

**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 2005-2006



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 1, 2006
PART II DUE FEBRUARY 1, 2007**

**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.*

In addition to the programs cited above, the Title X, Part C - *Education for Homeless Children and Youths* program data will be incorporated in the CSPR for 2005-2006.

The NCLB Consolidated State Performance Report for the 2005-2006 school year consists of two information collections. Part I of this report is due to the Department by December 1, 2006 . Part II is due to the Department by February 1, 2007.

PART I

Part I of the Consolidated State Report, which States must submit to the Department by **December 1, 2006**, 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 ESEA. The five ESEA Goals established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application are as follows:

- **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.

PART II

Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report consists of information related to State activities and outcomes of specific ESEA programs for the 2005-2006 school year. Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report is due to the Department by **February 1, 2007**. The information requested in Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report for the 2005-2006 school year necessarily varies from program to program. However, for all programs, 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 Consolidated State Performance Report is the best vehicle for collection of the data.

The Department is continuing to work with the Performance-Based Data Management Initiative (PBDMI) to streamline data collections for the 2005-2006 school year and beyond.

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the 2005-2006 school year must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **December 1, 2007**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **February 1, 2007**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the 2005-2006 school year, unless otherwise noted.

The format states will use to submit the Consolidated State Performance Report has changed to an online submission. This online submission system is being developed through the Education Data Exchange Network (EDEN) and will make the submission process less burdensome. Please see the following section on transmittal instructions for more information on how to submit this year's 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 "2005-06 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 2005-2006 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: 07/31/2007

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

Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting:

Part I, 2005-2006

Part II, 2005-2006

Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report:
Virginia Department of Education

Address:
PO 2120
Richmond, Virginia 23218

Person to contact about this report:

Name: Roberta Schlicher
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

Signature

Monday, February 26, 2007, 9:27:30 AM
Date

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART I

For reporting on
School Year 2005-2006



PART I DUE DECEMBER 1, 2006

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

Section 1111(b)(1) of ESEA requires States to adopt challenging academic content and achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science and to develop assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(3) in the required grade levels. In the following sections, States are asked to provide a detailed description of their progress in meeting the NCLB standards and assessments requirements.

1.1.1 Please provide a detailed description of the State's progress in adopting challenging academic content standards in science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(1).

State Response

The Virginia Science 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 science standards were revised in 2003 to reflect updated information related to science as well as input from the field. In addition to the standards, a companion curriculum framework document and an enhanced scope and sequence document have also been developed that provide detailed guidance for school divisions in the implementation of the Science Standards of Learning. The Science Standards of Learning can be accessed via the Department of Education Web site at:

<http://www.pen.k12.va.us/VDOE/Superintendent/Sols/home.shtml>.

The Science Curriculum Framework can be accessed via the Department of Education Web site at:

<http://www.pen.k12.va.us/VDOE/Instruction/Science/sciCF.html>.

The Enhanced Scope and Sequence for Science can be accessed via the Department of Education Web site at:

<http://www.pen.k12.va.us/VDOE/EnhancedSandS/science.shtml>.

Student performance on the Science Standards of Learning is assessed through a statewide criterion-referenced, multiple choice assessment directly linked to the standards. Students are assessed once in third, fifth, and eighth grades as well as at the end of high school science courses in Earth Science, Biology, and Chemistry. The third, fifth, and eighth grade assessments are cumulative.

1.1.2 Please provide a detailed description of the State's progress in developing and implementing, in consultation with LEAs, assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(3) in the required grade levels. Please provide in your response a description of the State's progress in developing alternate assessments for students with disabilities, including alternate assessments aligned to alternate achievement standards and those aligned to grade-level achievement standards.

State Response

For the 2005-2006 school year, Virginia administered reading/language arts and mathematics assessments in grades 3 through 8, and science assessments in third, fifth, and eighth grades. End-of-course Standards of Learning assessments in these subject areas are administered at the high school level after completion of the corresponding content course. Local school divisions are involved in the development of the assessments through content review committees in each subject area. Selected teachers, principals, and curriculum specialists representing all regions of the state meet annually to assist the test contractor and the state assessment office in development of each test in each subject area.

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) was administered to students with disabilities for the first time in 2004-2005. The VGLA is available for students with disabilities enrolled in grades 3 through 8. 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 area. The VGLA is aligned to grade-level achievement standards.

1.1.3 Please provide a detailed description of the State's progress in setting, in consultation with LEAs, academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(1). If applicable, please provide in your response a description of the State's progress in developing alternate achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.

State Response

The Virginia Board of Education has adopted challenging academic achievement standards called the Standards of Learning as the basis of a comprehensive reform effort begun in 1995. The Standards of Learning for reading/language arts, mathematics, and science can be assessed via the Virginia Department of Education's Web site at:

<http://www.pen.k12.va.us/VDOE/Superintendent/Sols/home.shtml>.

The Standards of Learning set forth minimum content standards for students in kindergarten through eighth grade as well as for high school level courses. The Standards of Learning set reasonable targets and expectations for what students should know and be able to do at each grade level or within each high school course.

The Board of Education has approved a seven-year schedule of evaluation and revision for all Standards of Learning. The Standards of Learning for Reading/Language Arts were most recently revised in 2002. The Standards of Learning for Mathematics were most recently revised in 2001. The Standards of Learning for Science were most recently revised in 2003. Additionally, a curriculum framework as well as an enhanced scope and sequence document have been developed for the reading/language arts, mathematics, and science standards. These documents provide detailed guidance for school divisions in implementation of the standards. The documents are available on the Department of Education Web site at:

<http://www.pen.k12.va.us/VDOE/CurriculumFramework/>

<http://www.pen.k12.va.us/VDOE/EnhancedSandS/>.

Virginia has alternate achievement standards in place for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities. The standards were developed by standard-setting committees through established state procedures and approved by the Virginia Board of Education in October 2001.

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

Participation of All Students in 2005-2006 State Assessments

In the following tables, please provide the total number and percentage for each of the listed subgroups of students who participated in the State's 2005-2006 school year academic assessments.

The data provided below for students with disabilities should include 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.

