CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT:
Parts I and II

for
STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS
under the
ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT
As amended in 2001

For reporting on
School Year 2013-14

VIRGINIA

PART I DUE THURSDAY, DECEMBER 18, 2014
PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 13, 2015

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202

INTRODUCTION

Sections 9302 and 9303 of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act* (*ESEA*), as amended in 2001 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 *ESEA* Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2013-14 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 EDFacts 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 2013-14 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Thursday, December 18, 2014**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 13, 2015**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2013-14, 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 2013-14 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 2013-14 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/).

	OMB Number: 1810-0614
	Expiration Date: 11/30/2013

Consolidated State Performance Report
For
State Formula Grant Programs
under the
Elementary And Secondary Education Act
as amended in 2001

Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting:
__X__Part I, 2013-14 ___Part II, 2013-14

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. Veronica Tate, Director of Program Administration and Accountability

Telephone: (804) 225-2870

Fax: (804) 371-7347

e-mail: Veronica.Tate@doe.virginia.gov

Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type):
Dr. Steven R. Staples, Superintendent of Public Instruction

_____ Thursday, December 18, 2014, 8:48:43 AM
Signature Date

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART I

For reporting on
School Year 2013-14

PART I DUE DECEMBER 18, 2014
5PM EST

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

STANDARDS OF ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

This section requests descriptions of the State's implementation of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as amended (ESEA)* 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

Indicate below whether your state has made or is planning to make revisions to or change the State's academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science since the State's content standards were most recently approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. If yes, indicate specifically in what school year your State implemented or will implement the revisions or changes.

Response	Options
	No revisions or changes to academic content standards in mathematics,reading/language arts or science made or planned.
State has revised or changed	State has revised or changed its academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science or is planning to make revisions to or change its academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Indicate below the year these changes were or will be implemented or "Not Applicable" to indicate that changes were not made or will not be made in the subject area.

Acceptable responses are a school year (e.g., 2013-14) or Not Applicable.

	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Academic Content Standards	2009-2010	2010-2011	2010-2011

If the responses above do not fully describe revisions or changes to your State's academic content standards, describe the revisions or changes below.

The response is limited to 1,000 characters.

1.1.1.1 Academic Achievement Standards in Mathematics, Reading/Language Arts and Science

Indicate below whether your state has changed or is planning to change the State's academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science since the State's academic achievement standards were most recently approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. If yes, indicate specifically in what school year your State implemented or will implement the changes.

As applicable, include changes to academic achievement standards based on any assessments (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.

Response	Options
State has revised or changed	No revisions or changes to academic achievement standards in mathematics,reading/language arts or science made or planned.
	State has changed its academic achievement standards or is planning to change its academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Indicate below either the school year in which these changes were or will be implemented or "Not Applicable" to indicate that changes were not made or will not be made in the subject area.

Acceptable responses are a school year (e.g., 2013-14) or Not Applicable.

Academic Achievement Standards for	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Regular Assessments in Grades 3-8	2011-2012	2012-2013	2012-2013
Regular Assessments in High School	2011-2012	2012-2013	2012-2013
Alternate Assessments Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards (if applicable)	Not Applicable	2012-2013	2012-2013
Alternate Assessments Based on Modified Achievement Standards (if applicable)	2011-2012	2012-2013	Not Applicable
Alternate Assessments Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	2011-2012	2012-2013	2012-2013

If the responses above do not fully describe revisions or changes to your State's academic achievement standards, describe the revisions or changes below.

The response is limited to 1,000 characters.

1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts and Science

Indicate below whether your state has changed or is planning to change the State's academic assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts or science since the State's academic assessments were most recently approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. If yes, indicate specifically in what school year your State implemented or will implement the changes.

As applicable, include any assessments (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.*

Response	Options
	No changes to assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts or science made or planned.
State has revised or changed	State has changed or is planning to change its assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Indicate below the year these changes were implemented or "Not Applicable" to indicate that changes were not made or will not be made in the subject area.

Acceptable responses are a school year (e.g., 2013-14) or Not Applicable.

Academic Assessments	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Regular Assessments in Grades 3-8	2011-2012	2012-2013	2012-2013
Regular Assessments in High School	2011-2012	2012-2013	2012-2013
Alternate Assessments Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards (if applicable)	Not Applicable	2012-2013	2012-2013
Alternate Assessments Based on Modified Achievement Standards (if applicable)	2011-2012	2012-2013	Not Applicable
Alternate Assessments Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	2011-2012	2012-2013	2012-2013

If the responses above do not fully describe revisions or changes to your State's academic achievement standards, describe the revisions or changes below.

The response is limited to 1,000 characters.

1.1.3 Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities

1.1.3.1 Percentages of Funds Used for Standards and Assessment Development and Other Purposes

For funds your State had available under *ESEA* section 6111 (Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities) during SY 2013-14, estimate what percentage of the funds your State used for the following (round to the nearest ten percent).

Purpose	Percentage (rounded to the nearest ten percent)
To pay the costs of the development of the State assessments and standards required by Section 1111(b)	45.00
To administer assessments required by Section 1111(b) or to carry out other activities described in section 6111 and other activities related to ensuring that the State's schools and local educational agencies are held accountable for the results	55.00
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.1.3.2 Uses of Funds for Purposes Other than Standards and Assessment Development

For funds your State had available under *ESEA* section 6111 (Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities) during SY 2013-14 that were used for purposes other than the costs of the development of the State assessments and standards required by section 1111(b), for what purposes did your State use the funds? (Enter "yes" for all that apply and "no" for all that do not apply).

Purpose	Used for Purpose (yes/no)
Administering assessments required by Section 1111(b)	Yes
Developing challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards and aligned assessments in academic subjects for which standards and assessments are not required by Section 1111(b)	No
Developing or improving assessments of English language proficiency necessary to comply with Section 1111(b)(7)	No
Ensuring the continued validity and reliability of State assessments, and/or refining State assessments to ensure their continued alignment with the State's academic content standards and to improve the alignment of curricula and instructional materials	Yes
Developing multiple measures to increase the reliability and validity of State assessment systems	No
Strengthening the capacity of local educational agencies and schools to provide all students the opportunity to increase educational achievement, including carrying out professional development activities aligned with State student academic achievement standards and assessments	Yes
Expanding the range of accommodations available to students with limited English proficiency and students with disabilities (*IDEA*) to improve the rates of inclusion of such students, including professional development activities aligned with State academic achievement standards and assessments	Yes
Improving the dissemination of information on student achievement and school performance to parents and the community, including the development of information and reporting systems designed to identify best educational practices based on scientifically based research or to assist in linking records of student achievement, length of enrollment, and graduation over time	Yes
Other	No
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.2 Participation in State Assessments

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

Note: States are not required to report these data by the racial/ethnic groups shown in the table below; instead, they are required to report these data by the major racial and ethnic groups that are identified in their Accountability Workbooks. The charts below display racial/ethnic data that have been mapped from the major racial and ethnic groups identified in their workbooks to the racial/ethnic groups shown.

