07
Total number of students who were enrolled in schools that received assistance through Section 1003 (a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	30,493	26,536
Total number of students who were proficient in mathematics in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	13,524	11,560
Percentage of students who were proficient in mathematics in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	44.4	43.6
Total number of students who were proficient in reading/language arts in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	14,202	12,146
Percentage of students who were proficient in reading/language arts in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	46.6	45.8
Number of schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	69	
Comments:		

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

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.4.8.2 School Improvement Status and School Improvement Assistance

In the table below, indicate the number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08 that:

- Made adequate yearly progress;
- Exited improvement status;
- Did not make adequate yearly progress.

Category	# of Schools
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08 that made adequate yearly progress based on testing in SY 2007-08	57
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08 that exited improvement status based on testing in SY 2007-08	15
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08 that did not make adequate yearly progress based on testing in SY 2007-08	12
Comments:	

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

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.4.8.3 Effective School Improvement Strategies

In the table below, indicate the effective school improvement strategies used that were supported through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds.

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4	Column 5	Column 6	Column 7
<p>Effective Strategy or Combination of Strategies Used</p> <p>(See response options in "Column 1 Response Options Box" below.)</p> <p>If your State's response includes a "5" (other strategies), identify the specific strategy(s) in Column 2.</p>	<p>Description of "Other Strategies"</p> <p>This response is limited to 500 characters.</p>	<p>Number of schools in which the strategy (s) was used</p>	<p>Number of schools that used the strategy(s), made AYP, and exited improvement status</p>	<p>Number of schools that used the strategy(s), made AYP, but did not exit improvement status</p>	<p>Most common other Positive Outcome from the Strategy</p> <p>(See response options in "Column 6 Response Options Box" below)</p>	<p>Description of "Other Positive Outcome" if Response for Column 6 is "D"</p> <p>This response is limited to 500 characters.</p>
5	Certain schools receiving 1003(g) funds implemented the following five types of "other strategies" to improve teaching and learning: 1) increased use of instructional materials and technology; 2) data-driven development of instructional resources and strategies; 3) additional remediation in reading and mathematics for low-achieving students; 4) design of incentives/rewards systems; and 5) additional time for teacher collaboration.	4	2	0	A	
6 = Combo 1	Strategies 1, 4, and 5 comprise this combination.	5	2	2	A	
7 = Combo 2	Strategies 1 and 4 comprise this combination.	1	0	0	A	
8 = Combo 3	Strategies 1 and 5 comprise this combination.	7	5	0	A	
8 = Combo 3	Strategies 4 and 5 comprise this combination.	2	0	0	A	

Comments: Strategies reported reflect those implemented by school divisions receiving 1003(g) funds.

Column 1 Response Options Box
1 = Provide customized technical assistance and/or professional development that is designed to build the capacity of LEA and school staff to improve schools and is informed by student achievement and other outcome-related measures.
2 = Utilize research-based strategies or practices to change instructional practice to address the academic achievement problems that caused the school to be identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.
3 = Create partnerships among the SEA, LEAs and other entities for the purpose of delivering technical assistance, professional development, and management advice.
4 = Provide professional development to enhance the capacity of school support team members and other technical assistance providers who are part of the Statewide system of support and that is informed by student achievement and other outcome-related measures.
5 = Implement other strategies determined by the SEA or LEA, as appropriate, for which data indicate the strategy is likely to result in improved teaching and learning in schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.
6 = Combination 1: Schools using a combination of strategies from above. Please use Column 2 to indicate which of the above strategies comprise this combination.
7 = Combination 2: Schools using a combination of strategies from above. Please use Column 2 to indicate which of the above strategies

comprise this combination.

8 = Combination 3: Schools Using a combination of strategies from above. Please use Column 2 to indicate which of the above strategies comprise this combination.

Column 6 Response Options Box

A = Improvement by at least five percentage points in two or more AYP reporting cells

B = Increased teacher retention

C = Improved parental involvement

D = Other

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

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.4.8.4 Sharing of Effective Strategies

In the space below, describe how your State shared the effective strategies identified in item 1.4.8.3 with its LEAs and schools. Please exclude newsletters and handouts in your description.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Virginia Department of Education conducted two audio-conferences for schools eligible for 1003(g) funds. The first audio-conference outlined the terms of the application for 1003(g) funds including general discussion on the choice of effective strategies from which to choose when applying for the funds. The second audio-conference provided direct technical assistance addressing: 1) the requirement for the chosen strategies to integrate with existing school improvement plans; and 2) the requirement to provide data to support the choice of strategies. Title I specialists provided ongoing individual technical assistance to school divisions on an as-needed basis. Additional technical assistance was conducted in fall 2008 and is planned for spring 2009 for those schools that did not exit school improvement.

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

1.4.8.5 Use of Section 1003(a) and (g) School Improvement Funds

Note: New section for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2007 (SY 2007-08) Title I, Part A allocation that the SEA reserved in accordance with Section 1003(a) of *ESEA* and §200.100(a) of ED's regulations governing the reservation of funds for school improvement under Section 1003(a) of *ESEA*: 4.0 %

Comments:

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

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.4.8.5.2 Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Allocations to LEAs and Schools

In the tables below, provide the requested information for FY 2007 (SY 2007-08).

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter allocation data.
Download template: [Question 1.4.8.5.2 \(Get MS Excel Viewer\)](#)

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

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

Name of LEA with One or More Schools Provided Assistance through Section 1003(a) Funds in SY 2007-08	NCES LEA ID	Amount of LEA's 1003(a) Allocation
Alexandria City Public Schools	5100120	225,000.00
Amherst County Public Schools	5100210	100,000.00
Arlington County Public Schools	5100270	500,000.00
Charles City County Public Schools	5100720	100,000.00
Colonial Beach Town Public Schools	5100930	100,000.00
Culpeper County Public Schools	5100930	100,000.00
Dickenson County Public Schools	5101140	100,000.00
Essex County Public Schools	5101200	250,000.00
Fairfax County Public Schools	5101260	550,000.00
Fauquier County Public Schools	5101320	100,000.00
Franklin City Public Schools	5101410	100,000.00
Fredericksbrg City Public Schools	5101510	200,000.00
Hampton City Public Schools	5101800	500,000.00
Henrico County Public Schools	5101890	300,000.00
Henry County Public Schools	5101920	200,000.00
King and Queen County Public Schools	5102070	100,000.00
King George County Public Schools	5102100	200,000.00
Lancaster County Public Schools	5102160	100,000.00
Louisa County Public Schools	5102280	125,000.00
Lunenburg County Public Schools	5102310	100,000.00
Montgomery County Public Schools	5102520	100,000.00
Newport News City Public Schools	5102640	200,000.00
Orange County Public Schools	5102820	100,000.00
Petersburg City Public Schools	5102910	525,000.00
Pittsylvania County Public Schools	5102940	300,000.00
Portsmouth City Public Schools	5103000	100,000.00
Prince Edward County Public Schools	5103060	125,000.00
Prince William County Public Schools	5103130	100,000.00
Richmond City Public Schools	5103240	850,000.00
Roanoke City Public Schools	5103300	425,000.00
Stafford County Public Schools	5103660	125,000.00
Suffolk City Public Schools	5103710	100,000.00
Sussex County Public Schools	5103780	125,000.00
Wythe County Public Schools	5104110	100,000.00