1.2.1 Student Participation in 2005-2006 School Year Test Administration**1.2.1.1 2005-2006 School Year Mathematics Assessment**

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Tested
All Students	782697	99.50
American Indian or Alaska Native	2523	98.90
Asian or Pacific Islander	40562	99.70
Black, non-Hispanic	204525	99.00
Hispanic	56355	99.30
White, non-Hispanic	464239	99.70
Students with Disabilities	101525	99.60
Limited English Proficient	51204	99.50
Economically Disadvantaged	213853	99.30
Migrant	518	99.20
Male	395130	99.50
Female	386777	99.60

Comments: (1)Racial totals do not equal all students total, as the racial category was not specified on some student test answer documents. (2)Male and Female totals do not equal all students total, as the gender category was not specified on some student test answer documents.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.2.1.2 2005-2006 School Year Reading/Language Arts Assessment

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Tested
All Students	639713	98.80
American Indian or Alaska Native	2069	99.50
Asian or Pacific Islander	32478	99.80
Black, non-Hispanic	169095	99.30
Hispanic	47072	99.60
White, non-Hispanic	377150	99.90
Students with Disabilities	90896	99.80
Limited English Proficient	44562	99.80
Economically Disadvantaged	185765	99.40
Migrant	442	99.60
Male	326751	99.70
Female	312331	99.80

Comments: (1)Racial totals do not equal all students total, as the racial category was not specified on some student test answer documents. (2)Male and Female totals do not equal all students total, as the gender category was not specified on some student test answer documents.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in State Assessment System

Students with disabilities (as defined under IDEA) participate in the State's assessment system either by taking the regular State assessment, with or without accommodations, by taking an alternate assessment aligned to grade-level standards, or by taking an alternate assessment aligned to alternate achievement standards. In the following table, please provide the total number and percentage of students with disabilities who participated in these various assessments.

The data provided below should include 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.

1.2.2

1.2.2.1 Participation of Students with Disabilities the in 2005-2006 School Year Test Administration -- Math Assessment

	Total Number of Students with Disabilities Tested	Percent of Students with Disabilities Tested
Regular Assessment, with or without accommodations	85380	84.10
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards	7538	7.40
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	8607	8.50

Comments:

1.2.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities the in 2005-2006 School Year Test Administration -- Reading/Language Arts Assessment

	Total Number of Students with Disabilities Tested	Percent of Students with Disabilities Tested
Regular Assessment, with or without accommodations	74158	81.60
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards	8126	8.90
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	8612	9.50

Comments:

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

In the following charts, please provide student achievement data from the 2005-2006 school year test administration. Charts have been provided for each of grades 3 through 8 and high school to accommodate the varied State assessment systems in mathematics and reading/language arts during the 2005-2006 school year. States should provide data on the total number of students tested as well as the percentage of students scoring at the proficient or advanced levels for those grades in which the State administered mathematics and reading/language arts assessments during the 2005-2006 school year.

The data for students with disabilities should include participation results from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, including results from alternate assessments, and do not include results from students covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

1.3.1 Grade 3 - Mathematics		
	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	85571	89.70
American Indian or Alaska Native	286	92.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	4465	95.20
Black, non-Hispanic	21875	81.50
Hispanic	6939	85.20
White, non-Hispanic	50089	93.40
Students with Disabilities	12361	74.60
Limited English Proficient	7548	84.90
Economically Disadvantaged	27487	82.50
Migrant	59	83.10
Male	43978	89.40
Female	41511	90.10

Comments: (1)Racial totals do not equal all students total, as the racial category was not specified on some student test answer documents. (2)Male and female totals do not equal all students total, as the gender category was not specified on some student test answer documents. (3)The ten percent variance in the number of migrant students at the 3rd grade level from the 2004-2005 submission is attributed to an increase in the number of students reported.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.2 Grade 3 - Reading/Language Arts		
	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	85728	83.60
American Indian or Alaska Native	289	86.20
Asian or Pacific Islander	4461	89.70
Black, non-Hispanic	21939	73.10
Hispanic	6918	78.50
White, non-Hispanic	50174	88.30
Students with Disabilities	12388	70.80
Limited English Proficient	7523	77.40
Economically Disadvantaged	27517	74.30
Migrant	66	71.20
Male	44034	81.90
Female	41592	85.50

Comments: (1)Racial totals do not equal all students total, as the racial category was not specified on some student test answer documents. (2)Male and female totals do not equal all students total, as the gender category was not specified on some student test answer documents. (3)The ten percent variance from the 2004-2005 submission for the Hispanic students, students with disabilities, and limited English proficient students is attributable to an increase in their performance on the reading/language arts assessment.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.3 Grade 4 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	86909	77.30
American Indian or Alaska Native	281	77.90
Asian or Pacific Islander	4485	86.70
Black, non-Hispanic	22313	63.70
Hispanic	6837	64.80
White, non-Hispanic	51270	83.90
Students with Disabilities	13028	58.60
Limited English Proficient	7255	63.20
Economically Disadvantaged	27453	63.20
Migrant	47	57.50
Male	44384	77.80
Female	42467	76.70

Comments: (1)Racial totals do not equal all students total, as the racial category was not specified on some student test answer documents. (2)Male and female totals do not equal all students total, as the gender category was not specified on some student test answer documents.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.4 Grade 4 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	86910	86.40
American Indian or Alaska Native	281	86.50
Asian or Pacific Islander	4466	91.70
Black, non-Hispanic	22305	78.00
Hispanic	6821	80.30
White, non-Hispanic	51284	90.40
Students with Disabilities	13009	71.90
Limited English Proficient	7236	79.20
Economically Disadvantaged	27395	76.80
Migrant	56	75.00
Male	44400	84.60
Female	42440	88.30

Comments: (1)Racial totals do not equal all students total, as the racial category was not specified on some student test answer documents. (2)Male and female totals do not equal all students total, as the gender category was not specified on some student test answer documents.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.5 Grade 5 - Mathematics		
	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	85916	83.10
American Indian or Alaska Native	289	84.80
Asian or Pacific Islander	3982	91.50
Black, non-Hispanic	22790	74.30
Hispanic	6621	74.00
White, non-Hispanic	50606	87.50
Students with Disabilities	13249	63.20
Limited English Proficient	6552	72.20
Economically Disadvantaged	27599	72.60
Migrant	55	65.50
Male	44144	81.80
Female	41711	84.50

