

**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 2014-15

VIRGINIA



PART I DUE THURSDAY, DECEMBER 17, 2015
PART II DUE THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 11, 2016

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) 2014-15 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 2014-15, all students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.
- | **Performance Goal 2:** All limited English proficient students will become proficient in English and reach high academic standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.
- | **Performance Goal 3:** By SY 2005-06, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.
- | **Performance Goal 4:** All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free, and conducive to learning.
- | **Performance Goal 5:** All students will graduate from high school.

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

PART II

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

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

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 2014-15 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Thursday, December 17, 2015**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Thursday, February 11, 2016**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2014-15, 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 2014-15 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 2014-15 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

		OMB Number: 1810-0724
		Expiration Date: 5/31/2018
<p>Consolidated State Performance Report For State Formula Grant Programs under the Elementary And Secondary Education Act as amended in 2001</p>		
Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2014-15 <input type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2014-15		
Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report:		
Address:		
		Person to contact about this report:
Name:		
Telephone:		
Fax:		
e-mail:		
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type):		
Signature _____		Date _____

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART I**

For reporting on
School Year 2014-15



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 17, 2015
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
<u>No Revisions or changes</u>	No revisions or changes to academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science made or planned.
	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., 2014-15) or Not Applicable.

	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Academic Content Standards	N/A	N/A	N/A

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
No Revisions or changes	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., 2014-15) or Not Applicable.

Academic Achievement Standards for	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Regular Assessments in Grades 3-8	N/A	N/A	N/A
Regular Assessments in High School	N/A	N/A	N/A
Alternate Assessments Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards (if applicable)	N/A	N/A	N/A
Alternate Assessments Based on Modified Achievement Standards (if applicable)	N/A	N/A	N/A
Alternate Assessments Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	N/A	N/A	N/A

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.

Virginia discontinued the use of alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards. The final administration of these assessments occurred in the 2013-2014 school year.

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
<u>No Revisions or changes</u>	No changes to assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts or science made or planned.
	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., 2014-15) or Not Applicable.

Academic Assessments	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Regular Assessments in Grades 3-8	N/A	N/A	N/A
Regular Assessments in High School	N/A	N/A	N/A
Alternate Assessments Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards (if applicable)	N/A	N/A	N/A
Alternate Assessments Based on Modified Achievement Standards (if applicable)	N/A	N/A	N/A
Alternate Assessments Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	N/A	N/A	N/A

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.

Virginia no longer administers the Alternate Assessments based on Grade-level Achievement Standards in the content areas of Mathematics or Science.
Virginia no longer administers Alternate Assessments based on Modified Achievement Standards in the content areas of Reading or Mathematics for federal accountability.

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 2014-15, 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)	50.00
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	50.00
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 2014-15 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)	<u>Yes</u>
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)	<u>No</u>
Developing or improving assessments of English language proficiency necessary to comply with Section 1111(b)(7)	<u>No</u>
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	<u>Yes</u>
Developing multiple measures to increase the reliability and validity of State assessment systems	<u>No</u>
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	<u>Yes</u>
Expanding the range of accommodations available to students with limited English proficiency and students with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) to improve the rates of inclusion of such students, including professional development activities aligned with State academic achievement standards and assessments	<u>Yes</u>
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	<u>Yes</u>
Other	<u>No</u>
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	786,413	782,475	99.50
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,258	2,245	99.42
Asian or Pacific Islander	52,293	52,116	99.66
<i>Asian</i>	51,104	50,933	99.67
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	1,189	1,183	99.50
Black or African American	181,020	179,877	99.37
Hispanic or Latino	107,622	106,800	99.24
White	405,572	403,995	99.61
Two or more races	37,648	37,442	99.45
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	97,300	96,482	99.16
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	48,805	48,465	99.30
Economically disadvantaged students	311,072	309,011	99.34
Migratory students	182	180	98.90
Male	400,422	398,135	99.43
Female	385,991	384,340	99.57

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	36,083	37.40
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	52,834	54.76
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.00
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	7,565	7.84
Total	96,482	////////////////////////////////////
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Virginia discontinued the use of alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards. The final administration of these assessments occurred in the 2013-2014 school year.		

