

**Office of English Language
Acquisition
Washington, D.C. 20024-6510**



Title III Biennial Report

**State Formula Grants under Title III, Part A, English Language Acquisition,
Language Enhancement and Academic Achievement Act**

(Public Law 107-110)

**CFDA NUMBER: 84.365A
FORM APPROVED
OMB NO. 1885-0553, EXP. 8/31/2009**

DATED MATERIAL -- OPEN IMMEDIATELY

DUE DATE: DECEMBER 31, 2006

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for each of these years (2004-05 and 2005-06) must respond to this Title III Biennial Report (TBR) by **December 31, 2006**. This report is based on student performance data and other related information from the two preceding years 2004-05 and 2005-06.

The format states will use to submit the Title III Biennial Report has changed to an online submission. 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 Title III Biennial Report.

TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

The Title III Biennial Report 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 TBR data entry. This area will utilize EDEN formatting to the extent possible and the data will be entered in the order of the revised TBR form. The data entry screens will include or provide access to all instructions and notes on the revised TBR 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 "2006 TBR". The main TBR screen will allow the user to select the section of the TBR that he or she needs to either view or enter data. After selecting a section of the TBR, the user will be presented with a screen or set of screens where the user can input the data for that section of the TBR. A user can only select one section of the TBR at a time. After a state has included all available data in the designated sections of the TBR, a lead state user will certify it and transmit it to the Department. Once the form 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 TBR. Detailed instructions for transmitting the 2006 TBR will be found on the main TBR page of the EDEN website (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1965, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1885-0553. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 2.50 hours (or 150 minutes) per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, complete and review the information collection. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimate(s) or suggestions for improving this form, please write to: U.S. Department of Education, Washington, D.C. 20202-6510. If you have comments or concerns regarding the status of your individual submission of this form, write directly to: OELA, U.S. Department of Education 550 12th Street SW, Room PCP 10-113, Washington, D.C. 20202-6510. Questions about the new electronic TBR submission process, should be directed to the EDEN Partner Support Center at 1-877-HLP-EDEN (1-877-457-3336).

State Response for Meeting Title III State Biennial Reporting Requirements

Reporting Instructions

States are to provide information for each section required for the Title III Biennial Report. States should respond to the items listed under each of the elements. If any of the information requested is not available, please **explain** why it is not available.

Please note the following:

- ***Specific instructions for each item are shown in bold type and/or enclosed in parentheses in this format.***
- ***Responses are required for all sections in the Title III Biennial Report.***
- ***Note that comment boxes are provided for each response should further information be needed however there is a limitation to the number of characters available therefore it is recommended that written responses be comprehensive and concise. Do not provide web site links or references and no attachments.***

Critical Elements (List of Sections within this Form)

- 1 Types of language instruction educational programs used by subgrantees
[SEC. 3115 (c)(1) p. 1698, 3121(b)(1) p.1701, 3123(b)(2) p. 1704]
- 2 Critical synthesis of data reported by Title III subgrantees [SEC. 3121(a) p.1701, 3123(b)(1, 3) p.1704]
 - LEP Student Progress Meeting AMAOs for English Language Proficiency
 - Performance of LEP Subgroup in Meeting State AYP Targets
 - LEP Students in Grades not Tested for AYP
 - Content Assessment in Native Languages
 - Accommodations for LEP Students
- 3 Academic content assessment results of monitored LEP students
[SEC. 3121(a)(4) p.1701, 3123(b)(8) p.1705]
 - Number of Former LEP Students by Year Monitored
 - Academic Achievement of Former LEP Students Tested for AYP
- 4 Title III Subgrantee Performance and State Accountability
[SEC. 3122(b)(2) p. 1703, 3123(b)(1, 4) p.1704-5, 3121(b)(2) p. 1701]
- 5 Programs and activities for immigrant children and youth
[SEC. 3115(e)(1)(A-G) p. 1699]
 - Number of Immigrants and Immigrant Subgrants
 - Subgrantee Programs or Activities
 - Distribution of Funds
- 6 Title III programs or activities conducted by subgrantees, as described in Section 3115 (c, d & e), terminated for failure to reach program goals during the two preceding years [SEC. 3123(b)(7) p.1705]
- 7 Teacher information and professional development activities conducted by the subgrantees [SEC. 3115(c)(1)(B) p. 1698, 3116 (c) p.1701, 3123(b)(5) p. 1705]
 - Number of Teachers
 - Teacher Certification
 - Teacher Language Fluency
 - Professional Development
- 8 State level activities conducted and technical assistance provided to subgrantees
[SEC. 3111(b)(2)(A-D) p.1691-2, 3123(b)(4) p. 1705]
 - Technical Assistance Provided by the State
 - Other State Activities
 - Parental Participation Compliance
- 9 Optional

Title III Biennial Report State Formula Grants under Title III, Part A, English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement and Academic Achievement Act	
Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report: Virginia Department of Education	
Address: P.O. Box 2120 Richmond, VA 23218-2120	
Person to contact about this report:	
Name: Ms. Roberta Schlicher, Director of Program Administration and Accountability	
Telephone: (804) 225-2870	
Fax: (804) 371-7347	
e-mail: Roberta.Schlicher@doe.virginia.gov	
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Dr. Patricia I. Wright, Chief Deputy Superintendent of Public Instruction	
_____ Signature	_____ Friday, December 22, 2006, 1:47:12 PM Date

This updated certified version was created by Paige Akins, OPEPD, US ED.

1. Types of Language Instruction Educational Programs Used by Subgrantees [Sec. 3115 (c)(1) p. 1698, 3121(b)(1) p.1701, 3123(b)(2) p. 1704]

1.1 Indicate the number of Title III subgrantees that use each type of language instruction educational program (as defined in Section 3301(8)) in Table 1.1.

Note: A significant amount of information needed to generate the Biennial Report to Congress will be gathered through other information collections. Specifically, the Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for the 2004-2005 (OMB # 1810-0614) and 2005-2006 school years, the Annual Collection of Elementary and Secondary Education Data for the Education Data Exchange Network (EDEN) for 2004-2005 and 2005-2006 (OMB # 1880-0541). Each provides information to the OELA Biennial Report. Information from other collections, which will be utilized in the OELA Biennial Report, has been marked in this collection form with the exact question or element number in the specific data collections.

It is not necessary to respond to items that reference other collections in this form. Information provided by SEAs to the referenced collections will be collected and utilized to produce the Biennial Report.

Blackened cells in this form indicate information which, each SEA should collect and maintain, but which is not being collected at this time for use in the current Biennial Report to Congress.

Definitions:

1. **# of Subgrantees Using Program** = Number of subgrantees that reported using a specific type of language instruction educational program. Subgrantees may have multiple programs. If multiple programs are used, report each program.
2. **Type of Program** = type of programs described in the subgrantee local plan (as submitted to the State or as implemented) that is closest to the descriptions in <http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/expert/glossary.html>

Table 1.1 Summary of Language Instruction Educational Programs

# of Subgrantees Using Program		Type of Program	Language of Instruction % English	Other Language % OLOI*
2004-2005	2005-2006			
		Dual Language		
		Two way immersion		
		Transitional bilingual		
		Developmental bilingual		
		Heritage language		
		Sheltered English instruction		
		Structured English immersion		
		Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)		
		Content-based ESL		
		Pull-out ESL		
		Other (explain)		

Comments: These data were not collected for the 2004-2005 or 2005-2006 school years.