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 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 *ESEA*. 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. Do not include former students with disabilities (*IDEA*). Do not include students only covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

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	784,966	780,562	99.44
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,379	2,362	99.29
Asian or Pacific Islander	51,456	51,252	99.60
Asian	50,331	50,137	99.61
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	1,125	1,115	99.11
Black or African American	181,845	180,559	99.29
Hispanic or Latino	101,041	100,237	99.20
White	412,328	410,442	99.54
Two or more races	35,917	35,710	99.42
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	97,137	96,281	99.12
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	48,473	48,161	99.36
Economically disadvantaged students	312,548	310,169	99.24
Migratory students	189	188	99.47
Male	399,984	397,400	99.35
Female	384,982	383,162	99.53
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities (IDEA) 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 (IDEA)*. Do not include former students with disabilities *(IDEA)*. Do not include students only covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

Type of Assessment	**# Children with Disabilities (*IDEA*) Participating**	**Percentage of Children with Disabilities (*IDEA*) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment**
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	34,179	35.50
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	48,125	49.98
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.00
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	6,399	6.65
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	7,578	7.87
Total	96,281	//
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

The "Asian/Pacific Islander" row in the tables below represent either the value reported by the state to the Department of Education for the major racial and ethnic group "Asian/Pacific Islander" or an aggregation of values reported by the state for the major racial and ethnic groups "Asian" and "Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander or Pacific Islander" (and "Filipino" in the case of California). When the values reported in the Asian/Pacific Islander row represent the U. S. Department of Education aggregation of other values reported by the state, the detail for "Asian" and Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander" are also included in the following rows. Disaggregated reporting for assessment participation data is done according to the provisions outlined within each state's Accountability Workbook. Accordingly, not every state uses major racial and ethnic groups which enable detail of Asian American/Pacific Islander (AAPI) populations.

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 reading/language arts assessment.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	658,816	657,248	99.76
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,933	1,930	99.84
Asian or Pacific Islander	44,059	44,016	99.90
Asian	43,111	43,071	99.91
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	948	945	99.68
Black or African American	151,829	151,204	99.59
Hispanic or Latino	82,188	81,979	99.75
White	347,998	347,369	99.82
Two or more races	30,809	30,750	99.81
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	84,773	84,374	99.53
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	37,096	37,000	99.74
Economically disadvantaged students	263,746	262,792	99.64
Migratory students	150	148	98.67
Male	336,409	335,517	99.73
Female	322,407	321,731	99.79
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.2.3.1 Recently Arrived LEP Students Taking ELP Assessments in Lieu of Reading/Language Arts Assessments

In the table below, provide the number of recently arrived LEP students (as defined in 34 C.F.R. Part 200.6(b)(4)) included in the participation counts in 1.2.3 who took an assessment of English language proficiency in lieu of the State's reading/language arts assessment, as permitted under 34 C.F.R. Part 200.20.

Recently Arrived LEP Students	#
Recently arrived LEP students who took an assessment of English language proficiency in lieu of the State's reading/language arts assessment	7

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

This section is similar to 1.2.2 and collects data on the State's 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 (IDEA)*. Do not include former students with disabilities (*IDEA*). Do not include students only covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.
Note: For this question only, report on students with disabilities (IDEA) who are also LEP students in the U.S. less than 12 months who took the ELP in lieu of the statewide reading/language arts assessment.

Type of Assessment	**# Children with Disabilities (*IDEA*) Participating**	**Percentage of Children with Disabilities (*IDEA*) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment**
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	49,503	58.67
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	21,072	24.97
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	753	0.89
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	5,488	6.50
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	7,552	8.95
LEP < 12 months, took ELP	6	0.01
Total	84,374	//
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

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 science assessment.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	520,417	512,084	98.40
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,586	1,535	96.78
Asian or Pacific Islander	34,173	33,291	97.42
Asian	33,411	32,546	97.41
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	762	745	97.77
Black or African American	118,701	117,323	98.84
Hispanic or Latino	63,922	59,645	93.31
White	278,459	276,910	99.44
Two or more races	23,576	23,380	99.17
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	59,308	57,793	97.45
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	30,864	25,145	81.47
Economically disadvantaged students	196,527	190,517	96.94
Migratory students	108	92	85.19
Male	263,642	259,013	98.24
Female	256,775	253,071	98.56
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Fewer grade 3 science assessments are taken than grade 3 mathematics assessments. Under the requirements of the ESEA, all students, including LEP students, are required to participate in Science tests once at the elementary school level, once at the middle school level, and once at the high school level. LEP students in Virginia may be exempted from the grade 3 SOL Science test but must take the grade 5 SOL Science test.			

1.2.6 Participation of Students with Disabilities (IDEA) in Science Assessment

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (*IDEA*) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (*IDEA*) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	23,329	40.37
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	29,901	51.74
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	387	0.67
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	4,176	7.23
Total	57,793	//
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

1.3 Student Academic Achievement

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

Note: States are not required to report these data by the racial/ethnic groups shown in the table below; instead, they are required to report these data by the major racial and ethnic groups that are identified in their Accountability Workbooks. The charts below display racial/ethnic data that have been mapped from the major racial and ethnic groups identified in their workbooks to the racial/ethnic groups shown.

1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics

In the format of the table below, provide the number of students who received a valid score on the State 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, and for whom a proficiency level was assigned in the regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments. Do not include former students with disabilities *(IDEA)*. 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 reading/language arts assessment, and the difference noted in the paragraph below.

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 and who took an assessment of English language proficiency in lieu of the State's reading/language arts assesment. 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 science assessment administered at least once in each of the following grade spans: 3 through 5, 6 through 9, and 10 through 12.

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

The "Asian/Pacific Islander" row in the tables below represent either the value reported by the state to the Department of Education for the major racial and ethnic group "Asian/Pacific Islander" or an aggregation of values reported by the state for the major racial and ethnic groups "Asian" and "Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander or Pacific Islander" (and "Filipino" in the case of California). When the values reported in the Asian/Pacific Islander row represent the U. S. Department of Education aggregation of other values reported by the state, the detail for "Asian" and Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander" are also included in the following rows. Disaggregated reporting for assessment participation data is done according to the provisions outlined within each state's Accountability Workbook. Accordingly, not every state uses major racial and ethnic groups which enable detail of Asian American/Pacific Islander (AAPI) populations.

1.3.1.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	94,812	62,948	66.39
American Indian or Alaska Native	283	173	61.13
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,542	5,511	84.24
Asian	6,399	5,416	84.64
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	143	95	66.43
Black or African American	21,224	10,813	50.95
Hispanic or Latino	13,436	7,476	55.64
White	48,491	35,637	73.49
Two or more races	4,836	3,338	69.02
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	12,205	5,153	42.22
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	11,917	5,912	49.61
Economically disadvantaged students	41,239	21,513	52.17
Migratory students	30	11	36.67
Male	48,859	32,349	66.21
Female	45,953	30,599	66.59
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Fewer grade 3 science assessments are taken than grade 3 mathematics assessments. Under the requirements of the ESEA, all students, including LEP students, are required to participate in Science tests once at the elementary school level, once at the middle school level, and once at the high school level. LEP students in Virginia may be exempted from the grade 3 SOL Science test but must take the grade 5 SOL Science test.			