Name of LEA with One or More Schools Provided Assistance through Section 1003(g) Funds in SY 2007-08	NCES LEA ID	Amount of LEA's 1003(g) Allocation
Charles City County Public Schools	5100720	87,950.00
Culpeper County Public Schools	5100930	125,001.00
Hampton City Public Schools	5101800	375,003.00
Henrico County Public Schools	5101890	125,001.00
Henry County Public Schools	5101920	175,900.00
King George County Public Schools	5102100	87,950.00
Lunenburg County Public Schools	5102310	87,950.00
Newport News City Public Schools	5102640	175,900.00
Orange County Public Schools	5102820	87,950.00
Pittsylvania County Public Schools	5102940	87,950.00
Roanoke City Public Schools	5103300	263,850.00
Suffolk City Public Schools	5103710	87,950.00
Wythe County Public Schools	5104110	87,950.00

1.4.8.5.3 Use of Section 1003(g)(8) Funds for Evaluation and Technical Assistance

Section 1003(g)(8) of *ESEA* allows States to reserve up to five percent of Section 1003(g) funds for administration and to meet the evaluation and technical assistance requirements for this program. In the space below, identify and describe the specific Section 1003(g) evaluation and technical assistance activities that your State conducted during SY 2007-08.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Virginia Department of Education conducted two audio-conferences for schools eligible for 1003(g) funds. The first audio-conference outlined the terms of the application for 1003(g) funds including general discussion on the choice of effective strategies from which to choose when applying for the funds. The second audio-conference provided direct technical assistance addressing: 1) the requirement for the chosen strategies to integrate with existing school improvement plans; and 2) the requirement to provide data to support the choice of strategies. Title I specialists provided ongoing individual technical assistance to school divisions on an as-needed basis. Additional technical assistance was conducted in fall 2008 and is planned for spring 2009 for those schools that did not exit school improvement.

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

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.4.8.6 Actions Taken for Title I Schools Identified for Improvement Supported by Funds Other than Those of Section 1003(a) and 1003(g).

In the space below, describe actions (if any) taken by your State in SY 2007-08 that were supported by **funds other than Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) funds** to address the achievement problems of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of *ESEA*.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Technical Assistance

Title I schools identified for School Improvement that are also considered "warned" under the Regulations Establishing Standards for Accrediting Public Schools in Virginia (SOA) receive assistance through state funds. The assistance is delivered through the tiered academic review process which provides targeted technical assistance based on level of need. Tier 1 provides the least amount of technical assistance while Tier 3 provides the greatest amount of technical assistance. Divisions with low-performing schools are assigned a tier and receive assistance based on their level of need as described below.

Tier 1 Intervention

In this tier, schools receive an enhanced academic review and are assigned a school support team. The support team consists of experts in the content area(s) and/or subgroup(s) with which the school is struggling.

Tier 2 Intervention

In this tier, schools receive coaches that have been trained in the Partnership for Achieving Successful Schools (PASS) model. The PASS model was developed by educators and is based on models of intervention that have been successful with low-performing schools. PASS coaches customize the technical assistance based on the individual needs of the school in improvement.

Tier 3 Intervention

In this tier, school divisions are assigned a chief academic officer. The chief academic officer serves as an on-site academic coach to the entire division. The technical assistance provided is customized based on the needs of the division.

State-level staff members from the Office of School Improvement work closely with the schools, divisions, and the assigned support system for each tier.

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

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

1.4.9 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on public school choice and supplemental educational services.

1.4.9.1 Public School Choice

This section collects data on public school choice. FAQs related to the public school choice provisions are at the end of this section.

1.4.9.1.2 Public School Choice – Students

In the table below, provide the number of students who were eligible for public school choice, the number of eligible students who applied for public school choice, and the number who transferred under the provisions for public school choice in Section 1116 of *ESEA*.

Students who are eligible for public school choice includes:

- (1) Students currently enrolled in a school identified for improvement, corrective action or restructuring.
- (2) Students who transferred in the current school year under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116, and
- (3) Students who previously transferred under Section 1116 and are continuing to transfer for the current school year under Section 1116.

	# Students
Eligible for public school choice	31,340
Applied to transfer	1,292
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	1,193

Indicate in the table below the categories of students that are included in the count of eligible students.

	Yes/No
Enrolled in a school identified for improvement	<u>Yes</u>
Transferred in the current school year, only	<u>Yes</u>
Transferred in a prior year and in the current year	<u>Yes</u>
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk.

1.4.9.1.3 Funds Spent on Public School Choice

In the table below, provide the total dollar amount spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice in Section 1116 of ESEA.

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$ 2,270,829
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk.

1.4.9.1.4 Availability of Public School Choice Options

In the table below provide the number of LEAs in your State that are unable to provide public school choice options to eligible students due to any of the following reasons:

1. All schools at a grade level are in school improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.
2. LEA only has a single school at the grade level of the school at which students are eligible for public school choice
3. LEA's schools are so remote from one another that choice is impracticable.

	# LEAs
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	3
Comments:	

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

FAQs about public school choice:

- a. *How should States report data on Title I public school choice for those LEAs that have open enrollment and other choice programs?* An LEA may consider a student as eligible for and participating in Title I public school choice, and may consider costs for transporting that student towards its funds spent on transportation for public school choice, if the student meets the following conditions:
 - Has a "home" or "neighborhood" school (to which the student would have been assigned, in the absence of a choice program) that receives Title I funds and has been identified, under the statute, as in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring; and
 - Has elected to enroll, at some point since July 1, 2002 (the effective date of the Title I choice provisions), and after the home school has been identified as in need of improvement, in a school that has not been so identified and is attending that school; and
 - Is using district transportation services to attend such a school.³
- b. *How do States report on public school choice for those LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice (e.g., LEAs in which all schools in a grade level are in school improvement, LEAs that have only a single school at that grade level, or LEAs whose schools are so remote from one another that choice is impracticable)?* For those LEAs, States should count as eligible all students who attend identified Title I schools. States should report that no eligible schools or students were provided the option to transfer and should provide an explanation why choice is not possible within the LEA in the Comment Section.

³ Adapted from OESE/OII policy letter of August 2004. The policy letter may be found on the Department's Web page at <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/stateletters/choice/choice081804.html>.

1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

1.4.9.2.2 Supplemental Educational Services – Students

In the table below, provide the number of students who were eligible for, who applied for, and who received supplemental educational services under Section 1116 of *ESEA*.