State response 1.1: (Provide further information as to the variations of the types of programs e.g., dual language, two-way/one-way, as implemented by subgrantees, including "Other". In reference to the type of instructional programs, see descriptions listed on NCELA's website: <http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/expert/glossary.html>)

These data were not collected for the 2004-2005 or 2005-2006 school years.

1.2 Language Instruction Based on Scientific Research

Title III language instruction educational programs must be based on scientific research and proven to be effective (Section 3115 (c)(1)).

1.2.1 Does the State provide written guidance for selecting a scientifically research based language instruction educational programs? (See SEC. 9101(37) for scientifically based research)

Yes

Comments:

1.2.2 How does the State ensure that subgrantees implement scientifically research based language instruction educational programs?

State response 1.2.2: (Provide narrative here)

Title III Academies

The Virginia Department of Education has sponsored Title III Academies on an annual basis since 2002. The purpose of the academies has been to provide technical assistance to school divisions applying for Title III funds. For the 2005 and 2006 Academies, both Title III and Title I coordinators (or designees), were invited to participate to assist school divisions with coordination across program areas. Included in the academy is the requirement under the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 to implement scientifically research-based language instruction educational programs.

New Title III Coordinators Academy

The Virginia Department of Education sponsored an academy for new Title I, Part A; Title II, Part A; and Title III, Part A, coordinators in 2005. The purpose of the academy was to assist new coordinators in understanding the requirements of Title I, Part A; Title II, Part A; and Title III, Part A, of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. Topics included an overview of federal programs, applying for and managing federal funds, implementing scientifically research-based language instruction educational programs; and federal program requirements. Breakout sessions were also provided for Title I, Title III, and Title III programs so that new coordinators could receive information specific to those titles.

Annual Review of Federal Program Applications

Applications for federal funds under the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 are submitted to the Virginia Department of Education for review and approval on an annual basis. Included in the review of applications for Title III, Part A, funds is an assurance that the proposed language instruction educational programs are scientifically research-based.

Annual Federal Program Monitoring

School divisions are monitored for compliance with Title III, Part A, on a five year cycle. Included in the monitoring of Title III, Part A, programs is a determination of whether the school division is implementing a scientifically research-based language instruction educational program.

2. Critical Synthesis of Data Reported by Title III Subgrantees [Sec. 3121(a) p. 1701, 3123(b)(1, 3) p.1704]

2.1 LEP Student Progress in Meeting State Annual AMAOs for English Language Proficiency

Included in this section are several tables that provide evidence of LEP student progress in meeting the Title III State annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) for English language proficiency (i.e., AMAO/making progress; AMAO/attainment) and academic achievement (AMAO/AYP).

It is not necessary to respond to items that reference other collections in this form. Information provided by SEAs to the referenced collections will be collected and utilized to produce the Biennial Report.

2.1.1 Number of LEP Students

Note: The figures in this item were taken from the last row of question 1.6.3.1 of the CSPR. If the figures shown do not match your expectations, go into the CSPR and modify question 1.6.3.1 to make sure the last row contains the total unduplicated counts. The information from the CSPR shown in this table is read only. Revisions can be made to the 2005-2006 CSPR data through December 31, 2006. The 2004-2005 CSPR data cannot be updated at this time.

	2004-2005	2005-2006
Total number of "ALL LEP" students in the State for each year.	67933	72380

Comments:

Note: "ALL LEP" students = All students in K-12:

1. who were newly enrolled in the year of reporting and assessed for English language proficiency using a State selected/approved ELP placement assessment and who meet the LEP definition in section 9101(25), and
2. who were assessed by State annual English language proficiency assessment and achieved below "proficient,"
 - a. in the previous year and continued to be enrolled in the year of reporting, (if the State English language proficiency assessment is at the end of the school year); or
 - b. in the year of reporting, (if the State English language proficiency is at the beginning of the school year).

"All LEP" students should include the newly enrolled and continually enrolled LEP students in the State for each year of this report, whether or not they receive services in a Title III language instruction educational program.

2.1.2 Number of LEP Students who Received Services

Note: The figures in this item were taken from the last row of question 1.6.3.3 of the CSPR. If the figures shown do not match your expectations, go into the CSPR and modify question 1.6.3.3 to make sure the last row contains the total unduplicated counts.

	2004-2005	2005-2006
Total number of LEP students in the State who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program for each year.	67176	69862

Comments:

2.1.3 Results on Achieving AMAO's in English Language Proficiency

Provide the results of Title III LEP students in meeting the State English language proficiency (ELP) annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) for making progress and attainment of English language proficiency as required in Table 2.1

Instructions:

Report **ONLY** the results from State annual English language proficiency assessment(s) for LEP students who participate in Title III English language instruction educational programs in grades K-12.

It is not necessary to respond to items that reference other collections in this form. Information provided by SEAs to the referenced collections will be collected and utilized to produce the Biennial Report.

Blackened cells in this form indicate information that each SEA should collect and maintain, but which is not being collected at this time for use in the current Biennial Report to Congress.

Definitions:

1. **MAKING PROGRESS** = as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
2. **DID NOT MAKE PROGRESS** = The number and percentage of Title III LEP students who did not meet the State definition of "Making Progress."
3. **ELP ATTAINMENT** = The number and percentage of Title III LEP students who attained English language proficiency as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended. (If the State is tracking true cohorts of LEP students, the number of monitored former LEP students included in the cohorts can be cumulative from year to year for up to two years.)
4. **AMAO TARGET** = the AMAO target for the year as established by the State and submitted to OELA in the CSA (September 2003 submission), or as amended and approved, for each of "Making progress" and "Attainment" of English language proficiency.
5. **AMAO RESULTS** = The number and percentage of Title III LEP students who met/did not meet the State definitions of "Making Progress" and the number and percentage of Title III LEP students who met the definition for "Attainment" of English language proficiency.
6. **Met AMAO Target** = Designation of whether the LEP students in Title III language instruction educational programs did or did not meet the AMAO targets for the year.

2.1.3 Title III LEP Student Language Proficiency Results

Note that the information from the CSPR shown in this table is read only. Revisions can be made to the 2005-2006 CSPR data through December 31, 2006. The 2004-2005 CSPR data cannot be updated at this time.

	2004-2005				2005-2006			
	AMAO TARGET	AMAO RESULTS		Met AMAO Target	AMAO TARGET	AMAO RESULTS		Met AMAO Target
	%	#	%	Y/N	%	#	%	Y/N
MAKING PROGRESS	25.00	53344	74.00	Y	30.00	43015	86.00	Y
DID NOT MAKE PROGRESS		12898				7002		
ELP ATTAINMENT	15.00	23604	31.00	Y	20.00	19810	38.00	Y

Comments: Based on the guidance provided in determining the LEP students "making progress" and "ELP attainment" for this report, the 2004-2005 figures for "making progress" should be 36,708 (54.3%) and the 2004-2005 figure for "ELP attainment" should be 17,974 (26.6%).

