

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

for  
**STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS**  
under the  
**ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT**  
As amended in 2001

For reporting on  
**School Year 2014-15**



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

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION**  
**WASHINGTON, DC 20202**

**PRIVACY PROTECTED VERSION**

**SOME DATA IN THIS REPORT HAVE BEEN SUPPRESSED OR BLURRED TO PROTECT STUDENT PRIVACY.**

## INTRODUCTION

Sections 9302 and 9303 of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)*, as amended in 2001 provide to States the option of applying for and reporting on multiple *ESEA* programs through a single consolidated application and report. Although a central, practical purpose of the Consolidated State Application and Report is to reduce "red tape" and burden on States, the Consolidated State Application and Report are also intended to have the important purpose of encouraging the integration of State, local, and *ESEA* programs in comprehensive planning and service delivery and enhancing the likelihood that the State will coordinate planning and service delivery across multiple State and local programs. The combined goal of all educational agencies—State, local, and Federal—is a more coherent, well-integrated educational plan that will result in improved teaching and learning. The Consolidated State Application and Report includes the following *ESEA* programs:

- Title I, Part A – *Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies*
- Title I, Part B, Subpart 3 – *William F. Goodling Even Start Family Literacy Programs*
- Title I, Part C – *Education of Migratory Children* (Includes the Migrant Child Count)
- Title I, Part D – *Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk*
- Title II, Part A – *Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund)*
- Title III, Part A – *English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement Act*
- Title IV, Part A, Subpart 1 – *Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities State Grants*
- Title IV, Part A, Subpart 2 – *Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Activities (Community Service Grant Program)*
- Title V, Part A – *Innovative Programs*
- Title VI, Section 6111 – *Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities*
- Title VI, Part B – *Rural Education Achievement Program*
- Title X, Part C – *Education for Homeless Children and Youths*

The *ESEA* Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2014-15 consists of two Parts, Part I and Part II.

### **PART I**

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

- | **Performance Goal 1:** By SY 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.

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

### **PART II**

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

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

## GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 2014-15 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Thursday, December 17, 2015**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Thursday, February 11, 2016**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2014-15, unless otherwise noted.

The format states will use to submit the Consolidated State Performance Report has changed to an online submission starting with SY 2004-05. This online submission system is being developed through the Education Data Exchange Network (EDEN) and will make the submission process less burdensome. Please see the following section on transmittal instructions for more information on how to submit this year's Consolidated State Performance Report.

## TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

The Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) data will be collected online from the SEAs, using the EDEN web site. The EDEN web site will be modified to include a separate area (sub-domain) for CSPR data entry. This area will utilize EDEN formatting to the extent possible and the data will be entered in the order of the current CSPR forms. The data entry screens will include or provide access to all instructions and notes on the current CSPR forms; additionally, an effort will be made to design the screens to balance efficient data collection and reduction of visual clutter.

Initially, a state user will log onto EDEN and be provided with an option that takes him or her to the "SY 2014-15 CSPR". The main CSPR screen will allow the user to select the section of the CSPR that he or she needs to either view or enter data. After selecting a section of the CSPR, the user will be presented with a screen or set of screens where the user can input the data for that section of the CSPR. A user can only select one section of the CSPR at a time. After a state has included all available data in the designated sections of a particular CSPR Part, a lead state user will certify that Part and transmit it to the Department. Once a Part has been transmitted, ED will have access to the data. States may still make changes or additions to the transmitted data, by creating an updated version of the CSPR. Detailed instructions for transmitting the SY 2014-15 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

		OMB Number: 1810-0724
		Expiration Date: 5/31/2018
Consolidated State Performance Report For State Formula Grant Programs under the Elementary And Secondary Education Act as amended in 2001		
Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2014-15 <input type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2014-15		
Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report: Virginia Department of Education		
Address: P. O. Box 2120 Richmond, VA 23218-2120		
Person to contact about this report:		
Name: Dr. Lynn Sodat, Acting Director of Program Administration and Accountability		
Telephone: (804) 371-2934		
Fax: (804) 371-7347		
e-mail: Lynn.Sodat@doe.virginia.gov		
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Dr. Steven R. Staples, Superintendent of Public Instruction		
		<u>Tuesday, April 12, 2016, 9:33:01 AM</u>
_____ Signature		_____ Date

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT  
PART I**

For reporting on  
**School Year 2014-15**



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 17, 2015  
5PM EST**

**1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT**

**STANDARDS OF ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT**

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

**1.1.1 Academic Content Standards**

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

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

Acceptable responses are a school year (e.g., 2014-15) or Not Applicable.

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

If the responses above do not fully describe revisions or changes to your State's academic content standards, describe the revisions or changes below.

The response is limited to 1,000 characters.

--

**1.1.1.1 Academic Achievement Standards in Mathematics, Reading/Language Arts and Science**

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

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

Response	Options
	No revisions or changes to academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science made or planned.
<u>No Revisions or changes</u>	State has changed its academic achievement standards or is planning to change its academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Indicate below either the school year in which these changes were or will be implemented or "Not Applicable" to indicate that changes were not made or will not be made in the subject area.

Acceptable responses are a school year (e.g., 2014-15) or Not Applicable.

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

If the responses above do not fully describe revisions or changes to your State's academic achievement standards, describe the revisions or changes below.

The response is limited to 1,000 characters.

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



**1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts and Science**

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

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

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

Acceptable responses are a school year (e.g., 2014-15) or Not Applicable.

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

If the responses above do not fully describe revisions or changes to your State's academic achievement standards, describe the revisions or changes below.

The response is limited to 1,000 characters.

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

**1.1.3 Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities****1.1.3.1 Percentages of Funds Used for Standards and Assessment Development and Other Purposes**

For funds your State had available under *ESEA* section 6111 (Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities) during SY 2014-15, estimate what percentage of the funds your State used for the following (round to the nearest ten percent).

Purpose	Percentage (rounded to the nearest ten percent)
To pay the costs of the development of the State assessments and standards required by Section 1111(b)	50.00
To administer assessments required by Section 1111(b) or to carry out other activities described in section 6111 and other activities related to ensuring that the State's schools and local educational agencies are held accountable for the results	50.00
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

**1.1.3.2 Uses of Funds for Purposes Other than Standards and Assessment Development**

For funds your State had available under *ESEA* section 6111 (Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities) during SY 2014-15 that were used for purposes other than the costs of the development of the State assessments and standards required by section 1111(b), for what purposes did your State use the funds? (Enter "yes" for all that apply and "no" for all that do not apply).

Purpose	Used for Purpose (yes/no)
Administering assessments required by Section 1111(b)	<u>Yes</u>
Developing challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards and aligned assessments in academic subjects for which standards and assessments are not required by Section 1111(b)	<u>No</u>
Developing or improving assessments of English language proficiency necessary to comply with Section 1111(b)(7)	<u>No</u>
Ensuring the continued validity and reliability of State assessments, and/or refining State assessments to ensure their continued alignment with the State's academic content standards and to improve the alignment of curricula and instructional materials	<u>Yes</u>
Developing multiple measures to increase the reliability and validity of State assessment systems	<u>No</u>
Strengthening the capacity of local educational agencies and schools to provide all students the opportunity to increase educational achievement, including carrying out professional development activities aligned with State student academic achievement standards and assessments	<u>Yes</u>
Expanding the range of accommodations available to students with limited English proficiency and students with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) to improve the rates of inclusion of such students, including professional development activities aligned with State academic achievement standards and assessments	<u>Yes</u>
Improving the dissemination of information on student achievement and school performance to parents and the community, including the development of information and reporting systems designed to identify best educational practices based on scientifically based research or to assist in linking records of student achievement, length of enrollment, and graduation over time	<u>Yes</u>
Other	<u>No</u>
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

## 1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

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

**Note:** States are not required to report these data by the racial/ethnic groups shown in the table below; instead, they are required to report these data by the major racial and ethnic groups that are identified in their Accountability Workbooks. The charts below display racial/ethnic data that have been mapped from the major racial and ethnic groups identified in their workbooks to the racial/ethnic groups shown.