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

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	94,416	64,954	68.80
American Indian or Alaska Native	281	183	65.12
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,447	5,301	82.22
Asian	6,305	5,203	82.52
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	142	98	69.01
Black or African American	21,216	11,064	52.15
Hispanic or Latino	13,208	7,877	59.64
White	48,419	37,034	76.49
Two or more races	4,845	3,495	72.14
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	12,199	5,512	45.18
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	11,394	5,999	52.65
Economically disadvantaged students	40,970	22,399	54.67
Migratory students	25	14	56.00
Male	48,649	31,922	65.62
Female	45,767	33,032	72.17
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	87,691	72,262	82.41
American Indian or Alaska Native	238	202	84.87
Asian or Pacific Islander	5,705	5,372	94.16
Asian	5,575	5,260	94.35
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	130	112	86.15
Black or African American	19,988	13,337	66.73
Hispanic or Latino	9,447	7,457	78.94
White	47,561	41,909	88.12
Two or more races	4,752	3,985	83.86
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	11,066	6,720	60.73
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,135	4,642	75.66
Economically disadvantaged students	35,640	25,218	70.76
Migratory students	17	13	76.47
Male	45,058	37,295	82.77
Female	42,633	34,967	82.02

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Under the requirements of the ESEA, all students, including LEP students, are required to participate in Science tests once at the elementary school level, once at the middle school level, and once at the high school level. LEP students in Virginia may be exempted from the grade 3 SOL Science test but must take the grade 5 SOL Science test. Therefore, fewer grade 3 science assessments are taken than grade 3 mathematics assessments.

1.3.1.2 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	94,987	75,607	79.60
American Indian or Alaska Native	240	180	75.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,698	6,171	92.13
Asian	6,558	6,046	92.19
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	140	125	89.29
Black or African American	21,053	14,111	67.03
Hispanic or Latino	12,786	9,112	71.27
White	49,388	42,116	85.28
Two or more races	4,822	3,917	81.23
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	12,861	6,672	51.88
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,894	3,759	54.53
Economically disadvantaged students	39,895	27,046	67.79
Migratory students	26	16	61.54
Male	48,487	38,312	79.01
Female	46,500	37,295	80.20
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

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

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	94,693	66,227	69.94
American Indian or Alaska Native	240	149	62.08
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,603	5,497	83.25
Asian	6,467	5,392	83.38
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	136	105	77.21
Black or African American	21,032	11,209	53.29
Hispanic or Latino	12,584	7,118	56.56
White	49,396	38,725	78.40
Two or more races	4,838	3,529	72.94
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	12,894	5,771	44.76
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,398	2,321	36.28
Economically disadvantaged students	39,673	21,437	54.03
Migratory students	24	10	41.67
Male	48,335	32,562	67.37
Female	46,358	33,665	72.62
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.3.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Asian			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Virginia does not administer the Standards of Learning assessments in science for grade 4.			

1.3.1.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	87,179	63,325	72.64
American Indian or Alaska Native	250	176	70.40
Asian or Pacific Islander	5,247	4,592	87.52
Asian	5,111	4,481	87.67
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	136	111	81.62
Black or African American	20,688	12,165	58.80
Hispanic or Latino	11,691	7,452	63.74
White	45,101	35,827	79.44
Two or more races	4,202	3,113	74.08
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	12,469	5,259	42.18
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,841	1,943	40.14
Economically disadvantaged students	38,139	22,852	59.92
Migratory students	18	9	50.00
Male	44,140	31,299	70.91
Female	43,039	32,026	74.41

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. In Virginia, mathematics instruction is accelerated. There are grade 5 students taking higher level mathematics courses and the associated assessments. Therefore, fewer grade 5 mathematics assessments are taken than grade 5 reading/language arts and science assessments.

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

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	93,013	67,957	73.06
American Indian or Alaska Native	259	188	72.59
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,440	5,562	86.37
Asian	6,292	5,447	86.57
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	148	115	77.70
Black or African American	21,077	12,092	57.37
Hispanic or Latino	11,939	7,374	61.76
White	48,729	39,288	80.63
Two or more races	4,569	3,453	75.57
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	12,692	5,553	43.75
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,406	1,502	34.09
Economically disadvantaged students	38,536	22,487	58.35
Migratory students	18	10	55.56
Male	47,253	33,079	70.00
Female	45,760	34,878	76.22

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. In Virginia, mathematics instruction is accelerated. There are grade 5 students taking higher level mathematics courses and the associated assessments. Therefore, fewer grade 5 mathematics assessments are taken than grade 5 reading/language arts assessments.

1.3.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	93,394	67,589	72.37
American Indian or Alaska Native	261	192	73.56
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,545	5,568	85.07
Asian	6,398	5,451	85.20
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	147	117	79.59
Black or African American	21,089	11,481	54.44
Hispanic or Latino	12,151	7,082	58.28
White	48,776	39,818	81.63
Two or more races	4,572	3,448	75.42
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	12,702	5,559	43.76
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,847	1,368	28.22
Economically disadvantaged students	38,683	21,825	56.42
Migratory students	18	8	44.44
Male	47,448	34,717	73.17
Female	45,946	32,872	71.54

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. In Virginia, mathematics instruction is accelerated. There are grade 5 students taking higher level mathematics courses and the associated assessments. Therefore, fewer grade 5 mathematics assessments are taken than grade 5 science assessments.
For the 2012-2013 school year, Virginia administered new science assessments which affected the percentage of students scoring at or above proficient.

1.3.1.4 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	83,937	63,349	75.47
American Indian or Alaska Native	274	202	73.72
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,909	4,458	90.81
Asian	4,800	4,367	90.98
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	109	91	83.49
Black or African American	20,616	12,298	59.65
Hispanic or Latino	11,443	7,949	69.47
White	42,783	35,335	82.59
Two or more races	3,912	3,107	79.42
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	12,270	5,693	46.40
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,329	2,061	47.61
Economically disadvantaged students	37,436	23,743	63.42
Migratory students	29	16	55.17
Male	43,014	31,504	73.24
Female	40,923	31,845	77.82
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. In Virginia, mathematics instruction is accelerated. There are grade 6 students taking higher level mathematics courses and the associated assessments. Therefore, fewer grade 6 mathematics assessments are taken than grade 6 reading/language arts assessments.			

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

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	93,279	67,827	72.71
American Indian or Alaska Native	286	193	67.48
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,290	5,477	87.07
Asian	6,165	5,377	87.22
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	125	100	80.00
Black or African American	21,572	11,875	55.05
Hispanic or Latino	11,800	7,375	62.50
White	48,889	39,470	80.73
Two or more races	4,442	3,437	77.38
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	12,441	4,817	38.72
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,882	1,160	29.88
Economically disadvantaged students	38,833	22,041	56.76
Migratory students	25	10	40.00
Male	47,810	32,975	68.97
Female	45,469	34,852	76.65
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. In Virginia, mathematics instruction is accelerated. There are grade 6 students taking higher level mathematics courses and the associated assessments. Therefore, fewer grade 6 mathematics assessments are taken than grade 6 reading/language arts assessments.			

1.3.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Asian			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Virginia does not administer the Standards of Learning assessments in science for grade 6.			

1.3.1.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	78,897	50,996	64.64
American Indian or Alaska Native	237	149	62.87
Asian or Pacific Islander	5,164	4,444	86.06
Asian	5,054	4,374	86.55
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	110	70	63.64
Black or African American	18,004	8,025	44.57
Hispanic or Latino	10,190	5,516	54.13
White	41,761	30,421	72.85
Two or more races	3,541	2,441	68.94
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	11,617	4,191	36.08
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,604	1,592	34.58
Economically disadvantaged students	32,840	15,750	47.96
Migratory students	22	5	22.73
Male	40,592	25,158	61.98
Female	38,305	25,838	67.45
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. In Virginia, mathematics instruction is accelerated. There are grade 7 students taking higher level mathematics courses and the associated assessments. Therefore, fewer grade 7 mathematics assessments are taken than grade 7 reading/language arts assessments.			

