

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT:
Parts I and II**

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

For reporting on
School Year 2006-07

VIRGINIA



PART I DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 28, 2007
PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 2008

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202

INTRODUCTION

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

The Consolidated State Application and Report includes the following *ESEA* programs:

- Title I, Part A – *Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies*
- Title I, Part B, Subpart 3 – *William F. Goodling Even Start Family Literacy Programs*
- Title I, Part C – *Education of Migratory Children*
- Title I, Part D – *Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk*
- Title I, Part F – *Comprehensive School Reform*
- Title II, Part A – *Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund)*
- Title II, Part D – *Enhancing Education through Technology*
- 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 IV, Part B – *21st Century Community Learning Centers.*
- Title V, Part A – *Innovative Programs*
- Title VI, Section 6111 – *Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities*
- Title VI, Part B – *Rural Education Achievement Program*
- Title X, Part C – *Education for Homeless Children and Youths*

The *NCLB* Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2006-07 consists of two information collections.

PART I

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

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

Starting with SY 2005-06, collection of data for the Education of Homeless Children and Youths was added to Part I in order to provide timely data for the program's performance measures. This change allowed ED to retire OMB collection 1810-0650. For SY 2006-07, Migrant Education Program child count information that is used for funding purposes is now collected via Part I. This change allowed ED to retire OMB collection 1810-0519

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.
3. The information will provide valid evidence of program outcomes or results.
4. The CSPR is the best vehicle for collection of the data.

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 2006-07 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, December 28, 2007**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 22, 2008**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2006-07, 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 2006-07 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 2006-07 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

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

	OMB Number: 1810-0614
	Expiration Date: 10/31/2010
<p>Consolidated State Performance Report For State Formula Grant Programs under the Elementary And Secondary Education Act as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001</p>	
Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2006-07 <input type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2006-07	
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	_____ Thursday, March 6, 2008, 3:23:42 PM Date

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT:
PART I**

For reporting on
School Year 2006-07



PART I DUE DECEMBER 28, 2007

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

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

1.1.1 Academic Content Standards

In the space below, provide a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Indicate specifically in what year your state expects the changes to be implemented.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Virginia Standards of Learning (SOL) were originally developed and approved by the Virginia Board of Education in June 1995. Following the schedule established by the Board of Education for revision of all content standards, the mathematics standards are scheduled to be reviewed in 2009. The science standards and reading/language arts standards are scheduled to be reviewed in 2010. Any revisions to the standards for each content area will be implemented the year following the revision.

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

Note: Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts has been added to this data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts

In the space below, provide a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's assessments in mathematics or reading/language arts required under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*. As applicable, include any assessment (e.g., alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards, alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards, native language assessments, or others) implemented to meet the assessment requirements under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*. Indicate specifically in what year your state expects the changes to be implemented.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

For the 2006-2007 school year, Virginia administered reading/language arts and mathematics assessments in grades three through eight. End-of-course Standards of Learning (SOL) assessments in these subject areas were administered at the high school level after completion of the corresponding content course.

The Virginia Alternate Assessment Program (VAAP) that measures alternate achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities has been in place in Virginia since the 2001-2002 school year. The VAAP is aligned to alternate achievement standards. The Virginia Grade Level Alternative Assessment Program (VGLA) has been administered to students with disabilities since the 2004-2005 school year. The VGLA is available for students with disabilities enrolled in third through eighth grades. A collection of evidence is used to demonstrate individual student achievement on grade-level Virginia Standards of Learning assessments for a given course or content areas. The VGLA is aligned to grade-level achievement standards. Additionally beginning with the 2006-2007 school year, limited English proficient (LEP) students at the lowest levels of English language proficiency or in their first year of enrollment in a United States school were also eligible to participate in VGLA to demonstrate proficiency in reading/language arts.

In summer 2007, Virginia was awarded a United States Department of Education (USED) grant to assist in the development of a new alternate assessment based on modified achievement standards for certain students with disabilities. The alternate assessment is planned to be piloted in spring 2008 and fall 2008. Field testing of the alternate assessment is planned for spring 2009 with full implementation planned for spring 2010.

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

Note: The subject of science has been removed from this data element.

1.1.3 Academic Achievement Standards in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts

In the space below, provide a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's academic achievement standards in mathematics or reading/language arts implemented to meet the requirements under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*. As applicable, include alternate achievement standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities and modified academic achievement standards implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*. Indicate specifically in what year your state expects the changes to be implemented.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

No revisions or changes to the academic achievement standards in mathematics or reading/language arts have been taken or are planned.

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

Note: The subject of science has been removed from this data element.

1.1.4 Assessments in Science

In the space below, provide a description of the State's progress in developing and implementing assessments in science that meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA in the required grade levels, including remaining major milestones (e.g., field testing) and a timeline for them. As applicable, include any assessment (e.g., alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards, alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards, native language assessments, or others) implemented to meet the assessment requirements under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Virginia has administered science assessments in third fifth and eighth grades since 1998 year. End-of-course Standards of Learning (SOL) assessments in science have also been administered at the high school level after completion of the corresponding content course since 1998.

The Virginia Alternate Assessment Program (VAAP) that measures alternate achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities has been in place in Virginia since the 2001-2002 school year. The VAAP is aligned to alternate achievement standards. The Virginia Grade Level Alternative Assessment Program (VGLA) has been administered to certain students with disabilities beginning with the 2004-2005 school year. The VGLA is available for certain students with disabilities enrolled in third through eighth grades. A collection of evidence is used to demonstrate individual student achievement on grade-level Virginia Standards of Learning assessments for a given course or content areas. The VGLA is aligned to grade-level achievement standards.

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

Note: This table was formerly part of Section 1.1.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.1.5 Academic Achievement Standards in Science

In the space below, provide a description of the State's progress in developing and implementing academic achievement standards in science that meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) in the required grade levels, including remaining major milestones and a timeline for them. As applicable, include alternate achievement standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Virginia has administered science assessments in third, fifth, and eighth grades since 1998. End-of-course Standards of Learning (SOL) assessments in science have also been administered at the high school level after completion of the corresponding content course since 1998. The academic achievement standards were set for these assessments during the summer of 1998.

New academic achievement standards will be adopted after standard setting in fall 2008 for the eighth-grade science assessment. This assessment will be based on the 2003 revised content standards. Since the assessment covers content in sixth, seventh, and eighth grades, the assessment could not be administered until the entire cohort of students had been exposed to the revised SOL content. After new cut scores are set the science assessment, expert committees will recommend comparable cut scores for the VGLA program in third, fifth, and eighth grades.

The Virginia Alternate Assessment Program (VAAP) that measures alternate achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities has been in place in Virginia since the 2001-2002 school year. The VAAP is aligned to alternate achievement standards.

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

Note: This table was formerly part of Section 1.1.3 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

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

1.2.1 Participation of All Students in Mathematics Assessment

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

The student group "children with disabilities (*IDEA*)" includes children who were tested using regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments.

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Tested	Percent of Students Tested
All students	779324	774750	99.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	2430	2419	99.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	42480	42340	99.7
Black, non-Hispanic	201176	199255	99.1
Hispanic	59676	59229	99.3
White, non-Hispanic	456012	454124	99.6
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	99846	98788	98.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	55687	55403	99.5
Economically disadvantaged students	234830	232660	99.1
Migratory students	549	548	99.8
Male	394797	392086	99.3
Female	384527	382664	99.5
Comments:			

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

Note: This table was formerly Section 1.2.1.1 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. For the SY 2006-07 CSPR, the total number of students enrolled has been added to this data collection.

1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Mathematics Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of children with disabilities (IDEA) tested during the State's testing window for 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 were tested in mathematics for each type of assessment will be calculated automatically. The total number of children with disabilities (IDEA) tested will also be calculated automatically.

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Tested	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Tested, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	28087	28.4
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	56434	57.1
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	6964	7.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	7303	7.4
Total	98788	
Comments: According to EDEN partner support, a programming error in this chart is requiring a comment in this section. The total number of children with disabilities tested as reported in this chart equals the total number of children with disabilities tested as reported in 1.2.1. A comment should not be required.		