	# Students
Eligible for supplemental educational services	16,775
Applied for supplemental educational services	3,767
Received supplemental educational services	3,446
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk.

1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services

In the table below, provide the total dollar amount spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services under Section 1116 of *ESEA*.

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$ 3,881,212
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk.

1.5 TEACHER QUALITY

This section collects data on "highly qualified" teachers as the term is defined in Section 9101(23) of ESEA.

1.5.1 Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified

In the table below, provide the number of core academic classes for each of the school types listed and the number of those core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified (as the term is defined in Section 9101(23) of ESEA) and the number taught by teachers who are not highly qualified. The percentage of core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified and the percentage taught by teachers who are not highly qualified will be calculated automatically. Below the table are FAQs about these data. The percentages used for high- and low-poverty schools and the poverty metric used to determine those percentages are reported in 1.5.3.

School Type	# of Core Academic Classes (Total)	# of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	# of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified
All schools	215,814	211,285	97.9	4,529	2.1
Elementary level					
High-poverty schools	11,249	10,967	97.5	282	2.5
Low-poverty schools	14,840	14,653	98.7	187	1.3
All elementary schools	53,140	52,298	98.4	842	1.6
Secondary level					
High-poverty schools	24,560	23,561	95.9	999	4.1
Low-poverty schools	56,082	55,466	98.9	616	1.1
All secondary schools	162,674	158,987	97.7	3,687	2.3
Comments:					

Do the data in Table 1.5.1 above include classes taught by special education teachers who provide direct instruction core academic subjects?

Data table includes classes taught by special education teachers who provide direct instruction core academic subjects.	<u>Yes</u>
---	------------

If the answer above is no, please explain below. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

Does the State count elementary classes so that a full-day self-contained classroom equals one class, or does the State use a departmentalized approach where a classroom is counted multiple times, once for each subject taught?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Elementary classes are counted so that a full-day self-contained classroom equals one class.
--

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

FAQs about highly qualified teachers and core academic subjects:

- a. *What are the core academic subjects?* English, reading/language arts, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, and geography [Title IX, Section 9101(11)]. While the statute includes the arts in the core academic subjects, it does not specify which of the arts are core academic subjects; therefore, States must make this determination.
- b. *How is a teacher defined?* An individual who provides instruction in the core academic areas to kindergarten, grades 1 through 12, or ungraded classes, or individuals who teach in an environment other than a classroom setting (and who maintain daily student attendance records) [from NCES, CCD, 2001-02]
- c. *How is a class defined?* A class is a setting in which organized instruction of core academic course content is provided to one or more students (including cross-age groupings) for a given period of time. (A course may be offered to more than one class.) Instruction, provided by one or more teachers or other staff members, may be delivered in person or via a different medium. Classes that share space should be considered as separate classes if they function as separate units for more than 50% of the time [from NCES Non-fiscal Data Handbook for Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education, 2003].
- d. *Should 6th-, 7th-, and 8th-grade classes be reported in the elementary or the secondary category?* States are responsible for determining whether the content taught at the middle school level meets the competency requirements for elementary or secondary instruction. Report classes in grade 6 through 8 consistent with how teachers have been classified to determine their highly qualified status, regardless of whether their schools are configured as elementary or middle schools.
- e. *How should States count teachers (including specialists or resource teachers) in elementary classes?* States that count self-contained classrooms as one class should, to avoid over-representation, also count subject-area specialists (e.g., mathematics or music teachers) or resource teachers as teaching one class. On the other hand, States using a departmentalized approach to instruction where a self-contained classroom is counted multiple times (once for each subject taught) should also count subject-area specialists or resource teachers as teaching multiple classes.
- f. *How should States count teachers in self-contained multiple-subject secondary classes?* Each core academic subject taught for which students are receiving credit toward graduation should be counted in the numerator and the denominator. For example, if the same teacher teaches English, calculus, history, and science in a self-contained classroom, count these as four classes in the denominator. If the teacher were Highly Qualified to teach English and history, he/she would be counted as Highly Qualified in two of the four subjects in the numerator.
- g. *What is a "high-poverty school"?* Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "high-poverty" schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State. The poverty quartile breaks are reported later in this section.
- h. *What is a "low-poverty school"?* Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "low-poverty" schools as schools in the bottom quartile of poverty in the State. The poverty quartile breaks are reported later in this section.

1.5.2 Reasons Core Academic Classes Are Taught by Teachers Who Are Not Highly Qualified

In the table below, estimate the percentages for each of the reasons why teachers who are not highly qualified teach core academic classes. For example, if 900 elementary classes were taught by teachers who are not highly qualified, what percentage of those 900 classes falls into each of the categories listed below? If the three reasons provided at each grade level are not sufficient to explain why core academic classes at a particular grade level are taught by teachers who are not highly qualified, use the row labeled "other" and explain the additional reasons. The total of the reasons is calculated automatically for each grade level and must equal 100% at the elementary level and 100% at the secondary level.

Note: Use the numbers of core academic classes taught by teachers who are not highly qualified from 1.5.1 for both elementary school classes (1.5.2.1) and for secondary school classes (1.5.2.2) as your starting point.

	Percentage
Elementary School Classes	
Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	64.0
Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	27.0
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	9.0
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.0
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

	Percentage
Secondary School Classes	
Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	64.0
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	20.0
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	16.0
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.0
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

In the table below, provide the poverty quartiles breaks used in determining high- and low-poverty schools and the poverty metric used to determine the poverty quartiles. Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

	High-Poverty Schools (more than what %)	Low-Poverty Schools (less than what %)
Elementary schools	58.4	21.8
Poverty metric used	Virginia uses the percentage of students who qualify for the free or reduced-price lunch program.	
Secondary schools	48.4	18.7
Poverty metric used	Virginia uses the percentage of students who qualify for the free or reduced-price lunch program.	
Comments:		

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

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

- a. *How are the poverty quartiles determined?* Separately rank order elementary and secondary schools from highest to lowest on your percentage poverty measure. Divide the list into four equal groups. Schools in the first (highest group) are high-poverty schools. Schools in the last group (lowest group) are the low-poverty schools. Generally, States use the percentage of students who qualify for the free or reduced-price lunch program for this calculation.
- b. *Since the poverty data are collected at the school and not classroom level, how do we classify schools as either elementary or secondary for this purpose?* States may include as elementary schools all schools that serve children in grades K through 5 (including K through 8 or K through 12 schools) and would therefore include as secondary schools those that exclusively serve children in grades 6 and higher.

1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

This section collects annual performance and accountability data on the implementation of Title III programs.

1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs

In the table below, place a check next to each type of language instruction educational programs implemented in the State, as defined in Section 3301(8), as required by Sections 3121(a)(1), 3123(b)(1), and 3123(b)(2).

Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

1. **Types of Programs** = Types of programs described in the subgrantee's local plan (as submitted to the State or as implemented) that is closest to the descriptions in <http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/expert/glossary.html>.
2. **Other Language** = Name of the language of instruction, other than English, used in the program.