### 1.2.1 Participation of all Students in Mathematics Assessment

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

The student group "children with disabilities (*IDEA*)" includes children who participated in the regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments. Do not include former students with disabilities (*IDEA*). Do not include students only covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	S	782,475	99.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	2,245	>=99
Asian or Pacific Islander	S	52,116	99.7
<i>Asian</i>	S	50,933	S
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	S	1,183	>=99
Black or African American	S	179,877	99.4
Hispanic or Latino	S	106,800	99.2
White	S	403,995	99.6
Two or more races	S	37,442	S
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	S	96,482	99.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	48,465	99.3
Economically disadvantaged students	S	309,011	99.3
Migratory students	S	180	>=95
Male	S	398,135	99.4
Female	S	384,340	99.6

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

**1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities (IDEA) in Mathematics Assessment**

In the table below, provide the number of children with disabilities (IDEA) participating during the State's testing window in mathematics assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA (regardless of whether the children were present for a full academic year) by the type of assessment. The percentage of children with disabilities (IDEA) who participated in the mathematics assessment for each assessment option will be calculated automatically. The total number of children with disabilities (IDEA) participating will also be calculated automatically.

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	36,083	37.40
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	52,834	54.76
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	7,565	7.84
Total	96,482	////////////////////////////////////
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Virginia discontinued the use of alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards. The final administration of these assessments occurred in the 2013-2014 school year.		

The "Asian/Pacific Islander" row in the tables below represent either the value reported by the state to the Department of Education for the major racial and ethnic group "Asian/Pacific Islander" or an aggregation of values reported by the state for the major racial and ethnic groups "Asian" and "Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander or Pacific Islander" (and "Filipino" in the case of California). When the values reported in the Asian/Pacific Islander row represent the U. S. Department of Education aggregation of other values reported by the state, the detail for "Asian" and Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander" are also included in the following rows. Disaggregated reporting for assessment participation data is done according to the provisions outlined within each state's Accountability Workbook. Accordingly, not every state uses major racial and ethnic groups which enable detail of Asian American/Pacific Islander (AAPI) populations.

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	S	659,570	99.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	1,862	>=99
Asian or Pacific Islander	S	45,172	99.9
Asian	S	44,177	S
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	S	995	>=99
Black or African American	S	150,795	99.7
Hispanic or Latino	S	86,780	99.7
White	S	342,884	99.8
Two or more races	S	32,077	S
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	S	84,227	99.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	36,909	99.6
Economically disadvantaged students	S	261,798	99.7
Migratory students	S	141	>=95
Male	S	336,716	99.8
Female	S	322,854	99.8
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

**1.2.3.1 Recently Arrived LEP Students Taking ELP Assessments in Lieu of Reading/Language Arts Assessments**

In the table below, provide the number of recently arrived LEP students (as defined in 34 C.F.R. Part 200.6(b)(4)) included in the participation counts in 1.2.3 who took an assessment of English language proficiency in lieu of the State's reading/language arts assessment, as permitted under 34 C.F.R. Part 200.20.

Recently Arrived LEP Students	#
Recently arrived LEP students who took an assessment of English language proficiency in lieu of the State's reading/language arts assessment	0

**1.2.4 Participation of Students with Disabilities (IDEA) in Reading/Language Arts Assessment**

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

The data provided should include reading/language arts participation data from all students with disabilities as defined under the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)*. Do not include former students with disabilities (*IDEA*). Do not include students only covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

Note: For this question only, report on students with disabilities (IDEA) who are also LEP students in the U.S. less than 12 months who took the ELP in lieu of the statewide reading/language arts assessment.

<b>Type of Assessment</b>	<b># Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating</b>	<b>Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment</b>
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	50,602	60.08
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	25,093	29.79
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	953	1.13
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	7,579	9.00
LEP < 12 months, took ELP	0	0.00
Total	84,227	////////////////////////////////////
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Virginia discontinued the use of alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards. The final administration of these assessments occurred in the 2013-2014 school year.		

**1.2.5 Participation of All Students in the Science Assessment**

This section is similar to 1.2.1 and collects data on the State's science assessment.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	S	427,813	99.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	1,214	>=99
Asian or Pacific Islander	S	28,545	99.7
Asian	S	27,871	S
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	S	674	>=99
Black or African American	S	96,740	99.0
Hispanic or Latino	S	53,494	98.9
White	S	228,186	99.6
Two or more races	S	19,634	S
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	S	47,531	98.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	19,148	98.5
Economically disadvantaged students	S	153,058	98.9
Migratory students	S	82	>=95
Male	S	216,172	99.3
Female	S	211,641	99.4

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

**1.2.6 Participation of Students with Disabilities (IDEA) in Science Assessment**

This section is similar to 1.2.2 and collects data on the State's science assessment.

The data provided should include science participation results from all students with disabilities as defined under the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)*. Do not include former students with disabilities (IDEA). Do not include students only covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	18,997	39.97
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	25,025	52.65
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	345	0.73
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	3,164	6.66
Total	47,531	////////////////////////////////////

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

### 1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

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

Note: States are not required to report these data by the racial/ethnic groups shown in the table below; instead, they are required to report these data by the major racial and ethnic groups that are identified in their Accountability Workbooks. The charts below display racial/ethnic data that have been mapped from the major racial and ethnic groups identified in their workbooks to the racial/ethnic groups shown.

#### 1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics

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

The student group "children with disabilities (*IDEA*)" includes children who participated, and for whom a proficiency level was assigned in the regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments. Do not include former students with disabilities (*IDEA*). The student group "limited English proficient (LEP) students" does include recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months. Do not include former LEP students.

#### 1.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts

This section is similar to 1.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State's reading/language arts assessment, and the difference noted in the paragraph below.

The student group "limited English proficient (LEP) students" does not include recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months and who took an assessment of English language proficiency in lieu of the State's reading/language arts assessment. Do not include former LEP students.

#### 1.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science

This section is similar to 1.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State's science assessment administered at least once in each of the following grade spans: 3 through 5, 6 through 9, and 10 through 12.

Limited English Proficient (LEP) students include recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months. Do not include former LEP students.

The "Asian/Pacific Islander" row in the tables below represent either the value reported by the state to the Department of Education for the major racial and ethnic group "Asian/Pacific Islander" or an aggregation of values reported by the state for the major racial and ethnic groups "Asian" and "Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander or Pacific Islander" (and "Filipino" in the case of California). When the values reported in the Asian/Pacific Islander row represent the U. S. Department of Education aggregation of other values reported by the state, the detail for "Asian" and Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander" are also included in the following rows. Disaggregated reporting for assessment participation data is done according to the provisions outlined within each state's Accountability Workbook. Accordingly, not every state uses major racial and ethnic groups which enable detail of Asian American/Pacific Islander (AAPI) populations.