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	660,969	659,570	99.79
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,864	1,862	99.89
Asian or Pacific Islander	45,230	45,172	99.87
<i>Asian</i>	44,229	44,177	99.88
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	1,001	995	99.40
Black or African American	151,292	150,795	99.67
Hispanic or Latino	87,027	86,780	99.72
White	343,420	342,884	99.84
Two or more races	32,136	32,077	99.82
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	84,610	84,227	99.55
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	37,041	36,909	99.64
Economically disadvantaged students	262,610	261,798	99.69
Migratory students	142	141	99.30
Male	337,527	336,716	99.76
Female	323,442	322,854	99.82
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	0

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	50,602	60.08
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	25,093	29.79
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	953	1.13
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	7,579	9.00
LEP < 12 months, took ELP	0	0.00
Total	84,227	////////////////////////////////////
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Virginia discontinued the use of alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards. The final administration of these assessments occurred in the 2013-2014 school year.		

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	430,617	427,813	99.35
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,225	1,214	99.10
Asian or Pacific Islander	28,637	28,545	99.68
Asian	27,960	27,871	99.68
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	677	674	99.56
Black or African American	97,714	96,740	99.00
Hispanic or Latino	54,112	53,494	98.86
White	229,152	228,186	99.58
Two or more races	19,777	19,634	99.28
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	48,162	47,531	98.69
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	19,437	19,148	98.51
Economically disadvantaged students	154,733	153,058	98.92
Migratory students	83	82	98.80
Male	217,775	216,172	99.26
Female	212,842	211,641	99.44

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

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	18,997	39.97
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	25,025	52.65
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	345	0.73
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	3,164	6.66
Total	47,531	////////////////////////////////////

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Virginia discontinued the use of alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards. The final administration of these assessments occurred in the 2013-2014 school year.

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 assessment. 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	96,511	71,350	73.93
American Indian or Alaska Native	293	209	71.33
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,685	5,879	87.94
<i>Asian</i>	6,542	5,760	88.05
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	143	119	83.22
Black or African American	21,609	13,024	60.27
Hispanic or Latino	14,748	9,602	65.11
White	48,001	38,679	80.58
Two or more races	5,175	3,957	76.46
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	12,031	5,583	46.41
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	12,386	7,203	58.15
Economically disadvantaged students	42,834	26,604	62.11
Migratory students	31	16	51.61
Male	49,237	36,273	73.67
Female	47,274	35,077	74.20

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

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	95,913	72,168	75.24
American Indian or Alaska Native	294	207	70.41
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,556	5,708	87.07
<i>Asian</i>	6,413	5,600	87.32
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	143	108	75.52
Black or African American	21,555	13,150	61.01
Hispanic or Latino	14,429	9,887	68.52
White	47,888	39,221	81.90
Two or more races	5,191	3,995	76.96
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	12,015	5,893	49.05
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	11,712	7,249	61.89
Economically disadvantaged students	42,382	26,953	63.60
Migratory students	30	11	36.67
Male	48,939	35,472	72.48
Female	46,974	36,696	78.12

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	0	0	0.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.00
<i>Asian</i>	0	0	0.00
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	0	0	0.00
Black or African American	0	0	0.00
Hispanic or Latino	0	0	0.00
White	0	0	0.00
Two or more races	0	0	0.00
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	0	0	0.00
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.00
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.00
Migratory students	0	0	0.00
Male	0	0	0.00
Female	0	0	0.00

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. For the 2014-2015 assessment year, Virginia's General Assembly passed bills to eliminate certain statewide assessments in favor of local alternative assessments. Among the eliminated assessments was the Grade 3 science assessment; therefore, Virginia does not have Grade 3 science results for the 2014-2015 assessment year.