Check Types of Programs	Type of Program	Other Language
<u>Yes</u>	Dual language	Spanish
<u>Yes</u>	Two-way immersion	Spanish
<u>Yes</u>	Transitional bilingual	Spanish
<u>Yes</u>	Developmental bilingual	Spanish
<u>Yes</u>	Heritage language	Spanish
<u>Yes</u>	Sheltered English instruction	
<u>Yes</u>	Structured English immersion	
<u>No</u>	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)	
<u>Yes</u>	Content-based ESL	
<u>Yes</u>	Pull-out ESL	
<u>No</u>	Other (explain in comment box below)	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

1.6.2 Student Demographic Data

1.6.2.1 Number of ALL LEP Students in the State

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of ALL LEP students in the State. LEP students are defined as all students assessed for English language proficiency (ELP) using an annual State ELP assessment as required under Section 1111(b)(7) of *ESEA* in the reporting year and who meet the LEP definition in Section 9101(25).

- Include newly enrolled (recent arrivals to the U.S.) and continually enrolled LEP students, whether or not they receive services in a Title III language instruction educational program
- Do not include Former LEP students (as defined in Section 200.20(f)(2) of the Title I regulation) and monitored Former LEP students (as defined in Section 3121(a)(4) of Title III) in the ALL LEP student count in this table.

Number of ALL LEP students in the State	89,968
Comments:	

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

Note: New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.6.2.2 Number of LEP Students Who Received Title III Language Instruction Educational Program Services

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of the number of LEP students who received services in Title III language instructional education programs.

	#
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	89,505
Comments:	

Source – The SEA submits the data in file N/X116 that contains data group ID 648, category set A.

1.6.2.3 Most Commonly Spoken Languages in the State

In the table below, provide the five most commonly spoken languages, other than English, in the State (for all LEP students, not just LEP students who received Title III Services). The top five languages should be determined by the highest number of students speaking each of the languages listed.

Language	# LEP Students
Spanish	56,445
Korean	4,709
Vietnamese	3,726
Arabic	3,490
Urdu	2,765

Report additional languages with significant numbers of LEP students in the comment box below.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

1.6.3 Student Performance Data

This section collects data on LEP student English language proficiency, as required by Sections 1111(h)(4)(D) and 3121(b)(1).

1.6.3.1.1 ALL LEP Participation in State Annual English Language Proficiency Assessment

In the table below, please provide the number of ALL LEP students tested on annual State English language proficiency assessment (as defined in 1.6.2.1).

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	89,206
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	762
Total	89,968
Comments:	

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

Note: New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

	#
Number proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	36,296
Percent proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	40.3
Comments:	

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

Note: New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.6.3.2.1 Title III LEP Participation in English Language Proficiency

In the table below, provide the number of Title III LEP students participating in the annual State English language proficiency assessment.

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	88,748
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	757
Total	89,505
Comments:	

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

Note: New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.6.3.2.2 Title III LEP English Language Proficiency Results

In the table below, provide the results from the annual State English language proficiency assessment for Title III-served LEP students who participated in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12.

Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:

1. **Making Progress** = Number of Title III LEP students who met the definition of "Making Progress" as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
2. **ELP Attainment** = Number of Title III LEP students who attained English language proficiency as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
3. **Results** = Number and percent of Title III LEP students who met the State definition of "Making Progress" and the number and percent that met the State definition of "Attainment" of English language proficiency.

	Results	
	#	%
Making progress	64,786	73.0
ELP attainment	24,142	67.0
Comments:		

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

1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP Students

This section collects data on the performance of former LEP students as required by Sections 3121(a)(4) and 3123(b)(8).

1.6.3.6.1 Title III Served MFLEP Students by Year Monitored

In the table below, report the unduplicated count of monitored former LEP students during the two consecutive years of monitoring, which includes both MFLEP students in AYP grades and in non-AYP grades.

Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) students include:

- Students who have transitioned out of a language instruction educational program funded by Title III into classrooms that are not tailored for LEP students.
- Students who are no longer receiving LEP services and who are being monitored for academic content achievement for 2 years after the transition.

Table 1.6.3.6.1 Definitions:

1. **# Year One** = Number of former LEP students in their first year of being monitored.
2. **# Year Two** = Number of former LEP students in their second year of being monitored.
3. **Total** = Number of monitored former LEP students in year one and year two. This is automatically calculated.

# Year One	# Year Two	Total
6,641	4,475	11,116
Comments:		

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

1.6.3.6.2 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Mathematics

In the table below, report the number of monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students who took the annual mathematics assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned into classrooms not designed for LEP students and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:

1. **# Tested** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in mathematics in all AYP grades.
2. **# At or Above Proficient** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual mathematics assessment.
3. **% Results** = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the number tested.
4. **# Below proficient** = State-aggregated number MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual mathematics assessment. This will be automatically calculated.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
6,915	5,822	84.2	1,093
Comments:			

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

1.6.3.6.3 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Reading/Language Arts

In the table below, report results monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students who took the annual reading/language arts assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned into classrooms not designed for LEP students and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

Table 1.6.3.6.3 Definitions:

1. **# Tested** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in reading/language arts in all AYP grades.
2. **# At or Above Proficient** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment.
3. **% Results** = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the total number tested.
4. **# Below proficient** = State-aggregated number MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment. This will be automatically calculated.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
5,581	4,988	89.4	593
Comments:			

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

1.6.3.6.4 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Science

In the table below, report results for monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students who took the annual science assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned into classrooms not designed for LEP students and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

Table 1.6.3.6.4 Definitions:

1. **# Tested** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in science.
2. **# At or Above Proficient** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual science assessment.
3. **% Results** = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the number tested.
4. **# Below proficient** = State-aggregated number MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual science assessment. This will be automatically calculated.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
4,490	3,929	87.5	561
Comments:			

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

Note: New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.6.4 Title III Subgrantees

This section collects data on the performance of Title III subgrantees.

1.6.4.1 Title III Subgrantee Performance

In the table below, report the number of Title III subgrantees meeting the criteria described in the table. Do not leave items blank. If there are zero subgrantees who met the condition described, put a zero in the number (#) column. Do not double count subgrantees by category.

Note: Do not include number of subgrants made under Section 3114(d)(1) from funds reserved for education programs and activities for immigrant children and youth. (Report Section 3114(d)(1) subgrants in 1.6.5.1 ONLY.)

	#
Total number of subgrantees for the year	102
Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	91
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	102
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	102
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	91
Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	0
Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2006-07 and 2007-08)	8
Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2007-08 for not meeting Title III AMAOs	8
Number of subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2004-05, 2005-06, 2006-07, and 2007-08)	0
Comments:	

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

1.6.4.2 State Accountability

In the table below, indicate whether the State met all three Title III AMAOs.

Note: Meeting all three Title III AMAOs means meeting each State-set target for each objective: Making Progress, Attaining Proficiency, and Making AYP for the LEP subgroup. This section collects data that will be used to determine State AYP, as required under Section 6161.