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

Note: This table was formerly Section 1.2.2.1 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Tested	Percent of Students Tested
All students	634457	631493	99.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	1978	1971	99.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	33751	33684	99.8
Black, non-Hispanic	164728	163429	99.2
Hispanic	48499	48250	99.5
White, non-Hispanic	370885	369663	99.7
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	88690	87659	98.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	45032	44854	99.6
Economically disadvantaged students	199471	197953	99.2
Migratory students	470	466	99.2
Male	324407	322569	99.4
Female	310050	308924	99.6
Comments:			

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

Note: This table was formerly Section 1.2.1.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. For the SY 2006-07 CSPR, the total number of students enrolled has been added to this data collection.

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

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Tested	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Tested, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	25171	28.7
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	47813	54.5
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	7380	8.4
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	7295	8.3
Total	87659	
Comments: According to EDEN partner support, a programming error in this chart is requiring a comment in this section. The total number of children with disabilities tested as reported in this chart equals the total number of children with disabilities tested as reported in 1.2.3. A comment should not be required.		

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

Note: This table was formerly Section 1.2.2.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

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

1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics

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

The student group "children with disabilities (*IDEA*)" includes children who were tested using regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments.

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

1.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts

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

1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	89239	79294	88.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	270	238	88.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	4990	4736	94.9
Black, non-Hispanic	22758	18356	80.7
Hispanic	7651	6391	83.5
White, non-Hispanic	50849	47149	92.7
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	12349	9158	74.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	8594	7173	83.5
Economically disadvantaged students	31146	25346	81.4
Migratory students	92	82	89.1
Male	45943	40732	88.7
Female	43296	38562	89.1
Comments: The ten percent variance in the number of Asian or Pacific Islander students, Hispanic students, limited English proficient students, economically disadvantaged students, and migratory students is due to an increase in the number of students reported.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by *EDFacts* in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

Grade 3	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	88825	71453	80.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	270	219	81.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	4857	4144	85.3
Black, non-Hispanic	22738	16111	70.9
Hispanic	7496	4838	64.5
White, non-Hispanic	50772	43936	86.5
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	12305	7679	62.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	8211	5056	61.6
Economically disadvantaged students	30972	21419	69.2
Migratory students	90	64	71.1
Male	45683	35840	78.5
Female	43142	35613	82.6
Comments: The ten percent variance in the percentage of students performing at or above proficient from the 2005-2006 submission for the Hispanic students, children with disabilities, and limited English proficient students is attributed to a decrease in their performance on the reading/language arts assessment. The ten percent variance in the number of economically disadvantaged students and migratory students from the 2005-2006 submission is attributed to an increase in the number of students reported.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by *EDFacts* in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	87568	70691	80.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	256	217	84.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	4890	4429	90.6
Black, non-Hispanic	21957	15111	68.8
Hispanic	7434	5201	70.0
White, non-Hispanic	50707	43803	86.4
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	12393	7674	61.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	8096	5597	69.1
Economically disadvantaged students	29648	20407	68.8
Migratory students	57	41	71.9
Male	44912	36293	80.8
Female	42656	34398	80.6

Comments: The ten percent variance in the number of limited English proficient students and migratory students from the 2005-2006 submission is attributed to an increase in the number of students reported. The ten percent variance in the percentage of students performing at or above proficient from the 2005-2006 submission for the migratory students is attributed to a decrease in their performance on the mathematics assessment.

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

Grade 4	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	87419	76168	87.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	258	240	93.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	4755	4373	92.0
Black, non-Hispanic	21982	17627	80.2
Hispanic	7360	5666	77.0
White, non-Hispanic	50723	46188	91.1
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	12332	8557	69.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	7797	5732	73.5
Economically disadvantaged students	29576	23098	78.1
Migratory students	60	48	80.0
Male	44814	38323	85.5
Female	42605	37845	88.8

Comments:

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	85783	74339	86.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	289	245	84.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	4430	4135	93.3
Black, non-Hispanic	22209	17684	79.6
Hispanic	7156	5606	78.3
White, non-Hispanic	49809	45020	90.4
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	12559	8741	69.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	7497	5822	77.7
Economically disadvantaged students	29211	22876	78.3
Migratory students	59	47	79.7
Male	43757	37432	85.6
Female	42026	36907	87.8

Comments: The ten percent variance in the number of Asian or Pacific Islander and limited English proficient students from the 2005-2006 submission is attributed to an increase in the number of students reported. The ten percent variance in the percentage of students performing at or above proficient from the 2005-2006 submission for the children with disabilities and migratory students is attributed to an increase in their performance on the mathematics assessment.

Source – Initially prepopulated by *EDFacts* in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

Grade 5	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	88409	76672	86.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	293	266	90.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	4778	4312	90.3
Black, non-Hispanic	22418	17884	79.8
Hispanic	7166	5320	74.2
White, non-Hispanic	51774	47134	91.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	12606	8633	68.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	7348	5168	70.3
Economically disadvantaged students	29257	22649	77.4
Migratory students	59	40	67.8
Male	45129	38181	84.6
Female	43280	38491	88.9

Comments: The ten percent variance in the number of Asian or Pacific Islander and limited English proficient students from the 2005-2006 submission is attributed to an increase in the number of students reported. The ten percent variance in the percentage of students performing at or above proficient from the 2005-2006 submission for the limited English proficient students is attributed to a decrease in their performance on the reading/language arts assessment.

Source – Initially prepopulated by *EDFacts* in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	81874	49532	60.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	267	169	63.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	3769	3019	80.1
Black, non-Hispanic	22318	9825	44.0
Hispanic	6713	3215	47.9
White, non-Hispanic	46918	32151	68.5
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	12798	5054	39.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6312	2934	46.5
Economically disadvantaged students	28768	12702	44.2
Migratory students	61	32	52.5
Male	42175	25153	59.6
Female	39699	24379	61.4

Comments: The ten percent variance in the number of limited English proficient students and migratory students from the 2005-2006 submission is attributed to an increase in the number of students reported. The ten percent variance in the percentage of students performing at or above proficient from the 2005-2006 submission for all students, American Indian or Alaska Native students, Black non-Hispanic students, Hispanic students, White non-Hispanic students, children with disabilities, limited English proficient students, economically disadvantaged students, migratory students, male students, and female students is attributed to an increase in their performance on the mathematics assessment.

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

Grade 6	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	89929	75900	84.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	304	266	87.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	4567	4182	91.6
Black, non-Hispanic	23256	17365	74.7
Hispanic	7057	5029	71.3
White, non-Hispanic	52706	47340	89.8
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	12998	7775	59.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6473	4314	66.7
Economically disadvantaged students	29588	21407	72.4
Migratory students	61	38	62.3
Male	46317	37918	81.9
Female	43612	37982	87.1

Comments: The ten percent variance in the number of limited English proficient students from the 2005-2006 submission is attributed to an increase in the number of students reported. The ten percent variance in the percentage of students performing at or above proficient from the 2005-2006 submission for migratory students is attributed to an increase in their performance on the reading/language arts assessment.

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07

CSPR.

1.3.9 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	76512	42474	55.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	231	131	56.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	3421	2513	73.5
Black, non-Hispanic	21933	8686	39.6
Hispanic	6162	2538	41.2
White, non-Hispanic	43181	27804	64.4
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	12388	4556	36.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5433	2173	40.0
Economically disadvantaged students	27288	10880	39.9
Migratory students	63	31	49.2
Male	39668	21622	54.5
Female	36844	20852	56.6

Comments: The ten percent variance in the number of American Indian or Alaska Native students from the 2005-2006 submission is attributed to an decrease in the number of students reported. The ten percent variance in the number of limited English proficient students from the 2005-2006 submission is attributed to an increase in the number of students reported. The ten percent variance in the percentage of students performing at or above proficient from the 2005-2006 submission for all students, American Indian or Alaska Native students, Asian or Pacific Islander students, Black non-Hispanic students, Hispanic students, White non-Hispanic students, children with disabilities, limited English proficient students, economically disadvantaged students, migratory students, male students, and female students is attributed to an increase in their performance on the mathematics assessment.

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

Grade 7	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	91385	75375	82.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	282	250	88.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	4621	4113	89.0
Black, non-Hispanic	24437	17647	72.2
Hispanic	6818	4796	70.3
White, non-Hispanic	53301	47005	88.2
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	12814	6983	54.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5627	3477	61.8
Economically disadvantaged students	29615	20488	69.2
Migratory students	61	38	62.3
Male	46991	37396	79.6
Female	44394	37979	85.6

Comments: The ten percent variance in the number of American Indian or Alaska Native students from the 2005-2006 submission is attributed to an decrease in the number of students reported. The ten percent variance in the number of Hispanic students, limited English proficient students, and migratory students from the 2005-2006 submission is attributed to an increase in the number of students reported.