Comments: (1)Racial totals do not equal all students total, as the racial category was not specified on some student test answer documents. (2)Male and female totals do not equal all students total, as the gender category was not specified on some student test answer documents. (3)The ten percent variance in the number of migrant students at the 5th grade level from the 2004-2005 submission is attributed to an increase in the number of students reported.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.6 Grade 5 - Reading/Language Arts		
	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	88354	86.90
American Indian or Alaska Native	296	88.90
Asian or Pacific Islander	4299	92.90
Black, non-Hispanic	22970	77.40
Hispanic	6692	81.40
White, non-Hispanic	52363	91.10
Students with Disabilities	13321	72.10
Limited English Proficient	6627	80.60
Economically Disadvantaged	27679	77.70
Migrant	58	67.20
Male	45461	85.10
Female	42819	88.70

Comments: (1)Racial totals do not equal all students total, as the racial category was not specified on some student test answer documents. (2)Male and female totals do not equal all students total, as the gender category was not specified on some student test answer documents. (3)The ten percent variance in the number of migrant students at the 5th grade level from the 2004-2005 submission is attributed to an increase in the number of students reported.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.7 Grade 6 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	82307	51.20
American Indian or Alaska Native	281	52.30
Asian or Pacific Islander	3620	73.10
Black, non-Hispanic	23654	33.70
Hispanic	6138	39.00
White, non-Hispanic	47145	59.60
Students with Disabilities	12952	30.20
Limited English Proficient	5594	39.10
Economically Disadvantaged	26949	34.60
Migrant	55	36.40
Male	42450	50.70
Female	39790	51.70

Comments: (1)Racial totals do not equal all students total, as the racial category was not specified on some student test answer documents. (2)Male and female totals do not equal all students total, as the gender category was not specified on some student test answer documents.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.8 Grade 6 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	90382	83.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	295	84.10
Asian or Pacific Islander	4323	91.50
Black, non-Hispanic	24516	70.70
Hispanic	6430	75.20
White, non-Hispanic	53290	88.80
Students with Disabilities	13138	60.20
Limited English Proficient	5814	71.00
Economically Disadvantaged	27881	70.80
Migrant	56	53.60
Male	46542	80.00
Female	43787	86.20

Comments: (1)Racial totals do not equal all students total, as the racial category was not specified on some student test answer documents. (2)Male and female totals do not equal all students total, as the gender category was not specified on some student test answer documents.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.9 Grade 7 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	78978	43.70
American Indian or Alaska Native	263	42.20
Asian or Pacific Islander	3150	63.80
Black, non-Hispanic	23821	26.40
Hispanic	5717	31.30
White, non-Hispanic	44732	52.90
Students with Disabilities	13194	26.40
Limited English Proficient	4673	30.00
Economically Disadvantaged	26183	28.40
Migrant	60	38.30
Male	40756	43.40
Female	38113	44.00

Comments: (1)Racial totals do not equal all students total, as the racial category was not specified on some student test answer documents. (2)Male and female totals do not equal all students total, as the gender category was not specified on some student test answer documents.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.10 Grade 7 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	92432	81.30
American Indian or Alaska Native	315	83.80
Asian or Pacific Islander	4433	88.60
Black, non-Hispanic	25569	69.10
Hispanic	6105	69.60
White, non-Hispanic	54444	87.60
Students with Disabilities	13458	55.40
Limited English Proficient	4944	62.20
Economically Disadvantaged	27777	67.40
Migrant	53	62.30
Male	47556	78.40
Female	44784	84.40

Comments: (1)Racial totals do not equal all students total, as the racial category was not specified on some student test answer documents. (2)Male and female totals do not equal all students total, as the gender category was not specified on some student test answer documents.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.11 Grade 8 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	91326	76.20
American Indian or Alaska Native	270	75.60
Asian or Pacific Islander	4131	89.30
Black, non-Hispanic	25253	62.50
Hispanic	5921	63.60
White, non-Hispanic	54028	82.80
Students with Disabilities	14644	44.60
Limited English Proficient	4435	58.00
Economically Disadvantaged	25811	62.00
Migrant	54	57.40
Male	47212	73.90
Female	43885	78.80

Comments: (1)Racial totals do not equal all students total, as the racial category was not specified on some student test answer documents. (2)Male and female totals do not equal all students total, as the gender category was not specified on some student test answer documents. (3)The ten percent variance from the 2004-2005 submission for limited English proficient students at the 8th grade level is due to implementation of a new mathematics assessment for the 2005-2006 school year. (4)The ten percent variance in the number of migrant students at the 8th grade level from the 2004-2005 submission is attributed to an increase in the number of students reported.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.12 Grade 8 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	93947	78.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	272	80.90
Asian or Pacific Islander	4421	84.90
Black, non-Hispanic	25487	64.50
Hispanic	6103	62.50
White, non-Hispanic	56139	85.10
Students with Disabilities	14381	49.80
Limited English Proficient	5028	54.40
Economically Disadvantaged	26670	63.30
Migrant	59	40.70
Male	48202	75.00
Female	45636	81.20

Comments: (1)Racial totals do not equal all students total, as the racial category was not specified on some student test answer documents. (2)Male and female totals do not equal all students total, as the gender category was not specified on some student test answer documents. (3)The ten percent variance in the number of American Indian or Alaska Native students at the 8th grade level from the 2004-2005 submission is attributed to a decrease in the number of students reported.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.13 High School - Mathematics		
	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	255364	85.20
American Indian or Alaska Native	768	81.80
Asian or Pacific Islander	14921	92.50
Black, non-Hispanic	61002	75.40
Hispanic	15012	79.50
White, non-Hispanic	159612	88.80
Students with Disabilities	20833	65.60
Limited English Proficient	11032	79.70
Economically Disadvantaged	47533	77.90
Migrant	130	78.50
Male	123924	84.80
Female	131307	85.60

Comments: (1)Racial totals do not equal all students total, as the racial category was not specified on some student test answer documents. (2)Male and female totals do not equal all students total, as the gender category was not specified on some student test answer documents. (3)The ten percent variance in the number of Black, non-Hispanic, Hispanic, students with disabilities, and migrant students from the 2004-2005 submission is attributed to an increase in the number of students reported.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.14 High School - Reading/Language Arts		
	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	89463	90.20
American Indian or Alaska Native	249	88.40
Asian or Pacific Islander	4812	90.90
Black, non-Hispanic	23205	82.70
Hispanic	5200	83.50
White, non-Hispanic	54717	94.00
Students with Disabilities	10015	69.10
Limited English Proficient	3632	73.40
Economically Disadvantaged	16534	82.00
Migrant	39	66.70
Male	44138	88.80
Female	45252	91.60

Comments: (1)Racial totals do not equal all students total, as the racial category was not specified on some student test answer documents. (2)Male and female totals do not equal all students total, as the gender category was not specified on some student test answer documents. (3)The ten percent variance in the number of Black, non-Hispanic, Hispanic, students with disabilities, and migrant students from the 2004-2005 submission is attributed to an increase in the number of students reported.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY

1.4.1 For all public elementary and secondary schools and districts in the State (Title I and non-Title I), please provide the total number and percentage of all schools and districts that made adequate yearly progress (AYP), based on data from the 2005-2006 school year.