State met <u>all</u> three Title III AMAOs	<u>Yes</u>
Comments:	

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

1.6.4.3 Termination of Title III Language Instruction Educational Programs

This section collects data on the termination of Title III programs or activities as required by Section 3123(b)(7).

Were any Title III language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> activities terminated for failure to reach program goals?	<u>No</u>
If yes, provide the number of language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> activities for immigrant children and youth terminated.	
Comments:	

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

1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students

This section collects data on education programs and activities for immigrant students.

1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students

In the table below, report the unduplicated number of immigrant students enrolled in the State and who participated in qualifying educational programs under Section 3114(d)(1).

Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:

1. **Immigrant Students Enrolled** = Number of students who meet the definition of immigrant children and youth in Section 3301(6) and enrolled in the elementary or secondary schools in the State.
2. **Students in 3114(d)(1) Program** = Number of immigrant students who participated in programs for immigrant children and youth funded under Section 3114(d)(1), using the funds reserved for immigrant education programs/activities. This number should not include immigrant students who receive services in Title III language instructional educational programs under Sections 3114(a) and 3115(a).
3. **3114(d)(1) Subgrants** = Number of subgrants made in the State under Section 3114(d)(1), with the funds reserved for immigrant education programs/activities. Do not include Title III LIEP subgrants made under Sections 3114(a) and 3115(a) that serve immigrant students enrolled in them.

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants
29,284	13,197	33

If state reports zero (0) students in programs or zero (0) subgrants, explain in comment box below.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk.

1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development

This section collects data on teachers in Title III language instruction education programs as required under Section 3123(b)(5).

1.6.6.1 Teacher Information

This section collects information about teachers as required under Section 3123 (b)(5).

In the table below, report the number of teachers who are working in the Title III language instruction educational programs as defined in Section 3301(8) and reported in 1.6.1 (Types of language instruction educational programs) even if they are not paid with Title III funds.

Note: Section 3301(8) – The term 'Language instruction educational program' means an instruction course – (A) in which a limited English proficient child is placed for the purpose of developing and attaining English proficiency, while meeting challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards, as required by Section 1111(b)(1); and (B) that may make instructional use of both English and a child's native language to enable the child to develop and attain English proficiency and may include the participation of English proficient children if such course is designed to enable all participating children to become proficient in English and a second language.

	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	1,821
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	1,037

Explain in the comment box below if there is a zero for any item in the table above.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

* This number should be the total additional teachers needed for the next 5 years, not the number needed for each year. Do not include the number of teachers currently working in Title III English language instruction educational programs.

1.6.6.2 Professional Development (PD) Activities of Subgrantees Related to the Teaching and Learning of LEP Students

In the table below, provide information about the subgrantee professional development activities that meets the requirements of Section 3115(c)(2).

Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:

1. **Professional Development Topics** = Subgrantee activities for professional development topics required under Title III.
2. **# Subgrantees** = Number of subgrantees who conducted each type of professional development activity. A subgrantee may conduct more than one professional development activity. (Use the same method of counting subgrantees, including consortia, as in 1.6.1.1 and 1.6.4.1.)
3. **Total Number of Participants** = Number of teachers, administrators and other personnel who participated in each type of the professional development (PD) activities reported.
4. **Total** = Number of all participants in PD activities.

Type of Professional Development Activity	# Subgrantees	
Instructional strategies for LEP students	53	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	39	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	38	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	30	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	27	
Other (Explain in comment box)	0	
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	43	6,918
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	42	2,445
PD provided to principals	40	1,336
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	34	1,672
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	34	1,672
PD provided to community based organization personnel	20	782
Total		14,825

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities

This section collects data on State grant activities.

1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process

In the table below, report the time between when the State receives the Title III allocation from ED, normally on July 1 of each year for the upcoming school year, and the time when the State distributes these funds to subgrantees for the intended school year. Dates must be in the format MM/DD/YY.

Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:

1. **Date State Received Allocation** = Annual date the State receives the Title III allocation from US Department of Education (ED).
2. **Date Funds Available to Subgrantees** = Annual date that Title III funds are available to approved subgrantees.
3. **# of Days/\$\$ Distribution** = Average number of days for States receiving Title III funds to make subgrants to subgrantees beginning from July 1 of each year, except under conditions where funds are being withheld.

Example: State received SY 2007-08 funds July 1, 2007, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2007, for SY 2007-08 programs. Then the "# of days/\$\$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
07/07/07	10/12/07	97
Comments: School divisions that submitted an approvable consolidated or individual application for their 2007-2008 federal funds under the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 by July 1, 2007, could access their 2007-2008 funds on a reimbursement basis by their submission date.		

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

1.6.7.2 Steps To Shorten the Distribution of Title III Funds to Subgrantees

In the comment box below, describe how your State can shorten the process of distributing Title III funds to subgrantees.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Office of Program Administration and Accountability will continue to work internally to streamline the process of distributing Title III funds to subgrantees. School divisions that submit an approvable application by July 1 of the application submission year can access fund for that year on a reimbursement basis beginning on July 1.
--

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

1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS

In the table below, provide the number of schools identified as persistently dangerous, as determined by the State, by the start of the school year. For further guidance on persistently dangerous schools, refer to Section B "Identifying Persistently Dangerous Schools" in the Unsafe School Choice Option Non-Regulatory Guidance, available at: <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/unsafeschoolchoice.pdf>.

	#
Persistently Dangerous Schools	0
Comments:	

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

1.8 GRADUATION RATES AND DROPOUT RATES

This section collects graduation and dropout rates.

1.8.1 Graduation Rates

In the table below, provide the graduation rates calculated using the methodology that was approved as part of the State's accountability plan for the **previous school year** (SY 2006-07). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	79.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	77.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	87.9
Black, non-Hispanic	70.7
Hispanic	64.9
White, non-Hispanic	83.7
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	42.0
Limited English proficient	64.1
Economically disadvantaged	67.6
Migratory students	68.9
Male	75.3
Female	83.7
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

FAQs on graduation rates:

- a. *What is the graduation rate?* Section 200.19 of the Title I regulations issued under the *No Child Left Behind Act* on December 2, 2002, defines graduation rate to mean:
 - The percentage of students, measured from the beginning of high school, who graduate from public high school with a regular diploma (not including a GED or any other diploma not fully aligned with the State's academic standards) in the standard number of years; or,
 - Another more accurate definition developed by the State and approved by the Secretary in the State plan that more accurately measures the rate of students who graduate from high school with a regular diploma; and
 - Avoids counting a dropout as a transfer.
- b. *What if the data collection system is not in place for the collection of graduate rates?* For those States that are reporting transitional graduation rate data and are working to put into place data collection systems that will allow the State to calculate the graduation rate in accordance with Section 200.19 for all the required subgroups, please provide a detailed progress report on the status of those efforts.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

1.8.2 Dropout Rates

In the table below, provide the dropout rates calculated using the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's (NCES) Common Core of Data (CCD) for the **previous school year** (SY 2006-07). Below the table is a FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Dropout Rate
All Students	1.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	2.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	1.0
Black, non-Hispanic	2.7
Hispanic	3.8
White, non-Hispanic	1.3
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	2.3
Limited English proficient	3.9
Economically disadvantaged	2.3
Migratory students	3.0
Male	2.2
Female	1.6
Comments:	

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

FAQ on dropout rates:

What is a dropout? A dropout is an individual who: 1) was enrolled in school at some time during the previous school year; and 2) was not enrolled at the beginning of the current school year; and 3) has not graduated from high school or completed a State- or district-approved educational program; and 4) does not meet any of the following exclusionary conditions: a) transfer to another public school district, private school, or State- or district-approved educational program (including correctional or health facility programs); b) temporary absence due to suspension or school-excused illness; or c) death.