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.3.11 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	93365	71861	77.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	303	236	77.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	4395	3970	90.3
Black, non-Hispanic	26043	16750	64.3
Hispanic	6567	4270	65.0
White, non-Hispanic	54120	45310	83.7
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	15021	7078	47.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5186	3233	62.3
Economically disadvantaged students	30025	19170	63.9
Migratory students	57	43	75.4
Male	48278	35976	74.5
Female	45086	35884	79.6

Comments: The ten percent variance in the number of American Indian or Alaska Native students, Hispanic students, limited English proficient students, and economically disadvantaged students from the 2005-2006 submission is attributed to an increase in the number of students reported. The ten percent variance in the percentage of students performing at or above proficient from the 2005-2006 submission for migratory students is attributed to an increase in their performance on the mathematics assessment.

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

Grade 8	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	94193	74911	79.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	309	266	86.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	4750	4111	86.6
Black, non-Hispanic	25598	17297	67.6
Hispanic	6523	4114	63.1
White, non-Hispanic	55050	47675	86.6
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	14385	7125	49.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5107	2677	52.4
Economically disadvantaged students	29488	19095	64.8
Migratory students	53	29	54.7
Male	48471	37039	76.4
Female	45722	37872	82.8

Comments: The ten percent variance in the number of American Indian or Alaska Native students and economically disadvantaged students from the 2005-2006 submission is attributed to an increase in the number of students reported. The ten percent variance in the number of migratory students from the 2005-2006 submission is attributed to a decrease in the number of students reported. The ten percent variance in the percentage of students performing at or above proficient from the 2005-2006 submission for migratory students is attributed to an increase in their performance on the reading/language arts assessment.

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.3.13 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - High School

High School	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	254540	226111	88.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	777	672	86.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	16009	15190	94.9
Black, non-Hispanic	60106	48458	80.6
Hispanic	15924	13378	84.0
White, non-Hispanic	157059	144283	91.9
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	20454	14564	71.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	12151	10298	84.8
Economically disadvantaged students	53748	43701	81.3
Migratory students	135	122	90.4
Male	124271	109715	88.3
Female	130254	116386	89.4

Comments: The ten percent variance in the number of limited English proficient students and economically disadvantaged students from the 2005-2006 submission is attributed to an increase in the number of students reported. The ten percent variance in the percentage of students performing at or above proficient from the 2005-2006 submission for migratory students is attributed to an increase in their performance on the mathematics assessment.

Source – Initially prepopulated by *EDFacts* in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

High School	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	88510	83019	93.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	245	224	91.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	5162	4953	96.0
Black, non-Hispanic	21926	19361	88.3
Hispanic	5234	4729	90.4
White, non-Hispanic	54595	52497	96.2
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	9501	7078	74.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3571	3095	86.7
Economically disadvantaged students	18016	15693	87.1
Migratory students	63	54	85.7
Male	43530	40407	92.8
Female	44976	42609	94.7

Comments: The ten percent variance in the number of migratory students from the 2005-2006 submission is attributed to an increase in the number of students reported. The ten percent variance in the percentage of students performing at or above proficient from the 2005-2006 submission for limited English proficient students and migratory students is attributed to an increase in their performance on the reading/language arts assessment.

Source – Initially prepopulated by *EDFacts* in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY

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

1.4.1 All Schools and Districts Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public elementary and secondary schools and districts in the State and the total number of those schools and districts that made AYP based on data for the SY 2006-07 school year. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	# That Made AYP in SY 2006-07	Percentage That Made AYP in SY 2006-07
Schools	1836	1361	74.1
Districts	132	59	44.7

Comments: The EDEN files submitted to EDFact by Virginia Department of Education are not correctly pre-populating in this table. Virginia Department of Education staff have been in contact with EDEN Partner Support to resolve the issue. The correct number of total schools is 1838. The correct number of schools that made AYP in 2006-2007 is 1361. The correct percentage of schools that made AYP in 2006-2007 is 74 percent. The division information is correct.

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

1.4.2 Title I School Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public Title I schools by type and the total number of those schools that made AYP based on data for the SY 2006-07 school year. Include only public Title I schools. Do not include Title I programs operated by local educational agencies in private schools. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools That Made AYP in SY 2006-07	Percentage of Title I Schools That Made AYP in SY 2006-07
All Title I schools	738	554	75.1
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	340	256	75.3
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	398	298	74.9

Comments: The EDEN files submitted to EDFact by the Virginia Department of Education are not correctly pre-populating in this table. Virginia Department of Education staff have been in contact with EDEN Partner Support to resolve the issue. The correct number of Title I schools is 739. The correct number of Title I schools that made AYP in 2006-2007 is 538. The correct percentage of Title I schools that made AYP in 2006-2007 is 72.8 percent. The correct number of schoolwide Title I schools is 341. The correct number of schoolwide Title I schools that made AYP in 2006-2007 is 268. The correct percentage of schoolwide Title I schools that made AYP in 2006-2007 is 78.6 percent. The correct number of targeted assistance Title I schools is 398. The correct number of targeted assistance Title I schools that made AYP in 2006-2007 is 270. The correct percentage of targeted assistance Title I schools that made AYP in 2006-2007 is 67.8 percent.

Source – The table above is produced through ED*Facts*. The SEA submits the data in N/X101 for data group 22 and N/X103 for data group 32.

Note: New for the SY 2006-07 CSPR is the data collection requirement to report for public schools and to include data for schoolwide (SWP) and targeted assistance (TAS) Title I Schools.

1.4.3 Accountability of Districts That Received Title I Funds

In the table below, provide the total number of districts that received Title I funds and the total number of those districts that made AYP based on data for SY 2006-07. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2006-07	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2006-07
132	59	44.7

Comments:

Source – Initially, pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X103 that is data group 32 and 582. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly part of Section 1.4.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.4.4 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

1.4.4.1 List of Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

In the following table, provide a list of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 for the SY 2007-08 based on the data from SY 2006-07. For each school on the list, provide the following:

- District Name and NCES ID Code
- School Name and NCES ID Code
- Whether the school missed the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the school missed the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the school missed the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school missed the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2007-08 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: School Improvement – Year 1, School Improvement – Year 2, Corrective Action, Restructuring Year 1 (planning), or Restructuring Year 2 (implementing))¹
- Whether the school is a Title I school (This column is optional and is used only by States that choose to list all schools in improvement.)

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter School Data.

Download template: [Question 1.4.4.1_0607.xls](#) ([Get MS Excel Viewer](#))

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

Note: Identification as Title I school is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

1.4.4.2 Actions Taken for Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

In the space below, describe the measures being taken to address the achievement problems of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring. Include a discussion of the technical assistance provided by and supported by the State, including a description of the statewide systems of support under *NCLB* (e.g., the number of schools served, the nature and duration of assistance provided, etc.).

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Virginia provides a Statewide System of Support as required under section 1117(a) of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB). The statewide system increases the opportunity for all students served by these divisions and schools to meet the state's academic content standards and student academic achievement standards.

Virginia has taken a comprehensive approach to meeting this requirement. Virginia's approach is best described as a toolkit that provides school divisions and schools with the opportunity to select the option(s) that best fits their needs. The toolkit model allows the state to match resources to school divisions and schools based on student achievement analysis and other analyses known to contribute to quality educational programs.

The toolkit is organized into six strands: 1) standards and instructional resources; 2) assessments and data-driven decision making; 3) instructional support interventions and acceleration; 4) teacher quality and leadership development; 5) partnerships and support networks; and 6) accountability for results and informed parents. A description of the components available within each strand and how this approach meets requirements in NCLB is located at:
<http://www.doe.virginia.gov/VDOE/nclb/statewidesupport.pdf>.

Examples of these categories are listed below with representative technical assistance examples.