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

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	93,707	70,853	75.61
American Indian or Alaska Native	285	205	71.93
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,138	5,450	88.79
Asian	6,005	5,351	89.11
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	133	99	74.44
Black or African American	21,705	12,655	58.30
Hispanic or Latino	11,264	7,447	66.11
White	50,112	41,784	83.38
Two or more races	4,203	3,312	78.80
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	12,062	4,978	41.27
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,276	1,546	36.16
Economically disadvantaged students	37,675	22,683	60.21
Migratory students	23	12	52.17
Male	47,830	34,427	71.98
Female	45,877	36,426	79.40
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. In Virginia, mathematics instruction is accelerated. There are grade 7 students taking higher level mathematics courses and the associated assessments. Therefore, fewer grade 7 mathematics assessments are taken than grade 7 reading/language arts assessments.			

1.3.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Asian			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Virginia does not administer the Standards of Learning assessments in science for grade 7.			

1.3.1.6 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	63,867	42,370	66.34
American Indian or Alaska Native	187	112	59.89
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,146	2,748	87.35
Asian	3,067	2,693	87.81
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	79	55	69.62
Black or African American	17,351	9,078	52.32
Hispanic or Latino	8,359	5,004	59.86
White	32,137	23,531	73.22
Two or more races	2,687	1,897	70.60
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	10,785	4,066	37.70
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,290	1,780	41.49
Economically disadvantaged students	29,668	16,051	54.10
Migratory students	33	14	42.42
Male	33,467	21,226	63.42
Female	30,400	21,144	69.55

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. In Virginia, mathematics instruction is accelerated. There are grade 8 students taking the end-of-course Algebra I, Algebra II, and Geometry assessments associated with high school courses. Therefore, fewer grade 8 mathematics assessments are taken than grade 8 science and reading/language arts assessments.

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

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	94,395	66,504	70.45
American Indian or Alaska Native	273	194	71.06
Asian or Pacific Islander	5,995	5,156	86.01
Asian	5,880	5,072	86.26
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	115	84	73.04
Black or African American	22,327	11,750	52.63
Hispanic or Latino	10,979	6,740	61.39
White	50,711	39,583	78.06
Two or more races	4,110	3,081	74.96
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	12,059	4,408	36.55
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,617	1,502	32.53
Economically disadvantaged students	37,228	20,029	53.80
Migratory students	23	9	39.13
Male	48,368	32,732	67.67
Female	46,027	33,772	73.37

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. In Virginia, mathematics instruction is accelerated. There are grade 8 students taking the end-of-course Algebra I, Algebra II, and Geometry assessments associated with high school courses. Therefore, fewer grade 8 mathematics assessments are taken than grade 8 reading/language arts assessments.

1.3.3.6 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	90,918	67,287	74.01
American Indian or Alaska Native	257	198	77.04
Asian or Pacific Islander	5,804	5,105	87.96
Asian	5,684	5,014	88.21
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	120	91	75.83
Black or African American	21,429	11,636	54.30
Hispanic or Latino	11,114	6,861	61.73
White	48,349	40,315	83.38
Two or more races	3,965	3,172	80.00
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	11,619	4,982	42.88
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,085	1,591	31.29
Economically disadvantaged students	36,229	20,674	57.06
Migratory students	26	9	34.62
Male	46,591	35,144	75.43
Female	44,327	32,143	72.51
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. In Virginia, mathematics instruction is accelerated. There are grade 8 students taking the end-of-course Algebra I, Algebra II, and Geometry assessments associated with high school courses. Therefore, fewer grade 8 mathematics assessments are taken than grade 8 science assessments.			

1.3.1.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - High School

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	276,883	218,499	78.91
American Indian or Alaska Native	891	682	76.54
Asian or Pacific Islander	19,546	17,875	91.45
Asian	19,148	17,549	91.65
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	398	326	81.91
Black or African American	61,623	40,822	66.24
Hispanic or Latino	32,332	22,896	70.82
White	150,781	126,617	83.97
Two or more races	11,710	9,607	82.04
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	24,074	11,771	48.90
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	11,286	6,660	59.01
Economically disadvantaged students	90,952	61,164	67.25
Migratory students	30	21	70.00
Male	138,841	106,719	76.86
Female	138,042	111,780	80.98
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. There are more end-of-course mathematics assessments administered than reading/language arts and science assessments.			

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

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	93,738	84,132	89.75
American Indian or Alaska Native	306	272	88.89
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,101	5,636	92.38
Asian	5,955	5,506	92.46
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	146	130	89.04
Black or African American	22,274	18,333	82.31
Hispanic or Latino	10,203	8,623	84.51
White	51,111	47,773	93.47
Two or more races	3,743	3,495	93.37
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	10,021	6,423	64.10
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,020	940	46.53
Economically disadvantaged students	29,872	24,301	81.35
Migratory students	10	9	90.00
Male	47,265	41,933	88.72
Female	46,473	42,199	90.80
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. There are more end-of-course mathematics assessments administered than reading/language arts and science assessments.			

1.3.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Science - High School

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	240,081	201,061	83.75
American Indian or Alaska Native	779	647	83.06
Asian or Pacific Islander	15,237	13,958	91.61
Asian	14,889	13,659	91.74
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	348	299	85.92
Black or African American	54,817	38,579	70.38
Hispanic or Latino	26,933	19,968	74.14
White	132,224	119,088	90.07
Two or more races	10,091	8,821	87.41
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	22,406	12,103	54.02
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	9,078	4,544	50.06
Economically disadvantaged students	79,965	56,965	71.24
Migratory students	31	17	54.84
Male	119,916	100,442	83.76
Female	120,165	100,619	83.73
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. There are more end-of-course mathematics assessments administered than reading/language arts and science assessments.			

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

For an SEA that has not received ESEA flexibility, or an SEA that received ESEA flexibility without the optional waiver to not make AYP determinations for LEAs and schools:

In the table below, provide the total number of public elementary and secondary schools and districts in the State, including charters, and the total number of those schools and districts that made AYP based on data for SY 2013-14. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2013-14	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2013-14
Schools			
Districts			
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

For an SEA with an approved ESEA flexibility request that includes the optional waiver to not make AYP determinations for LEAs and schools:

In the table below, provide the total number of public elementary and secondary schools and districts in the State, including charters, and the total number of those schools and districts that made all of their AMOs, the 95 percent participation rate, and other academic indicator [3] based on data for SY 2013-14. The percentage will be calculated automatically.

.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Met All AMOs, 95 Percent Participation Rate, and Other Academic Indicator in SY 2013-14	Percentage that Met All AMOs, 95 Percent Participation Rate and Other Academic Indicator in SY 2013-14
Schools	1,827	885	48.44
Districts	132	16	12.12
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

[3] For a high school, the other academic indicator is always graduation rate.

1.4.2 Title I School Accountability

For an SEA that has not received ESEA flexibility, or an SEA that received ESEA flexibility without the optional waiver to not make AYP determinations for LEAs and schools:

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 SY 2013-14. 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 2013-14	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2013-14
All Title I schools			
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools			
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools			
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

For an SEA with an approved ESEA flexibility request that includes the optional waiver to not make AYP determinations for LEAs and schools:

In the table below, provide the total number of public Title I schools by type and the total number of those schools that made all of their AMOs, the 95 percent participation rate, and the other academic indicator [4] based on data for SY 2013-14. Include only public Title I schools. Do not include Title I programs operated by LEAs in private schools. The percentage will be calculated automatically.