2.1.4 Monitored Former LEP Students

Check the answer to the following question:

Are **monitored former LEP** students reflected in Table 2.1.3 "Attainment"/"AMAO Results"? (**Note:** ONLY if the State is using true cohort data, i.e., the State tracked the same LEP students in the same groups for progress each year and has longitudinal data available.)

No

Note: Monitored former LEP students are those who

- have achieved "proficient" on the State ELP assessment;
- have transitioned into classrooms that are not designed for LEP students;
- are no longer receiving Title III services; and who
- are being monitored for academic content achievement for 2 years after transition.

State Response 2.1.4: (Provide narrative here if needed.)

2.1.5 Unduplicated count of Title III LEP students in the State.

Definitions:

1. **# Total LEP Enrolled** = the unduplicated count of LEP students who enrolled in a Title III language instruction educational program in the State.
2. **# Tested/State Annual ELP** = the number of LEP students in Title III language instruction educational programs who took the State annual English language proficiency assessment.
3. **# Not Available for State Annual ELP** = the number of LEP students in Title III language instruction educational programs who were enrolled at the time of testing, but were not available for State annual English language proficiency assessment for an excusable reason, acceptable "excusable reason" being the student was seriously ill, injured or in some way physically incapacitated state, to the point of keeping the student from attending school.
4. **Subtotal** = the sum of "Tested/State Annual ELP" and "Not Available for State Annual ELP."
5. **# LEP/One Data Point** = the number of LEP students in Title III language instruction educational programs who took the State annual English language proficiency assessment for the first time. This number should be part of the total number of "Tested/State Annual ELP" in 2 above.

2.1.5 Title III LEP Student/Testing Status		
	2004-2005	2005-2006
# Total LEP Enrolled	67176	69862
# Tested/State Annual ELP	67580	69827
# Not Available for State Annual ELP Test	0	35
Subtotal	67580	69862
# LEP/One Data Point	453	718
Comments:		

2.2 Report performance of the LEP subgroup in meeting the State adequate yearly progress (AYP) targets in math and reading/language arts in Table 2.2.

Instructions:

Fill in the number and percentage of LEP subgroup scoring at "Proficient & Advanced" compared to the State's AYP targets for math and reading/language arts, for grades tested in 2004-2005 and for all grades listed in 2005-2006.

It is not necessary to respond to items that reference other collections in this form. Information provided by SEAs to the referenced collections will be collected and utilized to produce the Biennial Report.

Definitions:

1. **Grade** = the grade tested for AYP
2. **3-HS not proficient** = the number of LEP students in all grades 3-8 and the HS grade tested for the year who were below proficient.
3. **Total # Tested** = the number of students in the LEP subgroup in all grades tested for the year. Provide the State aggregate number in the column labeled "Proficient & Advanced #"
4. **Total # 3-HS LEP not tested** = the total number of LEP students not tested and/or not counted as participating for AYP in grades 3-8 and the HS grade for the year
5. **Proficient & Advanced** = the number and the percent of the students in the LEP subgroup that achieved "proficient" and "advanced", in each of the content areas for the year
6. **Target** = the AYP target established by the State for that subject in that year

Note that the information from the CSPR shown in this table is read only. Revisions can be made to the 2005-2006 CSPR data through December 31, 2006. The 2004-2005 CSPR data cannot be updated at this time. Note that the information from the CSPR and accountability workbooks shown in this table is read only. Revisions can be made to the 2005-2006 CSPR data through December 31, 2006. Revisions to the accountability workbook information can only be made by working with Office of Elementary and Secondary Education (OESE) to submit a revised workbook. The 2004-2005 CSPR data cannot be updated at this time.

2.2 LEP Subgroup Content Results								
	2004-2005				2005-2006			
	GRADE	PROFICIENT & ADVANCED		TARGET	GRADE	PROFICIENT & ADVANCED		TARGET
		#	%	%		#	%	%
MATHEMATICS	3	5913	81.80	63.00	3	6409	84.91	67.00
	4				4	4587	63.23	67.00
	5	4337	69.90	63.00	5	4729	72.18	67.00
	6				6	2187	39.11	67.00
	7				7	1401	30.00	67.00
	8	3326	70.00	63.00	8	2573	58.02	67.00
	HS	8727	80.90	63.00	HS	8789	79.67	67.00
	3-HS NOT PROFICIENT				3-HS NOT PROFICIENT	20529		
	TOTAL # TESTED	31319			TOTAL # TESTED	51204		
	TOTAL # 3-HS LEP NOT TESTED	313			TOTAL # 3-HS LEP NOT TESTED	277		
READING/ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS	3	4740	64.60	65.00	3	5822	77.40	69.00
	4				4	5730	79.19	69.00
	5	5038	79.50	65.00	5	5342	80.61	69.00
	6				6	4125	70.95	69.00
	7				7	3075	62.20	69.00
	8	2917	60.60	65.00	8	2734	54.38	69.00
	HS	2147	70.30	65.00	HS	2665	73.40	69.00
	3-HS NOT PROFICIENT				3-HS NOT PROFICIENT	15069		
	TOTAL # TESTED	23526			TOTAL # TESTED	44562		
	TOTAL # 3-HS LEP NOT TESTED	0			TOTAL # 3-HS LEP NOT TESTED	0		
Comments: In 2004-2005 Virginia did not administer the Standards of Learning reading/language arts and mathematics tests at grades 4, 6, or 7.								
Does the State exercise the LEP flexibility afforded States by the Secretary for recent arrivals in AYP determination? (http://www.ed.gov/legislation/FedRegister/finrule/2006-3/091306a.html)							Yes	
Comments:								

2.3 LEP Students in Grades not Tested for AYP

Instructions:

Provide the total number of LEP students in grades that were not tested for AYP. These figures reflect all students in grades K-2 and in the high school grades not tested for AYP.

2.3 LEP Students/Non-AYP Grades		
Grade	2004-2005	2005-2006
# LEP K-2	18238	20846
# LEP HS	3583	2733
# LEP Other Grades	15475	

Comments: In 2004-2005, all students were assessed for Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in grades 3, 5, 8, and End-of Course (high school). In 2005-2006, all students were assessed for AYP in grades 3 through 8 and End-of Course (high school).

2.4 Content assessment in Students' Native Language

2.4.1 Does the State offer the State academic content tests in the students' native language(s)?
No

(If no, go to 2.5. If yes, complete Tables 2.4.2 and 2.4.3.)
Comments:

2.4.2 If the answer is **yes to 2.4.1**, list the languages other than English, of the academic content tests provided in the State by the grades for which these native language tests are available, in Table 2.4.2. If more than one language is available for the grade, place a hard return (if electronic) in the row to add more space.

State should only report tests used for AYP purposes in the table.

Definitions:

- Grade** = grades for which the native language version of the academic content test is offered
- Language(s)** = name of the language in which the academic content test is offered

2.4.2 Test in Student's Native Language

	GRADE	LANGUAGE		GRADE	LANGUAGE
		3			
	4			4	
	5			5	
	6			6	
	7			7	
	8			8	
MATHEMATICS	HS		RDG/LANGUAGE ARTS	HS	

Comments:
 State response 2.4.2: (Provide narrative here if needed.)