Standards and Instructional Resources

*Standards of Learning (SOL) Curriculum Frameworks/Enhanced Scope and Sequence/Pacing Guides

*SOL Instructional Modules/LEP and Special Education Differentiation Strategies

Assessment and Data-Driven Decision Making

*SOL Assessments

*Electronic Practice Assessment Tools

Instructional Support Interventions and Acceleration

*Project Graduation

*The PASS Initiative (Partnership of Achieving Successful Schools)

Teacher Quality and Leadership Development

*Guidelines for High Quality Professional Development

*Teacher Recruitment in Hard-to-Staff Schools

Partnerships and Support Networks

*Mathematics and Science Partnerships

*School/University Partnerships

Accountability and Results and Informed Parents

*School Accreditation

*School Division and State Report Cards

Technical Assistance for Title I Schools in School Improvement

Under the third strand of the statewide system of support, the Virginia Department of Education provides technical assistance to schools identified for improvement corrective action or restructuring through a school-level academic review process designed to provide individualized assistance to schools considered to have the greatest need. Schools in greatest need have failed to meet both the adequate yearly progress (AYP) targets and state accreditation requirements.

A school-level academic review and follow up school support teams assist schools in identifying and analyzing instructional and organizational factors affecting student achievement. The review process focuses on the systems, processes, and practices implemented at the school and division level. Information is gathered that relates to the following areas: 1) local curriculum alignment to the state standards; 2) use of time and school scheduling practices; 3) use of data to make instructional and planning decisions; 4) professional development opportunities provided for staff; 5) school improvement planning; 6) implementation of an instructional method or model/program for schools previously warned in English or mathematics; 7) organizational systems and processes; and 8) school culture.

Within each of these areas effective practices have been identified. These indicators are based on state laws, Virginia Board of Education regulations, and on research-based practices known to improve student achievement. On-site review teams collect and analyze data and provide the school with evidence regarding implementation of these practices. After the review, follow-up reports are given to the school and division. The report includes recommendations in developing, revising, and implementing the school's three-year improvement plan. Follow-up technical assistance is also provided.

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

Note: The inclusion of the discussion of technical assistance provided by and supported by the State is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.4.4.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for schools in corrective action, provide the number of schools for which the listed corrective actions under *NCLB* are being implemented.

Corrective Action	# of Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action Is Being Implemented
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	2
Extension of the school year or school day	1
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	8
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	1
Replacement of the principal	0
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	9
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	8
Comments: For school year 2006-2007 15 schools were required to implement the corrective action sanction. Some schools implemented more than one corrective action sanction in the 2006-2007 school year.	

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2

In the table below, for schools in restructuring – year 2 (implementation year), provide the number of schools for which the listed restructuring actions under *NCLB* are being implemented.

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

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.4.5 Districts That Received Title I Funds Identified for Improvement

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

In the following table, provide a list of districts that received Title I funds and were identified for improvement or corrective action under Section 1116 for the SY 2007-08 based on the data from SY 2006-07. For each district on the list, provide the following:

- District Name and NCES ID Code
- Whether the district missed the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the district missed the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the district met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2007-08 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: Improvement or Corrective Action²)
- Whether the district is a district that received Title I funds (This column is optional and is used only by States that choose to list all districts in improvement.)

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter School Data.

Download template: [Question 1.4.5.1_0607.xls](#) ([Get MS Excel Viewer](#))

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

Note: Identification of a district as receiving Title I funds is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Virginia had no divisions identified as in improvement or corrective action. The Virginia Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook amended July 2007 states:

Virginia will identify divisions for improvement only when they do not make AYP in the "same subject area or both other academic indicators" and all grade spans for two consecutive years. (p. 25) This identification process resulted in no divisions being identified as in improvement for 2007-2008.

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

Note: The inclusion of the discussion of technical assistance provided by the State is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.4.5.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for districts in corrective action, provide the number of districts in corrective action in which the listed corrective actions under *NCLB* are being implemented.

Corrective Action	# of Districts in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action Is Being Implemented
Implementing a new curriculum based on State standards	0
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	0
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	0
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	0
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	0
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	0
Restructured the district	0
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the SYs 2005-06 and 2006-07 as a corrective action)	0
Comments:	

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.4.6 Dates of AYP and Identification Determinations

In the table below, provide the dates (MM/DD/YY) when your State provided final school and district AYP and identification for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring to schools and districts based on SY 2006-07 assessments. If applicable, also provide the dates for preliminary determinations provided to schools and districts.

	Districts	Schools
Final AYP and identification determinations	08/22/07	08/22/07
Preliminary school AYP and identification determinations (if applicable)	08/10/07	08/10/07
Comments:		

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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 2006-07 data and the results of those appeals.

	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts	1	1
Schools	16	13
Comments:		

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2006-07 data was complete	10/25/07
---	----------

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.4.8 Section 1003(a) Funds

In the space below, describe your State's use of Section 1003(a) of ESEA funds. Specifically, address the following:

- Describe briefly any priorities the State uses in allocating these funds to schools.
- Describe briefly the State's methods for distributing these funds (e.g., formula, competitive, etc.).
- Describe briefly the types of activities supported by the Section 1003(a) funds.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Section 1003(a) of Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) funds are allocated to schools that have been identified as in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring (planning or implementation) status. Certain schools that have been identified by the state as persistently underperforming received additional funding. Funds are allocated on a formula basis to all schools except the persistently underperforming. The persistently underperforming schools are awarded additional funding based on the demonstration of need.

The Virginia Department of Education awards 1003(a) funds to support school and division efforts to implement Title I School Improvement planning requirements including:

*Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

*Corrective Action and Restructuring Initiatives

School improvement activities supported by the Office of School Improvement at the Virginia Department of Education include:

*Partnership for Achieving Successful Schools (PASS). PASS is a statewide initiative that fosters community involvement with schools that are having difficulty reaching targeted levels of academic performance and specific Standards of Learning goals.

*Data remediation or assessment specialists who work with teachers at grade levels or by departments to develop remediation programs for students or align the written and taught curriculum using benchmark assessment data;

*Leadership coaches who work directly with principals in the area of instructional leadership;

*Literacy and mathematics coaches who work with in-school instructional specialists and teacher teams;

*Book Buddies Math Buddies or other supplemental remediation programs that have a proven track record of success;

*Leadership and data assessment academies that train principals in the use of data to monitor the effectiveness of instructional programs;

*Professional development for teachers including the implementation of TeachFirst a Professional Learning Community (PLC) model to improve classroom instruction to struggling readers and writers;

*Special services for student subgroup populations identified under NLCB curriculum development and assessment resources; and

*Professional development for teachers and staff using research-based models such as Failure Is Not An Option through the Hope Foundation.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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.

1.4.9.1.1 Schools Using Public School Choice

In the table below, provide the number of public schools *from which* and *to which* students transferred under the provisions for public school choice in Section 1116 of ESEA.

	# Schools
Title I schools <i>from which</i> students transferred for public school choice	41
Public Schools <i>to which</i> students transferred for public school choice	57
Comments:	

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

Note: This table was formerly part of section 1.4.5.1 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.4.9.1.2 Public School Choice – Students

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

Students who are eligible for public school choice includes:

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

	# Students
Eligible for public school choice	29409
Who applied to transfer	752
Who transferred to another school under Title I public school choice provisions	666

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

	Yes/No
1. Enrolled in a school identified for improvement	<u>Yes</u>
2. Transferred in the current school year, only	<u>Yes</u>
3. Transferred in a prior year and in the current year	<u>No</u>
Comments: 3. Data are not available for those students who transferred in a prior year and the current year.	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X010 that includes data groups 579, 574 and 544. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly part of section 1.4.5.1 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.4.9.1.3 Funds Spent on Public School Choice

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

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$
Comments: Data were not collected for the 2006-2007 school year. The data will be collected through the 2007-2008 School Improvement Implementation Survey and will be available for reporting on school year 2007-2008.	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X102 that includes data group 652. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.4.9.1.4 Availability of Public School Choice Options

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

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

	# LEAs
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	5
Comments: Five (5) school divisions that were required to implement the choice option did not do so as they did not have an eligible school within their division to which students could transfer.	

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

FAQs about public school choice:

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

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

1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

1.4.9.2.1 Schools with Students Eligible for Supplemental Educational Services

In the table below, provide the number of Title I schools identified as in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring whose students received supplemental educational services under Section 1116 of ESEA. A Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) section related to supplemental educational services is below the table.

	# Schools
Title I schools whose students received supplemental educational services	47
Comments:	

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

Note: This table was formerly part of section 1.4.5.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

FAQ about supplemental education services

How should a State define the phrase "students who received supplemental educational services"? States should consider students who "received" supplemental educational services as those students who enrolled and participated in some hours of services. States have the discretion to determine the minimum number of hours of participation necessary for a student to have "received" services.