1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS PROGRAM

This section collects data on homeless children and youths and the McKinney-Vento grant program.

In the table below, provide the following information about the number of LEAs in the State who reported data on homeless children and youths and the McKinney-Vento program. The totals will be will be automatically calculated.

	#	# LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	104	104
LEAs with subgrants	28	28
Total	132	132
Comments:		

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

1.9.1 All LEAs (with and without McKinney-Vento subgrants)

The following questions collect data on homeless children and youths in the State.

1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youths

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youths by grade level enrolled in public school at any time during the regular school year. The totals will be automatically calculated:

Age/Grade	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs With Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	80	224
K	442	803
1	389	761
2	335	743
3	323	715
4	329	669
5	269	635
6	292	609
7	297	626
8	272	556
9	291	556
10	207	378
11	164	307
12	158	346
Ungraded	0	0
Total	3,848	7,928
Comments:		

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

1.9.1.2 Primary Nighttime Residence of Homeless Children and Youths

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youths by primary nighttime residence enrolled in public school at any time during the regular school year. The primary nighttime residence should be the student's nighttime residence when he/she was identified as homeless. The totals will be automatically calculated.

	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs With Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	784	1,622
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	2,584	5,111
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	34	285
Hotels/Motels	446	910
Total	3,848	7,928
Comments:		

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

1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants

The following sections collect data on LEAs with McKinney-Vento subgrants.

1.9.2.1 Homeless Children and Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youths by grade level who were served by McKinney-Vento subgrants during the regular school year. The total will be automatically calculated.

Age/Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	345
K	770
1	724
2	714
3	677
4	637
5	606
6	582
7	602
8	531
9	507
10	346
11	291
12	326
Ungraded	0
Total	7,658
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk.

1.9.2.2 Subpopulations of Homeless Students Served

In the table below, please provide the following information about the homeless students served during the regular school year.

	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied youth	311
Migratory children/youth	50
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,327
Limited English proficient students	674
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk.

1.9.2.3 Educational Support Services Provided by Subgrantees

In the table below, provide the number of subgrantee programs that provided the following educational support services with McKinney-Vento funds.

	# McKinney-Vento Subgrantees That Offer
Tutoring or other instructional support	27
Expedited evaluations	16
Staff professional development and awareness	27
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	21
Transportation	24
Early childhood programs	17
Assistance with participation in school programs	23
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	22
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	24
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	25
Coordination between schools and agencies	25
Counseling	22
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	21
Clothing to meet a school requirement	24
School supplies	26
Referral to other programs and services	25
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	22
Other (optional – in comment box below)	2
Other (optional – in comment box below)	1
Other (optional – in comment box below)	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Two subgrantees reported parenting or parent/child enrichment activities and one subgrantee reported providing assistance to find affordable housing.

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

1.9.2.4 Barriers To The Education Of Homeless Children And Youth

In the table below, provide the number of subgrantees that reported the following barriers to the enrollment and success of homeless children and youths.

	# Subgrantees Reporting
Eligibility for homeless services	5
School Selection	4
Transportation	11
School records	4
Immunizations	7
Other medical records	3
Other Barriers – in comment box below	1

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

One subgrantee reported difficulty finding a family that had moved as a barrier. Another subgrantee commented that while transportation was not a barrier, it was a challenge.

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

1.9.2.5 Academic Progress of Homeless Students

The following questions collect data on the academic achievement of homeless children and youths served by McKinney-Vento subgrants.

1.9.2.5.1 Reading Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youths served who were tested on the State *NCLB* reading/language arts assessment and the number of those tested who scored at or above proficient. Provide data for grades 9 through 12 only for those grades tested for *NCLB*.

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Reading Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	453	299
4	397	290
5	386	266
6	387	249
7	383	266
8	356	222
High School	268	192
Comments:		

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk.

1.9.2.5.2 Mathematics Assessment

This section is similar to 1.9.2.5.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State *NCLB* mathematics assessment.

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Mathematics Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	472	342
4	415	266
5	409	281
6	395	170
7	389	174
8	357	226
High School	544	399
Comments:		

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk.

1.10 MIGRANT CHILD COUNTS

This section collects the Title I, Part C, Migrant Education Program (MEP) child counts which States are required to provide and may be used to determine the annual State allocations under Title I, Part C. The child counts should reflect the reporting period of September 1, 2007 through August 31, 2008. This section also collects a report on the procedures used by States to produce true, accurate, and valid child counts.

To provide the child counts, each SEA should have sufficient procedures in place to ensure that it is counting only those children who are eligible for the MEP. Such procedures are important to protecting the integrity of the State's MEP because they permit the early discovery and correction of eligibility problems and thus help to ensure that only eligible migrant children are counted for funding purposes and are served. If an SEA has reservations about the accuracy of its child counts, it must inform the Department of its concerns and explain how and when it will resolve them in Section 1.10.3.4 *Quality Control Processes*.

Note: In submitting this information, the Authorizing State Official must certify that, to the best of his/her knowledge, the child counts and information contained in the report are true, reliable, and valid and that any false Statement provided is subject to fine or imprisonment pursuant to 18 U.S.C. 1001.

FAQs on Child Count:

How is "out-of-school" defined? Out-of-school means youth up through age 21 who are entitled to a free public education in the State but are not currently enrolled in a K-12 institution. This could include students who have dropped out of school, youth who are working on a GED outside of a K-12 institution, and youth who are "here-to-work" only. It does not include preschoolers, who are counted by age grouping.

How is "ungraded" defined? Ungraded means the children are served in an educational unit that has no separate grades. For example, some schools have primary grade groupings that are not traditionally graded, or ungraded groupings for children with learning disabilities. In some cases, ungraded students may also include special education children, transitional bilingual students, students working on a GED through a K-12 institution, or those in a correctional setting. (Students working on a GED outside of a K-12 institution are counted as out-of-school youth.)