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	94,759	78,753	83.11
American Indian or Alaska Native	276	225	81.52
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,713	6,284	93.61
<i>Asian</i>	6,559	6,159	93.90
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	154	125	81.17
Black or African American	21,130	15,217	72.02
Hispanic or Latino	13,639	10,173	74.59
White	48,155	42,719	88.71
Two or more races	4,846	4,135	85.33
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	12,788	7,025	54.93
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,821	3,823	56.05
Economically disadvantaged students	40,586	29,643	73.04
Migratory students	23	16	69.57
Male	48,795	40,258	82.50
Female	45,964	38,495	83.75

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	94,312	72,621	77.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	278	215	77.34
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,580	5,887	89.47
<i>Asian</i>	6,426	5,766	89.73
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	154	121	78.57
Black or African American	21,097	13,172	62.44
Hispanic or Latino	13,372	8,918	66.69
White	48,128	40,559	84.27
Two or more races	4,857	3,870	79.68
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	12,788	6,274	49.06
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,230	2,738	43.95
Economically disadvantaged students	40,215	25,806	64.17
Migratory students	22	14	63.64
Male	48,550	36,046	74.25
Female	45,762	36,575	79.92

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			
<i>Asian</i>			
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
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	88,248	69,185	78.40
American Indian or Alaska Native	222	155	69.82
Asian or Pacific Islander	5,330	4,809	90.23
<i>Asian</i>	5,195	4,690	90.28
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	135	119	88.15
Black or African American	20,541	13,656	66.48
Hispanic or Latino	12,501	8,708	69.66
White	45,200	38,269	84.67
Two or more races	4,454	3,588	80.56
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	12,786	6,044	47.27
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,254	2,341	44.56
Economically disadvantaged students	38,533	26,048	67.60
Migratory students	22	16	72.73
Male	44,911	34,472	76.76
Female	43,337	34,713	80.10

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	94,633	74,459	78.68
American Indian or Alaska Native	241	178	73.86
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,717	6,057	90.17
<i>Asian</i>	6,568	5,936	90.38
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	149	121	81.21
Black or African American	21,005	13,654	65.00
Hispanic or Latino	12,706	8,757	68.92
White	49,102	41,823	85.18
Two or more races	4,862	3,990	82.06
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	13,039	6,007	46.07
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,667	1,835	39.32
Economically disadvantaged students	38,854	25,354	65.25
Migratory students	21	11	52.38
Male	48,272	36,657	75.94
Female	46,361	37,802	81.54

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 reading/language arts and science 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	95,138	74,834	78.66
American Indian or Alaska Native	237	167	70.46
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,835	6,097	89.20
<i>Asian</i>	6,686	5,965	89.22
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	149	132	88.59
Black or African American	21,013	13,435	63.94
Hispanic or Latino	13,041	8,575	65.75
White	49,146	42,535	86.55
Two or more races	4,866	4,025	82.72
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	13,020	6,510	50.00
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,254	1,892	36.01
Economically disadvantaged students	39,138	25,476	65.09
Migratory students	22	15	68.18
Male	48,535	38,403	79.12
Female	46,603	36,431	78.17

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.

1.3.1.4 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	84,116	69,179	82.24
American Indian or Alaska Native	229	189	82.53
Asian or Pacific Islander	5,206	4,891	93.95
<i>Asian</i>	5,067	4,765	94.04
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	139	126	90.65
Black or African American	20,172	14,112	69.96
Hispanic or Latino	11,842	9,000	76.00
White	42,536	37,507	88.18
Two or more races	4,131	3,480	84.24
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	12,366	6,767	54.72
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,240	2,237	52.76
Economically disadvantaged students	36,376	26,390	72.55
Migratory students	15	9	60.00
Male	42,802	34,253	80.03
Female	41,314	34,926	84.54

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	92,976	70,859	76.21
American Indian or Alaska Native	243	175	72.02
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,526	5,851	89.66
<i>Asian</i>	6,372	5,726	89.86
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	154	125	81.17
Black or African American	21,166	12,646	59.75
Hispanic or Latino	12,119	7,984	65.88
White	48,289	40,515	83.90
Two or more races	4,633	3,688	79.60
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	12,472	5,013	40.19
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,691	1,157	31.35
Economically disadvantaged students	37,523	23,002	61.30
Migratory students	15	9	60.00
Male	47,280	34,452	72.87
Female	45,696	36,407	79.67