1.4.9.2.2 Supplemental Educational Services - Students

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

	# Students
Eligible for supplemental educational services	14578
Who applied for supplemental educational services	2993
Who received supplemental educational services	2769
Comments: Of the 2993 students who applied for supplemental educational services 224 did not receive services due to a variety of factors.	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X102 that includes data groups 578, 575, and 546. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly part of Section 1.4.5.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services

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

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$
Comments: Data were not collected for the 2006-2007 school year. The data will be collected through the 2007-2008 School Improvement Implementation Survey and will be available for reporting on school year 2007-2008.	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X102, which includes data group 651. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

School Type	# of Core Academic Classes (Total)	# of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	# of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified
All schools	233633	226058	96.8	7575	3.2
Elementary level					
High-poverty schools	12914	12472	96.6	442	3.4
Low-poverty schools	13117	12923	98.5	194	1.5
All elementary schools	50709	49619	97.9	1090	2.1
Secondary level					
High-poverty schools	20787	19444	93.5	1343	6.5
Low-poverty schools	61169	59981	98.1	1188	1.9
All secondary schools	182924	176439	96.5	6485	3.5
Comments:					

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

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

If the answer above is no, please explain:

--

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

Note: The data collection requirement to submit data for core classes taught by teachers who are NOT highly qualified has been added for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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 percent 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. See Question A-14 in the August 3, 2006, Non-Regulatory Guidance for additional information. Report classes in grade 6 through 8 consistent with how teachers have been classified to determine their highly qualified status, regardless of whether their schools are configured as elementary or middle schools.
- e. *How should States count teachers (including specialists or resource teachers) in elementary classes?* States that count self-contained classrooms as one class should, to avoid over-representation, also count subject-area specialists (e.g., mathematics or music teachers) or resource teachers as teaching one class. On the other hand, States using a departmentalized approach to instruction where a self-contained classroom is counted multiple times (once for each subject taught) should also count subject-area specialists or resource teachers as teaching multiple classes.
- f. *How should States count teachers in self-contained multiple-subject secondary classes?* Each core academic subject taught for which students are receiving credit toward graduation should be counted in the numerator and the denominator. For example, if the same teacher teaches English, calculus, history, and science in a self-contained classroom, count these as four classes in the denominator. If the teacher were Highly Qualified to teach English and history, he/she would be counted as Highly Qualified in two of the four subjects in the numerator.
- g. *What is a "high-poverty school"?* Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "high-poverty" schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State. The poverty quartile breaks are reported later in this section.
- h. *What is a "low-poverty school"?* Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "low-poverty" schools as schools in the bottom quartile of poverty in the State. The poverty quartile breaks are reported later in this section.

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

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

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

	Percentage
Elementary School Classes	
Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	58.0
Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	31.0
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	11.0
Other (please explain)	0.0
Total	100.0

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

	Percentage
Secondary School Classes	
Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	65.0
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	21.0
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	14.0
Other (please explain)	0.0
Total	100.0
Comments:	

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

1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

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

	High-Poverty Schools (more than what %)	Low-Poverty Schools (less than what %)
Elementary schools	59.2	21.7
Poverty metric used	Virginia uses the percentage of students who qualify for the free or reduced-price lunch program.	
Secondary schools	47.9	18.7
Poverty metric used	Virginia uses the percentage of students who qualify for the free or reduced-price lunch program.	
Comments:		

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

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

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

1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

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

Throughout this section:

- "AYP grades" is sometimes used to reference grades used for accountability determinations (grades 3 through 8 and one year of high school)
- "Non-AYP grades" is used to reference grades not used for accountability determinations.

1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs (formerly 1.1. of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, provide the number of Title III subgrantees that use each type of language instruction educational program, as defined in Section 3301(8).

Note: Numbers reflected in 1.6.1 can be duplicative due to subgrantees' use of more than one type of program. The number for each type of program should be equal to or less than the total number of subgrantees in 1.6.4.1.

Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

1. **# Using Program** = Number of subgrantees that reported using a specific type of language instruction educational program. Subgrantees may use multiple programs. **(a.)** If multiple programs are used, count one for each program type used. **(b.)** Consortium is always counted as **one if all members used the same type of program**. If consortium members used different types of programs, count all members using the same type of program as one for each type. Do not count the members of the consortium individually as one, unless each member used a different type of program (e.g., use the same method of counting as one subgrantee using multiple types of programs in **(a.)**)
2. **Type of Program** = Type of programs described in the subgrantee's local plan (as submitted to the State or as implemented) that is closest to the descriptions in <http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/expert/glossary.html>.
3. **Other Language** = Name of the language of instruction, other than English, used in the program.
4. **% Language of Instruction** = Average percentages of English and the other language used as a language of instruction in the program or use the percentage of the most common practice in the State (applies **only** to the first five bilingual program types).
5. **OLOI** = Other Language of Instruction used in the bilingual language instruction educational program.

# Using Program	Type of Program	Other Language	% Language of Instruction	
			English	OLOI
	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: The data were not collected for the 2006-2007 school year. The data have been collected through the 2007-2008 Title III federal No Child Left Behind application and will be available for reporting on school year 2007-2008.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.2 Student Demographic Data**1.6.2.1 Number of LEP Students Who Received Title III Language Instruction Educational Program Services**

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

	#
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	83806
Comments:	

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.2.2 Most Commonly Spoken Languages in the State

In the table below, provide the five most commonly spoken languages, other than English, in the State. The top five languages should be determined by the highest number of students speaking each of those languages listed.

Language	# LEP Students
Spanish	51980
Korean	4336
Vietnamese	3373
Arabic	3050
Urdu	2613

For additional significant languages please use comment box.

Comments:

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

Note: This table was formerly in Section 1.6.3.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.6.3 Student Performance Data

This section collects data on LEP student English language proficiency and LEP academic content performance data (e.g., LEP tested in native language tables and MFLEP/AYP Grades results table).

1.6.3.1 Student English Language Proficiency Testing Status

This section collects data on the number of ALL LEP students and Title III-served LEP students in the State by testing status for English language proficiency.

1.6.3.1.1 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Testing Status

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of ALL LEP students in the State by testing status for English language proficiency. ALL LEP students includes the following students:

- Newly enrolled and continually enrolled LEP students in the State for the year of this report, whether or not they receive services in a Title III language Instruction educational program;
- All students assessed for English language proficiency (ELP) using an annual State English Language proficiency (ELP) assessment as required under Section 1111(b)(7) of the ESEA in the reporting year and who meet the LEP definition in Section 9101 (25).

Table 1.6.3.1.1. Definitions:

- **Tested/State Annual ELP** = Number of LEP students who took the annual State English language proficiency assessment as required under Section 1111(b)(7) of the *ESEA* in this reporting year.
- **Not Tested/State Annual ELP** = Number of LEP students enrolled at the time of testing but did not take the annual State English language proficiency assessment.
- **Subtotal** = Sum of "Tested/State Annual ELP" and "Not Tested/State Annual ELP" (i.e., the number of LEP students enrolled at the time of testing).
- **LEP/One Data Point** = Number of LEP students who took the annual State English language proficiency assessment as required under Section 1111(b)(7) for the first time in this reporting year. Note that "LEP/One Data Point" is a subset of those students reported as Tested on the annual State English Language proficiency assessment.

ALL LEP Testing Status	#
Tested/State annual ELP	84187
Not tested/State annual ELP	772
Subtotal	84959
LEP/One Data Point	24135
Comments:	

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.1.2 Title III Student English Language Proficiency Testing Status

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of Title III-served LEP students in the State by testing status for English language proficiency.

Table 1.6.3.1.2. Definitions:

- **Tested/State Annual ELP** = Number of LEP students in Title III language instruction educational programs who took the annual State English language proficiency assessment.
- **Not Tested/State Annual ELP** = Number of LEP students in Title III language instruction educational programs enrolled at the time of testing but did not take the annual State English language proficiency assessment.
- **Subtotal** = Sum of "Tested/State Annual ELP" and "Not Tested/State Annual ELP" (i.e., the number of LEP students in Title III language instruction educational programs enrolled at the time of testing).
- **LEP/One Data Point** = Number of LEP students in Title III language instructional programs who took the annual State English language proficiency assessment for the first time in this reporting year. Note that "LEP/One Data Point" is a subset of those students reported as Tested on the annual State English Language proficiency assessment.