Instructions:

If State response to 2.4.1 is YES, fill in the number and percentage of LEP subgroup scoring at "Proficient & Advanced" compared to the State's AYP targets for math and reading/language arts, for grades tested in 2004-2005 and for all grades listed in 2005-2006.

It is not necessary to respond to items that reference other collections in this form. Information provided by SEAs to the referenced collections will be collected and utilized to produce the Biennial Report.

This table is populated only if the state's response to 2.4.1 is YES.

Definitions:

1. **Grade** = grades in which the native language versions of the State academic content assessment is provided for LEP students
2. **Proficient & Advanced** = the number and the percent of students of the LEP subgroup that achieved "proficient" and "advanced", for each year
3. **Total Tested** = total number of ALL LEP students in all grades tested for each year through native language versions of the State academic content assessments

2.4.3 Native Language Version of State Academic Content Assessment Results						
	2004-2005			2005-2006		
	GRADE	PROFICIENT & ADVANCED		GRADE	PROFICIENT & ADVANCED	
		#	%		#	%
MATHEMATICS	3			3		
	4			4		
	5			5		
	6			6		
	7			7		
	8			8		
	HS			HS		
	TOTAL TESTED			TOTAL TESTED		
		#	%		#	%
READING/ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS	3			3		
	4			4		
	5			5		
	6			6		
	7			7		
	8			8		
	HS			HS		
	TOTAL TESTED			TOTAL TESTED		

Comments:

State response 2.4.3: (Provide narrative here if needed.)

2.5 Accommodations on State academic content assessments for LEP students

If the State allows accommodations for academic content assessments, check the accommodations used by subgrantees for LEP students in Table 2.5.

Note: if the State has provided information regarding academic content assessment in the students' native language in Table 2.4, check "Assessment in the native language" in this table.

2.5 Test Accommodations			
Accommodations to Presentation		Accommodations to Response	
<u>No</u>	Assessment in the native language	<u>Yes</u>	Answers written directly in test booklet
<u>No</u>	Text changes in vocabulary	<u>Yes</u>	Answers dictated
<u>Yes</u>	Modification of linguistic complexity	<u>No</u>	Responses in native language
<u>Yes</u>	Addition of visual supports		
<u>Yes</u>	Use of glossaries in native language	Accommodations to Timing/Scheduling	
<u>Yes</u>	Use of glossaries in English	<u>Yes</u>	Extra assessment time
<u>No</u>	Linguistic modification of test directions	<u>Yes</u>	Breaks during testing
<u>No</u>	Additional example items/tasks	<u>Yes</u>	Administration in several sessions
<u>No</u>	Oral directions in the native language		
<u>Yes</u>	Use of dictionaries	Accommodations to Setting	
<u>Yes</u>	Reading aloud of questions in English	<u>Yes</u>	Small-group or individual administration
<u>Yes</u>	Directions read aloud or explained	<u>Yes</u>	Separate room administration
		<u> </u> Yes <u> </u> No	Other (Explain)
<small>Rivera, C. and C. Stansfield (2000). <i>An analysis of state policies for the inclusion and accommodation of English language learners in state assessment programs during 1998-1999</i> (Executive Summary). Washington, DC: Center for Equity and Excellence in Education, The George Washington University.</small>			
State response 2.5: (Provide narrative here if "Other" is checked and/or provide additional information as needed.)			

3. Academic Content Assessment Results of Monitored Former LEP Students [Sec. 3121(a)(4) p.1701, 3123(b)(8) p1705]

Monitored former LEP students are those who

- have achieved "proficient" on the State ELP assessment,
- have transitioned into classrooms that are not designed for LEP students,
- are no longer receiving Title III services, and who
- are being monitored for academic content achievement for 2 years after transition

Note: Monitoring of these students is required for 2 consecutive years and results must be reported whether or not they are in a grade counted for AYP.

3.1 Provide the count of "monitored former LEP students" in Table 3.1 below.

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. **Non-AYP Grades 3+** = Grades 3 and above not tested for AYP.
4. **Total** = The sum of the subtotal of monitored LEP students in grades tested for AYP and the number of former LEP students in grades not tested for AYP.

Table 3.1 Former LEP Student by Year Monitored

GRADE	2004-2005		2005-2006	
	# YEAR ONE	# YEAR TWO	# YEAR ONE	# YEAR TWO
3	791	752	741	610
4	0	0	609	613
5	538	700	662	493
6	0	0	910	491
7	0	0	970	489
8	629	627	699	672
HS	2566	2492	2811	1885
Subtotal	4524	4571	7402	5253
Non-AYP Grades 3+	2004	2064	0	0
TOTAL	6528	6635	7402	5253

Comments: In 2004-2005 Virginia did not administer the Standards of Learning reading/language arts and mathematics tests at grades 4, 6, or 7.

3.2 Academic achievement results by grade of monitored former LEP students tested for AYP.

It is not necessary to respond to items that reference other collections in this form. Information provided by SEAs to the referenced collections will be collected and utilized to produce the Biennial Report.

Definitions:

1. **Subject** = academic content subject areas in which former LEP student achievements are monitored
2. **Grade** = grade of the monitored former LEP students
3. **# monitored** = number of former LEP students being monitored for each year (year 1 plus year 2)
4. **# Proficient & Advanced** = the sum of the number of monitored former LEP students who achieved the "Proficient" level and the number of monitored LEP students who achieved the "Advanced" level on the State content tests
5. **# Below proficient** = the number of monitored former LEP students who did not achieve proficient level on the State academic content test at grade level
6. **Total** = the total numbers for each column and each subject

3.2 Monitored Former LEP Student Results by Grade

Note that the information from the CSPR shown in this table is read only. Revisions can be made to the 2005-2006 CSPR data through December 31, 2006. The 2004-2005 CSPR data cannot be updated at this time.

SUBJECT	GRADE	2004-2005			2005-2006		
		# MONITORED	# PROFICIENT & ADVANCED	# BELOW PROFICIENT	# MONITORED	# PROFICIENT & ADVANCED	# BELOW PROFICIENT
MATHEMATICS	3	1543	608	935	1351	410	941
	4	0			1222	651	571
	5	1238	902	336	1155	762	393
	6	0			1401	448	953
	7	0			1459	206	1253
	8	1256	977	279	1371	554	817
	HS	5058	2357	2701	4696	1693	3003
	TOTAL	9095			12655	4724	7931
RDG/LANGUAGE ARTS	3	1543	575	968	1351	375	976
	4	0			1222	710	512
	5	1238	897	341	1155	835	320
	6	0			1401	735	666
	7	0			1459	462	997
	8	1256	899	357	1371	796	575
	HS	5058	657	4401	4696	681	4015
	TOTAL	9095			12655	4594	8061

Comments: In 2004-2005 Virginia did not administer the Standards of Learning reading/language arts and mathematics tests at grades 4, 6, or 7.

