

**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 2015-16**

**VIRGINIA**



**PART I DUE THURSDAY, DECEMBER 15, 2016**  
**PART II DUE THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 9, 2017**

**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) 2015-16 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 *EDFacts* submission.
3. The information will provide valid evidence of program outcomes or results.

## GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 2015-16 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Thursday, December 15, 2016**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Thursday, February 9, 2017**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2015-16, 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 2015-16 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 2015-16 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
Consolidated State Performance Report For State Formula Grant Programs under the Elementary And Secondary Education Act as amended in 2001		
Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2015-16 <input type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2015-16		
Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report: Virginia Department of Education		
Address: P. O. Box 2120 Richmond, VA 23218-2120		
Person to contact about this report:		
Name: Dr. Lynn Sodat, Director of Program Administration and Accountability		
Telephone: (804) 225-2870		
Fax: (804) 371-7347		
e-mail: Lynn.Sodat@doe.virginia.gov		
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Dr. Steven R. Staples, Superintendent of Public Instruction		
		<u>Wednesday, December 14, 2016, 10:18:15 AM</u>
_____ Signature		_____ Date

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT  
PART I**

For reporting on  
**School Year 2015-16**



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 15, 2016  
5PM EST**

**1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT**

This section requests descriptions of the State's implementation of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)*, as amended, 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>State has revised or changed</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., 2015-16) or Not Applicable.

	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
<b>Academic Content Standards</b>	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.

Virginia adopted revised academic content standards in mathematics in 2009 and administered new assessments based on these standards in 2011-2012. Virginia adopted revised academic content standards in reading and science in 2010 and administered new assessments based on these standards in 2012-2013. ED Peer Review was suspended in December 2012 prior to Virginia being scheduled for a Peer Review submission for these changes.  N/A was selected above because the SY options needed were not listed. The details for each entry are provided below: Academic Content Standards: Mathematics 2008-2009; Reading 2009-2010; Science 2009-2010.
---

**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 to academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science made or planned.
State has revised or changed	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., 2015-16) 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 adopted revised academic content standards in mathematics in 2009 and administered new assessments based on these standards in 2011-2012. Virginia adopted revised academic content standards in reading and science in 2010 and administered new assessments based on these standards in 2012-2013. ED Peer Review was suspended in December 2012 prior to Virginia being scheduled for a Peer Review submission for these changes.

N/A was selected above because the SY options needed were not listed. The details for each entry are provided below:  
Academic Achievement Standards: Mathematics 2011-2012; Reading 2012-2013; Science 2012-2013.

Virginia continued 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, Reading/Language Arts and Science**

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

As applicable, include any assessments (e.g., alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards, alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards, native language assessments, or others) implemented to meet the assessment requirements under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA.

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

Acceptable responses are a school year (e.g., 2015-16) 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 adopted revised academic content standards in mathematics in 2009 and administered new assessments based on these standards in 2011-2012. Virginia adopted revised academic content standards in reading and science in 2010 and administered new assessments based on these standards in 2012-2013. ED Peer Review was suspended in December 2012 prior to Virginia being scheduled for a Peer Review submission for these changes.
N/A was selected above because the SY options needed were not listed. The details for each entry are provided below:
Regular Assessments in Grades 3-8: Mathematics SY 2011-2012; Reading SY 2012-2013; Science SY 2012-2013.
Regular Assessments in High School: Mathematics SY 2011-2012; Reading SY 2012-2013; Science SY 2012-2013.
Alternate Assessments Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards (if applicable): Administered only in Reading; SY 2012-2013.
Alternate Assessments Based on Modified Achievement Standards (if applicable): No longer administered.

**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 2015-16, 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
<b>Comments:</b> 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 2015-16 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>
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

**1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENT**<sup>2</sup>

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.

<sup>2</sup> 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.

**1.2.1 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	796,211	792,427	99.52
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,266	2,254	99.47
Asian or Pacific Islander	54,307	54,145	99.70
Asian	53,080	52,926	99.71
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	1,227	1,219	99.35
Black or African American	182,004	180,885	99.39
Hispanic or Latino	115,514	114,628	99.23
White	402,519	401,091	99.65
Two or more races	39,601	39,424	99.55
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	99,690	98,884	99.19
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	51,251	50,903	99.32
Economically disadvantaged students	316,009	314,009	99.37
Migratory students	195	195	100.00
Male	406,096	403,884	99.46
Female	390,115	388,543	99.60

**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	38,040	38.47
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	53,088	53.69
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	7,756	7.84
Total	98,884	////////////////////////////////////
<b>Comments:</b> 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.		

### 1.2.3 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	672,589	671,232	99.80
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,835	1,834	99.95
Asian or Pacific Islander	47,213	47,172	99.91
Asian	46,194	46,156	99.92
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	1,019	1,016	99.71
Black or African American	152,708	152,254	99.70
Hispanic or Latino	95,475	95,223	99.74
White	341,076	340,542	99.84
Two or more races	34,282	34,207	99.78
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	86,647	86,257	99.55
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	42,082	41,967	99.73
Economically disadvantaged students	267,856	267,038	99.69
Migratory students	149	149	100.00
Male	343,899	343,087	99.76
Female	328,690	328,145	99.83
<b>Comments:</b> 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	3,475

**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	51,078	59.22
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	26,327	30.52
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	1,089	1.26
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	7,715	8.94
LEP < 12 months, took ELP	48	0.06
Total	86,257	////////////////////////////////////
<b>Comments:</b> 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	436,424	433,805	99.40
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,279	1,271	99.37
Asian or Pacific Islander	29,998	29,925	99.76
Asian	29,346	29,278	99.77
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	652	647	99.23
Black or African American	98,364	97,405	99.03
Hispanic or Latino	58,234	57,670	99.03
White	227,957	227,078	99.61
Two or more races	20,592	20,456	99.34
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	49,682	49,043	98.71
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	20,474	20,226	98.79
Economically disadvantaged students	160,156	158,557	99.00
Migratory students	96	96	100.00
Male	220,932	219,468	99.34
Female	215,492	214,337	99.46

**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	19,057	38.86
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	26,568	54.17
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	3,418	6.97
Total	49,043	////////////////////////////////////

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Virginia discontinued the use of alternate assessments based on grade level achievement standards. The final administration of these assessments in science occurred in the 2014-2015 school year.

### 1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT<sup>3</sup>

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 States 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 States 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 States 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.

<sup>3</sup> 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	98,907	75,470	76.30
American Indian or Alaska Native	299	208	69.57
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,857	6,073	88.57
<i>Asian</i>	6,706	5,955	88.80
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	151	118	78.15
Black or African American	22,336	14,159	63.39
Hispanic or Latino	15,880	10,472	65.94
White	48,014	40,143	83.61
Two or more races	5,521	4,415	79.97
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	12,402	6,034	48.65
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	13,180	7,671	58.20
Economically disadvantaged students	43,241	27,850	64.41
Migratory students	27	14	51.85
Male	50,794	38,866	76.52
Female	48,113	36,604	76.08
<b>Comments:</b> 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	98,305	74,686	75.97
American Indian or Alaska Native	297	215	72.39
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,729	5,887	87.49
<i>Asian</i>	6,581	5,770	87.68
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	148	117	79.05
Black or African American	22,254	13,685	61.49
Hispanic or Latino	15,518	10,903	70.26
White	47,925	39,634	82.70
Two or more races	5,582	4,362	78.14
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	12,372	6,201	50.12
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	12,484	7,922	63.46
Economically disadvantaged students	42,815	27,431	64.07
Migratory students	25	14	56.00
Male	50,510	37,372	73.99
Female	47,795	37,314	78.07
<b>Comments:</b> 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			
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's General Assembly eliminated 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 2015-2016 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	96,404	79,262	82.22
American Indian or Alaska Native	277	216	77.98
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,823	6,313	92.53
<i>Asian</i>	6,674	6,183	92.64
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	149	130	87.25
Black or African American	21,473	15,151	70.56
Hispanic or Latino	14,972	11,104	74.17
White	47,639	42,118	88.41
Two or more races	5,220	4,360	83.52
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	12,798	7,162	55.96
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,992	3,849	55.05
Economically disadvantaged students	41,263	29,796	72.21
Migratory students	29	18	62.07
Male	49,195	40,174	81.66
Female	47,209	39,088	82.80
<b>Comments:</b> 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	95,872	73,946	77.13
American Indian or Alaska Native	273	191	69.96
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,709	5,956	88.78
<i>Asian</i>	6,562	5,834	88.91
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	147	122	82.99
Black or African American	21,413	13,681	63.89
Hispanic or Latino	14,672	9,737	66.36
White	47,574	40,181	84.46
Two or more races	5,231	4,200	80.29
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	12,793	6,269	49.00
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,365	2,788	43.80
Economically disadvantaged students	40,868	26,452	64.73
Migratory students	28	14	50.00
Male	48,902	36,210	74.05
Female	46,970	37,736	80.34
<b>Comments:</b> 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			
<b>Comments:</b> 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	88,224	69,624	78.92
American Indian or Alaska Native	246	186	75.61
Asian or Pacific Islander	5,387	4,886	90.70
<i>Asian</i>	5,246	4,771	90.95
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	141	115	81.56
Black or African American	20,594	13,687	66.46
Hispanic or Latino	13,296	9,411	70.78
White	44,157	37,765	85.52
Two or more races	4,544	3,689	81.18
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	12,715	6,269	49.30
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,347	2,473	46.25
Economically disadvantaged students	38,622	26,446	68.47
Migratory students	22	15	68.18
Male	45,169	35,052	77.60
Female	43,055	34,572	80.30

**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	94,537	76,313	80.72
American Indian or Alaska Native	260	205	78.85
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,710	6,161	91.82
<i>Asian</i>	6,560	6,035	92.00
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	150	126	84.00
Black or African American	21,048	14,208	67.50
Hispanic or Latino	13,600	9,726	71.51
White	47,925	41,842	87.31
Two or more races	4,994	4,171	83.52
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	12,980	6,579	50.69
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,799	1,954	40.72
Economically disadvantaged students	39,055	26,714	68.40
Migratory students	21	15	71.43
Male	48,584	38,215	78.66
Female	45,953	38,098	82.91

**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	95,004	76,682	80.71
American Indian or Alaska Native	261	209	80.08
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,837	6,178	90.36
<i>Asian</i>	6,684	6,055	90.59
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	153	123	80.39
Black or African American	21,063	14,301	67.90
Hispanic or Latino	13,870	9,483	68.37
White	47,988	42,290	88.13
Two or more races	4,985	4,221	84.67
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	12,955	6,703	51.74
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,377	1,892	35.19
Economically disadvantaged students	39,356	26,990	68.58
Migratory students	22	15	68.18
Male	48,827	39,544	80.99
Female	46,177	37,138	80.43

**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	83,812	68,785	82.07
American Indian or Alaska Native	202	159	78.71
Asian or Pacific Islander	5,112	4,804	93.97
<i>Asian</i>	4,977	4,678	93.99
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	135	126	93.33
Black or African American	19,836	13,711	69.12
Hispanic or Latino	12,492	9,429	75.48
White	41,903	37,058	88.44
Two or more races	4,267	3,624	84.93
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	12,683	6,990	55.11
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,564	2,371	51.95
Economically disadvantaged students	36,307	26,087	71.85
Migratory students	21	12	57.14
Male	42,831	34,265	80.00
Female	40,981	34,520	84.23

**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	94,820	73,195	77.19
American Indian or Alaska Native	230	177	76.96
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,844	6,248	91.29
<i>Asian</i>	6,696	6,124	91.46
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	148	124	83.78
Black or African American	21,046	12,926	61.42
Hispanic or Latino	13,010	8,722	67.04
White	48,754	41,105	84.31
Two or more races	4,936	4,017	81.38
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	12,889	5,305	41.16
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,030	1,332	33.05
Economically disadvantaged students	37,776	23,406	61.96
Migratory students	22	7	31.82
Male	48,394	35,886	74.15
Female	46,426	37,309	80.36

**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			
<b>Comments:</b> 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	80,082	57,316	71.57
American Indian or Alaska Native	206	141	68.45
Asian or Pacific Islander	5,769	5,227	90.60
<i>Asian</i>	5,654	5,138	90.87
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	115	89	77.39
Black or African American	17,402	9,201	52.87
Hispanic or Latino	11,443	6,806	59.48
White	41,231	32,919	79.84
Two or more races	4,031	3,022	74.97
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	11,747	4,806	40.91
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,578	1,581	34.53
Economically disadvantaged students	31,838	17,513	55.01
Migratory students	14	4	28.57
Male	41,050	28,208	68.72
Female	39,032	29,108	74.57
<b>Comments:</b> 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	93,189	76,438	82.02
American Indian or Alaska Native	234	187	79.91
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,593	6,120	92.83
<i>Asian</i>	6,432	5,981	92.99
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	161	139	86.34
Black or African American	21,085	14,486	68.70
Hispanic or Latino	12,406	9,088	73.25
White	48,164	42,534	88.31
Two or more races	4,707	4,023	85.47
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	12,243	5,773	47.15
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,056	1,656	40.83
Economically disadvantaged students	36,347	25,135	69.15
Migratory students	16	6	37.50
Male	47,368	37,246	78.63
Female	45,821	39,192	85.53
<b>Comments:</b> 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			
<b>Comments:</b> 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	65,227	47,154	72.29
American Indian or Alaska Native	196	134	68.37
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,276	2,895	88.37
<i>Asian</i>	3,179	2,814	88.52
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	97	81	83.51
Black or African American	18,008	10,600	58.86
Hispanic or Latino	9,725	6,299	64.77
White	30,824	24,738	80.26
Two or more races	3,198	2,488	77.80
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	11,153	4,747	42.56
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,353	1,808	41.53
Economically disadvantaged students	30,117	18,394	61.08
Migratory students	22	10	45.45
Male	34,497	23,731	68.79
Female	30,730	23,423	76.22

**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	93,933	70,674	75.24
American Indian or Alaska Native	255	182	71.37
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,521	5,788	88.76
<i>Asian</i>	6,410	5,696	88.86
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	111	92	82.88
Black or African American	21,522	12,418	57.70
Hispanic or Latino	12,514	8,244	65.88
White	48,559	40,375	83.15
Two or more races	4,562	3,667	80.38
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	12,100	4,582	37.87
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,469	1,489	33.32
Economically disadvantaged students	36,309	21,487	59.18
Migratory students	17	6	35.29
Male	48,126	34,515	71.72
Female	45,807	36,159	78.94

**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	92,587	73,170	79.03
American Indian or Alaska Native	254	204	80.31
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,622	6,073	91.71
<i>Asian</i>	6,506	5,972	91.79
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	116	101	87.07
Black or African American	21,116	13,104	62.06
Hispanic or Latino	12,824	8,579	66.90
White	47,283	41,389	87.53
Two or more races	4,488	3,821	85.14
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	11,844	5,569	47.02
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,075	1,620	31.92
Economically disadvantaged students	35,965	22,946	63.80
Migratory students	19	6	31.58
Male	47,468	37,552	79.11
Female	45,119	35,618	78.94

**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	279,771	232,881	83.24
American Indian or Alaska Native	828	658	79.47
Asian or Pacific Islander	20,921	19,641	93.88
<i>Asian</i>	20,490	19,280	94.09
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	431	361	83.76
Black or African American	61,236	44,658	72.93
Hispanic or Latino	36,820	27,410	74.44
White	147,323	129,765	88.08
Two or more races	12,643	10,749	85.02
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	25,386	14,273	56.22
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	11,889	7,085	59.59
Economically disadvantaged students	92,621	67,567	72.95
Migratory students	60	41	68.33
Male	140,348	113,701	81.01
Female	139,423	119,180	85.48

**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	97,101	86,525	89.11
American Indian or Alaska Native	276	247	89.49
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,430	5,979	92.99
<i>Asian</i>	6,285	5,850	93.08
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	145	129	88.97
Black or African American	23,612	19,092	80.86
Hispanic or Latino	11,512	9,702	84.28
White	51,100	47,676	93.30
Two or more races	4,171	3,829	91.80
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	10,832	6,922	63.90
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,289	1,121	48.97
Economically disadvantaged students	31,593	25,406	80.42
Migratory students	10	7	70.00
Male	49,343	43,200	87.55
Female	47,758	43,325	90.72

**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	246,214	208,979	84.88
American Indian or Alaska Native	756	622	82.28
Asian or Pacific Islander	16,466	15,292	92.87
<i>Asian</i>	16,088	14,964	93.01
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	378	328	86.77
Black or African American	55,226	40,113	72.63
Hispanic or Latino	30,976	23,154	74.75
White	131,807	120,106	91.12
Two or more races	10,983	9,692	88.25
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	24,244	13,890	57.29
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	9,774	4,615	47.22
Economically disadvantaged students	83,236	60,912	73.18
Migratory students	55	33	60.00
Male	123,173	104,035	84.46
Female	123,041	104,944	85.29

**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**

Per the *Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA)* FAQs located at the following link, some data in this section are no longer required: <http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/essa/faq/essa-faqs.pdf>

For an SEA that has not received ESEA flexibility, or an SEA that received availability 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 2015-16. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2015-16	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2015-16
Schools			
Districts			

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Not required under ESSA.

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 <sup>4</sup> based on data for SY 2015-16. The percentage will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Met All AMOs, 95 Percent Participation Rate, and Other Academic Indicator in SY 2015-16	Percentage that Met All AMOs, 95 Percent Participation Rate and Other Academic Indicator in SY 2015-16
Schools			
Districts			

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Not required under ESSA.

<sup>4</sup> For a high school, the other academic indicator is always graduation rate.

**1.4.2 Title I School Accountability**

Per the *ESSA* FAQs located at the following link, some data in this section are no longer required: <http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/essa/faq/essa-faqs.pdf>

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 2015-16. 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 2015-16	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2015-16
All Title I schools			
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools			
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools			

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Not required under ESSA.

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 <sup>5</sup> based on data for SY 2015-16. 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 2015-16	Percentage of Title I Schools that Met All AMOs, 95 Percent Participation Rate, and Other Academic Indicator in SY 2015-16
All Title I schools			
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools			
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools			

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Not required under ESSA.

<sup>5</sup> For a high school, the other academic indicator is always graduation rate.

**1.4.3 Accountability of Districts That Received Title I Funds**

Per the ESSA FAQs located at the following link, some data in this section are no longer required: <http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/essa/faq/essa-faqs.pdf>

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 2015-16. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds in SY 2015-16	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2015-16	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2015-16

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Not required under ESSA.

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

In the table below, provide the total number of districts that received Title I funds and the total number of those districts that met all of their AMOs, the 95 percent participation rate, and other academic indicator<sup>6</sup> based on data for SY 2015-16. The percentage will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds in SY 2015-16	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Met All AMOs, 95 percent Participation Rate, and Other Academic Indicator in SY 2015-16	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Met All AMOs, 95 percent Participation Rate, and Other Academic Indicator in SY 2015-16

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Not required under ESSA.

<sup>6</sup> 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 2015-16 (based on SY 2014-15 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2015-16
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	
<b>Comments:</b> 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 2015-2016.	

**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 2015-16 (based on SY 2014-15 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	
<b>Comments:</b> 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 2015-2016.	

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 2015-16 (based on SY 2014-15 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 2015-16
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 2014-15 and beginning of SY 2015-16 as a corrective action)	
<b>Comments:</b> 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 2015-16 data and the results of those appeals.

Entity	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts		
Schools		
<b>Comments:</b> 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 2015-2016 school year.		

In the table below, provide the data by which processing appeals based on SY 2015-16 data was complete.

Processing Appeals completion	Date
Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2015-16 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 2015 (SY 2015-16) 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 2015-16.

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. Several offices within the VDOE collaborated 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.

**Aligning Academic Review and Performance Evaluation (AARPE)**

During the 2015-2016 school year, AARPE technical assistance was provided for identified focus and priority schools. The purpose of the five AARPE technical assistance sessions was to develop sample evidence for the sample performance indicators in Teacher Performance Standard 4, Assessment of and for Learning. The sample evidence for each performance indicator was used by principals and district leaders as a tool to enhance their observation tools. Moreover, the AARPE provided opportunities for participants to develop a common vocabulary and shared understanding of formative assessment as well as enhancing data analysis skills to set meaningful goals at the school, grade/department, teacher, and principal levels. These activities ultimately resulted in the enhancement of instructional leaders' feedback skills.

Each focus and priority school was assigned a contractor, a highly-skilled retired educator, to assist schools in the inter-rater reliability process of observing developed performance indicators. 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 performance indicators created for Teacher Performance Standards related to formative assessment were posted on a dedicated VDOE webpage as a resource for divisions and schools to use with their own classroom walkthrough and observation tools.

**Contractors for Focus Schools**

Local educational agencies associated with the identified 73 focus schools were assigned a VDOE contractor to assist with the development of processes for increasing local capacity. Contractors modeled procedures for conducting division leadership team meetings, monitoring interventions, and providing explicit feedback regarding classroom observations. On a monthly basis, division leadership teams received in-person and virtual coaching from their assigned contractors related to implementation of improvement plans and data analysis. Outcomes gleaned from reviews of quarterly student performance data and evaluation of intervention strategies were reported via the quarterly Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA) Progress Monitoring Report for Focus Schools. This monitoring report included subsequent actions for the division leadership team to complete in response to the quarterly student performance data and evaluation activities.

**Contractors for Priority Schools**

The Office of School Improvement provided contractors, who were highly-skilled retired educators, to support priority schools in ensuring that each 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. They also participated in technical assistance sessions of newly identified (cohort VI) schools. On a monthly basis, contractors submitted reports to document schools' implementation and monitoring of the USED 7 Turnaround Principles.

**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 73 focus and 36 priority schools and their respective 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.

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

In the space below, describe actions (if any) taken by your State in SY 2015-16 that were supported by **funds other than Sections 1003(a) and 1003(g) funds** to address the achievement problems of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Sections 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 Partially Accredited 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. Additional evaluation tools are used 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, principals created a 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 rated Partially Accredited: Warned School in specific academic areas and/or in achievement of the minimum threshold for the Graduation and Completion Index, 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 based on the Graduation and Completion Index, 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), and 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 rated Partially Accredited: Warned School for two or three years, Partially Accredited: Reconstituted School, or Denied Accreditation. Aligning Academic Review and Performance Evaluation (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 assessment of and for learning. 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.

3. Hanover Research. Hanover Research completed a multi-stage evaluation of the support of lead turnaround partners (LTP) for priority schools in Virginia. The report included a quantitative analysis comparing scores on Virginia's Standards of Learning assessments for students in LTP schools and similar students in non-LTP schools, as well as a review of trends in LTPs, using information obtained from in-depth interviews with school leaders and LTP program staff. Hanover Research also created an online data collection tool for required quarterly reporting by schools denied accreditation, warned for the third consecutive year, and schools rated Partially Accredited: Reconstituted School. Hanover Research designed a database to house 2015-2016 data collected from these schools related to attendance, behavior offenses, teacher observation, teacher attendance, and teacher retention.

4. Partially Accredited: Reconstituted 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 Partially Accredited: Reconstituted School. As defined by the Standards of Accreditation, reconstitution is a process that may be used to initiate 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 Reconstitution Agreement Plan (RAP) which will serve as the school's operating plan for improvement. The RAP is developed in collaboration with and monitored by VDOE through required triannual 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 with the Board of Education. The memorandum of understanding 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 memorandum of understanding 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.

<b>Public School Choice</b>	<b># Students</b>
Eligible for public school choice	0
Applied to transfer	0
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	86
<b>Comments:</b> 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.

<b>Transportation for Public School Choice</b>	<b>Dollars Spent</b>
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.

<b>Unable to Provide Public School Choice</b>	<b># LEAs</b>
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 school 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.<sup>7</sup> Adapted from Public School Choice Non-Regulatory Guidance, Available at: <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/schoolchoiceguid.doc>

- 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.

<b>Comments:</b> 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 2015-2016 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.

<b>Supplemental Educational Services</b>	<b># Students</b>
Eligible for supplemental educational services	
Applied for supplemental educational services	
Received supplemental educational services	
<b>Comments:</b> 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 2015-2016 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.

<b>Spending on Supplemental Educational Services</b>	<b>Dollars Spent</b>
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$ 0
<b>Comments:</b> 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 2015-2016 school year.	

**1.5 TEACHER QUALITY**

This section collects data on "highly qualified" teachers as the term is defined in Section 9101(23) of the 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	243,181	239,930	98.66	3,251	1.34
All elementary classes	48,160	47,422	98.47	738	1.53
All secondary classes	195,021	192,508	98.71	2,513	1.29

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 one section.
--

**FAQs about highly qualified teachers and core academic subjects:**

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

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

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

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

<b>1.5.2.1 Elementary School Classes</b>	
<b>Elementary School Classes</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
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	62.00
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	12.70
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	25.30
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.00</b>

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

<b>1.5.2.2 Secondary School Classes</b>	
<b>Secondary School Classes</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
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)	40.20
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	32.90
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	26.90
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.00</b>

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	12,334	12,135	98.39
Low-poverty elementary schools	16,109	15,888	98.63
Secondary Schools			
High-poverty secondary schools	33,155	32,391	97.70
Low-poverty secondary schools	62,236	61,600	98.98

#### 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	68.46	29.18
Poverty metric used	Virginia uses the percentages of students who qualify for the free or reduced-price lunch program.	
Secondary schools	56.86	26.62
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

- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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 program.

**1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational program**

In the table below, place a check next to each type of language instruction educational program implemented in the State, as defined under 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.us/files/rcd/BE021775/Glossary\\_of\\_Terms.pdf](http://www.ncela.us/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	Spanish
<u>Yes</u>	Developmental bilingual	Spanish
<u>Yes</u>	Heritage language	Spanish
<u>Yes</u>	Sheltered English instruction	////////////////////////////////////
<u>Yes</u>	Structured English immersion	////////////////////////////////////
<u>Yes</u>	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)	////////////////////////////////////
<u>Yes</u>	Content-based ESL	////////////////////////////////////
<u>Yes</u>	Pull-out ESL	////////////////////////////////////
<u>Yes</u>	Other (explain in comment box below)	////////////////////////////////////

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other types of programs and support for ELs include elementary and secondary newcomer programs, virtual ESL classes, after school tutoring, push-in ESL, parental outreach, inclusion, and collaboration among teachers.

**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).

- n 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.
- n 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	107,547
<p><b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. For the 2015-2016 school year, Virginia LEAs reported 588 LEP students as not tested. The remaining number of students in the 2015- 2016 ELP assessment data reported as not tested on the ELP assessment is in part to an influx of students enrolling in the school divisions in the beginning of SY 2015-2016 who were not enrolled at the time of the administration of the ELP assessment. Although 107,548 LEP students were enrolled in Virginia at the start of the 2015-2016 school year, only 101,992, or 94.83% as compared to the total fall enrollment, were enrolled at the end of the 2015-2016 school year. LEP enrollment decreased from the start of the 2015-2016 school year to the end of the 2015-2016 school year by 5,556 students. VDOE continues to provide ongoing technical assistance to school divisions to ensure the most accurate data possible given the transient nature of this population and working with school divisions to determine reasons why students may lack an assessment record for the most recent administration of the ELP assessment.</p>	

**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.	107,532
<p><b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. For the 2015-2016 school year, Virginia LEAs reported 588 LEP students as not tested. The remaining number of students in the 2015- 2016 ELP assessment data reported as not tested on the ELP assessment is in part to an influx of students enrolling in the school divisions in the beginning of SY 2015-2016 who were not enrolled at the time of the administration of the ELP assessment. Although 107,548 LEP students were enrolled in Virginia at the start of the 2015-2016 school year, only 101,992, or 94.83% as compared to the total fall enrollment, were enrolled at the end of the 2015-2016 school year. LEP enrollment decreased from the start of the 2015-2016 school year to the end of the 2015-2016 school year by 5,556 students. VDOE continues to provide ongoing technical assistance to school divisions to ensure the most accurate data possible given the transient nature of this population and working with school divisions to determine reasons why students may lack an assessment record for the most recent administration of the ELP assessment.</p>	

**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	73,017
Arabic	6,019
Vietnamese	2,529
Urdu	2,500
Chinese	1,812

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).

<b>All LEP Testing</b>	<b>#</b>
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	100,952
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	6,595
<b>Total</b>	<b>107,547</b>
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. For the 2015-2016 school year, Virginia LEAs reported 588 LEP students as not tested. The remaining number of students in the 2015- 2016 ELP assessment data reported as not tested on the ELP assessment is in part to an influx of students enrolling in the school divisions in the beginning of SY 2015-2016 who were not enrolled at the time of the administration of the ELP assessment. Although 107,548 LEP students were enrolled in Virginia at the start of the 2015-2016 school year, only 101,992, or 94.83% as compared to the total fall enrollment, were enrolled at the end of the 2015-2016 school year. LEP enrollment decreased from the start of the 2015-2016 school year to the end of the 2015-2016 school year by 5,556 students. VDOE continues to provide ongoing technical assistance to school divisions to ensure the most accurate data possible given the transient nature of this population and working with school divisions to determine reasons why students may lack an assessment record for the most recent administration of the ELP assessment.	

**1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results**

<b>All LEP Results</b>	<b>#</b>
Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	17,413
Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	17.26
<b>Comments:</b> 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.

<b>Title III LEP Testing</b>		<b>#</b>
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment		99,312
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment		8,220
Total		107,532
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. For the 2015-2016 school year, Virginia LEAs reported 588 LEP students as not tested. The remaining number of students in the 2015- 2016 ELP assessment data reported as not tested on the ELP assessment is in part to an influx of students enrolling in the school divisions in the beginning of SY 2015-2016 who were not enrolled at the time of the administration of the ELP assessment. Although 107,548 LEP students were enrolled in Virginia at the start of the 2015-2016 school year, only 101,992, or 94.83% as compared to the total fall enrollment, were enrolled at the end of the 2015-2016 school year. LEP enrollment decreased from the start of the 2015-2016 school year to the end of the 2015-2016 school year by 5,556 students. VDOE continues to provide ongoing technical assistance to school divisions to ensure the most accurate data possible given the transient nature of this population and working with school divisions to determine reasons why students may lack an assessment record for the most recent administration of the ELP assessment.		

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

<b>Title III First Time Tested</b>		<b>#</b>
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.		26,095

**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:**

- Annual Measureable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs)** = State targets for the number and percent of students making progress and attaining proficiency.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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%).

<b>Title III Results</b>	<b>Results</b>		<b>Targets</b>	
	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>
Making progress	57,883	79.06		
Attained proficiency	17,245	17.36		
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. During the transition from the Elementary and Secondary Education Act [ESEA] to the newly authorized Every Student Succeeds Act of 2015 [ESSA], USED is not requiring states to report performance against Title III AMAOs for the 2014-2015 or 2015-2016 school years.				

**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.

<b>Native Language Testing</b>	<b>Yes/No</b>
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
<b>Comments:</b> 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.

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

**1.6.3.5.3 Native Language of Reading/Language Arts Tests Given**

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

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

**1.6.3.5.4 Native Language of Science Tests Given**

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

Language(s)
<b>Comments:</b> 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
16,641	15,785	32,426
<b>Comments:</b> 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
27,972	23,118	82.65	4,854
<b>Comments:</b> 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
25,670	20,722	80.72	4,948
<b>Comments:</b> 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
13,627	10,724	78.70	2,903
<b>Comments:</b> 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

Per the ESSA FAQs located at the following link, this section is no longer required: <http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/essa/faq/essa-faqs.pdf>

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.)

Table with 2 columns: Title III Subgrantees, #. Rows include: Total number of subgrantees for the year, 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, 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 2014-15 and 2015-16), Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2015-16 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 2012-13, 2013-14, 2014-15, and 2015-16)

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. Not required under transition to ESSA.

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).

Table with 2 columns: Termination of Title III Programs, Yes/No. Rows include: Were any Title III language instruction educational programs or activities terminated for failure to reach program goals?, If yes, provide the number of language instruction educational programs or activities for immigrant children and youth terminated., Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

**1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students**

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

**Note: All immigrant students are not LEP students.**

**1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students**

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

**Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:**

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

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants
29,753	26,143	37

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.

<b>Title III Teachers</b>	<b>#</b>
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	1,199
Estimate number of <b>additional</b> certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	800

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 1.6.4.1).
3. **Total Number of Participants** = Number of teachers, administrators and other personnel who participated in each type of the professional development activities reported.
4. **Total** = Number of all participants in professional development (PD) activities.

Professional Development (PD) Topics	# Subgrantees
Instructional strategies for LEP students	51
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	42
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	48
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	45
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	31
Other (Explain in comment box)	0

PD Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	51	8,200
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	51	4,252
PD provided to principals	51	1,393
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	51	591
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	51	1,245
PD provided to community based organization personnel	31	720
Total	//////////	16,401

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 U.S. 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 2015-16 funds July 1, 2015, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2015, for SY 2015-16 programs. Then the "# of days/\$\$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
7/1/2015	9/18/15	80
<b>Comments:</b> 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>.

<b>Persistently Dangerous Schools</b>	<b>#</b>
Persistently Dangerous Schools	0
<b>Comments:</b> 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.

<b>LEAs</b>	<b>#</b>	<b># LEAs Reporting Data</b>
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)	115	452
K	382	1,222
1	418	1,238
2	438	1,194
3	386	1,151
4	355	1,089
5	387	993
6	372	884
7	331	891
8	296	944
9	346	1,447
10	262	1,084
11	229	904
12	255	929
Ungraded		
Total	4,572	14,422

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Virginia has no homeless children and youths students under the classification of ungraded.

**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	589	1,648
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	3,205	10,481
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	74	169
Hotels/Motels	704	2,124
Total	4,572	14,422

**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	369	2,154
Migratory children/youth	25	74
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	908	2,731
Limited English Proficient (LEP) students	255	2,734

**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.

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b># Homeless Children/Youth Served by Subgrants</b>
Age Birth Through 2	181
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	543
K	1,246
1	1,252
2	1,225
3	1,165
4	1,110
5	1,023
6	903
7	917
8	934
9	1,482
10	1,101
11	926
12	946
Ungraded	
Total	14,954

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

**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.

<b>Subgroup</b>	<b># Homeless Students Served</b>
Unaccompanied homeless youth	2,180
Migratory children/youth	82
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	2,778
Limited English Proficient (LEP) students	2,861

**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	339	203	59.88	997	499	50.05
4	312	182	58.33	944	542	57.42
5	338	202	59.76	866	505	58.31
6	325	188	57.85	754	369	48.94
7	303	194	64.03	760	437	57.50
8	255	152	59.61	807	358	44.36
High School	235	179	76.17	830	623	75.06

**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	344	203	59.01	1,036	479	46.24
4	315	201	63.81	981	556	56.68
5	337	198	58.75	891	473	53.09
6	322	198	61.49	764	402	52.62
7	281	157	55.87	738	305	41.33
8	241	153	63.49	721	291	40.36
High School	592	401	67.74	2,157	1,263	58.55

**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	340	203	59.71	899	499	55.51
6						
7						
8	250	164	65.60	833	388	46.58
High School	599	402	67.11	1,792	1,066	59.49

**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.