School Accountability	Total number of public elementary and secondary schools (Title I and non-Title I) in State	Total number of public elementary and secondary schools (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP	Percentage of public elementary and secondary schools (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP
Based on 2005-2006 School Year Data	1833	1413	77.10

Comments:

District Accountability	Total number of public elementary and secondary districts (Title I and non-Title I) in State	Total number of public elementary and secondary districts (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP	Percentage of public elementary and secondary districts (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP
Based on 2005-2006 School Year Data	132	83	62.90

Comments:

1.4.2 For all Title I schools and districts in the State, please provide the total number and percentage of all Title I schools and districts that made AYP, based on data from the 2005-2006 school year.

Title I School Accountability	Total number of Title I schools in State	Total number of Title I schools in State that made AYP	Percentage of Title I schools in State that made AYP
Based on 2005-2006 School Year Data	755	610	80.80

Comments:

Title I District Accountability	Total number of Title I districts in State	Total number of Title I districts in State that made AYP	Percentage of Title I districts in State that made AYP
Based on 2005-2006 School Year Data	132	83	62.90

Comments:

1.4.3 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

1.4.3.1 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement, Corrective Action, and Restructuring (in 2006-2007 based on the data from 2005-2006)

1.4.3.2 Briefly describe the measures being taken to address the achievement problems of **schools** identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring.

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 is 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 are the primary vehicle for helping schools identify and analyze instructional and organizational factors affecting student achievement. The review process focuses on the systems, processes, and practices implemented at the school and division. Specifically, information is gathered that relates to the following areas: 1) local curriculum alignment to the state learning 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, indicators reflecting 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 its ability to implement these practices. After the review, follow-up reports are given to the school and division. This report includes recommendations in developing, revising, and implementing the school's three-year improvement plan. Follow-up technical assistance is also provided.

A detailed description of the school-level academic review process and related technical assistance provided by the Virginia Department of Education can be found at:

<http://www.doe.virginia.gov/VDOE/suptsmemos/2005/inf202a.pdf>

1.4.4 Title I Districts Identified For Improvement.

1.4.4.1 Title I Districts Identified for Improvement and Corrective Action (in 2006-2007 based on the data from 2005-2006)

1.4.4.2 Briefly describe the measures being taken to address the achievement problems of districts identified for improvement and corrective action.

Virginia has no divisions identified as in improvement or corrective action. The Virginia Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook, amended July 2006, 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.24) This identification process resulted in no divisions being identified as in improvement for 2006-07.

1.4.5 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

1.4.5.1 Public School Choice	
	Number
1. Please provide the number of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring from which students transferred under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	57
2. Please provide the number of public schools to which students transferred under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	87
How many of these schools were charter schools?	0
3. Please provide the number of students who transferred to another public school under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	922
4. Please provide the number of students who were eligible to transfer to another public school under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	49755
Optional Information:	
5. If the State has the following data, the Department would be interested in knowing the following:	
6. The number of students who applied to transfer to another public school under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	997
7. The number of students, among those who applied to transfer to another public school under the Title I public school choice provisions, who were actually offered the opportunity to transfer by their LEAs, during the 2005-2006 school year.	
Comments:	

1.4.5.2 Supplemental Educational Services	
	Number
1. Please provide the number of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring whose students received supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	39
2. Please provide the number of students who received supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	2526
3. Please provide the number of students who were eligible to receive supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	14854
Optional Information:	
If the State has the following data, the Department would be interested in knowing the following:	
4. The number of students who applied to receive supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	
Comments: Includes students who participated in USED Reversal of Public School Choice(PSC) and Supplemental Educational Services(SES)Pilot.	

1.5 TEACHER AND PARAPROFESSIONAL QUALITY

1.5.1 In the following table, please provide data from the 2005-2006 school year for classes in the core academic subjects being taught by "highly qualified" teachers (as the term is defined in Section 9101(23) of the ESEA), in the aggregate for all schools and in "high-poverty" and "low-poverty" elementary schools (as the terms are defined in Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) of the ESEA). Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "high-poverty" schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State and "low-poverty" schools as schools in the bottom quartile of poverty in the State. Additionally, please provide information on classes being taught by highly qualified teachers by the elementary and secondary school level.

School Type	Total Number of Core Academic Classes	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers
All Schools in State	215827	208796	96.74
Elementary Level			
High-Poverty Schools	11216	10784	96.20
Low-Poverty Schools	13120	12937	98.61
All Elementary Schools	47347	46218	97.62
Secondary Level			
High-Poverty Schools	17307	16250	93.89
Low-Poverty Schools	58701	57490	97.94
All Secondary Schools	168480	162577	96.50
Comments:			

Definitions and Instructions

What are the core academic subjects?

English, reading or 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.

How is a teacher defined?

An individual who provides instruction in the core academic areas to kindergarten, grades 1 through 12, or un-graded 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]

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].

Should 6th, 7th, and 8th grade classes be reported in the elementary or 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 if their schools are configured as elementary or middle schools.

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.

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 English, calculus, history, and science are taught in a self-contained classroom by the same teacher, count these as four classes in the denominator. If the teacher is Highly Qualified in English and history, he/she would be counted as Highly Qualified in two of the four subjects in the numerator.

1.5.2 For those classes in core academic subjects being taught by teachers who are **not highly qualified** as reported in Question 1.5.1, estimate the percentages of those classes in the following categories (Note: Percentages should add to 100 percent of classes taught by not highly qualified teachers for each level).

Reason For Being Classified as Not Highly Qualified	Percentage
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL CLASSES	
a) 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	63.50
b) 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	36.10
c) Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	0.50
d) Other (please explain)	0.00
SECONDARY SCHOOL CLASSES	
a) 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)	69.30
b) Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	30.10
c) Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	0.60
d) Other (please explain)	0.00
Comments:	

1.5.3 Please report the State poverty quartile breaks for high- and low-poverty elementary and secondary schools used in the table in Question 1.5.1.