1.10.1 Category 1 Child Count

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number by age/grade of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, resided in your State for one or more days during the reporting period of September 1, 2007 through August 31, 2008. This figure includes all eligible migrant children who may or may not have participated in MEP services. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

- Children age birth through 2 years
- Children served by the MEP (under the continuation of services authority) after their period of eligibility has expired when other services are not available to meet their needs
- Previously eligible secondary-school children who are receiving credit accrual services (under the continuation of services authority).

Age/Grade	12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	239
K	135
1	84
2	78
3	79
4	48
5	67
6	66
7	54
8	45
9	45
10	42
11	49
12	45
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	347
Total	1,423

Comments:

Source – Initially populated from ED*Facts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED*Facts* Data Crosswalk.

1.10.1.1 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases

In the space below, explain any increases or decreases from last year in the number of students reported for Category 1 greater than 10 percent.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

There was no significant increase or decrease on the Category I Child Count from 2006-2007 to 2007-2008.

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

1.10.2 Category 2 Child Count

In the table below, enter by age/grade the unduplicated statewide number of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, were served for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods that occurred within the reporting period of September 1, 2007 through August 31, 2008. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. Count a child who moved to different schools within the State and who was served in both traditional summer and year-round school intersession programs only once. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

- Children age birth through 2 years
- Children served by the MEP (under the continuation of services authority) after their period of eligibility has expired when other services are not available to meet their needs
- Previously eligible secondary-school children who are receiving credit accrual services (under the continuation of services authority).

Age/Grade	Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	157
K	68
1	42
2	49
3	70
4	47
5	60
6	47
7	49
8	37
9	39
10	40
11	43
12	31
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	325
Total	1,104
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from ED*Facts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED*Facts* Data Crosswalk.

1.10.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases

In the space below, explain any increases or decreases from last year in the number of students reported for Category 2 greater than 10 percent.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

There was no significant increase or decrease on the Category 2 Child Count from 2006-2007 to 2007-2008.

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

1.10.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures

The following question requests information on the State's MEP child count calculation and validation procedures.

1.10.3.1 Student Information System

In the space below, respond to the following questions: What system(s) did your State use to compile and generate the Category 1 and Category 2 child count for this reporting period (e.g., NGS, MIS 2000, COEStar, manual system)? Were child counts for the last reporting period generated using the same system(s)? If the State's category 2 count was generated using a different system from the category 1 count, please identify each system.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Virginia used the MIS 2000 database system to generate the 2007-2008 category 1 and 2 child count. The database consists of core and additional data that represent the elements within the Certificate of Eligibility (COE) used by recruiters and migrant coordinators around the state.

Virginia used the MIS 2000 database system to generate the 2006-2007 category 1 and category 2 child count.

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

1.10.3.2 Data Collection and Management Procedures

In the space below, respond to the following questions: How was the child count data collected? What data were collected? What activities were conducted to collect the data? When were the data collected for use in the student information system? If the data for the State's category 2 count were collected and maintained differently from the category 1 count, please describe each set of procedures.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The migratory child count data are collected year round from September 1, 2007, through August 31, 2008.

The data collected are found on the Certificate of Eligibility (COE). The COE is divided into four sections: 1) parent data; 2) child data; 3) eligibility data; and 4) verification. The parent data include parent or guardian names as well as current and home addresses. The child data include name, birth date, type of documentation used to confirm birth date, gender, grade enrollment date, and service location. The Virginia COE was updated in the spring of 2008 to reflect the new data required for MSIX. Additional data included: suffixes, immunization records, and qualification for other services, such as ESL and special education. The eligibility data for the 2007-2008 school year include the qualifying arrival date (QAD), the last qualifying move (LQM), principal means of livelihood (PMOL), qualifying activity, the category of the move (with, to join, or on own), and the residency date.

The activities used to collect data were: personal interviews, a review of school records, school record requests from previous schools, discussion and communication with previous and current school personnel, and/or telephone updates. The data were collected by recruiters and/or migrant coordinators. When migratory families are identified, COE forms are completed. Each migrant coordinator reviews the COE for accuracy and verifies the information within five business days. After verification, all COE forms are submitted to the data entry specialist at the regional office for a final verification before being entered into the state database (MIS 2000).

A system of cross checks is also implemented with the student information system in the local school division. After the COE has been verified and eligibility determined, the recruiter and/or migrant coordinator works with the registrar or local student information systems specialist to ensure the child is flagged as migrant in the student database. A Superintendent's Informational Memorandum, Number 193, Accurate Identification of Eligible Migrant Students, was released in the summer of 2008 to remind school divisions that a child may only be identified as migrant if there is a verified Certificate of Eligibility. The importance of accurate migrant student identification in the local student information systems was also emphasized.

At the end of each semester or when a migrant child leaves, the program teacher/recruiter completes a withdrawal form. The withdrawal form collects demographic data on the student as well as program services. The withdrawal form was updated for the 2007-2008 school year to collect additional data. Additional elements added include: 1) ESL services and LEP level; 2) referred services; and 3) achievement of GED. The teacher/recruiter indicates if and what type of instructional support or referred services the student received. Other data collected include ESL level and assessment data. The withdrawal form is submitted to the migrant coordinator who reviews it for accuracy before submitting to the migrant data specialist. The information is entered into the master database in MIS 2000 from the withdrawal form. If the student remains in the migrant program and receives services the next semester or school year, a re-enrollment form or a new COE is completed at the start of the new semester. An interview with the family is conducted to check accuracy of the data on the original COE. Changes, if any, on the re-enrollment form or the new COE are entered into the master database.

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

In the space below, describe how the child count data are inputted, updated, and then organized by the student information system for child count purposes at the State level

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The data are entered by the migrant data entry specialist at the regional migrant office. The data entry specialist is responsible for inputting and updating all data in the state database. The coordinator for each Migrant Education Program (MEP) in Virginia is required to send the following data to the data entry specialist: Certificate of Eligibility (COE), School Re-enrollment Form (if used instead of a new COE), Withdrawal Form, and Health and Education Data.

The coordinators communicate with the data entry specialist regarding COE information submitted to ensure accuracy of new and existing student records. Student records are updated through re-enrollment forms and withdrawal forms as well as changes to key data fields within the child data of the COE. In the re-enrollment form or the COE, coordinators list students who are currently enrolled and update exiting information. Coordinators submit a separate withdrawal form upon a student's departure.

Coordinators and recruiters evaluate the accuracy and efficiency of the forms used to collect the data. Throughout the year, each MEP coordinator trains program staff as needed. Reports from the coordinators regarding identification, certification, participation, and withdrawal are submitted throughout the school year. Local migrant coordinators review program eligibility and then forward the data to the data entry specialist who conducts a second review of eligibility. If the data entry specialist has concerns about eligibility, the state migrant education specialist is consulted and a final review is conducted.