Title III LEP Testing Status	#
Tested/State annual ELP	83056
Not tested/State annual ELP	750
Subtotal	83806
LEP/One Data Point	23651
Comments:	

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.2 Student English Language Proficiency Results

This section collects data on the results from the annual State English language proficiency assessment(s) for LEP students. Before completing Table 1.6.3.2.2 or 1.6.3.2.3, please indicate your State's use of the flexibility to apply annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) to all LEP students.

1.6.3.2.1 Application of Title III English Language Proficiency Annual Assessment and AMAOs (formerly 1.6.8 of the Title III Biennial Collection, reformatted)

In the table below, indicate the State application of the following:

State applied the Title III English language proficiency annual assessment to all LEP students in LEAs receiving Title III funds.	<u>Yes</u>
State applied the annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) to ALL LEP students in LEAs receiving Title III funds.	<u>Yes</u>
Comments:	

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.2.2 All LEP English Language Proficiency Results

Please report information in this section **ONLY** if the State checked "Yes" in section 1.6.3.2.1 (row 2), that annual measurable achievement objectives are applied to all LEP students in LEAs receiving Title III funds.

Report the results from the annual State English language proficiency assessment(s) for ALL LEP students in grades K through 12.

Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:

1. **Making Progress** = Number of LEP students who met the definition of "Making Progress" as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
2. **No Progress** = Number of LEP students who did not meet the State definition of "Making Progress."
3. **ELP Attainment** = Number of 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.
4. **Target** = AMAO target for the year as established by the State and submitted to OELA in the CSA (September 2003 submission), or as amended, for each of "Making Progress" and "Attainment" of ELP.
5. **Results** = Number and percent of LEP students who met the State definition of "Making Progress" and the definition of "Attainment" of English language proficiency.
6. **Met/Y** = Met the annual target, "Met/N" = did not meet annual target. This cell will be automatically populated, based on the Target % and the Results %.

	Target	Results		Met
	%	#	%	Y/N
Making progress	35.0	56119	85.0	Y
No progress		9903		
ELP attainment	25.0	18165	43.0	Y
Comments:				

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

If a State does not count "ELP attainment" students as also "Making Progress", the number for "No Progress" should be the "Subtotal" in 1.6.3.1.1 minus the number "Making Progress" and "Attainment." If a State counts "ELP attainment" students as also "Making Progress", the number for "No Progress" should be the "Subtotal" in 1.6.3.1.1 minus "Making Progress".

1.6.3.2.3 Title III LEP English Language Proficiency Results

Please report information in this section **ONLY** if the State checked "No" in section in 1.6.3.2.1 (row 2), reporting that annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) are applied to LEP students served by Title III.

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

Table 1.6.3.2.3 Definitions:

1. **Making Progress** = Number of Title III LEP students who met the definition of "Making Progress" as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
2. **No Progress** = Number of Title III LEP students who did not meet the State definition of "Making Progress."
3. **ELP Attainment** = Number of Title III LEP students who attained English language proficiency as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
4. **Target** = AMAO target for the year as established by the State and submitted to OELA in the CSA (September 2003 submission), or as amended, for each of "Making Progress" and "Attainment" of ELP.
5. **Results** = Number and percent of Title III LEP students who met the State definition of "Making Progress" and the definition of "Attainment" of English language proficiency.
6. **Met/Y** = Met the annual target, "Met/N" = did not meet annual target. This cell will be automatically populated, based on the Target % and the Results %.

	Target	Results		Met
	%	#	%	Yes/No
Making progress	35.0	54655	84.0	Y
No progress		10411		
ELP attainment	25.0	17990	43.0	Y
Comments:				

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

If a State does not count "ELP attainment" students as also "Making Progress", the number for "No Progress" should be the "Subtotal" in 1.6.3.1.2 minus the number "Making Progress" and "Attainment." If a State counts "ELP attainment" students as also "Making Progress", the number for "No Progress" should be the "Subtotal" in 1.6.3.1.2 minus "Making Progress".

1.6.3.4 LEP Subgroup Academic Content Assessment Results (formerly 3.2.3/MFLEP of the Title III Biennial Collection)

This section collects data on the academic content assessment results for LEP students.

1.6.3.4.1 LEP Subgroup Flexibility

In the table below, report whether the State exercises the LEP flexibility afforded States through the new regulation for monitored former LEP (MFLEP), in AYP determination.

MFLEP	Yes
Comments:	

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.4.3 Status of Monitored Former LEP Students (MFLEP) (formerly 3.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection, modified)

In the table below, report the unduplicated count of MFLEP students in K-12 for each of the two years monitored during the SY 2006-07, which includes both MFLEP students in AYP grades and in non-AYP grades in row 1 and MFLEP students only in AYP grades in row 2.

Table 1.6.3.4.3 Definitions:**1. Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) includes:**

- Students that have transitioned into classrooms that are not designed for LEP students;
- Students that are no longer receiving LEP services; and who are being monitored for academic content achievement for 2 years after transition.

2. Total MFLEP = State aggregated number of all MFLEP students in grades K through 12.**3. MFLEP/AYP Grades =** State aggregated number of MFLEP students in grades used for accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school). These students may be included in the LEP subgroup AYP calculations.

	#
Total MFLEP	9119
MFLEP/AYP grades	6161
Comments: The total number of MFLEP students in AYP grades is lower than the total number of MFLEP students in AYP grades for mathematics reported in 1.6.3.6.2 due to some students taking more than one mathematics End-of-Course assessments in one year. The total number of MFLEP students in AYP grades is higher than the total number of MFLEP students in AYP grades reported in 1.6.3.6.3 for reading/language arts due to absences and transfers at the time of testing.	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X126, which contains data group 668, category set A. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.4.4 LEP Students in Non-AYP Grades (formerly 2.3 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the total number of LEP students in grade ranges that were not tested for AYP in SY 2006-07.

Table 1.6.3.4.4 Definitions:

- LEP K-2 =** All LEP students in these grades. Do not include pre-K students.
- LEP HS/Non-AYP =** High school students (grades 9 through 12 or 10 through 12 [State specific]) who are in the high school grades that are not tested for AYP in the State (e.g., if the State tested grade 10 for AYP, then the State should provide the aggregated number of LEP students in grades 9, 11 and 12).
- LEP Other Grades =** Number of LEP students enrolled in public schools but not in grades K through 12. Students in non-graded grades or grade spans. Do not report LEP students in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school) in this row.

Grade	#
LEP K-2	18749
LEP HS/Non-AYP	10047
LEP other grades	0
Comments: The LEP HS/Non-AYP data represent LEP students who did not take the reading/language arts End-of-Course SOL assessment in the 11th grade.	

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments

This section collects data on LEP students assessed in their native language.

1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language (formerly 2.4.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

State offers the State mathematics or reading/language arts content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
Comments:	

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

* If "No", proceed to 1.6.3.6.

1.6.3.5.2 Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given (formerly 2.4.2 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the language(s) in which native language assessments are given at each grade used for NCLB accountability determinations for mathematics.

Grade	Language
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
HS	
Comments:	

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.5.3 Native Language of Reading/Language Arts Tests Given (formerly 2.4.2 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the language(s) in which native language assessments are given at each grade used for NCLB accountability determinations for reading/language arts.

Grade	Language
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
HS	
Comments:	

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.5.4 Native Language Version of State NCLB Mathematics Assessment Results (formerly 2.4.3 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the number of LEP students who took a mathematics assessment in their native language across all grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school).

Table 1.6.3.5.4 Definitions:

1. **# Tested** = Number of LEP students in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school) who took the native language version of the mathematics assessment.
2. **# At or Above Proficient** = Number of students tested through the native language version of the mathematics assessment who scored at or above proficient.
3. **% Results** = Automatically calculated based on the number who scored at or above proficient divided by the number tested.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results
Comments:		

Source – Initially pre-populated by *EDFacts* file N/X049 that is data group 272, category set A. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.5.5 Native Language Version of State NCLB Reading/Language Arts Assessment Results (formerly 2.4.3 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the number of LEP students who took a reading/language arts assessment in their native language across all grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school).

Table 1.6.3.5.5 Definitions:

1. **# Tested** = Number of LEP students in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school) who took the native language version of the reading/language arts assessment.
2. **# At or Above Proficient** = Number of students tested through the native language version of the reading/language arts assessment who scored at or above proficient.
3. **% Results** = Automatically calculated based on the number who scored at or above proficient divided by the number tested.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results
Comments:		

Source – Initially pre-populated by *EDFacts* file N/X049 that is data group 272, category set A. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP Students

This section collects data on the performance of former LEP students.