	High-Poverty Schools (more than what %)	Low-Poverty Schools (less than what %)
Elementary Schools	59.61	21.98
Poverty Metric Used	Percentage of students receiving free and reduced lunch.	
Secondary Schools	46.84	18.48
Poverty Metric Used	Percentage of students receiving free and reduced lunch.	

Comments:

Definitions and Instructions

How are the poverty quartiles determined?

Separately rank order elementary and secondary schools from highest to lowest on your percent poverty measure. Divide the list into 4 equal groups. Schools in the first (highest group) are high-poverty schools. Schools in the last group (lowest group) are the low-poverty schools. Generally, states use the percentage of students who qualify for the free or reduced price lunch program for this calculation.

Since the poverty data are collected at the school and not classroom level, how do we classify schools as either elementary or secondary for this purpose?

States may include as elementary schools all schools that serve children in grades K-5 (including K-8 or K-12 schools) and would therefore include as secondary schools those that exclusively serve children in grades 6 and higher.

1.5.4 Paraprofessional Quality. NCLB defines a qualified paraprofessional as an employee who provides instructional support in a program supported by Title I, Part A funds who has (1) completed two years of study at an institution of higher education; (2) obtained an associate's (or higher) degree; or (3) met a rigorous standard of quality and be able to demonstrate, through a formal State or local academic assessment, knowledge of and the ability to assist in instructing reading, writing, and mathematics (or, as appropriate, reading readiness, writing readiness, and mathematics readiness) (Section 1119(c) and (d).) For more information on qualified paraprofessionals, please refer to the Title I paraprofessionals Guidance, available at:

<http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/paraguidance.doc>

In the following chart, please provide data from the 2005-2006 school year for the percentage of Title I paraprofessionals (excluding those with sole duties as translators and parental involvement assistants) who are qualified.

School Year	Percentage of Qualified Title I Paraprofessionals
2005-2006 School Year	88.20

Comments:

1.6 ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY

1.6.1.1 English Language Proficiency (ELP) Standards

Has the State developed ELP standards (k-12) as required under Section 3113(b)(2) and are these ELP standards fully approved, adopted, or sanctioned by the State governing body?

Developed	Yes
Approved, adopted, sanctioned	Yes
Operationalized (e.g., Are standards being used by district and school teachers?)	Yes

Please provide a detailed description of the State's progress in establishing, implementing, and operationalizing English Language Proficiency (ELP) standards for raising the level of ELP, that are derived from the four domains of speaking, listening, reading, and writing, and that are aligned with achievement of the challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards described in section 1111(b)(1).

STATE RESPONSE

English Language Proficiency (ELP) Standards of Learning for limited English proficient (LEP) students were adopted by the Virginia Board of Education in November 2002. The ELP Standards of Learning are currently undergoing review and revision. They were presented to the Virginia Board of Education for first review in October 2006. The standards were developed in each of the four domains of speaking, listening, reading, and writing and include four levels of English language proficiency. The four levels of proficiency defined in the standards provide the framework for initial placement of LEP students in instructional programs. Student progress on the standards is measured annually through an English language proficiency assessment. The results of the annual assessment are used to measure progress and proficiency in English language acquisition as well as place students in the appropriate instructional level.

1.6.1.2 Alignment of Standards

Please provide a detailed description of the State's progress for linking/aligning the State English Proficiency Standards to the State academic content and student academic achievement standards in English language arts/reading and mathematics.

STATE RESPONSE

The ELP Standards are linked to the Reading/Language Arts Standards of Learning, which is demonstrated through their publication as an integrated section of the Reading/Language Arts Standards of Learning. The domain descriptors for both the Reading/Language Arts Standards of Learning and the ELP Standards are the same and serve as the linking strand between the two groups of standards. The proposed revised ELP Standards can be accessed via the link below:

<http://www.doe.virginia.gov/VDOE/suptsmemos/2006/inf209a.pdf>

An additional linkage between the Reading/Language Arts Standards of Learning and the ELP Standards has been created via a resource document entitled, "Strategies for Teaching Limited English Proficient Students - A Supplemental Resource Guide to the K-12 English Standards of Learning Enhanced Scope and Sequence." The document serves as a supplement to the K-12 English Standards of Learning Enhanced Scope and Sequence, which assists teachers with aligning their instruction with the English Standards of Learning. This document is intended to provide classroom teachers with effective strategies for differentiating instruction for LEP students. This document can be accessed via the link below:

<http://www.pen.k12.va.us/VDOE/Instruction/ESL/LEPenglishResource.pdf>

The linkage between the ELP Standards and the Mathematics Standards of Learning has been accomplished via a resource document entitled, "Mathematics: Strategies for Teaching Limited English Proficient (LEP) Students - A Supplemental Resource to the K-12 Mathematics Standards of Learning Enhanced Scope and Sequence." The document serves as a supplement to the K-12 Mathematics Standards of Learning Enhanced Scope and Sequence, which assists teachers with aligning their instruction with the Mathematics Standards of Learning. This document is intended to provide classroom teachers with effective strategies for differentiating instruction for LEP students. The document can be accessed via the link below:

<http://www.doe.virginia.gov/VDOE/Instruction/ESL/LEPmathResource.pdf>

1.6.2 English Language Proficiency (ELP) Assessments

1. The expectation for the full administration of the new or enhanced ELP assessment(s) that are aligned with the State's English language proficiency (ELP) standards as required under Section 3113 (b)(2) is spring 2007. Please indicate if the State has conducted any of the following:

- An independent alignment study No
- Other evidence of alignment Yes

2. Provide an updated description of the State's progress in developing and implementing the new or enhanced ELP assessments. Specifically describe how the State ensures:

1. The annual assessment of all LEP students in the State in grades k-12;
2. The ELP assessment(s) which address the five domains of listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension;
3. ELP assessments are based on ELP standards;
4. Technical quality (validity, reliability, etc.)

STATE RESPONSE

The state ensures that all local school divisions in the state annually administer an English language proficiency (ELP) assessment to all K-12 LEP students in the state in the following ways. The information is announced annually via Superintendent's Memoranda that remind school divisions of the requirement. Follow-up Superintendent's Memoranda are issued that describe regional trainings that are held regarding the administration of the ELP assessment. Additionally, Title III Coordinators and Division Directors of Testing (DDOTs) receive technical assistance through a series of meetings in the fall and spring of each year. These meetings, which are sponsored by the Virginia Department of Education, include formal presentations that address assessment requirements for LEP students.