**1.3.1.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 3**

<b>Grade 3</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	96,511	S	73.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	293	S	71
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,685	S	87.9
<i>Asian</i>	6,542	S	88.0
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	143	S	83
Black or African American	21,609	S	60.3
Hispanic or Latino	14,748	S	65.1
White	48,001	S	80.6
Two or more races	5,175	S	76.5
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	12,031	S	46.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	12,386	S	58.2
Economically disadvantaged students	42,834	S	62.1
Migratory students	31	S	52
Male	49,237	S	73.7
Female	47,274	S	74.2

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

**1.3.2.1 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 3**

<b>Grade 3</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	95,913	S	75.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	294	S	70
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,556	S	87.1
<i>Asian</i>	6,413	S	87.3
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	143	S	76
Black or African American	21,555	S	61.0
Hispanic or Latino	14,429	S	68.5
White	47,888	S	81.9
Two or more races	5,191	S	77.0
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	12,015	S	49.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	11,712	S	61.9
Economically disadvantaged students	42,382	S	63.6
Migratory students	30	S	37
Male	48,939	S	72.5
Female	46,974	S	78.1

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

1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
<i>Asian</i>			
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			

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

## 1.3.1.2 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	94,759	S	83.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	276	S	82
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,713	S	93.6
<i>Asian</i>	6,559	S	93.9
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	154	S	81
Black or African American	21,130	S	72.0
Hispanic or Latino	13,639	S	74.6
White	48,155	S	88.7
Two or more races	4,846	S	85.3
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	12,788	S	54.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,821	S	56.0
Economically disadvantaged students	40,586	S	73.0
Migratory students	23	S	70
Male	48,795	S	82.5
Female	45,964	S	83.8

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

## 1.3.2.2 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	94,312	S	77.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	278	S	77
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,580	S	89.5
<i>Asian</i>	6,426	S	89.7
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	154	S	79
Black or African American	21,097	S	62.4
Hispanic or Latino	13,372	S	66.7
White	48,128	S	84.3
Two or more races	4,857	S	79.7
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	12,788	S	49.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,230	S	43.9
Economically disadvantaged students	40,215	S	64.2
Migratory students	22	S	64
Male	48,550	S	74.2
Female	45,762	S	79.9

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

## 1.3.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
<i>Asian</i>			
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Virginia does not administer the Standards of Learning assessments in science for grade 4.			

## 1.3.1.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	88,248	S	78.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	222	S	70
Asian or Pacific Islander	5,330	S	90.2
<i>Asian</i>	5,195	S	90.3
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	135	S	88
Black or African American	20,541	S	66.5
Hispanic or Latino	12,501	S	69.7
White	45,200	S	84.7
Two or more races	4,454	S	80.6
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	12,786	S	47.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,254	S	44.6
Economically disadvantaged students	38,533	S	67.6
Migratory students	22	S	73
Male	44,911	S	76.8
Female	43,337	S	80.1

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. In Virginia, mathematics instruction is accelerated. There are grade 5 students taking higher level mathematics courses and the associated assessments. Therefore, fewer grade 5 mathematics assessments are taken than grade 5 reading/language arts and science assessments.

## 1.3.2.3 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	94,633	S	78.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	241	S	74
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,717	S	90.2
<i>Asian</i>	6,568	S	90.4
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	149	S	81
Black or African American	21,005	S	65.0
Hispanic or Latino	12,706	S	68.9
White	49,102	S	85.2
Two or more races	4,862	S	82.1
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	13,039	S	46.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,667	S	39.3
Economically disadvantaged students	38,854	S	65.3
Migratory students	21	S	52
Male	48,272	S	75.9
Female	46,361	S	81.5

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. In Virginia, mathematics instruction is accelerated. There are grade 5 students taking higher level mathematics courses and the associated assessments. Therefore, fewer grade 5 mathematics assessments are taken than grade 5 reading/language arts and science assessments.

## 1.3.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	95,138	S	78.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	237	S	70
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,835	S	89.2
<i>Asian</i>	6,686	S	89.2
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	149	S	89
Black or African American	21,013	S	63.9
Hispanic or Latino	13,041	S	65.8
White	49,146	S	86.5
Two or more races	4,866	S	82.7
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	13,020	S	50.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,254	S	36.0
Economically disadvantaged students	39,138	S	65.1
Migratory students	22	S	68
Male	48,535	S	79.1
Female	46,603	S	78.2

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. In Virginia, mathematics instruction is accelerated. There are grade 5 students taking higher level mathematics courses and the associated assessments. Therefore, fewer grade 5 mathematics assessments are taken than grade 5 reading/language arts and science assessments.

## 1.3.1.4 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	84,116	S	82.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	229	S	83
Asian or Pacific Islander	5,206	S	93.9
<i>Asian</i>	5,067	S	94.0
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	139	S	91
Black or African American	20,172	S	70.0
Hispanic or Latino	11,842	S	76.0
White	42,536	S	88.2
Two or more races	4,131	S	84.2
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	12,366	S	54.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,240	S	52.8
Economically disadvantaged students	36,376	S	72.5
Migratory students	15	S	>=50
Male	42,802	S	80.0
Female	41,314	S	84.5

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. In Virginia, mathematics instruction is accelerated. There are grade 6 students taking higher level mathematics courses and the associated assessments. Therefore, fewer grade 6 mathematics assessments are taken than grade 6 reading/language arts assessments.

## 1.3.2.4 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	92,976	S	76.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	243	S	72
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,526	S	89.7
<i>Asian</i>	6,372	S	89.9
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	154	S	81
Black or African American	21,166	S	59.7
Hispanic or Latino	12,119	S	65.9
White	48,289	S	83.9
Two or more races	4,633	S	79.6
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	12,472	S	40.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,691	S	31.3
Economically disadvantaged students	37,523	S	61.3
Migratory students	15	S	>=50
Male	47,280	S	72.9
Female	45,696	S	79.7

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. In Virginia, mathematics instruction is accelerated. There are grade 6 students taking higher level mathematics courses and the associated assessments. Therefore, fewer grade 6 mathematics assessments are taken than grade 6 reading/language arts assessments.

## 1.3.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
<i>Asian</i>			
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Virginia does not administer the Standards of Learning assessments in science for grade 6.			



## 1.3.1.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	80,205	S	71.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	221	S	65
Asian or Pacific Islander	5,399	S	90.5
<i>Asian</i>	5,300	S	90.8
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	99	S	72
Black or African American	18,276	S	54.0
Hispanic or Latino	11,148	S	62.1
White	41,455	S	79.2
Two or more races	3,706	S	75.4
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	11,732	S	39.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,667	S	38.9
Economically disadvantaged students	33,097	S	56.8
Migratory students	21	S	38
Male	41,331	S	68.7
Female	38,874	S	74.8

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. In Virginia, mathematics instruction is accelerated. There are grade 7 students taking higher level mathematics courses and the associated assessments. Therefore, fewer grade 7 mathematics assessments are taken than grade 7 reading/language arts assessments.

## 1.3.2.5 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	93,280	S	81.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	267	S	79
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,375	S	92.1
<i>Asian</i>	6,253	S	92.2
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	122	S	85
Black or African American	21,456	S	66.6
Hispanic or Latino	12,080	S	74.4
White	48,636	S	87.3
Two or more races	4,466	S	85.4
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	12,130	S	45.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,159	S	43.5
Economically disadvantaged students	37,326	S	68.6
Migratory students	23	S	57
Male	47,795	S	77.5
Female	45,485	S	84.8

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. In Virginia, mathematics instruction is accelerated. There are grade 7 students taking higher level mathematics courses and the associated assessments. Therefore, fewer grade 7 mathematics assessments are taken than grade 7 reading/language arts assessments.

1.3.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
<i>Asian</i>			
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Virginia does not administer the Standards of Learning assessments in science for grade 7.			

## 1.3.1.6 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	64,033	S	73.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	205	S	76
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,258	S	89.1
<i>Asian</i>	3,157	S	89.5
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	101	S	76
Black or African American	17,146	S	60.3
Hispanic or Latino	9,081	S	67.2
White	31,414	S	80.0
Two or more races	2,929	S	77
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	10,843	S	42.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,239	S	45.4
Economically disadvantaged students	29,119	S	62.4
Migratory students	26	S	46
Male	33,601	S	70.0
Female	30,432	S	76.8

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. In Virginia, mathematics instruction is accelerated. There are grade 8 students taking the end-of-course Algebra I, Algebra II, and Geometry assessments associated with high school courses. Therefore, fewer grade 8 mathematics assessments are taken than grade 8 science and reading/language arts assessments.