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools that Met All AMOs, 95 Percent Participation Rate, and Other Academic Indicator in SY 2013-14	Percentage of Title I Schools that Met All AMOs, 95 Percent Participation Rate, and Other Academic Indicator in SY 2013-14
All Title I schools	731	322	44.05
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	545	219	40.18
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	186	103	55.38
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

[4] For a high school, the other academic indicator is always graduation rate.

1.4.3 Accountability of Districts That Received Title I Funds

For an SEA that has not received ESEA flexibility, or an SEA that received ESEA flexibility without the optional waiver to not make AYP determinations for LEAs and schools:

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 2013-14. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds in SY 2013-14	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2013-14	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2013-14
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

For an SEA with an approved ESEA flexibility request that includes the optional waiver to not make AYP determinations for LEAs and schools:

In the table below, provide the total number of districts that received Title I funds and the total number of those districts that met all of their AMOs, the 95 percent participation rate, and other academic indicator [5] based on data for SY 2013-14. The percentage will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds in SY 2013-14	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Met All AMOs, 95 percent Participation Rate, and Other Academic Indicator in SY 2013-14	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Met All AMOs, 95 percent Participation Rate, and Other Academic Indicator in SY 2013-14
132	16	12.12
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

[5] For a high school, the other academic indicator is always graduation rate.

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 *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2013-14 (based on SY 2012-13 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2013-14
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	
Extension of the school year or school day	
Replacement of staff members, not including the principal, relevant to the school's low performance	
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	
Replacement of the principal	
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Under the provisions of Virginia's approved ESEA flexibility application, Corrective Action was not implemented in SY 2013-2014.	

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 *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2013-14 (based on SY 2012-13 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)	
Reopening the school as a public charter school	
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	
Takeover the school by the State	
Other major restructuring of the school governance	
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Under the provisions of Virginia's approved ESEA flexibility application, Restructuring Action was not implemented in SY 2013-2014	

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.

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.

There were no divisions that received Title I funds and were identified for Improvement in Virginia.

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 *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2013-14 (based on SY 2012-13 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 2013-14
Implemented a new curriculum based on State standards	
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	
Restructured the district	
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2012-13 and beginning of SY 2013-14 as a corrective action)	
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. There were no divisions that received Title I funds and were identified for Improvement in Virginia.	

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 SY 2013-14 data and the results of those appeals.

Entity	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts		
Schools		
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Under the provisions of Virginia's approved ESEA flexibility application, Adequate Yearly Progress ratings are not required for the 2013-2014 school year.		

In the table below, provide the data by which processing appeals based on SY 2013-14 data was complete.

Processing Appeals completion	Date
Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2013-14 data was complete	

1.4.8 Sections 1003(a) and (g) School Improvement Funds

In the section below, "schools in improvement" refers to Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of *ESEA* .

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

1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2013 (SY 2013-14) 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*: 3.81 %

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

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

The data for this question are reported through ED*Facts* files and compiled in the EDEN012 "Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Allocations to LEAs and Schools" report in the ED*Facts* Reporting System (ERS). The ED*Facts* files and data groups used in this report are listed in the CSPR Crosswalk. The CSPR Data Key contains more detailed information on how the data are populated into the report.

Before certifying Part I of the CSPR, a state user must run the EDEN012 report in ERS and verify that the state's data are correct. The final, certified data from this report will be made publicly available alongside the state's certified CSPR PDF.

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 2013-14.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

In an effort to meet the varied needs of schools in Virginia Department of Education (VDOE) has designed a differentiated technical assistance process to provide direct technical assistance to school and central office personnel via a cadre of highly-skilled retired educators and educational consultants. VDOE has worked collaboratively with the Center on Innovations in Learning (CIL), the College of William and Mary, Stronge and Associates, Corbett Consulting, the Virginia School Board Association, and Mass Insight to develop a comprehensive system of evaluation and technical assistance for implementation of the 1003(g) grants. The allowable five-percent set-aside of the 1003(g) funds was used for technical assistance. The technical assistance as described below was provided to all grantees in the development and implementation of their grant applications.

Early Warning System Training
The Virginia Early Warning System (VEWS) relies on readily available data - housed at the school - to predict which students are at risk for dropping out of high school; target resources at the school- and division-level to support students not on track to graduate while they are still in school and before they drop out; examine patterns and identify school climate issues that may contribute to disproportionate dropout rates. Virginia provided training to high schools selected based on graduation data.

Stronge and Associates
Working with Stronge and Associates, Virginia developed a series of tools to help divisions and schools evaluate the alignment and quality of the written, taught and tested curriculum. At the division level, tools addressed leadership, curriculum guides, and professional development. At the school level, tools addressed leadership, lesson plans, lesson observations, master schedule, teacher made assessments, data analysis, and professional development.

Virginia School Board Association
Virginia partnered with the Virginia School Board Association to provide technical assistance to school boards and superintendents in Virginia. The focus of this training was on building the capacity to support targeted and continuous school improvement efforts and on examining the critical role of the school board and the division in effective and sustainable change efforts.

Mass Insight (SDN Participation)
Virginia participated in a state development network for school turnaround in which Virginia received opportunities to collaborate with SIG states about best practices. Virginia received a framework of allowable expenditures for school improvement grants.

Collaboration with the College of William and Mary
The Office of School Improvement collaborated with The College of William and Mary to support and develop leadership at the division level through the Division Leadership Support Team (DLST) Project. The goal of the project was to achieve efficient and effective division policies, programs, and practices to enhance growth in student learning through differentiated support to identified focus schools per the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA) flexibility waiver. Each participating division leadership team received ongoing support from a VDOE contractor with extensive experience in public education. Examples of support included modeling procedures for convening a division leadership team meeting, needs sensing interviews, and analyzing data related to tiered, differentiated interventions provided to students. In addition, DLST participants reviewed John Hattie's research related to high-yield instructional strategies, and used the information to make decisions regarding the most appropriate approach to the tiered needs of low-achieving students.

Tools Developed by the Office of School Improvement in Partnership with the Center on Innovations in Learning
Indistar®, an online portal created and managed by the Center on Innovations in Learning, was used by both focus and priority schools and LEAs (district, school, and Lead Turnaround Partner staff) to track, develop, coordinate, and report improvement activities. Wise Ways® research briefs enabled school and division-level staff users to explore the research associated with individual indicators, and also informed the development of tasks or action steps. In an effort to continuously improve the online portal, the OSI conducted several focus groups resulting in several enhancements including a document upload feature, navigation toolbar, and other productivity tools.

Contractors for Priority Schools
The Office of School Improvement provided trained contractors to support priority schools in ensuring that the school's reform was implemented with fidelity. Contractors monitored the alignment of supports from the division, Lead Turnaround Partner and school to support the school's identified needs; and ensured the transformation "work" was evidenced in the school improvement plan, meeting minutes and reports.

Corbett Consulting
Corbett Consulting provided newly identified priority schools with technical assistance sessions throughout 2013-2014 that included background research and information about selected strands of the improvement models, facilitated sharing, and mock board meetings. Corbett Consulting also suggested promising strategies and timelines for implementation, made recommendations to division teams regarding 1003(g) compliance, and provided guidance on the implementation of the transformation and turnaround models.