For 2005-2006, the majority of school divisions in Virginia used an augmented version of the Stanford English Language Proficiency (SELP) test. One school division was approved to use a locally developed ELP assessment. This locally developed assessment was used at the highest proficiency levels. The augmented version of the SELP included: 1) a revised writing rubric designed by Virginia educators; 2) a tighter alignment with Virginia ELP standards; 3) additional reading passages designed to discriminate at the upper proficiency levels; and 4) a separate form designed to address the needs of K-1 students. Each form of the Stanford ELP contains four components: 1) speaking, 2) listening, 3) reading, and 4) writing as required in Section 1111(b)(7) of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. The Stanford ELP yields a score for each of these four components as well as a composite score. Additionally, as required only for Title III sub-grantees in Section 3121(d) of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, the listening and reading components of the Stanford ELP are combined to yield a comprehension score.

The SELP test reflects all aspects necessary for comprehensive, standards-based assessment of English language proficiency. Developed by ESL experts, this research-based test evaluates the listening, reading, comprehension, writing, and speaking skills of K-12 English language learners. The SELP is correlated to Virginia's English Language Proficiency Standards of Learning. It offers multiple-choice and performance-based assessment formats. It aligns with the Stanford Scale for consistent information across assessment programs. The SELP tests supports the validity-related standards set forth in the current edition of the Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing. The SELP test has been evaluated to determine its validity by assessing the test content, its internal structure, and its relationship to other variables. The reliability of the SELP was examined to ensure that the SELP yields consistent results from year to year. The results indicated that the SELP is a valid and reliable measure of English language proficiency for LEP students in grades K-12. For detailed information relating to the technical quality of the SELP test, please access the link: <http://harcourtassessment.com/haiweb/cultures/en-us/productdetail.htm?pid=015-8429-206>.

1.6.3.2 Data Reflecting the Most Common Languages Spoken in the State		
2005-2006 Data of the Most Common Languages Spoken by LEPs		
Language	Number of ALL LEP Students in the State	Percentage of ALL LEP Students in the State
1. Spanish	46583	58.60
2. Korean	4294	5.40
3. Vietnamese	3156	4.00
4. Arabic	2705	3.40
5. Urdu	2587	3.30
6. Chinese, Mandarin	1611	2.00
7. Farsi	1513	1.90
8. Tagalog	1319	1.70
9. Amharic	953	1.20
10. Russian	928	1.20
Comments:		

- In the above chart, list the ten most commonly spoken languages in your State. Indicate the number and percentage of LEP students that speak each of the languages listed in table 1.6.3.2.

1.6.4 Immigrant Children and Youth Data

Programs and activities for immigrant children and youth

Definitions:

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

**Table 1.6.4 Education Programs for Immigrant Students
2005-2006**

# Immigrants enrolled in the State	# Immigrants served by Title III	# Immigrant subgrants
26040	25912	32

Comments:

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

The number of immigrant children and youth has continued to increase in Virginia over the past two years. In 2004-2005, 23,232 immigrant children and youth were enrolled in Virginia's 132 school divisions. In 2005-2006, the number of immigrant children and youth enrolled in Virginia's 132 school divisions increased to 25,912.

1.6.5 Definition of Proficient

If the State has made changes since the last Consolidated State Performance Report submission (for school year 2004-2005), please provide the State's definition of "proficient" in English as defined by the State's English language proficiency standards and assessments under Section 3122(a)(3). Please include the following in your response:

1. The test score range or cut scores for each of the State's ELP assessments;
2. A description of how the five domains of listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension are incorporated or weighted in the State's definition of "proficient" in English;
3. Other criteria used to determine attaining proficiency in English.

STATE RESPONSE

There have been no changes to the state's definition of proficient since the Consolidated State Performance Report submission in 2004-2005.

1.6.6 Definition of Making Progress

If the State has made changes since the last Consolidated State Performance Report submission (for school year 2004-2005), please provide the State's definition of "making progress" in learning English as defined by the State's English language proficiency standards and assessment(s) in Section 3122(a)(3).

Please include the following in your response:

1. A description of the English language proficiency levels and any sub-levels as defined by the State's English language proficiency standards and assessments;
2. A description of the criteria students must meet to progress from one proficiency level to the next (e.g., narrative descriptions, cut scores, formula, data from multiple sources).

STATE RESPONSE

There have been no changes to the state's definition of making progress since the Consolidated State Performance Report submission in 2004-2005.

1.6.7 Definition of Cohort

If the State has made changes since the last Consolidated State Performance Report submission (for school year 2004-2005), please provide the State's definition of "cohort." Include a description of the specific characteristics of the cohort(s) in the State, e.g., grade/grade span or other characteristics.

STATE RESPONSE

There have been no changes to the state's definition of cohort since the Consolidated State Performance Report submission in 2004-2005.

1.6.8 Information on the Acquisition of English Language Proficiency for ALL Limited English Proficient Students in the State.

Please provide information on the progress made by **ALL LEP students in your State** in learning English and attaining English language proficiency.

Did your State apply the Title III English language proficiency annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) to **ALL LEP** students in the State? Yes

If yes, you may use the format provided below to report the requested information.

English Language Proficiency	Percent and Number of ALL LEP Students in the State Who Made Progress in Learning English				Percent and Number of ALL LEP Students in the State Who Attained English Proficiency			
	Projected AMAO Target		Actual		Projected AMAO Target		Actual	
2005-2006 School Year	% 30.00	#	% 85.00	# 59981	% 20.00	#	% 38.00	# 26815

If no, please describe the different evaluation mechanism used by the State to measure both the progress of ALL LEP students in learning English and in attaining English language proficiency and provide the data from that evaluation.

1.6.9 Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs) for English Language Proficiency for Title III Participants

Critical synthesis of data reported by Title III subgrantees

[SEC. 3121(a) p. 1701, 3123(b)(1, 3) p.1704]

Provide the results of Title III LEP students in meeting the State English language proficiency (ELP) annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) for making progress and attainment of English language proficiency as required in Table 1.6.9.

TABLE 1.6.9 INSTRUCTIONS:

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

Blackened cells in this form indicate information which, each SEA should collect and maintain, but which is not being collected at this time.