## 1.3.2.6 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	94,190	S	75.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	266	S	73
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,258	S	89.0
<i>Asian</i>	6,112	S	89.4
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	146	S	74
Black or African American	21,776	S	57.9
Hispanic or Latino	11,590	S	65.0
White	50,034	S	83.0
Two or more races	4,266	S	79.1
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	12,029	S	38.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,447	S	33.2
Economically disadvantaged students	35,987	S	59.5
Migratory students	22	S	50
Male	48,113	S	71.8
Female	46,077	S	78.7

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. In Virginia, mathematics instruction is accelerated. There are grade 8 students taking the end-of-course Algebra I, Algebra II, and Geometry assessments associated with high school courses. Therefore, fewer grade 8 mathematics assessments are taken than grade 8 science and reading/language arts assessments.

## 1.3.3.6 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	90,602	S	78.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	247	S	76
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,126	S	90.4
<i>Asian</i>	5,981	S	90.7
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	145	S	77
Black or African American	21,006	S	61.9
Hispanic or Latino	11,801	S	65.6
White	47,323	S	86.5
Two or more races	4,099	S	82.8
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	11,504	S	45.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,998	S	34.4
Economically disadvantaged students	35,224	S	63.3
Migratory students	23	S	52
Male	46,278	S	78.4
Female	44,324	S	77.9

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. In Virginia, mathematics instruction is accelerated. There are grade 8 students taking the end-of-course Algebra I, Algebra II, and Geometry assessments associated with high school courses. Therefore, fewer grade 8 mathematics assessments are taken than grade 8 science and reading/language arts assessments.

**1.3.1.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - High School**

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	274,603	S	82.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	799	S	79
Asian or Pacific Islander	19,525	S	93.2
<i>Asian</i>	19,113	S	93.4
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	412	S	86
Black or African American	61,003	S	71.8
Hispanic or Latino	33,841	S	74.6
White	147,234	S	86.8
Two or more races	12,201	S	84.4
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	23,936	S	54.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	10,858	S	60.8
Economically disadvantaged students	88,466	S	72.3
Migratory students	42	S	74
Male	137,458	S	80.2
Female	137,145	S	84.4

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. There are more end -of-course mathematics assessments administered than reading/language arts and science assessments.

**1.3.2.7 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - High School**

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	94,266	S	89.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	273	S	89
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,160	S	93.2
<i>Asian</i>	6,033	S	93.3
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	127	S	87
Black or African American	22,740	S	81.0
Hispanic or Latino	10,484	S	84.2
White	50,807	S	93.2
Two or more races	3,802	S	92.3
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	9,754	S	60.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,003	S	46
Economically disadvantaged students	29,511	S	80.8
Migratory students	8	S	>=50
Male	47,767	S	87.6
Female	46,499	S	90.8

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. There are more end -of-course mathematics assessments administered than reading/language arts and science assessments.

## 1.3.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Science - High School

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	242,073	S	84.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	730	S	84
Asian or Pacific Islander	15,584	S	91.9
<i>Asian</i>	15,204	S	92.0
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	380	S	87
Black or African American	54,721	S	71.7
Hispanic or Latino	28,652	S	74.8
White	131,717	S	90.6
Two or more races	10,669	S	87.6
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	23,007	S	55.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	8,896	S	46.0
Economically disadvantaged students	78,696	S	72.3
Migratory students	37	S	65
Male	121,359	S	84.3
Female	120,714	S	84.4

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. There are more end -of-course mathematics assessments administered than reading/language arts and science assessments.

**1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY**

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

**1.4.1 All Schools and Districts Accountability**

For an SEA that has not received ESEA flexibility, or an SEA that received ESEA flexibility without the optional waiver to not make AYP determinations for LEAs and schools:

In the table below, provide the total number of public elementary and secondary schools and districts in the State, including charters, and the total number of those schools and districts that made AYP based on data for SY 2014-15. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2014-15	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2014-15
Schools			
Districts			

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

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

In the table below, provide the total number of public elementary and secondary schools and districts in the State, including charters, and the total number of those schools and districts that made all of their AMOs, the 95 percent participation rate, and other academic indicator <sup>3</sup> based on data for SY 2014-15. The percentage will be calculated automatically.

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

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

<sup>3</sup> For a high school, the other academic indicator is always graduation rate.

**1.4.2 Title I School Accountability**

For an SEA that has not received ESEA flexibility, or an SEA that received ESEA flexibility without the optional waiver to not make AYP determinations for LEAs and schools:

In the table below, provide the total number of public Title I schools by type and the total number of those schools that made AYP based on data for SY 2014-15. Include only public Title I schools. Do not include Title I programs operated by local educational agencies in private schools. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2014-15	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2014-15
All Title I schools			
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools			
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools			

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

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

In the table below, provide the total number of public Title I schools by type and the total number of those schools that made all of their AMOs, the 95 percent participation rate, and the other academic indicator <sup>4</sup> based on data for SY 2014-15. Include only public Title I schools. Do not include Title I programs operated by LEAs in private schools. The percentage will be calculated automatically.

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

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

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

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

For an SEA that has not received ESEA flexibility, or an SEA that received ESEA flexibility without the optional waiver to not make AYP determinations for LEAs and schools:

In the table below, provide the total number of districts that received Title I funds and the total number of those districts that made AYP based on data for SY 2014-15. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

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

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

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

In the table below, provide the total number of districts that received Title I funds and the total number of those districts that met all of their AMOs, the 95 percent participation rate, and other academic indicator<sup>5</sup> based on data for SY 2014-15. The percentage will be calculated automatically.

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

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

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



**1.4.4.3 Corrective Action**

In the table below, for schools in corrective action, provide the number of schools for which the listed corrective actions under *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2014-15 (based on SY 2013-14 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2014-15
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	
Extension of the school year or school day	
Replacement of staff members, not including the principal, relevant to the school's low performance	
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	
Replacement of the principal	
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Under the provisions of Virginia's approved ESEA flexibility application, Corrective Action was not implemented in SY 2014-2015.	

**1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2**

In the table below, for schools in restructuring – year 2 (implementation year), provide the number of schools for which the listed restructuring actions under *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2014-15 (based on SY 2013-14 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Restructuring Action	# of Title I Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	
Reopening the school as a public charter school	
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	
Takeover the school by the State	
Other major restructuring of the school governance	
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Under the provisions of Virginia's approved ESEA flexibility application, Restructuring Action was not implemented in SY 2014-2015.	

In the space below, list specifically the "other major restructuring of the school governance" action(s) that were implemented.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

There were no divisions that received Title I funds and were identified for Improvement in Virginia.

**1.4.5.3 Corrective Action**

In the table below, for districts in corrective action, provide the number of districts in corrective action in which the listed corrective actions under ESEA were implemented in SY 2014-15 (based on SY 2013-14 assessments under Section 1111 of ESEA).

Corrective Action	# of Districts receiving Title I funds in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2014-15
Implemented a new curriculum based on State standards	
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	
Restructured the district	
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2013-14 and beginning of SY 2014-15 as a corrective action)	
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. There were no divisions that received Title I funds and were identified for Improvement in Virginia.	

**1.4.7 Appeal of AYP and Identification Determinations**

In the table below, provide the number of districts and schools that appealed their AYP designations based on SY 2014-15 data and the results of those appeals.

Entity	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts		
Schools		
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Under the provisions of Virginia's approved ESEA flexibility application, Adequate Yearly Progress ratings are not required for the 2014-2015 school year.		