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			
<i>Asian</i>			
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
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	80,205	57,465	71.65
American Indian or Alaska Native	221	144	65.16
Asian or Pacific Islander	5,399	4,884	90.46
<i>Asian</i>	5,300	4,813	90.81
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	99	71	71.72
Black or African American	18,276	9,878	54.05
Hispanic or Latino	11,148	6,928	62.15
White	41,455	32,836	79.21
Two or more races	3,706	2,795	75.42
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	11,732	4,583	39.06
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,667	1,815	38.89
Economically disadvantaged students	33,097	18,813	56.84
Migratory students	21	8	38.10
Male	41,331	28,392	68.69
Female	38,874	29,073	74.79

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	93,280	75,615	81.06
American Indian or Alaska Native	267	210	78.65
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,375	5,871	92.09
<i>Asian</i>	6,253	5,767	92.23
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	122	104	85.25
Black or African American	21,456	14,279	66.55
Hispanic or Latino	12,080	8,987	74.40
White	48,636	42,452	87.29
Two or more races	4,466	3,816	85.45
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	12,130	5,478	45.16
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,159	1,809	43.50
Economically disadvantaged students	37,326	25,597	68.58
Migratory students	23	13	56.52
Male	47,795	37,037	77.49
Female	45,485	38,578	84.81

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			
<i>Asian</i>			
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
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	64,033	46,885	73.22
American Indian or Alaska Native	205	156	76.10
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,258	2,902	89.07
<i>Asian</i>	3,157	2,825	89.48
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	101	77	76.24
Black or African American	17,146	10,337	60.29
Hispanic or Latino	9,081	6,102	67.20
White	31,414	25,136	80.02
Two or more races	2,929	2,252	76.89
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	10,843	4,558	42.04
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,239	1,923	45.36
Economically disadvantaged students	29,119	18,172	62.41
Migratory students	26	12	46.15
Male	33,601	23,514	69.98
Female	30,432	23,371	76.80

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	94,190	70,806	75.17
American Indian or Alaska Native	266	193	72.56
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,258	5,572	89.04
<i>Asian</i>	6,112	5,464	89.40
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	146	108	73.97
Black or African American	21,776	12,617	57.94
Hispanic or Latino	11,590	7,529	64.96
White	50,034	41,521	82.99
Two or more races	4,266	3,374	79.09
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	12,029	4,578	38.06
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,447	1,476	33.19
Economically disadvantaged students	35,987	21,395	59.45
Migratory students	22	11	50.00
Male	48,113	34,523	71.75
Female	46,077	36,283	78.74

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.

1.3.3.6 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	90,602	70,788	78.13
American Indian or Alaska Native	247	188	76.11
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,126	5,538	90.40
<i>Asian</i>	5,981	5,427	90.74
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	145	111	76.55
Black or African American	21,006	13,008	61.93
Hispanic or Latino	11,801	7,737	65.56
White	47,323	40,925	86.48
Two or more races	4,099	3,392	82.75
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	11,504	5,220	45.38
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,998	1,719	34.39
Economically disadvantaged students	35,224	22,290	63.28
Migratory students	23	12	52.17
Male	46,278	36,261	78.35
Female	44,324	34,527	77.90

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.

1.3.1.7 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	274,603	225,996	82.30
American Indian or Alaska Native	799	633	79.22
Asian or Pacific Islander	19,525	18,198	93.20
<i>Asian</i>	19,113	17,844	93.36
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	412	354	85.92
Black or African American	61,003	43,809	71.81
Hispanic or Latino	33,841	25,248	74.61
White	147,234	127,806	86.80
Two or more races	12,201	10,302	84.44
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	23,936	12,982	54.24
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	10,858	6,599	60.78
Economically disadvantaged students	88,466	63,927	72.26
Migratory students	42	31	73.81
Male	137,458	110,248	80.20
Female	137,145	115,748	84.40