1.6.3.6.1 Title III Served MFLEP Students by Year Monitored (formerly 3.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

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.

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
5266	3745	9011
Comments:		

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.6.2 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students in AYP Grades Results for Mathematics (formerly 3.2 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the number of monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students who took the annual mathematics assessment.

Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:

1. **# Tested** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in mathematics for AYP.
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 in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school) who did not score proficient on the State *NCLB* mathematics assessment. This will be automatically calculated.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
6863	5771	84.1	1092

The number tested should be the same or near the total in 1.6.3.4.3 row 2, if not explain the difference in the comment box below.

Comments: The number of MFLEP students taking mathematics assessments reflect assessments that can be administered in grades 3 through 12. The number of students tested exceeds the number of students available to test reported in 1.6.3.4.3 due to some students taking more than one mathematics End-of-Course assessment in one year.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.6.3 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students in AYP Grades Results for Reading/Language Arts (formerly 3.2 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, provide the number of monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students who took the annual reading/language arts assessment.

Table 1.6.3.6.3 Definitions:

1. **# Tested** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in reading/language arts for AYP.
2. **# At or Above Proficient** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment.
3. **% Results** = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the total number tested.
4. **# Below proficient** = State-aggregated number MFLEP students in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school) who did not score proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment. This will be automatically calculated.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
5540	4948	89.3	592

The number tested should be the same or near the total in 1.6.3.4.3 row 2, if not explain the difference in the comment box below.

Comments:

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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 (formerly 4.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the number of Title III subgrantees meeting the criteria described in the table. Use the same method of counting consortia as in 1.6.1 (consortia regardless of number of members is only counted as one). 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. The total of the # met all three AMAOs + # met 2 AMAOs only + # Met one AMAO + # Met zero AMAOs=total # of subgrantees for the year.

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

	#
Total number of subgrantees for the year	78
Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	31
Number of subgrantees that met only 2 AMAOs	42
Number of subgrantees that met AMAOs of Making Progress and ELP Attainment	15
Number of subgrantees that met AMAOs of Making Progress and AYP	27
Number of subgrantees that met AMAOs of ELP Attainment and AYP	0
Number of subgrantees that met only 1 AMAO	4
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO of Making Progress	4
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO of Attainment of ELP	0
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO AYP	0
Number of subgrantees that did not meet any AMAOs	1
Number of subgrantees that did not meet AMAOs for two consecutive years	27
Number of subgrantees with an improvement plan for not meeting Title III AMAOs	27
Number of subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (beginning in SY 2007-08)	17
Comments:	

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

Note: This table was formerly in section 1.6.10 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.6.4.2 State Accountability (formerly 4.2 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

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

Note: Meeting all three Title III AMAOs means meeting each State-set target for each objective: Making Progress, Attaining Proficiency, and Making AYP for the LEP subgroup.

State met <u>all</u> three Title III AMAOs	<u>No</u>
Comments:	

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

Note: This table was formerly in Section 1.6.10 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.6.4.3 Termination of Title III Language Instruction Educational Programs (formerly 6.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

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

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students (formerly 5.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

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

1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students

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

Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:

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

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants
27152	10667	37

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

Comments:

Source – Initially, the first column of the table is pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X045 that contains data group 519, grand total. The second and third columns are manual entry by the SEA.

Note: This table was formerly in section 1.6.4 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.6.5.2 Distribution of Immigrant Funds (formerly 5.3 of the Title III Biennial Collection, reformatted)

In the table below, report how the State distributes the funds reserved for the education of immigrant children and youth to subgrantees.

Subgrant award cycle			
Annual	<u>Yes</u>	Multi-year	<u>No</u>
Type of subgrant awarded			
Competitive	<u>No</u>	Formula	<u>Yes</u>

If the State checked more than one item in each category, explain in the comment box.

Comments:

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development

This section collects data on teachers in Title III language instruction education programs.

1.6.6.1 Teacher Information (formerly 7.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection, modified)

In the table below, report the number of teachers who are working in the Title III language instruction educational programs as defined in Section 3301(8) and reported in table 1.6.1 (Types of language instruction educational programs).

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

	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	1697
Number of certified/licensed/endorsed ESL/BE teachers in the state currently working with LEP students (e.g., ESL/BE teachers for ALL LEP students), if the State has such requirements. <u>Or</u> number of teachers with professional development points or course work in ESL/BE, if the State does not require such certification/licensure/endorsement.	1624
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	1100

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

Comments:

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

1.6.6.2 Professional Development (PD) Activities of Subgrantees Related to the Teaching and Learning of LEP Students
(formerly 7.4 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, provide the number of professional development activities that specifically address only the teaching of LEP students or are related to the learning of LEP students. These professional development activities must meet the requirements of the Title III subgrantee required activities.

Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:

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

Type of Professional Development Activity	# Subgrantees	
Instructional strategies for LEP students		
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 in comment box)		
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# 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 organization personnel		
Total		
Comments: The data were not collected for the 2006-2007 school year. The data have been collected through the 2007-2008 Title III federal No Child Left Behind application and will be available for reporting on school year 2007-2008.		

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities

This section collects data on State grant activities.

1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process

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

Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:

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

Example: State received SY 2006-07 funds July 1, 2006, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2006, for SY 2006-07 programs. Then the "# of days/\$\$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
07/10/06	09/01/06	52
Comments: School divisions that submitted an approvable consolidated or individual application for their 2006-2007 federal funds under the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 by July 1, 2006, could access their 2006-2007 funds on a reimbursement basis by their submission date.		

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS

In the table below, provide the number of schools identified as persistently dangerous, as determined by the State, by the start of the school year. For further guidance on persistently dangerous schools, refer to section B "Identifying Persistently Dangerous Schools" in the Unsafe School Choice Option Non-Regulatory Guidance, available at:

<http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/unsafeschoolchoice.pdf>.

Persistently Dangerous Schools	0
Comments:	

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

1.8 GRADUATION RATES AND DROPOUT RATES

This section collects graduation and dropout rates.

1.8.1 Graduation Rates

In the table below, provide the graduation rates calculated using the methodology that was approved as part of the State's accountability plan for the **previous school year** (SY 2005-06). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	79.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	77.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	87.9
Black, non-Hispanic	71.0
Hispanic	64.9
White, non-Hispanic	83.8
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	42.3
Limited English proficient	64.1
Economically disadvantaged	68.3
Migratory students	68.9
Male	75.6
Female	83.7
Comments: Beginning with the 2005-2006 school year Virginia was able to disaggregate graduation for children with disabilities, limited English proficient students, economically disadvantaged students, and migratory students.	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X041 that is data group 563, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

FAQs on graduation rates:

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

1.8.2 Dropout Rates

In the table below, provide the dropout rates calculated using the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's (NCES) Common Core of Data (CCD) for the **previous school year** (SY 2005-06). Below the table is an FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Dropout Rate
All Students	1.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	2.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	1.2
Black, non-Hispanic	2.7
Hispanic	4.3
White, non-Hispanic	1.3
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	2.3
Limited English proficient	4.3
Economically disadvantaged	2.2
Migratory students	4.6
Male	2.2
Female	1.6
Comments:	

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

FAQ on dropout rates:

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

1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS PROGRAM

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

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

	#	# LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	103	102
LEAs with subgrants	29	29
Total	132	131
Comments: Data were not reported from Charles City County Public Schools.		

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

Note: This table was formerly Section 1.9.1.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

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

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

1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youths

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

Age/Grade	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	87	179
K	284	736
1	278	709
2	256	644
3	234	655
4	234	577
5	211	611
6	211	551
7	235	547
8	185	476
9	233	572
10	126	358
11	84	249
12	81	245
Ungraded	0	50
Total	2739	7159
Comments:		

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

Note: This table was formerly section 1.9.1.3 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.9.1.2 Primary Nighttime Residence of Homeless Children and Youths

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

	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	541	1982
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	1810	3613
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	80	328
Hotels/Motels	308	1236
Total	2739	7159
Comments:		

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

Note: This table was formerly section 1.9.1.4 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

1.9.2.1 Homeless Children and Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

Age/Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	215
K	702
1	670
2	614
3	600
4	528
5	577
6	495
7	495
8	423
9	515
10	310
11	222
12	212
Ungraded	50
Total	6628

Comments:

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X043 that is data group 560, category set A. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

1.9.2.2 Subpopulations of Homeless Students Served

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

	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied youth	271
Migratory children/youth	68
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1308
Limit English proficient students	706

Comments:

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X043 that is data group 560, category sets B, C, D, and E. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly Sections 1.9.2.3, 1.9.2.4, and 1.9.2.5 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. For the SY 2006-07 CSPR, the data collection has been changed to show the total number of students served.