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

Processing Appeals completion	Date
Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2014-15 data was complete	

**1.4.8 Sections 1003(a) and (g) School Improvement Funds**

In the section below, "schools in improvement" refers to Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of *ESEA*.

**1.4.8.5 Use of Sections 1003(a) and (g) School Improvement Funds.****1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations**

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2014 (SY 2014-15) Title I, Part A allocation that the SEA reserved in accordance with Section 1003(a) of *ESEA* and §200.100(a) of ED's regulations governing the reservation of funds for school improvement under Section 1003(a) of *ESEA*: 4.00 %

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

**1.4.8.5.2 Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Allocations to LEAs and Schools**

The data for this question are reported through *EDFacts* files and compiled in the EDEN012 "Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Allocations to LEAs and Schools" report in the *EDFacts* Reporting System (ERS). The *EDFacts* files and data groups used in this report are listed in the CSPR Crosswalk. The CSPR Data Key contains more detailed information on how the data are populated into the report.

Before certifying Part I of the CSPR, a state user must run the EDEN012 report in ERS and verify that the state's data are correct. The final, certified data from this report will be made publicly available alongside the state's certified CSPR PDF.

#### 1.4.8.5.3 Use of Section 1003(g)(8) Funds for Evaluation and Technical Assistance

Section 1003(g)(8) of ESEA allows States to reserve up to five percent of Section 1003(g) funds for administration and to meet the evaluation and technical assistance requirements for this program. In the space below, identify and describe the specific Section 1003(g) evaluation and technical assistance activities that your State conducted during SY 2014-15.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

In an effort to meet the varied needs of schools, the Virginia Department of Education (VDOE) has designed a differentiated technical assistance process to provide direct technical assistance to school and central office personnel via a cadre of highly-skilled retired educators and educational consultants. VDOE has worked collaboratively with the Center on Innovations in Learning (CIL), the College of William and Mary, and Corbett Consulting to develop a comprehensive system of evaluation and technical assistance for implementation of the 1003(g) grants. The allowable five-percent set-aside of the 1003(g) funds was used for technical assistance.

##### Collaboration with the College of William and Mary

The Office of School Improvement collaborated with The College of William and Mary to support and develop leadership at the division level through the Division Leadership Support Team (DLST) Project. The goal of the project was to achieve efficient and effective division policies, programs, and practices to enhance growth in student learning through differentiated support to the identified 73 focus schools per the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA) flexibility waiver. Each of the 39 participating division leadership teams received ongoing support from a VDOE contractor who was a highly-skilled retired educator with extensive experience in public education. Examples of support included modeling procedures for convening a division leadership team meeting, needs sensing interviews, and analyzing data related to tiered, differentiated interventions provided to students. During 2014-2015, DLST participants reviewed research related to student engagement and its impact on student achievement, and observed classroom instruction for evidence of engagement indicators.

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

Technical assistance was provided for 25 Cohorts I- IV priority schools. The purpose of AARPE technical assistance was to improve instruction and instructional practices by strengthening the alignment between the Performance Standards for Teachers and Principals and the Lesson Planning, Lesson Observation, Professional Development, and Leadership Academic Review Tools. Technical assistance focused on developing sample evidence for the sample performance indicators in Teacher Performance Standards for professional knowledge, instructional delivery, and the learning environment. Instructional planning was an embedded part of the sessions as it is an inherent part of delivery and assessment. The priority school contractor, a highly-skilled retired educator, was assigned to assist schools in the inter-rater reliability process of observing developed "look-fors". There were a total of five sessions which principals and division leaders attended. Principals and/or district staff used their classroom walkthroughs, formal observations, and evaluations to reflect and direct next steps after each session in order to improve skills. The technical assistance materials and the "look-fors" created for Teacher Performance Standards for professional knowledge, instructional delivery, and learning environment were posted as a resource for divisions and schools to use with their own classroom walkthrough and observation tools.

##### Contractors for Priority Schools

The Office of School Improvement provided contractors, who were highly-skilled retired educators, to support priority schools in ensuring that the school's reform was implemented with fidelity. Contractors participated in AARPE and monitored the alignment of supports from the division, Lead Turnaround Partner and school to support the school's identified needs, and ensured the transformation "work" was evidenced in the school improvement plan, meeting minutes and reports.

##### Corbett Consulting

Corbett Consulting provided 11 newly identified priority schools with technical assistance sessions throughout 2014-2015 that included background research and information about selected strands of the improvement models, facilitated sharing, and mock board meetings. Corbett Consulting also suggested promising strategies and timelines for implementation, made recommendations to division teams regarding 1003(g) compliance, and provided guidance related to the implementation of the transformation and turnaround models.

##### Tools Developed by the Office of School Improvement in Partnership with the Center on Innovations in Learning

Indistar®, an online portal created and managed by the Center on Innovations in Learning, was used by both 73 focus and 36 priority schools and their respective LEAs (district, school, and Lead Turnaround Partner staff) to track, develop, coordinate, and report improvement activities. Wise Ways® research briefs enabled school and division-level staff users to explore the research associated with individual indicators, and also informed the development of tasks or action steps. In an effort to continuously improve the online portal, the OSI administered an online survey to end-users, and utilized the results to recommend enhancements to the tool.

##### Hanover Research

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

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

In the space below, describe actions (if any) taken by your State in SY 2014-15 that were supported by **funds other than Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) funds** to address the achievement problems of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of ESEA.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Virginia used state funds as follows:

1. Academic review. The Standards of Accreditation require schools that are Accredited with Warning, Accredited with Warning-Graduation Rate, or Provisionally Accredited - Graduation Rate to undergo an academic review and prepare a three-year school improvement plan. Virginia continues to leverage the human capacity needed to implement the work by contracting with retired educators experienced in working with high-poverty and high achievement schools.

The academic review was designed to help schools and divisions identify and analyze instructional and organizational factors at the school- and division-level affecting student achievement. Virginia provided training and recorded webinars to division-led teams on the use of the alignment tools. The academic review team, consisting of trained Virginia Department of Education (VDOE) contractors, division staff, and/or Department staff, conducted the academic reviews using evaluation tools provided by VDOE. Divisions used the tools to evaluate leadership and professional development. Schools used the tools to evaluate leadership, the taught curriculum, and professional development. Divisions and schools could also use additional evaluation tools, including evaluating the written curriculum and the assessed curriculum. The VDOE contractor led the academic review and created the "Academic Review Findings and Essential Actions Report" to identify and address the needs of the division or school. Following the approval of the developed essential actions, VDOE contractors assisted principals to create the school improvement plan using the essential actions provided in the report of findings to select the indicators that were addressed in the three-year school improvement plan.

For high schools that were Accredited with Warning in specific academic areas and/or Provisionally Accredited-Graduation Rate, the academic review process also addressed graduation and academic issues as well as the required elements of three year school improvement plans.

For schools warned or provisionally accredited in graduation rate, the academic review included a six component process requiring description, summary, and artifacts for each component. The components were Current Practices (data used, prevention strategies, recovery strategies for the school and district), Division and School Level Teams (membership of each, roles/responsibilities, meeting schedules, agendas, minutes), Virginia Early Warning System 7 Steps; Needs Assessment (tool used, date administered, data analysis, next steps), 8 Elements of High School Improvement Webinar Series (dates, purpose, next steps), School Improvement Plan. Following the interview and review of artifacts, the VDOE contractor completed the "Graduation Rate Academic Review School Findings" report and essential actions were developed as needed for each appropriate component.

Once the teams reviewed the data and developed a comprehensive school improvement plan, the plan was monitored for three years. In years two and three, the teams continued to meet, discuss data, modify, and implement the school improvement plan.

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### 1.4.9 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on public school choice and supplemental educational services.

##### 1.4.9.1 Public School Choice

This section collects data on public school choice. FAQs related to the public school choice provisions are at the end of this section.