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 2013-14 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.

Virginia used state funds to support the following:
1. Academic review. The Standards of Accreditation requires schools that are Accredited with Warning, Accredited with Warning-Graduation Rate, or Provisionally Accredited - Graduation Rate to undergo an academic review and prepare a three-year school improvement plan. To further differentiate work needed in schools, the academic review process was revised in 2005. In 2011, Virginia's accreditation standards were changed to require high schools to meet specific graduation rate targets. The academic review process was revised to include actions for schools not meeting high school graduation benchmarks. Virginia continues to leverage the human capacity needed to implement the work by contracting with retired educators experienced in working with high-poverty and high achievement schools.

The academic review was designed to help schools and divisions identify and analyze instructional and organizational factors at the school and division level affecting student achievement. In 2013-14, emphasis was placed on aligning the written, taught, and tested curricula with both the content and cognitive levels of the Standards of Learning. Studies strongly support the correlation between an aligned curriculum and increased or high student achievement (Price-Baugh, 1997; Mitchell, 1998; Wishnick, 1989; Gamoran, Porter, Smithson, & White, 1997).

Virginia provided live regional trainings and recorded webinars to division-led teams on the use of newly developed alignment tools. Divisions provided additional trainings to their school and division personnel. The academic review team, consisting of division staff, trained Virginia Department of Education (VDOE) contractors, and/or Department staff, conducted the academic reviews using tools selected by the division from an array provided by VDOE. The VDOE contractor wrote a report based on the academic review that included essential actions that the school needed to address. The school used the essential actions provided in the report of findings to select the indicators that were addressed in the three-year school improvement plan. Concurrent with developing a school improvement plan, priority assistance was prescribed by the VDOE contractor and approved by the Virginia Department of Education for immediate delivery. Department staff and/or VDOE contractors monitored implementation of the essential actions as documented in final reports for each school Accredited with Warning.

For high schools that were Accredited with Warning in specific academic areas and/or in achievement of the minimum threshold for the graduation and completion index or Provisionally Accredited-Graduation Rate, the academic review process also addressed graduation and academic issues as well as the required elements of three year school improvement plans.

The Virginia Early Warning System (VEWS) was developed for the Department of Education in collaboration with the National High School Center as a data tracking tool designed to assist schools in identifying which students showed signs of being at-risk of failure or dropping out. The VEWS indicators were based upon predictors of drop out and graduation that had been validated by national research and by four Virginia school divisions that participated in a pilot program. The VEWS data provided quarterly reports to the school team to track progress on selected indicators. These indicators included attendance, grades, credits earned, scores on SOL assessments, and behavior. The 7-Step VEWS implementation process is available at the following Web site:
http://www.doe.virginia.gov/support/school_improvement/early_warning_system/index.shtml.

For schools warned or provisionally accredited in graduation rate, the academic review included a six component process requiring description, summary, and artifacts for each component. The components were Current Practices (data used, prevention strategies, recovery strategies for the school and district), Division and School Level Teams (membership of each, roles/responsibilities, meeting schedules, agendas, minutes), Virginia Early Warning System 7 Steps; Needs Assessment (tool used, date administered, data analysis, next steps), 8 Elements of High School Improvement Webinar Series (dates, purpose, next steps), School Improvement Plan. Following the interview and review of artifacts, essential actions were developed as needed for each appropriate component.

The VDOE contractor, in collaboration with the division and school teams, customized a framework for improvement developed by either the National High School Center (NHSC) and/or the Center on Innovations in Learning (CIL).

The division and school teams used an online electronic improvement planning tool to develop, implement and monitor a single, comprehensive three-year improvement plan that incorporated school and division actions using either the targeted indicators from Center on Innovations in Learning or the broader indicators provided by the National High School Center.

Once the teams reviewed the data and developed a comprehensive school improvement plan, the plan was monitored for three years. In years two and three, the teams continued to meet, discuss data, modify, and implement the school improvement plan.

2. TenMarks. Virginia identified eight schools Accredited with Warning in seven divisions to provide support to implement TenMarks, an online, SOL-aligned intervention and instructional math program.

3. Hanover Research. Hanover research conducted a customer satisfaction survey of superintendents, division contacts, and key instructional staff as well as independent contractors engaged by VDOE to facilitate academic reviews for schools Accredited with Warning. Results were used in the development of support and technical assistance for the current year.

4. VCU Mathematics Institutes. The Office of School Improvement collaborated with Virginia Commonwealth University (VCU) to offer three 3-day workshops, Principals Partnering to Raise the Ceiling and the Floor in the New Era of Mathematics Standards, for principals representing schools rated Accredited with Warning in mathematics. The goals for the institute were to engage the principals: 1) to strengthen their understanding of the Virginia Process Goals; 2) to refine their understanding of ways to support teachers for effective mathematics instruction; and 3) to develop their capacity to share the leadership in improving the schools mathematics program. Results of the institute were used to design an extension day in October 2014 for participating principals and their mathematics specialists or lead teachers.

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 to transfer, and the number who transferred under the provisions for public school choice under Section 1116 of *ESEA*. The number of students who were eligible for public school choice should include:

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

The number of students who applied to transfer should include:

1. All students who applied to transfer in the current school year but did not or were unable to transfer.
2. All students who transferred in the current school year under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116; and
3. All students who previously transferred under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116 and are continuing to transfer for the current school year under Section 1116.

For any of the respective student counts, States should indicate in the Comment section if the count does not include any of the categories of students discussed above.

Public School Choice	# Students
Eligible for public school choice	0
Applied to transfer	0
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	287
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Under the provisions of Virginia's approved ESEA flexibility application: 1) priority and focus schools have the option of offering choice as an intervention strategy; and 2) students who previously transferred under choice provisions are allowed to continue to transfer until they reach the highest grade of the transfer school.	

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 under Section 1116 of *ESEA*.

Transportation for Public School Choice	Dollars Spent
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	$ 0

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 to eligible students due to any of the following reasons:

1. All schools at a grade level in the LEA 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.

Unable to Provide Public School Choice	# LEAs
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	

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?* For those LEAs that implement open enrollment or other school choice programs in addition to public school choice under Section 1116 of *ESEA*, the State may consider a student as having applied to transfer if the student meets the following:
   - Has a "home" or "neighborhood" school (to which the student would have been assigned, in the absence of a school 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.

   In addition, the State may consider costs for transporting a student meeting the above conditions towards the funds spent by an LEA on transportation for public school choice if the student is using district transportation services to attend the non-identified school.

b. *How should States report on public school choice for those LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice?* In the count of LEAS that are not able to offer public school choice (for any of the reasons specified in 1.4.9.1.4), States should include those LEAs that are unable to offer public school choice at one or more grade levels. For instance, if an LEA is able to provide public school choice to eligible students at the elementary level but not at the secondary level, the State should include the LEA in the count. States should also include LEAs that are not able to provide public school choice at all (i.e., at any grade level). States should provide the reason(s) why public school choice was not possible in these LEAs at the grade level(s) in the Comment section. In addition, States may also include in the Comment section a separate count just of LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice at any grade level.

   For LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice at one or more grade levels, States should count as eligible for public school choice (in 1.4.9.1.2) all students who attend identified Title I schools regardless of whether the LEA is able to offer the students public school choice.