Definitions:

1. **MAKING PROGRESS** = as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
2. **DID NOT MAKE PROGRESS** = The number and percentage of Title III LEP students who did not meet the State definition of "Making Progress."
3. **ATTAINED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY** = as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
4. **TOTAL** = the total number of students from **making progress**, **not making progress**, and **attainment**, for each year in the table. The figure reported in this cell should be an unduplicated count of LEP students who participate in Title III English language instruction educational programs in grades K-12.
5. **AMAO TARGET** = the AMAO target for the year as established by State and submitted to OELA in the CSA (September 2003 submission), or as amended and approved, for each objective for "Making progress" and "Attainment" of English language proficiency.
6. **ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS** = The number and percentage of Title III LEP students who met/did not meet the State definitions of "Making Progress" and the number and percentage of Title III LEP students who met the definition for "Attainment" of English language proficiency.

1.6.9 Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs) for English Language Proficiency for Title III Participants			
	2005-2006		
	AMAO TARGET	ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS	
	%	#	%
MAKING PROGRESS	30.00	43015	86.00
DID NOT MAKE PROGRESS		7002	
ATTAINED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY	20.00	19810	38.00
TOTAL		69827	

Explanation of data for Table

Check the answer to the following question.

Are monitored* LEP students reflected in the Table "Attainment" "Achievement Results"? Yes No

* Monitored LEP students are those who

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

1.6.10 Title III program effectiveness in assisting LEP students to meet State English language proficiency and student academic achievement standards

[SEC. 3122(b)(2) p. 1703, 3123(b)(1, 4) p.1704-5, 3121(b)(2) p. 1701,]

Provide the count for each year.

It is not necessary to respond to the items in this form, which reference other collections. The information provided by each SEA to those other collections will be collected by OELA and utilized to produce the Biennial Report.

Title III Subgrantee Information

	2005-2006
Total number of Title III subgrantees for each year	80
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for making progress	77
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for attaining English proficiency	40
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for AYP	29
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs*	16
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met 2 AMAOs	37
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met 1 AMAO	24
Total number of Title III subgrantees that did not meet any AMAO	0
Total number of Title III subgrantees that did not meet AMAOs for two consecutive years	45
Total number of Title III subgrantees with an improvement plan for not meeting Title III AMAOs	45
Total number of Title III subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (beginning in 2007-08)	0
Did the State meet all three Title III AMAOs? *	Yes

Comments:

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

1.6.11 On the following tables for 2005-2006, please provide data regarding the academic achievement of monitored LEP students who transitioned into classrooms not designated for LEP students and who are no longer receiving services under Title III. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned in 2005-2006 school year.

1.6.11.1 Number and percent of former Title III served, monitored LEP students scoring at the proficient and advanced levels on the State reading language arts assessments		
Grade/Grade Span	Students Proficient & Advanced	
	#	%
3	375	84.30
4	710	92.90
5	835	93.00
6	735	91.10
7	462	86.20
8	796	78.90
H.S.	681	75.50

Comments:

1.6.11.2 Number and percent of former Title III served, monitored LEP students scoring at the proficient and advanced levels on the State mathematics assessments

Grade/Grade Span	Students Proficient & Advanced	
	#	%
3	410	93.20
4	651	86.50
5	762	89.90
6	448	63.80
7	206	42.50
8	554	72.60
H.S.	1693	76.30

Comments:

1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS

1.7.1 In the following chart, please provide data for the number of schools identified as persistently dangerous as determined by the State by the start of the 2006-2007 school year. For further guidance on persistently dangerous schools, please refer to the Unsafe School Choice Option Non-Regulatory Guidance, available at:

	Number of Persistently Dangerous Schools
2006-2007 School Year	0

Comments:

1.8 GRADUATION AND DROPOUT RATES

1.8.1 Graduation Rates

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.

1. The Secretary approved each State's definition of the graduation rate, consistent with section 200.19 of the Title I regulations, as part of each State's accountability plan. Using the definition of the graduation rate that was approved as part of your State's accountability plan, in the following chart please provide graduation rate data for the 2004-2005 school year.

2. 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.

1.8.1 Graduation Rates	
High School Graduates	Graduation Rate
Student Group	2004-2005 School Year
All Students	79.50
American Indian or Alaska Native	81.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	89.20
Black, non-Hispanic	70.10
Hispanic	68.10
White, non-Hispanic	83.00
Students with Disabilities	0.00
Limited English Proficient	0.00
Economically Disadvantaged	0.00
Migrant	0.00
Male	75.70
Female	83.30

Comments: (1) In 2004-2005 we did not track the graduation rate of students with disabilities, limited English proficient students, economically disadvantaged students, and migrant students. (2) The five percent variance from the 2004-2005 submission for American Indian or Alaska Native student group is attributed to an increase in the number of American Indian or Alaska Native students.

Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the

major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.8.2 Dropout Rate

For purposes of calculating and reporting a dropout rate for this performance indicator, States should use the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistics' (NCES) Common Core of Data

Consistent with this requirement, States must use NCES' definition of "high school dropout," 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.

In the following chart, please provide data for the 2004-2005 school year for the percentage of students who drop out of high school, disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged.

1.8.2 Dropout Rate	
Dropouts	Dropout Rate
Student Group	2004-2005 School Year
All Students	1.80
American Indian or Alaska Native	2.10
Asian or Pacific Islander	1.50
Black, non-Hispanic	2.40
Hispanic	5.30
White, non-Hispanic	1.30
Students with Disabilities	2.00
Limited English Proficient	4.20
Economically Disadvantaged	2.00
Migrant	3.20
Male	2.10
Female	1.60

Comments: The three percent variance from the 2004-2005 submission for all students, Asian or Pacific Islander, Black, non-Hispanic, Hispanic, students with disabilities, migrant, male and female is attributable to a decrease in the dropout rate statewide.

Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

Provide the following information for homeless children and youth in your State for the 2005-2006 school year (as defined by your State). To complete this form, compile data for LEAs with and without subgrants.

1.9.1 DATA FROM ALL LEAs WITH AND WITHOUT MCKINNEY-VENTO SUBGRANTS

1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTH PROGRAM

1.9.1.1 How does your State define the period that constitutes a school year? (e.g., "The school year shall begin on the first day of July and end on the thirtieth day of June" or "A total of 175 instructional days").

STATE RESPONSE

The length of every school's term in every school division shall be 180 teaching days or 990 teaching hours in any school year.