##### 1.4.9.1.2 Public School Choice – Students

In the table below, provide the number of students who were eligible for public school choice, the number of eligible students who applied to transfer, and the number who transferred under the provisions for public school choice under Section 1116 of *ESEA*. The number of students who were eligible for public school choice should include:

1. All students currently enrolled in a Title I school identified for improvement, corrective action or restructuring.
2. All students who transferred in the current school year under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116, and
3. All students who previously transferred under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116 and are continuing to transfer for the current school year under Section 1116.

The number of students who applied to transfer should include:

1. All students who applied to transfer in the current school year but did not or were unable to transfer.
2. All students who transferred in the current school year under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116; and
3. All students who previously transferred under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116 and are continuing to transfer for the current school year under Section 1116.

For any of the respective student counts, States should indicate in the Comment section if the count does not include any of the categories of students discussed above.

Public School Choice	# Students
Eligible for public school choice	0
Applied to transfer	0
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	163
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Under the provisions of Virginia's approved ESEA flexibility application: 1) priority and focus schools have the option of offering choice as an intervention strategy; and 2) students who previously transferred under choice provisions are allowed to continue to transfer until they reach the highest grade of the transfer school. Students who exercised choice prior to approval of ESEA flexibility waivers were allowed to continue to transfer through the highest grade of enrollment of the transfer school.	



**1.4.9.1.3 Funds Spent on Public School Choice**

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

Transportation for Public School Choice	Dollars Spent
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$0

**1.4.9.1.4 Availability of Public School Choice Options**

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

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

Unable to Provide Public School Choice	# LEAs
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	

**FAQs about public school choice:**

- a. *How should States report data on Title I public school choice for those LEAs that have open enrollment and other choice programs?* For those LEAs that implement open enrollment or other school choice programs in addition to public school choice under Section 1116 of ESEA, the State may consider a student as having applied to transfer if the student meets the following:
  - Has a "home" or "neighborhood" school (to which the student would have been assigned, in the absence of a school choice program) that receives Title I funds and has been identified, under the statute, as in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring; and
  - Has elected to enroll, at some point since July 1, 2002 (the effective date of the Title I choice provisions), and after the home school has been identified as in need of improvement, in a school that has not been so identified and is attending that school; and
  - Is using district transportation services to attend such a school.

In addition, the State may consider costs for transporting a student meeting the above conditions towards the funds spent by an LEA on transportation for public school choice if the student is using district transportation services to attend the non-identified school.

- b. *How should States report on public school choice for those LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice?* In the count of LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice (for any of the reasons specified in 1.4.9.1.4), States should include those LEAs that are unable to offer public school choice at one or more grade levels. For instance, if an LEA is able to provide public school choice to eligible students at the elementary level but not at the secondary level, the State should include the LEA in the count. States should also include LEAs that are not able to provide public school choice at all (i.e., at any grade level). States should provide the reason(s) why public school choice was not possible in these LEAs at the grade level(s) in the Comment section. In addition, States may also include in the Comment section a separate count just of LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice at any grade level.

For LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice at one or more grade levels, States should count as eligible for public school choice (in 1.4.9.1.2) all students who attend identified Title I schools regardless of whether the LEA is able to offer the students public school choice.

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Under the provisions of Virginia's approved ESEA flexibility application, Public School Choice was not required for the 2014-2015 school year.

**1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services**

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

**1.4.9.2.2 Supplemental Educational Services – Students**

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

The number of students who received supplemental educational services should include all students who were enrolled with a provider and participated in some hours of services. States and LEAs have the discretion to determine the minimum number of hours of participation needed by a student to be considered as having received services.

<b>Supplemental Educational Services</b>	<b># Students</b>
Eligible for supplemental educational services	
Applied for supplemental educational services	
Received supplemental educational services	
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Under the provisions of Virginia's approved ESEA flexibility application, Supplemental Educational Services were not required for the 2014-2015 school year.	

**1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services**

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

<b>Spending on Supplemental Educational Services</b>	<b>Dollars Spent</b>
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$0
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Under the provisions of Virginia's approved ESEA flexibility application, Supplemental Educational Services were not required for the 2014-2015 school year.	

**1.5 TEACHER QUALITY**

This section collects data on "highly qualified" teachers as the term is defined in Section 9101(23) of ESEA.

**1.5.1 Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified**

In the table below, provide the number of core academic classes for the grade levels listed, the number of those core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified, and the number taught by teachers who are not highly qualified. The percentage of core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified and the percentage taught by teachers who are not highly qualified will be calculated automatically. Below the table are FAQs about these data.

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

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

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

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

--

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Elementary classes are counted so that a full -day self-contained classroom equals on section.
--

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

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

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

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

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

<b>1.5.2.1 Elementary School Classes</b>	
<b>Elementary School Classes</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	61.50
Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	13.30
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	25.20
Other (please explain in comment box below)	
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.00</b>

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

<b>1.5.2.2 Secondary School Classes</b>	
<b>Secondary School Classes</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	43.40
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	27.10
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	29.50
Other (please explain in comment box below)	
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.00</b>

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

### 1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

In the table below, provide the number of core academic classes for each of the school types listed and the number of those core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified. The percentage of core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified will be calculated automatically. The percentages used for high- and low-poverty schools and the poverty metric used to determine those percentages are reported in the second table. Below the tables are FAQs about these data.

**NOTE:** No source of classroom-level poverty data exists, so States may look at school-level data when figuring poverty quartiles. Because not all schools have traditional grade configurations, and because a school may not be counted as both an elementary and as a secondary school, States may include as elementary schools all schools that serve children in grades K through 5 (including K through 8 or K through 12 schools).

This means that *for the purpose of establishing poverty quartiles*, some classes in schools where both elementary and secondary classes are taught would be counted as classes in an elementary school rather than as classes in a secondary school in 1.5.3. This also means that such a 12th grade class would be in a different category in 1.5.3 than it would be in 1.5.1.

School Type	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified
Elementary Schools			
High Poverty Elementary Schools	12,154	12,026	98.95
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	15,072	14,918	98.98
Secondary Schools			
High Poverty secondary Schools	31,443	30,687	97.60
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	58,646	58,085	99.04

#### 1.5.3.1 Poverty Quartile Breaks

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

	High-Poverty Schools (more than what %)	Low-Poverty Schools (less than what %)
Elementary schools	67.50	29.60
Poverty metric used	Virginia uses the percentages of students who qualify for the free and reduced-price lunch program.	
Secondary schools	57.80	27.50
Poverty metric used	Virginia uses the percentages of students who qualify for the free or reduced-price lunch program.	

**FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty**

- a. *What is a "high-poverty school"?* Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "high-poverty" schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State.
- b. *What is a "low-poverty school"?* Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "low-poverty" schools as schools in the bottom quartile of poverty in the State.
- c. *How are the poverty quartiles determined?* Separately rank order elementary and secondary schools from highest to lowest on your percentage poverty measure. Divide the list into four equal groups. Schools in the first (highest group) are high-poverty schools. Schools in the last group (lowest group) are the low-poverty schools. Generally, States use the percentage of students who qualify for the free or reduced-price lunch program for this calculation.
- d. *Since the poverty data are collected at the school and not classroom level, how do we classify schools as either elementary or secondary for this purpose?* States may include as elementary schools all schools that serve children in grades K through 5 (including K through 8 or K through 12 schools) and would therefore include as secondary schools those that exclusively serve children in grades 6 and higher.

**1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS**

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

**1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs**

In the table below, place a check next to each type of language instruction educational programs implemented in the State, as defined in Section 3301(8), as required by Sections 3121(a)(1), 3123(b)(1), and 3123(b)(2).