3.2.3 Does the State include the students reported in Table 3.2 in the calculations for the LEP subgroup AYP?

Yes

Comments:

3.2.4 Provide the number of the Year 1 and Year 2 monitored former LEP students in grades not tested for AYP who met grade level academic achievement standards in Math and Reading/Language Arts based on State/local criteria.

3.2.4 Performance of Monitored Former LEP Students /Non-AYP Grades			
2004-2005		2005-2006	
# Achieved Grade Level Standards		# Achieved Grade Level Standards	
Monitored Year 1	Monitored Year 2	Monitored Year 1	Monitored Year 2

Comments: These data were not collected for the 2004-2005 or 2005-2006 school years.

State response 3.2.4: (Describe how the monitored former LEP students in the State are performing at grade level or meeting grade level standards.)

These data were not collected for the 2004-2005 or 2005-2006 school years.

3.2.5 What percentage of the monitored former LEP students were returned to LEP services, if the State exercise such practice?

State response 3.2.5: (Explain the criteria and process of returning monitored former LEP students to LEP services.)

These data were not collected for the 2004-2005 or 2005-2006 school years.

3.2.6 If monitored former LEP students were returned to LEP services, how does this impact the performance of the subgrantees and the State in meeting Title III AMAO for "Attainment" of English proficiency?

State response 3.2.6:

These data were not collected for the 2004-2005 or 2005-2006 school years.

3.3 What is the State's policy on monitored former LEP students when they fail to meet state academic achievement standards? What technical assistance does the State provide to subgrantees whose monitored former LEP students do not meet State academic achievement standards during the 2 years while those students were being monitored?

State response 3.3: (Provide narrative here)

To assist subgrantees in ensuring former LEP students meet state academic achievement standards, the Virginia Department of Education (VDOE) offers technical assistance to school divisions. Some examples of technical assistance offered by the state are provided below.

Graduate-level Course: EDUC 600 Reading and Writing Strategies for English Language Learners (ELL) Students

VDOE works in collaboration with George Mason University to provide a three-hour graduate level course entitled "EDUC 600: Reading and Writing Strategies for English Language Learners" to ESL teachers, content teachers, and administrators in school divisions throughout the state. The course has been offered since 2004, and has been approved by the Office of Teacher Licensure as one of the elective requirements for the state ESL endorsement.

The course provides a strong foundation in effective approaches for teaching reading and writing to ELL students. Course topics include: 1) recent research on reading comprehension; 2) bi-literacy acquisition; 3) interaction between reading and writing; 4) current practice in literacy instruction; 5) evaluating reading and writing growth in the classroom and; 6) authentic, performance-based assessments of reading and writing. Participants in the course demonstrate an increased knowledge of subject matter, increased teaching knowledge and skills, a greater understanding of effective use of curricula, more effective use of assessment measures, and an increase in effective instructional practices for LEP students.

Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) Training

VDOE collaborates with the Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL) to offer eight-day intensive workshops to ESL and content teachers in divisions throughout the state on the Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) method. The SIOP workshops have been offered since 2004.

The SIOP Model, developed by CAL, incorporates integrated language and content methods, standards-based language and content objectives, language strategies, cooperative learning strategies, and the integration of background knowledge. It consists of eight major instructional components: preparation, building background, comprehensible input, strategies, interaction, practice/application, lesson delivery, and review/assessment. In SIOP workshops, teachers learn to incorporate these eight components into their teaching. The workshops include a variety of activities such as lecture, demonstration, analysis of video teaching sequences, small group tasks, and the creation of instructional activities.

Mathematics Focused Professional Development

Regional academies were offered throughout the state during the 2004-2005 and 2005-2006 school years for school divisions that needed assistance in meeting Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) targets for mathematics. The professional development academies focused on innovative teaching strategies and practices that ensure success in mathematics. Strategies that are appropriate for students with limited English proficiency (LEP) were an integral part of the presentations. The 2004-2005 academies were conducted by the nationally known mathematics project, EQUALS Programs, developed at the University of California, Berkeley. The 2005-2006 academies were conducted by Department subject matter experts.

Reading First Teacher Reading Academies

As part of the Reading First grant, regional reading academies have been offered throughout the state since 2003. The academies are offered for kindergarten through third grade reading teachers, kindergarten through twelfth grade English as a Second Language teachers, and kindergarten through twelfth grade teachers of special education. Each academy includes a series of sessions built on scientifically-based components of reading instruction as follows: 1) phonemic awareness; 2) phonics; 3) fluency; 4) vocabulary; and 5) comprehension.

4. Title III Subgrantee Performance and State Accountability [Sec. 3122(b)(2) p. 1703, 3123(b)(1, 4) p.1704-5, 3121(b)(2) p. 1701]

4.1 Provide the count for each year in Table 4.1

It is not necessary to respond to items that reference other collections in this form. Information provided by SEAs to the referenced collections will be collected and utilized to produce the Biennial Report.

Note that the information from the CSPR shown in this table is read only. Revisions can be made to the 2005-2006 CSPR data through December 31, 2006. The 2004-2005 CSPR data cannot be updated at this time.

Table 4.1 Title III Subgrantee Performance Information		
	2004-2005	2005-2006
Total number of subgrantees for each year	78	80
Total number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs*	15	16
Total number of subgrantees that met 2 AMAOs only	27	37
Number of subgrantees that met AMAOs of Making Progress and ELP Attainment	12	24
Number of subgrantees that met AMAOs of Making Progress and AYP	15	13
Number of subgrantees that met AMAOs of ELP Attainment and AYP	0	0
Total number of subgrantees that met 1 AMAO only	28	26
Number of subgrantees that met AMAOs of Making Progress	19	24
Number of subgrantees that met AMAOs of Attainment of ELP	0	0
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO AYP	9	2
Total number of subgrantees that did not meet any AMAO	8	1
Total number of subgrantees that did not meet AMAOs for two consecutive years	43	45
Total number of subgrantees with an improvement plan for not meeting Title III AMAOs		45
Total number of subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (beginning in 2007-08)		
Comments:		

4.2 Did the State meet all three Title III AMAOs in 2005-2006? *

Yes

* Meeting all three Title III AMAOs means meeting each State set target for each objective:
Making Progress, Attaining Proficiency and making AYP

Comments:

State response 4.2.1: **(Provide narrative here if needed.)**

4.3 Describe the State plan to provide technical assistance in developing improvement plans and other technical assistance to subgrantees that have failed to meet Title III AMAOs for two or more consecutive years.

State response 4.3: **(Provide narrative here.)**

The Virginia Department of Education has provided several technical assistance programs over the past two years to assist subgrantees that have failed to meet the Title III AMAOs for two or more consecutive years. Examples of some of these programs are listed below.

Data Analysis for Improving LEP Student Achievement

During summer of 2005, a technical assistance academy was provided for Title III coordinators across the state. The focus of the academy was using division-level data on LEP student performance on state academic content assessments as well as English language proficiency assessments to improve LEP student achievement. Included in the academy was an opportunity for local school divisions that had not met their AMAOs for two consecutive years to draft improvement plans.