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	94,266	84,075	89.19
American Indian or Alaska Native	273	242	88.64
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,160	5,739	93.17
<i>Asian</i>	6,033	5,628	93.29
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	127	111	87.40
Black or African American	22,740	18,416	80.99
Hispanic or Latino	10,484	8,828	84.20
White	50,807	47,340	93.18
Two or more races	3,802	3,510	92.32
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	9,754	5,879	60.27
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,003	928	46.33
Economically disadvantaged students	29,511	23,846	80.80
Migratory students	8	8	100.00
Male	47,767	41,864	87.64
Female	46,499	42,211	90.78

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	242,073	204,249	84.37
American Indian or Alaska Native	730	613	83.97
Asian or Pacific Islander	15,584	14,317	91.87
<i>Asian</i>	15,204	13,986	91.99
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	380	331	87.11
Black or African American	54,721	39,242	71.71
Hispanic or Latino	28,652	21,440	74.83
White	131,717	119,292	90.57
Two or more races	10,669	9,345	87.59
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	23,007	12,643	54.95
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	8,896	4,093	46.01
Economically disadvantaged students	78,696	56,876	72.27
Migratory students	37	24	64.86
Male	121,359	102,343	84.33
Female	120,714	101,906	84.42

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 2014-15. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2014-15	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2014-15
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 2014-15. The percentage will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Met All AMOs, 95 Percent Participation Rate, and Other Academic Indicator in SY 2014-15	Percentage that Met All AMOs, 95 Percent Participation Rate and Other Academic Indicator in SY 2014-15
Schools	1,825	876	48.00
Districts	132	11	8.33

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 2014-15. 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 2014-15	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2014-15
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 2014-15. 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 2014-15	Percentage of Title I Schools that Met All AMOs, 95 Percent Participation Rate, and Other Academic Indicator in SY 2014-15
All Title I schools	727	349	48.01
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	558	264	47.31
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	169	85	50.30

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 2014-15. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds in SY 2014-15	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2014-15	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2014-15

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 indicator⁵ based on data for SY 2014-15. The percentage will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds in SY 2014-15	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Met All AMOs, 95 percent Participation Rate, and Other Academic Indicator in SY 2014-15	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Met All AMOs, 95 percent Participation Rate, and Other Academic Indicator in SY 2014-15
132	11	8.33

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 2014-15 (based on SY 2013-14 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2014-15
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 2014-2015.	

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 2014-15 (based on SY 2013-14 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 2014-2015.	

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 2014-15 (based on SY 2013-14 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 2014-15
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 2013-14 and beginning of SY 2014-15 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 2014-15 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 2014-2015 school year.		

In the table below, provide the data by which processing appeals based on SY 2014-15 data was complete.

Processing Appeals completion	Date
Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2014-15 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 2014 (SY 2014-15) Title I, Part A allocation that the SEA reserved in accordance with Section 1003(a) of *ESEA* and §200.100(a) of ED's regulations governing the reservation of funds for school improvement under Section 1003(a) of *ESEA*: 4.00 %

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 *EDFacts* files and compiled in the EDEN012 "Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Allocations to LEAs and Schools" report in the *EDFacts* Reporting System (ERS). The *EDFacts* 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 2014-15.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

In an effort to meet the varied needs of schools, the 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, and Corbett Consulting 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.

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. During 2014-2015, DLST participants reviewed research related to student engagement and its impact on student achievement, and observed classroom instruction for evidence of engagement indicators.

Aligning Academic Review and Performance Evaluation (AARPE) Technical assistance was provided to Cohorts I-IV priority schools. The purpose of AARPE technical assistance was to improve instruction and instructional practices by strengthening the alignment between the Performance Standards for Teachers and Principals and the Lesson Planning, Lesson Observation, Professional Development, and Leadership Academic Review Tools. Technical assistance focused on developing sample evidence for the sample performance indicators in Teacher Performance Standards for professional knowledge, instructional delivery, and the learning environment. Instructional planning was an embedded part of the sessions as it is an inherent part of delivery and assessment. The priority school contractor was assigned to assist schools in the inter-rater reliability process of observing developed look-fors. There were a total of five sessions which principals and division leaders attended. Principals and/or district staff used their classroom walkthroughs, formal observations, and evaluations to reflect and direct next steps after each session in order to improve skills. The technical assistance materials and the look-fors created for Teacher Performance Standards for professional knowledge, instructional delivery, and learning environment were posted as a resource for divisions and schools to use with their own classroom walkthrough and observation tools.