**Table 1.6.1 Definitions:**

1. **Types of Programs** = Types of programs described in the subgrantee's local plan (as submitted to the State or as implemented) that is closest to the descriptions in [http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/files/rcd/BE021775/Glossary\\_of\\_Terms.pdf](http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/files/rcd/BE021775/Glossary_of_Terms.pdf).
2. **Other Language** = Name of the language of instruction, other than English, used in the programs.

Check Types of Programs	Type of Program	Other Language
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Dual language	Spanish
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Two-way immersion	Spanish
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Transitional bilingual programs	Spanish
No <input type="checkbox"/>	Developmental bilingual	Spanish
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Heritage language	Spanish
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Sheltered English instruction	////////////////////////////////////
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Structured English immersion	////////////////////////////////////
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)	////////////////////////////////////
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Content-based ESL	////////////////////////////////////
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Pull-out ESL	////////////////////////////////////
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Other (explain in comment box below)	////////////////////////////////////

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other types of programs include: elementary and secondary newcomer programs; virtual ESL classes; after school tutoring; push-in; support for parents; inclusion; and collaboration.



**1.6.2 Student Demographic Data**

**1.6.2.1 Number of ALL LEP Students in the State**

In the table below, provide the October 1 count of ALL LEP students in the State who meet the LEP definition under Section 9101(25).

- o Include newly enrolled (recent arrivals to the U.S.) and continually enrolled LEP students, whether or not they receive services in a Title III language instruction educational program.
- o Do not include Former LEP students (as defined in Section 200.20(f)(2) of the Title I regulation) and monitored Former LEP students (as defined under Section 3121(a)(4) of Title III) in the ALL LEP student count in this table.

Number of ALL LEP students in the State	104,823
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

**1.6.2.2 Number of LEP Students Who Received Title III Language Instruction Educational Program Services**

In the table below, provide the October 1 count of LEP students in the State who received services in Title III language instructional education programs.

LEP Students Receiving Services	#
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	104,680
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The number of LEP students receiving services for SY2014 -2015 is 10% or more higher than the number reported for SY2013-2014 due to Virginia receiving an influx of students, especially refugees, ELLs at the secondary level, and unaccompanied minors.	

**1.6.2.3 Most Commonly Spoken Languages in the State**

In the table below, provide the five most commonly spoken languages, other than English, in the State (for all LEP students, not just LEP students who received Title III services). The top five languages should be determined by the highest number of students speaking each of the languages listed.

Language	# LEP Students
Spanish; Castilian	70,802
Arabic	5,868
Vietnamese	2,656
Urdu	2,465
Chinese	1,918

Report additional languages with significant numbers of LEP students in the comment box below.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

**1.6.3 Student Performance Data**

This section collects data on LEP students' English language proficiency, as required by Sections 1111(h)(4)(D) and 3121(a)(2).

**1.6.3.1.1 All LEP Students Tested on the State Annual English Language Proficiency Assessment**

In the table below, please provide the number of ALL LEP students tested and not tested on annual State English language proficiency (ELP) assessment (as defined in 1.6.2.1).

<b>All LEP Testing</b>	<b>#</b>
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	99,059
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	5,743
Total	104,802
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The number of students in the 2014 -2015 ELP assessment data reported as not tested on the ELP assessment may be due to an influx of students enrolling in the school divisions in the beginning of SY2014-2015 who were not enrolled at the time of the administration of the ELP assessment. VDOE continues to provide ongoing technical assistance to school divisions to ensure the most accurate data possible given the transient nature of this population and working with school divisions to determine reasons why students may lack an assessment record for the most recent administration of the ELP assessment.	

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

<b>All LEP Results</b>	<b>#</b>
Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	S
Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	17.4
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

**1.6.3.2.1 Title III LEP Students Tested on the State Annual English Language Proficiency Assessment**

In the table below, provide the number of Title III LEP students tested and not tested on annual State English language proficiency assessment.

<b>Title III LEP Testing</b>		<b>#</b>
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment		97,298
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment		5,742
Total		103,040
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The number of students in the 2014 -2015 ELP assessment data reported as not tested on the ELP assessment may be due to an influx of students enrolling in the school divisions in the beginning of SY2014-2015 who were not enrolled at the time of the administration of the ELP assessment. VDOE continues to provide ongoing technical assistance to school divisions to ensure the most accurate data possible given the transient nature of this population and working with school divisions to determine reasons why students may lack an assessment record for the most recent administration of the ELP assessment.		

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

<b>Title III First Time Tested</b>		<b>#</b>
Number of Title III students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time whose progress cannot be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO 1.		27,138

**1.6.3.2.2 Title III LEP English Language Proficiency Results**

This section collects information on Title III LEP students' development of English and attainment of English proficiency.

**Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:**

- Annual Measureable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs)** = State targets for the number and percent of students making progress and attaining proficiency.
- Making Progress** = Number and percent of Title III LEP students that met the definition of "Making Progress" as defined by the State and submitted to ED in the Consolidated State Application (CSA), or as amended.
- Attained Proficiency** = Number and percent of Title III LEP students that met the State definition of "Attainment" of English language proficiency submitted to ED in the Consolidated State Application (CSA), or as amended.
- Results** = Number and percent of Title III LEP students that met the State definition of "Making Progress" and the number and percent that met the State definition of "Attainment" of English language proficiency.

In the table below, provide the State targets for the number and percent of students making progress and attaining English proficiency for this reporting period. Additionally, provide the results from the annual State English language proficiency assessment for Title III-served LEP students who participated in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12. If your State uses cohorts, provide us with the range of targets, (i.e., indicate the lowest target among the cohorts, e.g., 10% and the highest target among a cohort, e.g., 70%).

<b>Title III Results</b>	<b>Results #</b>	<b>Results %</b>	<b>Targets #</b>	<b>Targets %</b>
Making progress				
Attained proficiency				

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

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

**1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments**

This section collects data on LEP students assessed in their native language (Section 1111(b)(6)) to be used for AYP determinations.

**1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language**

In the table below, check "Yes" if the specified assessment is used for AYP purposes.

State offers the State reading/language arts content tests in the students' native language(s).	<u>No</u>
State offers the State mathematics content tests in the students' native language(s).	<u>No</u>
State offers the State science content tests in the students' native language(s).	<u>No</u>
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

**1.6.3.5.2 Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given**

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

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



**1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students**

This section collects data on the performance of former LEP students as required by Sections 3121(a)(4) and 3123(b)(8).

**1.6.3.6.1 Title III Served MFLEP Students by Year Monitored**

In the table below, report the unduplicated count of monitored former LEP students during the two consecutive years of monitoring, which includes both MFLEP students in AYP grades and in non-AYP grades.

Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) students include:

- Students who have transitioned out of a language instruction educational program.
- Students who are no longer receiving LEP services and who are being monitored for academic content achievement for 2 years after the transition.

**Table 1.6.3.6.1 Definitions:**

1. **# Year One** = Number of former LEP students in their first year of being monitored.
2. **# Year Two** = Number of former LEP students in their second year of being monitored.
3. **Total** = Number of monitored former LEP students in year one and year two. This is automatically calculated.