1.9.2.3 Educational Support Services Provided by Subgrantees

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

	# McKinney-Vento Subgrantees That Offer
1. Tutoring or other instructional support	25
2. Expedited evaluations	18
3. Staff professional development and awareness	24
4. Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	22
5. Transportation	25
6. Early childhood programs	14
7. Assistance with participation in school programs	18
8. Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	23
9. Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	23
10. Parent education related to rights and resources for children	26
11. Coordination between schools and agencies	27
12. Counseling	22
13. Addressing needs related to domestic violence	24
14. Clothing to meet a school requirement	18
15. School supplies	24
16. Referral to other programs and services	24
17. Emergency assistance related to school attendance	18
18. Other (optional)	1
19. Other (optional)	0
20. Other (optional)	0
Comments: Other program support is for infant/toddler development.	

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

Note: This table was formerly Section 1.9.2.6 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.9.2.4 Barriers To The Education Of Homeless Children And Youth

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

	# Subgrantees Reporting
1. Eligibility for homeless services	8
2. School Selection	5
3. Transportation	8
4. School records	6
5. Immunizations	9
6. Other medical records	0
7. Other Barriers	0
Comments: 6. Combined with response to barriers with immunizations.	

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

Note: This table was formerly Section 1.9.2.7 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. Immunizations and Other Medical Records have been changed to two separate data collections for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.9.2.5 Academic Progress of Homeless Students

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

1.9.2.5.1 Reading Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Reading Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	468	299
4	409	284
5	393	281
6	340	193
7	319	201
8	293	166
High School	250	174
Comments:		

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category set G. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly part of section 1.9.2.9 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. Grades 9 through 12 have been changed to High School for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.9.2.5.2 Mathematics Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Mathematics Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	477	355
4	414	252
5	400	263
6	347	116
7	326	116
8	318	179
High School	439	312
Comments:		

Source – Similar to 1.9.2.5.1 but the file specification is N/X075 that is data group 583, category set G.

Note: This table was formerly part of section 1.9.2.9 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. Grades 9 through 12 have been changed to High School for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.10 MIGRANT CHILD COUNTS

This section collects the Title I, Part C, Migrant Education Program (MEP) child counts which States are required to provide and may be used to determine the annual State allocations under Title I, Part C. The child counts should reflect the reporting period of September 1, 2006 through August 31, 2007. This section also collects a report on the procedures used by States to produce true, accurate, and valid child counts.

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

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

FAQs on Child Count:

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

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

1.10.1 Category 1 Child Count

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number by age/grade of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, resided in your State for one or more days during the reporting period of September 1, 2006 through August 31, 2007. This figure includes all eligible migrant children who may or may not have participated in MEP services. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

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

Age/Grade	12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	229
K	128
1	78
2	87
3	101
4	81
5	69
6	72
7	56
8	51
9	70
10	70
11	59
12	30
Ungraded	<N
Out-of-school	306
Total	

Comments: In the original submission, 5 year olds in kindergarten were reported in the age 3 through 5 category.

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X121 that is data group 634, Subtotal 1. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.10.1.1 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The category 1 2006-2007 child count for Virginia reflects an overall decrease over the 2005-2006 child count report. This decrease is primarily the result of the migrant families "settling out" in Virginia and therefore they are no longer classified as migrant.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.10.2 Category 2 Child Count

In the table below, enter by age/grade the unduplicated statewide number of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, were served for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods that occurred within the reporting period of September 1, 2006 through August 31, 2007. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. Count a child who moved to different schools within the State and who was served in both traditional summer and year-round school intersession programs only once. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

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

Age/Grade	Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	160
K	83
1	46
2	64
3	89
4	63
5	59
6	54
7	54
8	39
9	50
10	51
11	47
12	26
Ungraded	<N
Out-of-school	222
Total	

Comments: In the original submission, 5 year olds in kindergarten were reported in the age 3 through 5 category.

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X122 that is data group 635, Subtotal 1. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.10.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

There is no significant increase or decrease in the category 2 child count.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.10.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures

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

1.10.3.1 Student Information System

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Virginia used the MIS 2000 database system to generate the 2006-2007 category 1 and 2 child count. The database consists of core and additional data that represent the elements within the certificate of eligibility (COE) used by migrant coordinators around the state.

Virginia used the MIS 2000 database system to generate the 2005-2006 category 1 and category 2 child count.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.10.3.2 Data Collection and Management Procedures

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The migratory child count data are collected year round (September 1, 2006, through August 31, 2007.)

The data collected are found on the Certificate of Eligibility (COE). The COE is divided into three sections: 1) parent data; 2) child data; and 3) eligibility data. The parent data include parent or guardian names as well as current and home addresses. The child data include name, birth date, type of documentation used to confirm birth date, gender, grade enrollment date, and service location. The eligibility data include the qualifying arrival date (QAD), the last qualifying move (LQM), principal means of livelihood (PMOL), qualifying activity, the category of the move (with to join or on own), and the residency date.

The activities used to collect data were: personal interviews, a review of school records, school personnel, and/or telephone updates. The data were collected by recruiters and/or migrant coordinators. When migratory families are identified, COE forms are completed. All COE forms are submitted to the data entry specialist at the regional office where the data are entered into the state database (MIS 2000).

At the end of each semester, or when a migrant child leaves, the program teacher/recruiter completes a withdrawal form. The information is entered into the master database from the withdrawal form. If the student remains in the migrant program, and receives services the next semester, a re-enrollment form is completed at the start of the new semester. An interview with the family is conducted to check accuracy of the data on the original COE. Changes, if any, on the re-enrollment form are entered into the master database.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.10.3.3 Methods Used To Count Children

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The child count is calculated through the MIS 2000 system. The MIS 2000 database consists of core and additional data that are representative of the elements within the Certificate of Eligibility (COE) used by the migrant coordinators and recruiters around the state. The key data elements used to ensure accurate category 1 and category 2 child counts consist of the enrollment withdrawal residency qualifying activity and qualifying arrival date (QAD) dates as well as school history data that establish a child's presence during the year. The database also assigns students unique identification numbers. Virginia is currently working with MIS 2000 to include a field that will contain the Virginia State Testing Identification number to allow linking of migrant student records.

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Virginia has several steps that are taken to ensure proper eligibility of children in the Migrant Education Program (MEP). Virginia uses a standard Certificate of Eligibility (COE) form statewide. Virginia is currently revising the state COE to include data elements requested by the new Migrant Student Information Exchange (MSIX) initiative. Information collected within the COE is gathered by conducting interviews with the parents, guardians, or other adults legally responsible for the students. The qualifying arrival date, residency date, qualifying activity, and withdrawal dates are examples of data elements within the COE used to determine whether or not a student held residency status during the reporting period.

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

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

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

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

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

For the 2006-2007 school year, Virginia did not conduct a re-interview process.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Virginia Migrant Education Program (MEP) staff members take several steps to check that child count data are entered and updated accurately. Through "read only" capabilities on the MIS 2000 database, coordinators are required to monitor the student information entered on the state database system to ensure correct records at both state and local levels. Throughout the year, the MEP coordinators submit re-enrollment forms to the data entry specialist that reflect changes and/or revisions to student information within the COE. The state director also monitors and tracks the flow of data from the local and regional migrant programs to the regional office as needed. The state director communicates and meets with the MEP coordinators and the data entry specialist to discuss programmatic issues and the status of child counts.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Throughout the year, state staff review reports that are generated by the database to ensure accuracy of eligible students present during the current reporting period. The data entry specialist produces monthly participation reports that show participants in the regular and summer/intersession terms when determining the category 1 and category 2 child count. The MEP coordinators review the reports before data are submitted to the state director. If discrepancies are found, the data entry specialist and coordinators communicate by telephone to determine whether a correction is necessary. If clarification is needed, the state migrant director works with the Office of Migrant Education to determine eligibility. The same data elements are collected from the local migrant program coordinators as the U.S. Department of Education collects from states in the annual Consolidated State Performance Report.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

For the 2006-2007 school year, Virginia did not conduct a re-interview process.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Virginia does not have any concerns about the accuracy of the reported child counts or underlying eligibility determinations.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.