Reporting and Data Analysis Requirements for LEP Students

During spring of 2006, a Web-based technical assistance program was provided for Title III coordinators across the state. The technical assistance focused on the reporting requirements for LEP students under the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 as well as the requirement to develop an improvement plan if the Title III AMAOs had not been met for two or more consecutive years.

Building Capacity through Knowledge

In July 2005 and July 2006, academies were provided for new Title III Coordinators. Included in the academy was the requirement to develop an improvement plan for any Title III subgrantee that fails to meet the Title III AMAOs for two or more consecutive years.

Future academies similar to those described above are currently being planned for subgrantees that fail to meet the Title III AMAOs for the 2006-2007 school year.

5. Programs and Activities for Immigrant Children and Youth [Sec. 3115(e)(1)(A-G) p. 1699]

5.1 Complete Table 5.1

It is not necessary to respond to items that reference other collections in this form. Information provided by SEAs to the referenced collections will be collected and utilized to produce the Biennial Report.

Definitions:

1. **# immigrants enrolled in the State** = the number of students, who meet the definition of immigrant children and youth in Section 3301(6), enrolled in elementary or secondary schools in the State
2. **# immigrants served by Title III** = the 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
3. **# of immigrant subgrants** = the number of subgrants made in the State under Section 3114(d)(1), with the funds reserved for immigrant education programs/activities

Note that the information from the CSPR shown in this table is read only. Revisions can be made to the 2005-2006 CSPR data through December 31, 2006. The 2004-2005 CSPR data cannot be updated at this time.

Table 5.1 Education Programs for Immigrant Students

2004-2005			2005-2006		
# Immigrants enrolled in the State	# Immigrants served by Title III	# Immigrant subgrants	# Immigrants enrolled in the State	# Immigrants served by Title III	# Immigrant subgrants
23232	15658	31	26040	25912	32

Comments:

State response 5.1: (Provide information on what has changed, e.g., sudden influx of large number of immigrant children and youth, increase/change of minority language groups, or sudden population change in school districts that are less experienced with education services for immigrant students in the State during the 2 previous years.)

The number of immigrant children and youth has continued to increase in Virginia over the past two years. In 2004-2005, 23,232 immigrant children and youth were enrolled in Virginia's 132 school divisions. In 2005-2006, the number of immigrant children and youth enrolled in Virginia's 132 school divisions increased to 26,040.

5.2 Provide information on the programs or activities conducted by subgrantees for immigrant children and youth.

Instructions: Provide the number of subgrantees who have conducted each of the activities in Table 5.2 for the education enhancement of immigrant children and youth. A subgrantee may conduct more than one such activity. This table requires the aggregated number of activities conducted in the 2 years covered by this biennial report. The State should provide more detailed information for each year in the narrative if needed.

5.2 Subgrantee Activities for Immigrant Youth and Children	
# subgrantees	Activity conducted
	family literacy, parent outreach, and training
	support for personnel, including teacher aides, to provide services for immigrant children and youth
	provision of tutorials, mentoring, and academic career counseling
	identification and acquisition of curricular materials, software, and technologies
	basic instructional services
	other instructional services, such as programs of introduction to the educational system and civics education
	activities coordinated with community based organizations, institutions of higher education, private sector entities, or other entities to assist parents by offering comprehensive community services
	Other authorized activities for the education of immigrant children and youth (Describe)

Comments: These data were not collected for the 2004-2005 or 2005-2006 school years.

State response 5.2: (Summarize the most common activities conducted and discuss the effectiveness of the activities in meeting the needs of the immigrant children and youth and in achieving the goals of this program.)

The state does not currently collect data on the number of subgrantees conducting activities solely with immigrant and youth funds. Eligible school divisions apply for both Title III, Part A, and Immigrant and Youth funds. Through this joint funding stream, the majority of school divisions use the funds for family literacy, parental outreach, tutoring, curriculum materials and software, and instructional services.

5.3 Distribution of Funds

How does the State distribute the funds reserved for the education of immigrant children and youth to subgrantees? (Check those that apply)

Annual	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	Competitive	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Multi-year	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Formula	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No

Comments:

State response 5.3: (Provide additional information on the State's subgrant process, as needed)

Virginia reserves five percent of the state set-aside for Immigrant Children and Youth Funding under Title III. School divisions in the state that have experienced an increase of five or more immigrant children and youth as compared to the average of the two preceding fiscal years prior to the fiscal year for which the subgrants are awarded are eligible for funding in this category. The state considers equally eligible entities that meet the above criteria but have no experience serving immigrant children and youth. The state also considers the quality of each local plan and ensures that each subgrant is of sufficient size and scope to meet the purposes of this part.

6. Title III Programs or Activities (as described in Section 3115 (c, d & e)) Conducted by Subgrantees Terminated for Failure to Reach Program Goals During the Two Preceding Years [Sec. 3123(b)(7) p.1705]

6.1 Programs/Activities for Immigrant Children and Youth Terminated for Failing to Reach Program Goals
Were any Title III language instruction educational programs OR programs and activities for immigrant children and youth terminated for failure to reach program goals during the two preceding years in the State?
<u>No</u>
(If NO, proceed to 7. If YES, provide the number in 6.1.2.)
Comments:
6.1.2 Number of terminated programs or activities
State Response 6.1.2: (Provide a summary explaining why these programs or activities did not reach program goals.)

7. Teacher Information and Professional Development Activities Conducted by Subgrantees [Sec. 3115(c)(1)(B) p. 1698, Sec. 3116 (c) p.1701, 3123(b)(5) p. 1705]

7.1 Provide the number of teachers in the State who are working in the Title III language instruction educational programs as defined in SEC. 3301(8) and reported in Table 1.1.

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

Total number of certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs in the State.	1571
---	------

Total estimated number of additional certified/licensed teachers that the State will need for the Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years *	
--	--

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

State response 7.1: (Provide narrative here if needed.)

Data are not currently collected on the estimated number of additional certified/licensed teachers.

7.2.1 Does the State require special certification/licensure/endorsement for teachers who teach in language instruction educational programs (Section 3301(8))?

Yes

If **yes**, describe the eligibility requirements for teachers to teach in language instruction educational programs in the State.

If **no**, does the State plan to develop eligibility requirements for teachers to teach in language instruction educational programs?

State response 7.2.1: (Provide narrative here if needed.)

Teachers must demonstrate the following competencies: knowledge of general linguistics and English linguistics; skills in elementary and secondary teaching methods and student assessment for English as a second language; skills in the teaching of reading; knowledge of the effects of socio-cultural variables in the instruction setting; proficiency in spoken and written English; knowledge of another language and its structure; and understanding of and proficiency in grammar, usage, and mechanics and their integration in writing. The teachers must also meet the following requirements for endorsement in English as a second language. Teachers must have graduated from an approved teacher preparation program in English as a second language or have completed a major in English as a second language or 24 semester hours or coursework distributed in the following areas: teaching of reading: 3 semester hours; English linguistics (including phonology, morphology, syntax of English): 3 semester hours; cross-cultural education: 3 semester hours; modern foreign languages: 6 semester hours; electives in second language acquisition, general linguistics, applied linguistics, psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics, ESL assessment, or ESL curriculum development: 6 semester hours; and methods of teaching English as a second language at the elementary and secondary levels: 3 semester hours.