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Under the provisions of Virginia's approved ESEA flexibility application, Public School Choice was not required for the 2013-2014 school year.

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*.

The number of students who received supplemental educational services should include all students who were enrolled with a provider and participated in some hours of services. States and LEAs have the discretion to determine the minimum number of hours of participation needed by a student to be considered as having received services.

Supplemental Educational Services	# Students
Eligible for supplemental educational services	
Applied for supplemental educational services	
Received supplemental educational services	
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Under the provisions of Virginia's approved ESEA flexibility application, Supplemental Educational Services were not required for the 2013-2014 school year.	

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*.

Spending on Supplemental Educational Services	Dollars Spent
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	$ 0
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Under the provisions of Virginia's approved ESEA flexibility application, Supplemental Educational Services were not required for the 2013-2014 school year.	

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 the grade levels listed, the number of those core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified, 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.

Classes	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Number 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 classes	234,603	231,665	98.75	2,938	1.25
All elementary classes	50,969	50,583	99.24	386	0.76
All secondary classes	183,634	181,082	98.61	2,552	1.39

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

Data table includes classes taught by special education teachers who provide direct instruction in core academic subjects.	Yes

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 section.

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 is 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 the reporting period?* The reporting period is the school year. The count of classes must include all semesters, quarters, or terms of the school year. For example, if core academic classes are held in summer sessions, those classes should be included in the count of core academic classes. A state determines into which school year classes fall.

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

In the tables 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.

1.5.2.1 Elementary School Classes

Elementary School Classes	Percentage
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	56.60
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	22.30
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	21.10
Other (please explain in comment box below)	
Total	100.00

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.5.2.2 Secondary School Classes

Secondary School Classes	Percentage
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)	55.30
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	27.20
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	17.50
Other (please explain in comment box below)	
Total	100.00

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

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. The percentage of core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified will be calculated automatically. The percentages used for high- and low-poverty schools and the poverty metric used to determine those percentages are reported in the second table. Below the tables are FAQs about these data.

NOTE: No source of classroom-level poverty data exists, so States may look at school-level data when figuring poverty quartiles. Because not all schools have traditional grade configurations, and because a school may not be counted as both an elementary and as a secondary school, 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).

This means that *for the purpose of establishing poverty quartiles*, some classes in schools where both elementary and secondary classes are taught would be counted as classes in an elementary school rather than as classes in a secondary school in 1.5.3. This also means that such a 12th grade class would be in a different category in 1.5.3 than it would be in 1.5.1.

School Type	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified
Elementary Schools			
High Poverty Elementary Schools	14,295	14,130	98.85
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	14,506	14,404	99.30
Secondary Schools			
High Poverty secondary Schools	29,417	28,774	97.81
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	58,608	58,062	99.07

1.5.3.1 Poverty Quartile Breaks

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	67.20	29.65
Poverty metric used	Virginia uses the percentages of students who qualify for the free or reduced-price lunch program.	
Secondary schools	58.17	27.47
Poverty metric used	Virginia uses the percentages of students who qualify for the free or reduced-price lunch program.	

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

a. *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.

b. *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.

c. *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.

d. *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/files/rcd/BE021775/Glossary_of_Terms.pdf.
2. **Other Language =** Name of the language of instruction, other than English, used in the programs.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other types of programs include: elementary and secondary newcomer programs; virtual ESL classes; after school tutoring; push-in; support for parents; inclusion; and collaboration.

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 who meet the LEP definition under 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 under Section 3121(a)(4) of Title III) in the ALL LEP student count in this table.

Number of ALL LEP students in the State	102,815
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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 LEP students in the State who received services in Title III language instructional education programs.

LEP Students Receiving Services	#
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	93,603
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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; Castilian	68,142
Arabic	5,746
Vietnamese	2,879
Urdu	2,464
Korean	1,987

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.6.3 Student Performance Data

This section collects data on LEP students' English language proficiency, as required by Sections 1111(h)(4)(D) and 3121(a)(2).

1.6.3.1.1 All LEP Students Tested on the State Annual English Language Proficiency Assessment

In the table below, please provide the number of ALL LEP students tested and not tested on annual State English language proficiency (ELP) assessment (as defined in 1.6.2.1).

All LEP Testing	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	96,095
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	6,720
Total	102,815
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. For the 2013-2014 school year, Virginia LEAs reported 140 LEP students as not tested. The remaining number of students in the 2013-2014 ELP assessment data reported as not tested on the ELP assessment may be due in part to an influx of students enrolling in the school divisions in the beginning of SY 2013-2014 who were not enrolled at the time of the administration of the ELP assessment. Although 102,815 LEP students were enrolled in Virginia at the start of the 2013-2014 school year, only 97,535, or 94.86% as compared to the total fall enrollment, were enrolled at the end of the 2013-2014 school year. LEP enrollment decreased from the start of the 2013-2014 school year to the end of the 2013-2014 school year by 5,280 students. VDOE continues to provide ongoing technical assistance to school divisions to ensure the most accurate data possible given the transient nature of this population and working with school divisions to determine reasons why students may lack an assessment record for the most recent administration of the ELP assessment.	

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

All LEP Results	#
Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	17,868
Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	18.59
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.6.3.2.1 Title III LEP Students Tested on the State Annual English Language Proficiency Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of Title III LEP students tested and not tested on annual State English language proficiency assessment.

Title III LEP Testing	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	86,239
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	7,372
Total	93,611
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. For the 2013-2014 school year, Virginia LEAs reported 140 LEP students as not tested. The remaining number of students in the 2013-2014 ELP assessment data reported as not tested on the ELP assessment may be due in part to an influx of students enrolling in the school divisions in the beginning of SY 2013-2014 who were not enrolled at the time of the administration of the ELP assessment. Although 102,815 LEP students were enrolled in Virginia at the start of the 2013-2014 school year, only 97,535, or 94.86% as compared to the total fall enrollment, were enrolled at the end of the 2013-2014 school year. LEP enrollment decreased from the start of the 2013-2014 school year to the end of the 2013-2014 school year by 5,280 students. VDOE continues to provide ongoing technical assistance to school divisions to ensure the most accurate data possible given the transient nature of this population and working with school divisions to determine reasons why students may lack an assessment record for the most recent administration of the ELP assessment.	

In the table below, provide the number of Title III students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time and whose progress cannot be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO 1. Report this number ONLY if the State did not include these students in establishing AMAO 1/ making progress target and did not include them in the calculations for AMAO 1/ making progress (# and % making progress).

Title III First Time Tested	#
Number of Title III students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time whose progress cannot be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO 1.	22,624

1.6.3.2.2 Title III LEP English Language Proficiency Results

This section collects information on Title III LEP students' development of English and attainment of English proficiency.

Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:

1. **Annual Measureable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs) =** State targets for the number and percent of students making progress and attaining proficiency.
2. **Making Progress =** Number and percent of Title III LEP students that met the definition of "Making Progress" as defined by the State and submitted to ED in the Consolidated State Application (CSA), or as amended.
3. **Attained Proficiency =** Number and percent of Title III LEP students that met the State definition of "Attainment" of English language proficiency submitted to ED in the Consolidated State Application (CSA), or as amended.
4. **Results =** Number and percent of Title III LEP students that met the State definition of "Making Progress" and the number and percent that met the State definition of "Attainment" of English language proficiency.