1.9.1.2 What are the totals in your State as follows:

	Total Number in State	Total Number LEAs Reporting
LEAs without Subgrants	104	104
LEAs with Subgrants	28	28

Comments:

1.9.1.3 Number of Homeless Children And Youth In The State

Provide the number of homeless children and youth in your State enrolled in public school (compulsory grades--excluding pre-school) during the 2005-2006 school year according to grade level groups below:

Grade Level	Number of homeless children/youth enrolled in public school in LEAs without subgrants	Number of homeless children/youth enrolled in public school in LEAs with subgrants
K	313	790
1	338	825
2	283	825
3	255	737
4	241	679
5	222	691
6	263	662
7	242	542
8	228	488
9	230	579
10	128	320
11	87	269
12	90	237

Comments:

1.9.1.4 Primary Nighttime Residence Of Homeless Children And Youth

Of the total number of homeless children and youth (excluding preschoolers), provide the numbers who had the following as their primary nighttime residence at the time of initial identification by LEAs.

Primary nighttime residence	* Number of homeless children/ youth-- excluding preschoolers LEAs without subgrants	* Number of homeless children/ youth-- excluding preschoolers LEAs with subgrants
Shelters	518	1903
Doubled-up	1260	3806
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, etc.)	46	149
Hotels/Motels	276	829
Unknown	820	957

Comments:

* The primary nighttime residence is the basis for identifying homeless children and youth. The totals should match the totals in item #3 above.

1.9.2 DATA FROM LEAs WITH MCKINNEY-VENTO SUBGRANTS**1.9.2.1 Number Of Homeless Children And Youths Served By McKinney-Vento Subgrants**

Provide the number of homeless children and youth that were served by McKinney-Vento subgrants in your State during the 2005-2006 academic school year disaggregated by grade level groups

Grade levels of homeless children and youth served by subgrants in 2005-2006	Number of homeless children and youth <i>served</i> by subgrants enrolled in school by grade level
K	719
1	686
2	668
3	598
4	562
5	550
6	543
7	458
8	406
9	490
10	277
11	224
12	190

Comments:

1.9.2.2 Number of homeless preschool-age children

Provide the number of homeless preschool-age children in your State in districts with subgrants attending public preschool programs during the 2005-2006 school year (i.e., from birth through pre-K).

Number of homeless preschool-age children enrolled in public preschool in LEAs with subgrants in 2005-2006

195

Comments: Subgrants reported serving an additional 436 preschoolers not enrolled in public preschools.

1.9.2.3 Unaccompanied Youths

Provide the number of unaccompanied youths served by subgrants during the 2005-2006 school year.

Number of homeless unaccompanied youths enrolled in public schools in LEAs with subgrants in 2005-2006

228

Comments:

1.9.2.4 Migrant Children/Youth Served

Provide the number of homeless migrant children/youth served by subgrants during the 2005-2006 school year.

Number of homeless migrant children/youth enrolled in public schools (Total for LEAs with subgrants)

62

Comments:

1.9.2.5 Number of Children Receiving Educational and School Support Services

Provide the number of homeless children and youth served by subgrants and enrolled in school during the 2005-2006 school year that received the following educational and school support services from the LEA

Educational and school related activities and services	Number of homeless students in subgrantee programs that received educational and support services
Special Education (IDEA)	1149
English Language Learners (ELL)	546
Gifted and Talented	172
Vocational Education	783

Comments:

1.9.2.6 Educational Support Services

Provide the number of subgrantee programs that provided the following educational support services with McKinney-Vento funds.

Services and Activities Provided by the McKinney-Vento subgrant program	Number of your State's subgrantees that offer these services
Tutoring or other instructional support	25
Expedited evaluations	17
Staff professional development and awareness	25
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	22
Transportation	25
Early childhood programs	14
Assistance with participation in school programs	22
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	24
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	25
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	25
Coordination between schools and agencies	28
Counseling	19
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	22
Clothing to meet a school requirement	22
School supplies	26
Referral to other programs and services	27
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	18
Other (optional)	4

Comments:

1.9.2.7 Barriers To The Education Of Homeless Children And Youth

Provide the number of subgrantees that reported the following barriers to the enrollment and success of homeless children and youth during the 2005-2006 school year.

Barriers	List number of subgrantees reporting each barrier
Eligibility for homeless services	5
School selection	7
Transportation	12
School records	8
Immunizations or other medical records	8
Other enrollment issues	3

Comments:

1.9.2.8 Additional Barriers (Optional)

Note any other barriers not listed above that were frequently reported:

List other barriers	List number of subgrantees reporting each barrier
Lack of housing/shelters	1
Difficulty locating parents/guardians	1

Comments:

1.9.2.9 Academic Progress of Homeless Students

In order to ensure that homeless children and youth have access to education and other services needed to meet the State's challenging academic standards:

a) Check the grade levels in which your State administered a statewide assessment in reading or mathematics; b) note the number of homeless children and youth served by subgrants in 2005-2006 that were included in statewide assessments in reading or mathematics; and c) note the number of homeless children and youth that met or exceeded the State's proficiency level or standard on the reading or mathematics assessment.

Reading Assessment:

School Grade Levels *	a) Reading assessment by grade level (check boxes where appropriate; indicate "DNA" if assessment is required and data is not available for reporting; indicate "N/A" for grade not assessed by State)	b) Number of homeless children/youth taking reading assessment test.	c) Number of homeless children/youth that met or exceeded state proficiency.
Grade 3	Yes	432	285
Grade 4	Yes	329	232
Grade 5	Yes	376	260
Grade 6	Yes	360	233
Grade 7	Yes	272	172
Grade 8	Yes	210	117
Grade 9	N/A		
Grade 10	N/A		
Grade 11	Yes	83	66
Grade 12	N/A		

Comments:**Mathematics Assessment:**

School Grade Levels *	a) Mathematics assessment by grade level (check boxes where appropriate; indicate "DNA" if assessment is required and data is not available for reporting; indicate "N/A" for grade not assessed by State)	b) Number of homeless children/youth taking mathematics assessment test.	c) Number of homeless children/youth that met or exceeded state proficiency.
Grade 3	Yes	384	284
Grade 4	Yes	288	153
Grade 5	Yes	334	220
Grade 6	Yes	299	79
Grade 7	Yes	247	61
Grade 8	Yes	210	104
Grade 9	Yes	116	82
Grade 10	Yes	103	77
Grade 11	Yes	64	53
Grade 12	Yes	44	30

Comments:

* Note: State assessments in grades 3-8 and one year of high school are NCLB requirements. However, States may assess students in other grades as well.