Corbett Consulting

Corbett Consulting provided newly identified priority schools with technical assistance sessions throughout 2014-2015 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.

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 administered an online survey to end-users, and utilized the results to recommend enhancements to the tool.

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 participated in AARPE and 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.

Hanover Research

Hanover Research began a multi-stage evaluation of the lead turnaround partners (LTPs) of priority schools in Virginia. Phase I consisted of creating data portraits of 37 Virginia priority schools. The purpose of these data portraits is to provide a baseline understanding of the priority schools and a frame of reference for the larger LTP evaluation. More specifically, these data portraits describe the priority schools' performance from three years prior to the partnership to the most recent year available. The data presented in the portraits are drawn from various databases available on Virginia Department of Education's (VDOE) website. Each school's data portrait includes its LTP participation information, student demographic composition, and student behavioral and academic performance. The multi-stage evaluation continues in 2015-16 with interviews of LTPs, principals, and division staff.

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 2014-15 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 require 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. 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. Virginia provided training and recorded webinars to division-led teams on the use of the alignment tools. The academic review team, consisting of trained Virginia Department of Education (VDOE) contractors, division staff, and/or Department staff, conducted the academic reviews using evaluation tools provided by VDOE. Divisions were required to use the tools to evaluate leadership and professional development. Schools were required to use the tools to evaluate leadership, the taught curriculum, and professional development. Divisions and schools had the option to use additional evaluation tools as needed. The additional tools included the evaluation of the written curriculum and the assessed curriculum. The VDOE contractor led the academic review and created the "Academic Review Findings and Essential Actions Report" to identify and address the needs of the division or school. Following the approval of the developed essential actions, VDOE contractors assisted principals to create the school improvement plan using the essential actions provided in the report of findings to select the indicators that were addressed in the three-year school improvement plan.

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.

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, the VDOE contractor completed the "Graduation Rate Academic Review School Findings" report and essential actions were developed as needed for each appropriate component.

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. Aligning Academic Review and Performance Evaluation (AARPE). Technical assistance was provided to schools which were accredited with warning for two or three years, conditionally accredited, or denied accreditation. AARPE was developed in response to the data from the academic review process and through priority schools' technical assistance in the previous year. The purpose of AARPE technical assistance was to improve instruction and instructional practices by strengthening the alignment between the Performance Standards for Teachers and Principals and the Lesson Planning, Lesson Observation, Professional Development, and Leadership Academic Review Tools. Technical assistance focused on developing sample evidence for the sample performance indicators in Teacher Performance Standards for professional knowledge, instructional delivery, and the learning environment. Instructional planning was an embedded part of the sessions as it is an inherent part of delivery and assessment. A VDOE contractor was assigned to assist schools in the inter-rater reliability process of observing developed look-fors.

There were a total of five sessions for each of six regionally located groups in which principals and division leaders attended. For each session, a presentation was developed using the VDOE academic review resources and the teacher and principal evaluation resources. Principals and/or district staff used their classroom walkthroughs, formal observations, and evaluations to reflect and direct next steps after each session in order to improve skills.

The technical assistance materials and the look-fors created for performance Standards 1, 3, and 5 were combined from each of the six regional groups and posted as a resource for divisions and schools to use with their own classroom walkthrough and observation tools.

3. Hanover Research. Hanover Research conducted an analysis of the schools in Virginia that were accredited with warning in the first year during 2014-15. The report included a descriptive analysis of the overall trends in accreditation ratings at the division level over four academic school years (2011-12 to 2014-15). The report noted key trends among the typical first-year warned school in terms of school and grade subject-specific passage rates. Schools were identified that were the closest to the accreditation benchmarks but fell short of the minimum passage rate. The data from this research was used in considerations for providing future technical assistance for divisions and schools and updating the standards of accreditation.

4. Conditionally Accredited Schools. Schools that are not fully accredited for three consecutive years may be assigned the rating of Accreditation Denied in the fourth year of warning or the school division may apply for the school to have the status of Conditionally Accredited-Reconstituted. As defined by the Standards of Accreditation, reconstitution is a process that may be used to initial a range of accountability actions to improve pupil performance, curriculum, and instruction to address deficiencies that caused a school to be rated Accreditation Denied. Actions may include, but not be limited to, restructuring a school's governance, instructional program, staff or student population. If the request is approved, the school will use the School Improvement Plan (SIP) to develop a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) which will serve as the school's operating plan for improvement. The CAP is developed in collaboration with and monitored by VDOE through required quarterly meetings with the division superintendent and the director of the VDOE school improvement office.

5. Denied Accreditation Schools. Schools rated Accreditation Denied are subject to actions prescribed by the Board of Education. The local school board must enter into a memorandum of understanding (MOU) with the Board of Education. The MOU is developed in collaboration with VDOE and identifies responsibilities of VDOE, the school division, the local school board and the school to improve instructional practices in warned academic areas. Division superintendents and staff must meet quarterly with the director of the VDOE school improvement office to monitor the memorandum of understanding and the corrective action plan for the school. VDOE offers technical assistance in support of the MOU and corrective action plan. A VDOE contractor is assigned to provide necessary support and to conduct asset mapping with the school.

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	163
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 2014-2015 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 2014-2015 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 2014-2015 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 <u>NOT</u> Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are <u>NOT</u> Highly Qualified
All classes	234,676	231,734	98.75	2,942	1.25
All elementary classes	47,908	47,424	98.99	484	1.01
All secondary classes	186,768	184,310	98.68	2,458	1.32

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.	<u>Yes</u>
--	------------

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

--

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Elementary classes are counted so that a full-day self-contained classroom equals on 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	61.50
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	13.30
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	25.20
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)	43.40
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	27.10
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	29.50
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	12,154	12,026	98.95
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	15,072	14,918	98.98
Secondary Schools			
High Poverty secondary Schools	31,443	30,687	97.60
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	58,646	58,085	99.04

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	67.48	29.59
Poverty metric used	Virginia uses the percentages of students who qualify for the free and reduced-price lunch program.	
Secondary schools	57.75	27.45
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
<u>Yes</u>	Dual language	Spanish
<u>Yes</u>	Two-way immersion	Spanish
<u>Yes</u>	Transitional bilingual programs	Spanish
<u>No</u>	Developmental bilingual	Spanish
<u>Yes</u>	Heritage language	Spanish
<u>No Response</u>	Sheltered English instruction	////////////////////////////////////
<u>No Response</u>	Structured English immersion	////////////////////////////////////
<u>No Response</u>	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)	////////////////////////////////////
<u>No Response</u>	Content-based ESL	////////////////////////////////////
<u>No Response</u>	Pull-out ESL	////////////////////////////////////
<u>No Response</u>	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 October 1 count of ALL LEP students in the State who meet the LEP definition under Section 9101(25).

- o 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.
- o 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	104,823
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 October 1 count 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.	104,680
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	70,802
Arabic	5,868
Vietnamese	2,656
Urdu	2,465
Chinese	1,918

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	99,059
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	5,764
Total	104,823
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

All LEP Results	#
Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	17,252
Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	17.42
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		97,298
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment		7,382
Total		104,680
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

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.		27,138

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	57,742	82.30		
Attained proficiency	17,085	17.56		

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Virginia received a response from USED on November 19, 2015, regarding amendments to its statewide Title III Accountability Plan, including proposed revisions to the Title III AMAO 1 and 2 targets. While USED approved Virginia's proposed AMAO 1 target for assessment year 2014-2015, the Department did not approve the AMAO 2 target for the 2014-2015 assessment year. Virginia is in the process of submitting a revised Title III Accountability Plan to USED. Virginia is unable to calculate results for AMAO 1 and 2 until a final amended Title III Accountability Plan is approved by USED.

The Virginia 2015-2016 Title III AMAO results, based on 2014-2015 assessment data, includes 1 Title III statewide consortium with 68 participating divisions, and 2 independent consortia with 4 participating divisions. AMAOs 1 and 2 will be calculated at the consortia level following final approval by USED of Virginia's Title III Accountability Plan.