# Year One	# Year Two	Total
16,699	15,617	32,316
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

**1.6.3.6.2 MFLEP Students Results for Mathematics**

In the table below, report the number of MFLEP students who took the annual mathematics assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned out of language instruction educational programs and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

**Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:**

1. **# Tested** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in mathematics in all AYP grades.
2. **# At or Above Proficient** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual mathematics assessment.
3. **% Results** = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the number tested.
4. **# Below proficient** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual mathematics assessment. This will be automatically calculated.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
27,692	S	83.4	S
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

**1.6.3.6.3 MFLEP Students Results for Reading/Language Arts**

In the table below, report results for MFLEP students who took the annual reading/language arts assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned out of language instruction educational programs and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

**Table 1.6.3.6.3 Definitions:**

1. **# Tested** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in reading/language arts in all AYP grades.
2. **# At or Above Proficient** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment.
3. **% Results** = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the total number tested. This will be automatically calculated.
4. **# Below proficient** = State-aggregated number MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
24,656	S	80.9	S
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

**1.6.3.6.4 MFLEP Students Results for Science**

In the table below, report results for MFLEP students who took the annual science assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned out of language instruction educational programs and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are MFLEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

**Table 1.6.3.6.4 Definitions:**

1. **# Tested** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in science.
2. **# At or Above Proficient** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual science assessment.
3. **% Results** = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the total number tested. This will be automatically calculated.
4. **# Below proficient** = State-aggregated number MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual science assessment.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
13,361	S	76.8	S
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

**1.6.4 Title III Subgrantees**

This section collects data on the performance of Title III subgrantees.

**1.6.4.1 Title III Subgrantee Performance**

In the table below, report the number of Title III subgrantees meeting the criteria described in the table. Do not leave items blank. If there are zero subgrantees who met the condition described, put a zero in the number (#) column. Do not double count subgrantees by category.

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

<b>Title III Subgrantees</b>		<b>#</b>
Total number of subgrantees for the year		51
////////////////////////////////////		
Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs		
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO 1		
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO 2		
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO 3		96
////////////////////////////////////		
Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs		
////////////////////////////////////		
Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2013 -14 and 2014-15)		
Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2014-15 for not meeting Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years		
Number of subgrantees that have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2011-12, 2012-13, 2013-14, and 2014-15)		

Provide information on how the State counted consortia members in the total number of subgrantees and in each of the numbers in table 1.6.4.1. If applicable, also please note if this method is the same or different from the previous year.

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

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

**1.6.4.3 Termination of Title III Language Instruction Educational Programs**

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

Were any Title III language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> activities terminated for failure to reach program goals?	<u>No</u>
If yes, provide the number of language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> activities for immigrant children and youth terminated.	
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	



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

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

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

**1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students**

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

**Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:**

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

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants
27,816	23,599	27

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

**1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development**

This section collects data on teachers in Title III language instruction educational programs as required under Section 3123(b)(5).

**1.6.6.1 Teacher Information**

This section collects information about teachers as required under Section 3123 (b)(5).

In the table below, report the number of teachers who are working in the Title III language instruction educational programs as defined under Section 3301(8) and reported in 1.6.1 (Types of language instruction educational programs) even if they are not paid with Title III funds.

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

<b>Title III Teachers</b>	<b>#</b>
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	1,164
Estimate number of <b>additional</b> certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	700

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

**1.6.6.2 Professional Development Activities of Subgrantees Related to the Teaching and Learning of LEP Students**

In the tables below, provide information about the subgrantee professional development activities that meet the requirements of Section 3115(c)(2).

**Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:**

1. **Professional Development Topics** = Subgrantee professional development topics required under Title III.
2. **#Subgrantees** = Number of subgrantees who conducted each type of professional development activity. A subgrantee may conduct more than one professional development activity. (Use the same method of counting subgrantees, including consortia, as in 1.6.1 and 1.6.4.)
3. **Total Number of Participants** = Number of teachers, administrators and other personnel who participated in each type of the professional development activities reported.
4. **Total** = Number of all participants in professional development (PD) activities.

Professional Development (PD) Topics	# Subgrantees
Instructional strategies for LEP students	43
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	36
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	41
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	33
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	28
Other (Explain in comment box)	0

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

**1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities**

This section collects data on State grant activities.

**1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process**

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

**Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:**

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

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

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
07/01/15	09/18/15	80
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

**1.6.7.2 Steps To Shorten the Distribution of Title III Funds to Subgrantees**

In the comment box below, describe how your State can shorten the process of distributing Title III funds to subgrantees.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

**1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS**

In the table below, provide the number of schools identified as persistently dangerous, as determined by the State, by the start of the school year. For further guidance on persistently dangerous schools, refer to Section B "Identifying Persistently Dangerous Schools" in the Unsafe School Choice Option Non-Regulatory Guidance, available at: <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/unsafeschoolchoice.pdf>.

<b>Persistently Dangerous Schools</b>	<b>#</b>
Persistently Dangerous Schools	0
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

**1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS PROGRAM**

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

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

<b>LEAs</b>	<b>#</b>	<b># LEAs Reporting Data</b>
LEAs without subgrants	101	101
LEAs with subgrants	31	31
Total	132	132

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

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

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

**1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youth**

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

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b># of Homeless Children/Youth Enrolled in Public School in LEAs Without Subgrants</b>	<b># of Homeless Children/Youth Enrolled in Public School in LEAs With Subgrants</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	102	368
K	412	1,278
1	437	1,262
2	427	1,226
3	392	1,173
4	404	1,037
5	340	901
6	323	865
7	302	912
8	300	877
9	311	1,375
10	263	951
11	175	786
12	254	844
Ungraded		
Total	4,442	13,855

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

**1.9.1.2 Primary Nighttime Residence of Homeless Children and Youth**

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

<b>Primary Nighttime Residence</b>	<b># of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs Without Subgrants</b>	<b># of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs With Subgrants</b>
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	593	1,778
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	3,072	9,707
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	48	167
Hotels/Motels	729	2,203
Total	4,442	13,855

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

**1.9.1.3 Subgroups of Homeless Students Enrolled**

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

<b>Special Population</b>	<b># Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs Without Subgrants</b>	<b># of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs With Subgrants</b>
Unaccompanied homeless youth	453	1,720
Migratory children/youth	25	64
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	877	2,524
Limited English Proficient (LEP) students	253	2,151

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

**1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants**

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

**1.9.2.1 Homeless Children and Youth Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants**

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

Age/Grade	# Homeless Children/Youth Served by Subgrants
Age Birth Through 2	678
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	511
K	1,106
1	1,191
2	1,123
3	1,116
4	1,000
5	871
6	836
7	829
8	857
9	1,295
10	942
11	764
12	847
Ungraded	0
Total	13,966

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

**1.9.2.2 Subgroups of Homeless Students Served**

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

Subgroup	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied homeless youth	1,650
Migratory children/youth	56
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	2,131
Limited English Proficient (LEP) students	2,074

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



**1.9.3 Academic Achievement of Homeless Students**

The following questions collect data on the academic achievement of enrolled homeless children and youth.

**1.9.3.1 Reading Assessment**

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

Grade	LEAs Without Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	LEAs Without Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs Without Subgrants - % of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs With Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	LEAs With Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs With Subgrants - % of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient
3	329	S	54	1,025	S	52
4	341	S	56	903	S	52
5	293	S	58	801	S	59
6	272	S	58	730	S	47
7	245	S	58	762	S	56
8	253	S	48	762	S	47
High School	192	S	76	687	S	77

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

**1.9.3.2 Mathematics Assessment**

This section is similar to 1.9.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State mathematics assessment.

Grade	LEAs Without Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	LEAs Without Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs Without Subgrants - % of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs With Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	LEAs With Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs With Subgrants - % of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient
3	331	S	47	1,049	S	45
4	341	S	65	920	S	56
5	294	S	57	813	S	59
6	267	S	68	741	S	53
7	238	S	50	730	S	39
8	224	S	52	655	S	45
High School	504	S	65	1,927	S	60

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

**1.9.3.3 Science Assessment**

This section is similar to 1.9.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State science assessment.

Grade	LEAs Without Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	LEAs Without Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs Without Subgrants - % of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs With Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	LEAs With Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs With Subgrants - % of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient
3						
4						
5	293	S	59	818	S	51
6						
7						
8	244	S	54	754	S	47
High School	527	S	65	1,668	S	62

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