In the table below, provide the State targets for the number and percent of students making progress and attaining English proficiency for this reporting period. Additionally, 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. If your State uses cohorts, provide us with the range of targets, (i.e., indicate the lowest target among the cohorts, e.g., 10% and the highest target among a cohort, e.g., 70%).

Title III Results	Results #	Results %	Targets #	Targets %
Making progress	51,056	80.26		68.00
Attained proficiency	16,289	18.89		19.00
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.				

1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments

This section collects data on LEP students assessed in their native language (Section 1111(b)(6)) to be used for AYP determinations.

1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language

In the table below, check "Yes" if the specified assessment is used for AYP purposes.

State offers the State reading/language arts content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
State offers the State mathematics content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
State offers the State science content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.6.3.5.2 Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given

In the table below, report the language(s) in which native language assessments are given for *ESEA* accountability determinations for mathematics.

Language(s)
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

1.6.3.5.3 Native Language of Reading/Language Arts Tests Given

In the table below, report the language(s) in which native language assessments are given for *ESEA* accountability determinations for reading/language arts.

Language(s)
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

1.6.3.5.4 Native Language of Science Tests Given

In the table below, report the language(s) in which native language assessments are given for *ESEA* accountability determinations for science.

Language(s)
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) 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.
- 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
17,050	13,651	30,701
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

1.6.3.6.2 MFLEP Students Results for Mathematics

In the table below, report the number of MFLEP students who took the annual mathematics assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned out of language instruction educational programs 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 of 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
23,591	18,508	78.45	5,083
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.6.3.6.3 MFLEP Students Results for Reading/Language Arts

In the table below, report results for MFLEP students who took the annual reading/language arts assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned out of language instruction educational programs 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. This will be automatically calculated.
4. **# Below proficient =** State-aggregated number MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
21,112	15,735	74.53	5,377
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.6.3.6.4 MFLEP Students Results for Science

In the table below, report results for MFLEP students who took the annual science assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned out of language instruction educational programs and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are MFLEP 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 total number tested. This will be automatically calculated.
4. **# Below proficient =** State-aggregated number MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual science assessment.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
13,346	10,083	75.55	3,263
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

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.)

Title III Subgrantees	#
Total number of subgrantees for the year	58
//	
Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	21
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO 1	58
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO 2	42
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO 3	102
//	
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 2012-13 and 2013-14)	6
Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2013-14 for not meeting Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years	6
Number of subgrantees that have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2010-11, 2011-12, 2012-13, and 2013-14)	1

Provide information on how the State counted consortia members in the total number of subgrantees and in each of the numbers in table 1.6.4.1. If applicable, also please note if this method is the same or different from the previous year.

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The Virginia 2014-2015 Title III AMAO results, based on 2013-2014 assessment data, includes 64 divisions participating in 11 consortia. AMAOs 1 and 2 were calculated at the consortia level. AMAO 3 was calculated at the individual division level.

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.

State met all three Title III AMAOs	No
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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 or activities terminated for failure to reach program goals?	No
If yes, provide the number of language instruction educational programs or activities for immigrant children and youth terminated.	
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students

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

Note: All immigrant students are not LEP students.

1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students

In the table below, report the unduplicated number of immigrant students enrolled in schools 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 under 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 only 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 Language Instruction Educational Program (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
24,653	6,720	21

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.

1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development

This section collects data on teachers in Title III language instruction educational 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 under 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 as a second language.

Title III Teachers	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	1,240
Estimate number of **additional** certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	700

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.

* 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 Activities of Subgrantees Related to the Teaching and Learning of LEP Students

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

Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:

1. **Professional Development Topics =** Subgrantee 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 and 1.6.4.)
3. **Total Number of Participants =** Number of teachers, administrators and other personnel who participated in each type of the professional development activities reported.
4. **Total =** Number of all participants in professional development (PD) activities.

Professional Development (PD) Topics	# Subgrantees
Instructional strategies for LEP students	51
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	46
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	48
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	44
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	38
Other (Explain in comment box)	0

PD Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	52	13,871
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	54	4,569
PD provided to principals	52	1,766
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	52	1,766
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	44	1,391
PD provided to community based organization personnel	31	867
Total	////////////////////////////////////	24,230

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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 submitted using the MM/DD/YY format.

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 2013-14 funds July 1, 2013, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2013, for SY 2013-14 programs. Then the "# of days/$$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/$$ Distribution
7/2/2013	9/6/2013	66
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

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.

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	#
Persistently Dangerous Schools	0
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Virginia has no persistently dangerous schools.	

1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS PROGRAM

This section collects data on homeless children and youth 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 youth and the McKinney-Vento program. The totals will be automatically calculated.

LEAs	#	# LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	101	101
LEAs with subgrants	31	31
Total	132	132
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

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

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

1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youth

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youth 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/Youth Enrolled in Public School in LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youth Enrolled in Public School in LEAs With Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	119	368
K	446	1,314
1	435	1,286
2	428	1,157
3	410	1,110
4	396	994
5	360	963
6	362	1,007
7	370	947
8	292	970
9	341	1,278
10	223	865
11	211	706
12	276	852
Ungraded		
Total	4,669	13,817
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

1.9.1.2 Primary Nighttime Residence of Homeless Children and Youth

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youth 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.

Primary Nighttime Residence	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs With Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	588	1,771
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	3,211	9,834
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	63	282
Hotels/Motels	807	1,930
Total	4,669	13,817
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

1.9.1.3 Subgroups of Homeless Students Enrolled

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

Special Population	# Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs With Subgrants
Unaccompanied homeless youth	370	2,556
Migratory children/youth	46	16
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	835	2,618
Limited English Proficient (LEP) students	265	1,819
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

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 Youth Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youth 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/Youth Served by Subgrants
Age Birth Through 2	284
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	392
K	1,112
1	1,054
2	927
3	916
4	827
5	832
6	820
7	801
8	820
9	1,088
10	694
11	614
12	711
Ungraded	0
Total	11,892
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Virginia has no homeless children and youths students under the classification of ungraded.	

1.9.2.2 Subgroups of Homeless Students Served

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

Subgroup	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied homeless youth	1,448
Migratory children/youth	73
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	1,843
Limited English Proficient (LEP) students	1,794
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.9.3 Academic Achievement of Homeless Students

The following questions collect data on the academic achievement of enrolled homeless children and youth.

1.9.3.1 Reading Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of enrolled homeless children and youth who were tested on the State 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 *ESEA*.

Grade	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs Without Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs Without Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs With Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs With Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient
3	339	148	948	444
4	327	152	863	428
5	311	151	834	396
6	295	142	843	383
7	321	168	816	401
8	248	94	833	376
High School	211	157	657	489
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.				

1.9.3.2 Mathematics Assessment

This section is similar to 1.9.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State mathematics assessment.

Grade	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs Without Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs Without Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs With Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs With Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient
3	341	142	963	352
4	328	194	869	499
5	313	168	843	390
6	286	170	845	424
7	269	97	779	246
8	248	115	681	279
High School	539	338	1,921	1,084
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.				

1.9.3.3 Science Assessment

This section is similar to 1.9.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State science assessment.

Grade	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs Without Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs Without Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs With Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs With Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient
3	319	183	856	511
4				
5	312	149	851	369
6				
7				
8	244	112	825	375
High School	503	341	1,668	1,008
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Virginia does not administer the Standards of Learning assessments in science for grade 4, 6, and 7.				