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.

1.6.3.6 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
16,699	15,617	32,316
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
27,692	23,106	83.44	4,586
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
24,656	19,941	80.88	4,715
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
13,361	10,256	76.76	3,105
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	51
////////////////////////////////////	
Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO 1	
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO 2	
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO 3	96
////////////////////////////////////	
Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	
////////////////////////////////////	
Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2013-14 and 2014-15)	
Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2014-15 for not meeting Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years	
Number of subgrantees that have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2011-12, 2012-13, 2013-14, and 2014-15)	

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. Virginia received a response from USED on November 19, 2015, regarding amendments to its statewide Title III Accountability Plan, including proposed revisions to the Title III AMAO 1 and 2 targets. While USED approved Virginia's proposed AMAO 1 target for assessment year 2014-2015, the Department did not approve the AMAO 2 target for the 2014-2015 assessment year. Virginia is in the process of submitting a revised Title III Accountability Plan to USED. Virginia is unable to calculate results for AMAO 1 and 2 until a final amended Title III Accountability Plan is approved by USED.

1.6.4.3 Termination of Title III Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

Were any Title III language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> activities terminated for failure to reach program goals?	<u>No</u>
If yes, provide the number of language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> activities for immigrant children and youth terminated.	
Comments: 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
27,816	23,599	27

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.	1,164
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	43
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	36
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	41
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	33
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	28
Other (Explain in comment box)	0

PD Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	47	7,013
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	46	3,532
PD provided to principals	41	1,491
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	18	574
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	28	955
PD provided to community based organization personnel	25	667
Total	//////////	14,232

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 2014-15 funds July 1, 2014, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2014, for SY 2014-15 programs. Then the "# of days/\$\$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
07/01/15	09/18/15	80
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.	

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)	102	368
K	412	1,278
1	437	1,262
2	427	1,226
3	392	1,173
4	404	1,037
5	340	901
6	323	865
7	302	912
8	300	877
9	311	1,375
10	263	951
11	175	786
12	254	844
Ungraded		
Total	4,442	13,855

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	593	1,778
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	3,072	9,707
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	48	167
Hotels/Motels	729	2,203
Total	4,442	13,855

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	453	1,720
Migratory children/youth	25	64
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	877	2,524
Limited English Proficient (LEP) students	253	2,151

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	678
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	511
K	1,106
1	1,191
2	1,123
3	1,116
4	1,000
5	871
6	836
7	829
8	857
9	1,295
10	942
11	764
12	847
Ungraded	0
Total	13,966

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Virginia has no homeless children and youth 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	1,650
Migratory children/youth	56
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	2,131
Limited English Proficient (LEP) students	2,074

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 and percentage of those tested who scored at or above proficient. Provide data for grades 9 through 12 only for those grades tested for ESEA.

Grade	LEAs Without Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	LEAs Without Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs Without Subgrants - % of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs With Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	LEAs With Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs With Subgrants - % of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient
3	329	177	53.80	1,025	530	51.71
4	341	191	56.01	903	467	51.72
5	293	170	58.02	801	472	58.93
6	272	159	58.46	730	344	47.12
7	245	143	58.37	762	426	55.91
8	253	122	48.22	762	355	46.59
High School	192	145	75.52	687	532	77.44

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	LEAs Without Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	LEAs Without Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs Without Subgrants - % of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs With Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	LEAs With Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs With Subgrants - % of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient
3	331	155	46.83	1,049	469	44.71
4	341	223	65.40	920	511	55.54
5	294	169	57.48	813	483	59.41
6	267	182	68.16	741	392	52.90
7	238	118	49.58	730	282	38.63
8	224	117	52.23	655	292	44.58
High School	504	327	64.88	1,927	1,147	59.52

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	LEAs Without Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	LEAs Without Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs Without Subgrants - % of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs With Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	LEAs With Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs With Subgrants - % of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient
3						
4						
5	293	173	59.04	818	416	50.86
6						
7						
8	244	131	53.69	754	351	46.55
High School	527	343	65.09	1,668	1,026	61.51

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Virginia does not administer the Standards of Learning assessments in science for grade 3, 4, 6, and 7.