If the data for the State's category 2 count were collected and maintained differently from the category 1 count, please describe each set of procedures.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

1.10.3.3 Methods Used To Count Children

In the space below, respond to the following question: How was each child count calculated? Please describe the compilation process and edit functions that are built into your student information system(s) specifically to produce an accurate child count. In particular, describe how your system includes and counts only:

- children who were between age 3 through 21;
- children who met the program eligibility criteria (e.g., were within 3 years of a last qualifying move, had a qualifying activity);
- children who were resident in your State for at least 1 day during the eligibility period (September 1 through August 31);
- children who—in the case of Category 2—received a MEP-funded service during the summer or intersession term; and
- children once per age/grade level for each child count category.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The child count is calculated through the MIS 2000 system. The MIS 2000 database consists of core and additional data that are representative of the elements within the Certificate of Eligibility (COE) used by the migrant coordinators and recruiters around the state. The key data elements used to ensure accurate category 1 and category 2 child counts consist of the enrollment, withdrawal, residency, qualifying activity, and qualifying arrival date (QAD) dates, as well as school history data that establish a child's presence during the year. The COE was revised in the spring of 2008 to collect accurate data that is required by MSIX. The database also assigns students unique identification numbers in MIS 2000. In addition, Virginia collects the Virginia State Test Identifier (STI) on the COE. Virginia included the STI to allow linking of migrant student records to the Virginia Student Information System.

To maintain accurate counts of eligible students, the database recognizes migrant students who are between the ages of three and twenty-one as well as those who were previously enrolled. The database allows the data entry specialist to set parameters that eliminate students without adequate school history data as well as students whose three-year eligibility has expired from being included in the child count. Additional data fields (parent data, mother's maiden name, child's birthplace, birth date, age, home base, and identification number) are used to avoid duplication.

During the summer/intersession terms, coordinators are required to submit weekly attendance records to the regional office to ensure accurate counts. The data entry specialist produces monthly participation reports that show participants in the regular and summer/intersession terms when determining the category 1 and category 2 child count. These reports are distributed to the migrant coordinators who verify the student information.

If your State's category 2 count was generated using a different system from the category 1 count, please describe each system separately.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes

In the space below, respond to the following question: What steps are taken to ensure your State properly determines and verifies the eligibility of each child included in the child counts for the reporting period of September 1 through August 31 before that child's data are included in the student information system(s)?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Virginia has several steps that are taken to ensure proper eligibility of children in the Migrant Education Program (MEP). Virginia uses a standard Certificate of Eligibility (COE) form statewide. Virginia revised the state COE to include data elements requested by the new Migrant Student Information Exchange (MSIX) initiative. Information collected within the COE is gathered by conducting interviews with the parents, guardians, or other adults legally responsible for the students, or the student themselves in the case of emancipated youth. The qualifying arrival date, residency date, qualifying activity, and withdrawal dates are examples of data elements within the COE used to determine whether a student held residency status during the reporting period.

Local recruiters and program coordinators initially review program eligibility via the COE and then forward the data to the data entry specialist who conducts a second review of eligibility. If the data entry specialist has concerns, the state migrant education specialist conducts a final review.

The COEs from each MEP are crosschecked for accuracy against the data elements in the state database at the regional office prior to being compiled into a state report. If questions arise concerning the data within the report, the data entry specialist verifies that the data are correct. All local MEP data are confirmed with the data entry specialist and forwarded to the state director at the Virginia Department of Education for final review and approval.

During the summer/intersession terms, coordinators are required to submit weekly attendance records to the regional office to ensure accurate counts. Procedures are provided to personnel on how to collect and report pupil enrollment and attendance data for summer enrollees. In addition, a manual crosscheck is done from information gathered from the MIS 2000 database system and COEs to eliminate within-state duplication.

The Virginia Migrant Education Identification and Recruitment Manual is provided for each recruiter. The manual contains information on eligibility, including federal definitions, temporary and seasonal work, qualifying activities, red flags for possible non-qualification, and agricultural activities in Virginia. The manual also contains information on recruitment, including recruiting out-of-school youth. As updates are made to the manual, statewide training is provided.

In addition, for the 2007-2008 school year, the Virginia Department of Education worked with the Migrant Education Resource Center (MERC) to provide four days of training on identification and recruitment. This training provided information on identification and recruitment, and eligibility determinations.

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

In the space below, describe specifically the procedures used and the results of any re-interview processes used by the SEA during the reporting period to test the accuracy of the State's MEP eligibility determinations. In this description, please include the number of eligibility determinations sampled, the number for which a test was completed, and the number found eligible.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Virginia conducted extensive reinterviewing in the summer of 2006. Virginia did not conduct reinterviewing for the 2007-2008 school year.

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

In the space below, respond to the following question: Throughout the year, what steps are taken by staff to check that child count data are inputted and updated accurately (and—for systems that merge data—consolidated accurately)?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Virginia Migrant Education Program (MEP) staff members take several steps to check that child count data are entered and updated accurately. Through "read only" capabilities on the MIS 2000 database, coordinators are required to monitor the student information entered on the state database system to ensure correct records at both state and local levels.

Throughout the year, the MEP coordinators submit re-enrollment forms to the data entry specialist that reflect changes and/or revisions to student information within the COE. The state director also monitors and tracks the flow of data from the local and regional migrant programs to the regional office as needed. The state director communicates and meets with the MEP coordinators and the data entry specialist to discuss programmatic issues and the status of child counts.

Virginia conducts Title I, Part C, Federal Program Monitoring for divisional and regional Migrant Education Programs (MEP) on a five year cycle. As part of the monitoring process, Virginia monitors division and regional MEPs for record keeping activities. If the monitoring indicates that records are not being checked and cross-checked, corrective actions are taken.

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

In the space below, respond to the following question: What final steps are taken by State staff to verify the child counts produced by your student information system(s) are accurate counts of children in Category 1 and Category 2 prior to their submission to ED?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Throughout the year, state staff review reports to ensure accuracy of eligible students present during the current reporting period. The data entry specialist produces monthly participation reports that show participants in the regular and summer/intersession terms when determining the category 1 and category 2 child count. The MEP coordinators review the reports before data are submitted to the state director. If discrepancies are found, the data entry specialist and coordinators communicate to determine whether a correction is necessary. If clarification is needed, the state migrant director works with the Office of Migrant Education to determine eligibility. At the state level, migrant data from the MIS 2000 is cross-checked against the data from the state student information system to ensure accuracy.

The same data elements are collected from the local migrant program coordinators as the U.S. Department of Education collects from states in the annual Consolidated State Performance Report.

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

In the space below, describe those corrective actions or improvements that will be made by the SEA to improve the accuracy of its MEP eligibility determinations in light of the prospective re-interviewing results.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Virginia conducted extensive reinterviewing in the summer of 2006. Virginia did not conduct reinterviewing for the 2007-2008 school year.

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

In the space below, discuss any concerns about the accuracy of the reported child counts or the underlying eligibility determinations on which the counts are based.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

As a result of extensive reinterviewing in summer of 2006, and subsequent revisions to the identification and verification process, Virginia does not have any concerns about the accuracy of the reported child counts or underlying eligibility determinations.

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