7.2.2 Does the State have specific qualification requirements in addition to those cited in Section 1119(3)(g) for paraprofessionals who assist teachers in Title III language instruction educational programs?

No

State response 7.2.2: (Provide narrative here if needed.)

7.3 How is teacher language fluency determined for English and any other language of instruction used in Title III language instruction educational programs? (SEC. 3116(c))

Instructions:

Fill in the number of subgrantees that use each of the following methods. This table requires the aggregated data for the 2 years covered by this biennial report. The State should provide additional information for each year in the narrative response, if needed.

7.3 Methods of Determining Language Fluency	
# of Subgrantees	Methods
80	State required English fluency exam for oral and written skills
	State required exam for fluency in another language for oral and written skills
	State certification/recertification/licensing requirement
	LEA required English fluency exam for oral and written communication skills
	LEA required fluency exam for another language for oral and written skills
	LEA testing/interview during hiring
	LEA endorsed, based on professional development and other training
	LEA determined other evidence of language fluency (explain)
	Other (explain)
State response 7.3: (Provide narrative here if needed.)	

7.4 Provide information on the subgrantees that conducted professional development activities that met Title III requirements (SEC. 3115 (c)(2 A-D)) in Table 7.4.

Instructions:

Report professional development activities that are funded under Title III and/or related to Title III required activities ONLY. The table covers the period of this report.

Definitions:

1. **Professional Development Activity** = subgrantee activities for professional development required under Title III [SEC. 3115(c)(2)(A-D)]
2. **# subgrantees** = the number of subgrantees who conducted each type of professional development activity. A subgrantee may conduct more than one professional development activity.
3. **Total Number of Participants** = the total number of teachers, administrators and other personnel who participated in each type of the professional development (PD) activities

7.4 Subgrantee Professional Development Activities		
Type of PD Activity	# Subgrantees	
Instructional strategies for LEP students		
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students		
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students		
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards		
Subject matter knowledge for teachers		
Other (Explain)		
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	Total Number of Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers		
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers		
PD provided to principals		
PD provided to administrators/other than principals		
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative		
PD provided to community based organizational personnel		

Comments: The state does not currently collect these data.

7.4 State response: (Explain what the State did to ensure that PD activities conducted by subgrantees meet the Title III requirements under Section 3115 (c)(2)(A-D), including how the PD activities were based on scientific research and were effective in enhancing teacher knowledge and skills in teaching LEP students.)

The Virginia Department of Education ensured that the subgrantees conducted professional development activities that meet Title III requirements through the following:

Title III Application Process

To receive Title III, Part A, funds, a school division must submit a Title III application using the Web-based Online Management of Education Grant Awards (OMEGA) system. Applications pass through several levels of review at the state level for approval to ensure that the policies, procedures, and activities developed by the school divisions meet the requirements of Title III, Part A, including providing high-quality research-based professional development to teachers, principals, administrators, and other school personnel.

Federal Program Monitoring

School divisions receive federal program monitoring visits as an extension of the established Virginia Department of Education academic review process. Trained federal program monitors conduct on-site visits to selected school divisions to monitor for program compliance for federal requirements and ensure the correction of deficiencies in program implementation and operations. Federal program monitors ensure that professional development activities which meet Title III, Part A, requirements are being conducted by the school divisions.

Technical Assistance Academy for New Title I, Title II, and Title III Coordinators

A professional development academy entitled, "Building Capacity Through Knowledge" was provided to assist new Title I, Part A; Title II, Part A; and Title III, Part A, coordinators, with two or less years experience, in understanding the requirements of Title I, Part A; Title II, Part A; and Title III, Part A, of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. This academy was held in summer 2005 and 2006. An integral part of the academy was ensuring that new Title III coordinators understood the professional development requirements in the law.

Technical Assistance Academy on Completing the 2006-2007 Applications for Federal Funds Under the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB)

Regional technical assistance academies were held to provide guidance to school divisions in completing the 2005-2006 and 2006-2007

applications for federal funds under the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB). The academies addressed the following topics: 1) mechanics of completing the electronic application; 2) writing measurable goals and objectives; 3) completing the program-specific information requests; 4) implementing research-based professional development activities; and 5) the process for revising and resubmitting the electronic applications.

8. State Level Activities Conducted and Technical Assistance Provided to Subgrantees [Sec. 3111(b)(2)(A-D) p.1691-2, 3123(b)(4) p. 1705]

8.1 Technical Assistance Provided by the States

During the two preceding years, what technical assistance was provided by the State to subgrantees?

(Check all that apply)

The State provided technical assistance to subgrantees in:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1. Identifying and implementing English language instructional programs and curricula based on scientific research
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2. Helping LEP students to meet academic content and student academic achievement standards expected of all students
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3. Identifying or developing and implementing measures of English language proficiency
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4. Promoting parental and community participation in programs that serve LEP children

Comments:

State response 8.1: (Describe how the State evaluates the effectiveness of State level technical assistance (TA), including how the TA has improved subgrantees' performance in assisting LEP students to achieve English proficiency and academic standards.)

The Virginia Department of Education formally evaluates the effectiveness of state level technical assistance activities through on-site surveys completed by participants. Participants rate the technical assistance activity according to a five point scale that includes the following levels: strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree, and strongly disagree. Participants are also asked to list the strengths of the event as well as offer recommendations for improvement. The results are compiled and used for future planning of technical assistance activities.

The professional development activities have also indirectly contributed to the continued success of the LEP students on the state academic content assessments. The LEP student subgroup exceeded the Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) target in reading/language arts of 65 percent for the 2004-2005 and 69 percent for the 2005-2006 school years. Seventy (70) percent of the LEP students scored at the proficient level on the reading/language arts Standards of Learning (SOL) assessment for the 2004-2005 school year. Seventy-two (72) percent of the LEP students scored at the proficient level on the reading/language arts SOL assessment for the 2005-2006 school year. The LEP student subgroup also exceeded the AYP target in mathematics of 63 percent for the 2004-2005 school year. Seventy-seven (77) percent of the LEP students scored at the proficient level on the mathematics SOL assessment for the 2004-2005 school year. The LEP student subgroup met or exceeded the AYP target in mathematics of 67 percent for the 2005-2006 school year in every grade except sixth, seventh, and eighth. The implementation of new mathematics SOL assessments at these grade levels impacted all subgroups.

8.2 Other State activities conducted during the two preceding years, and the effectiveness of such activities.

Check all that apply

8.2.1 Professional development and other activities to assist personnel in meeting certification requirements	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Increased the number of certified/licensed/endorsed teachers for language instruction educational programs in the State
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	Increased the number of teachers trained in teaching LEP students by course credits or professional development points towards certification/endorsement
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	Increased teacher knowledge and ability in using State ELP standards and assessment
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Other (explain)
Comments:	

8.2.2 Planning, evaluation, administration, and interagency coordination related to subgrants	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	Planning: facilitated comprehensive services for LEP students
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	Planning: facilitated utilizing all professional development resources for the training of all teachers on the teaching and learning of LEP students
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	Evaluation: informed improvement of Title III program implementation
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	Interagency Coordination: facilitated establishing State level standards and/or guidelines for instructional and other educational services for LEP students
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	Consolidating Title III SEA Administrative Funds: provided additional resources for Title III program implementation/administration
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Other (explain)
Comments:	

8.2.3 Recognition of subgrantees that exceeded AMAOs	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
Comments:	

8.2.4 Other state level authorized activities	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
Comments:	

State response 8.2: (Describe how the State evaluates the effectiveness of State level activities conducted, including how these activities have improved subgrantees' performance in assisting LEP students to achieve English proficiency and academic standards.)

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.

The Virginia Department of Education formally evaluates the effectiveness of state level technical assistance activities through on-site surveys completed by participants. Participants rate the technical assistance activity according to a five point scale that includes the following levels: strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree, and strongly disagree. Participants are also asked to list the strengths of the event as well as offer recommendations for improvement. The results are compiled and used for future planning of technical assistance activities.

The professional development activities have also indirectly contributed to the continued success of the LEP students on the state academic content assessments. The LEP student subgroup exceeded the Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) target in reading/language arts of 65 percent for the 2004-2005 and 69 percent for the 2005-2006 school years. Seventy (70) percent of the LEP students scored at the proficient level on the reading/language arts Standards of Learning (SOL) assessment for the 2004-2005 school year. Seventy-two (72) percent of the LEP students scored at the proficient level on the reading/language arts SOL assessment for the 2005-2006 school year. The LEP student subgroup also exceeded the AYP target in mathematics of 63 percent for the 2004-2005 school year. Seventy-seven (77) percent of the LEP students scored at the proficient level on the mathematics SOL assessment for the 2004-2005 school year. The LEP student subgroup met or exceeded the AYP target in mathematics of 67 percent for the 2005-2006 school year in every grade except sixth, seventh, and eighth. The implementation of new mathematics SOL assessments at these grade levels impacted all subgroups.

8.3 Compliance with parental notification and parental participation requirements under Section 3302. Describe how the State ensured that subgrantees:

1. complied with parental notification provisions for identification and placement. Ensured that parents were informed on all the requirements specified in [SEC. 3302(a)(1-8) p. 1732]
2. complied with parental notification when the LEA failed to meet Title III annual measurable achievement objectives each year within prescribed time frame [SEC. 3302(b) p. 1732]
3. provided parental notifications in an understandable and uniform format, and, to the extent practical, in a language that the parent could understand. [SEC. 3302(c) p. 1732-3]
4. fulfilled the parental participation and outreach provisions. [SEC. 3302(e) p. 1732-3]

State response 8.3: (Address each of the items above.)

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.

1. The Department of Education ensured that subgrantees met parental notification and parental participation requirements in Section 3302 through assurances in the applications for federal funding. Superintendents and board chairpersons from all school divisions who receive Title III, Part A, funds sign an assurance as part of the application process stating that the local educational agency will comply with the parental notification requirements. In addition, parental notification expectations are included in Virginia's Title III, Part A, Technical Assistance Document, which was provided to Title III, Part A, Coordinators in each school division. Parental notification requirements as described in the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 have been included in several statewide presentations such as: the Technical Assistance Academies for New Title I, Title II, and Title III Coordinators (summers 2005 and 2006), Technical Assistance Academy on Completing the Applications for Federal Funds Under the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (March 2005 and 2006), and the Web-based Technical Assistance (April 2006). In addition, information about parental notification requirements under Title III has been presented at several statewide conferences including: Virginia ESL Supervisor's Association (VESA) meetings (October 2005 and September 2006), VESA Conference (February 2005 and 2006), Virginia Association for Teachers of Speakers of Other Languages (VATESOL) conference (September 2006), the Institute for Teaching Through Technology and Innovative Practices (ITTIP) at the Longwood University consortium for the Southside Virginia (May, October, and November 2006), and the Virginia Association of Federal Program Administrators (VAFEPA) conference (October 2006).

The Virginia Department of Education also assists school divisions in meeting parental notification requirements under Title III, Part A, through a professional development academy for Title III coordinators or their designee. The two day academy was offered in July 2005 and 2006, and is entitled, "Parents as Educational Partners (PEP): School Related Curriculum for Language Minority Parents." The academy prepares Title III coordinators or designees to train school division personnel on appropriate programs to assist limited English proficient (LEP) parents in overcoming language and cultural barriers that make them particularly vulnerable to being left out of their children's educational experiences.

2. School divisions receive federal program monitoring visits as an extension of the established Virginia Department of Education academic review process. Trained federal program monitors conduct on-site visits to selected school divisions to monitor for program compliance for federal requirements and ensure the correction of deficiencies in program implementation and operations. Federal program monitors ensure that parental notification activities which meet Title III, Part A, requirements are being conducted by the school divisions.

3. To ensure that school divisions meet the parental notification requirements of Title III, Part A, with regard to providing communication in a language that parents can understand, the Virginia Department of Education conducts federal program monitoring visits as an extension of the established Virginia Department of Education academic review process. Trained federal program monitors ensure that parental notification activities which meet Title III requirements are being conducted by the school divisions in languages that are understandable for parents to the extent practicable. In addition, the Department's ESL Web site provides a variety of documents, translated from English into Spanish, which are commonly used by school divisions to communicate with parents. Over 50 percent of limited English proficient (LEP) students in Virginia are Spanish-speakers. The ESL Web site also includes a parental involvement document entitled, "Best Practices for Inclusion of Limited English Proficient (LEP) Parents in Education." This document contains an overview of federal requirements under the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB) and strategies to promote LEP parental involvement. The document contains a chart of effective parental involvement programs being implemented in Virginia and a self-assessment checklist to help school divisions develop programs.

4. The Department of Education ensured that subgrantees met parental notification and parental participation requirements in Section 3302 through assurances in the Title III, Part A, in the following ways: 1) the application process for federal funds; 2) federal program monitoring for Title III, Part A, program compliance; 3) parental notification expectations included in Virginia's Title III, Part A, Technical Assistance Document; 4) the Technical Assistance Academies for New Title I, Title II, and Title III Coordinators (summers 2005 and 2006); and 5) a professional development academy for Title III coordinators or their designees entitled, "Parents as Educational Partners (PEP): School Related Curriculum for Language Minority Parents", to train school division personnel on appropriate programs to assist limited English proficient (LEP) parents in overcoming language and cultural barriers.

9. Optional Questions

RESPONSES TO THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS ARE NOT REQUIRED, BUT WOULD BE HELPFUL TO THE DEPARTMENT IN UNDERSTANDING SERVICES TO LEP STUDENTS IN THE STATE.

9.1 Do LEAs provide information to the State on mobility rates for all students? (Mobility rate has been collected by NCES. It is defined in the Common Core of Data collection and in the national education data dictionary.)

Yes No

(If yes, please provide that rate.)

Comments:

9.2 Does the State calculate a State LEP mobility rate?

Yes No

(If yes, please provide that rate.)

Comments:

9.3 Does the State calculate the difference between the LEP subgroup AYP status with or without the inclusion of monitored former LEP students' achievement results?

Yes No

(If yes, what is the difference?)

Comments: