



VIRGINIA BOARD OF EDUCATION

2006 ANNUAL REPORT

2006
***ANNUAL REPORT ON THE
CONDITION AND NEEDS
OF PUBLIC SCHOOLS IN VIRGINIA***

PRESENTED TO
THE GOVERNOR AND
THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

NOVEMBER 30, 2006
VIRGINIA BOARD OF EDUCATION

Members of the Board of Education as of July 30, 2006

Dr. Mark E. Emblidge,
President
413 Stuart Circle
Suite 130
Richmond, VA 23220

Dr. Thomas M. Brewster
172 Angel Lane
Falls Mills, VA 24613

Mrs. Isis M. Castro
2404 Culpeper Road
Alexandria, VA 22308

Mr. David L. Johnson
3103 B Stony Point Road
Richmond, VA 23235

Dr. Gary L. Jones
7016 Balmoral Forest Road
Clifton, VA 20124

Mr. Kelvin L. Moore
616 Court Street
Lynchburg, VA 24504

Mr. Andrew J. Rotherham
750 Montei Drive
Earlysville, VA 22936

Mrs. Eleanor B. Saslaw
4418 Random Court
Annandale, VA 22003

Dr. Ella P. Ward
Vice President
1517 Pine Grove Lane
Chesapeake, VA 23321

Superintendent of Public Instruction

Dr. Billy K. Cannaday, Jr.
Virginia Department of Education
P.O. Box 2120
Richmond, VA 23218

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA
BOARD OF EDUCATION
P.O. BOX 2120
RICHMOND, VIRGINIA 23218-2120

November 30, 2006

The Honorable Timothy Kaine, Governor
Members of the Virginia General Assembly
Commonwealth of Virginia
Richmond, Virginia 23219

Dear Governor Kaine and Members of the Virginia General Assembly:


On behalf of the Board of Education, I am pleased to transmit the *2006 Annual Report on the Condition and Needs of Public Schools in Virginia*, submitted pursuant to § 22.1-18 of the Code of Virginia. The report contains information about the condition and needs of Virginia's public schools, including an analysis of student academic performance and a report on the local divisions' compliance with the requirements of the Standards of Quality and the Standards of Accreditation.

The Board of Education's *2006 Report on the Condition and Needs of Public Schools in Virginia* highlights the success as well as the challenges faced by Virginia's public school system. Improving academic achievement for students is the core of the Board of Education's mission, and producing well-educated adults is a complex undertaking. Schools matter, and so do families and communities as a whole. The Board of Education, working with its many partners, has a responsibility to help localities provide the best possible public education system for all students – regardless of wealth, race, ethnicity, disability or place of birth. As a result, the Board of Education's goal is to ensure that all students achieve standards of excellence, no matter what community they reside in or what challenges they face.

The progress shown by our public schools is the result of ongoing collaboration, dedication, workable strategies and wise use of resources, both human and financial. It is the result of the hard work of teachers, administrators, support staff, students, parents, and supporters throughout the Commonwealth. The Board of Education is grateful for the cooperation and support the Governor and General Assembly have given to Virginia's school improvement efforts.

As we look to the future, the members of the Board of Education pledge to remain focused on providing the best educational opportunities and the brightest future for the young people enrolled in Virginia's public schools.

Sincerely,



Mark E. Emblidge
President, Board of Education

Statutory Requirement for the Annual Report

The *Code of Virginia*, in § 22.1-18, states:

By November 15 of each year, the Board of Education shall submit to the Governor and the General Assembly a report on the condition and needs of public education in the commonwealth and shall identify any school divisions and the specific schools therein which have failed to establish and maintain schools meeting the existing prescribed standards of quality. Such standards of quality shall be subject to revision only by the General Assembly, pursuant to Article VIII, Section 2 of the Constitution of Virginia. Such report shall include a complete listing of the current standards of quality for the commonwealth's public schools, together with a justification for each particular standard, how long each such standard has been in its current form, and whether the Board recommends any change or addition to the standards of quality.

Table of Contents

Members of the Board of Education as of July 30, 2006.....	2
Letter of Transmittal.....	3
Statutory Requirements.....	4
Executive Summary.....	7
Education for Virginia’s Future: The Board of Education’s Vision for the Public Schools.....	11
The Board of Education’s Comprehensive Plan: 2005-2010.....	11
Measurable Progress for Virginia’s Schools and Students.....	12
The Challenges Confronting Virginia’s Public Schools.....	14
From Competence to Excellence.....	17
Revisions to the Standards of Quality.....	20
Compliance with the Requirements of the Standards of Quality.....	23
Compliance with the Standards of Accreditation.....	26
Condition and Needs of Virginia’s Lowest Performing Schools and School Divisions.....	30
Condition and Needs of Virginia’s Schools as Identified by Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Results.....	31
Condition and Needs of Virginia’s Public Schools as Identified by Standards of Learning Test Results.....	35
Closing Statement by the Virginia Board of Education.....	40

Appendices..... 41

Appendix A: Statewide Standards of Learning Test Results: 1998-2006

Appendix B: Virginia's Public Schools: Demographic and Statistical Data

Appendix C: Standards of Quality as Amended by the Board of Education on
November 29, 2006

Appendix D: Schools Rated Accredited with Warning: 2006

Appendix E: List of Data and Reports Used to Document the Condition and
Needs of the Public Schools and Compliance with the
Standards of Quality

Executive Summary: **2006 Annual Report on the Condition and Needs of Public Schools in Virginia**

The Board of Education's Vision

The vision of the Board of Education and the Superintendent of Public Instruction, in cooperation with local school boards and other partners, is to create an excellent statewide system of public education that equips all students with the knowledge and skills to excel in postsecondary education and careers and to become capable, responsible, and self-reliant citizens.

The Board of Education's Plan of Action

The Board of Education has set forth a comprehensive plan of action for the coming years. More details for the plan of action may be found in the Board of Education's Comprehensive Plan: 2005-2010, which may be viewed on the Board of Education's Web site at the following address: http://www.doe.virginia.gov/VDOE/VA_Board/comprehensiveplan.pdf. The plan outlines eight objectives, along with strategies and activities that will provide the framework for the Board of Education's focus for the near future. The objectives of the Board are:

- To improve the quality standards for all public schools in Virginia.
- To provide leadership to help schools and school divisions close the achievement gap and increase the academic success of all students.
- To work to ensure meaningful, ongoing professional development for teachers, administrators, and professional educational personnel.
- To support accountability for all schools, with a focus on assisting chronically low-performing schools and school divisions.
- To work cooperatively with partners to help ensure that young children are ready for school.
- To assist teachers to improve reading skills of all students, kindergarten through grade 12.
- To continue efforts to enhance the training, recruitment, and retention of highly qualified teachers, educational support personnel, and administrators, with a focus on the needs of hard-to-staff schools.
- To provide leadership for implementing the provisions of state and federal laws and regulations smoothly and with minimal disruption to local divisions.

Summary of the Academic Performance of Virginia's Students

The Code of Virginia also requires that the Board's annual report include a progress report on the academic performance of Virginia's students, which may be summarized as follows:

The number of Virginia high school students who took Advanced Placement (AP) examinations jumped by nearly 12 percent this year, more African-American and Hispanic students took AP tests, and Virginia is poised to join a select group of states in which 20 percent or more of high school seniors earn a grade of 3 or more on an AP examination.

- Virginia continued to have one of the highest participation rates in the nation on the SAT Reasoning Test with 67 percent of seniors in public high schools taking the test, and participation by minority groups is up as well.

- The average ACT composite score among Virginia high school graduates increased significantly this year as the number of test-takers in the state continued to rise.
- Virginia’s academic standards in world history are among the best in the nation, according to a report released by the influential Thomas B. Fordham Institute, which gave Virginia an “A” for its coverage of world history in the History and Social Science Standards of Learning (SOL) and praises the standards as “a model of clarity.” The commonwealth was one of only eight states to receive an “A” from the Fordham Institute.
- Virginia students achieved at significantly higher levels on last year’s national science tests, bucking a national trend of flat or declining achievement since the previous administration of the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) science tests in 2000. And the Commonwealth was the only state in the nation in which students in both tested grades increased their level of achievement on all three subcomponents of the test (Earth Science, Physical Science, and Life Science).
- *Education Week*, a prominent education journal, ranked Virginia as a national leader in the use of technology and data to improve instruction and raise student achievement. Only one state, West Virginia, received a higher grade in the magazine’s report.

Summary of the Significant Needs of Virginia’s Public Schools

As required by the Code of Virginia the annual report identifies any school divisions and the specific schools therein which have failed to establish and maintain schools meeting the existing prescribed standards of quality. In summary:

- For 2005-2006, sixty-eight of Virginia’s 132 school divisions are in full compliance with the SOQ.
- Accreditation results show that 1,670, or 92 percent, of the 1,822 schools met or exceeded state achievement objectives on SOL tests and other statewide assessments in the four core academic areas.
- Six schools were denied state accreditation because of persistently low achievement in the four core content areas.

Further analysis of the significant needs of the public schools may be summarized as follows:

- The need for students to have ever-increasing levels of skills and knowledge—including career and technical skills—for all students, which presents the particular challenge to address the needs of students for whom achievement gaps persist: children of poverty, students who possess limited English proficiency, and students at-risk of academic failure;
- The need to increase the percentage of young students reading on grade level by grade three and to work to ensure that their reading and literacy skills remain up to par throughout their schooling;

- The need to increase the percentage of fully accredited schools and to provide meaningful, ongoing technical assistance to school divisions that are struggling to meet state's academic standards and the federal No Child Left Behind requirements;
- The need to help schools that are struggling to improve student achievement need additional help to use classroom instructional time effectively and to monitor the implementation of effective programs. Teachers and administrators also need additional assistance in using data to improve classroom instruction;
- The need to increase the graduation rate, which presents unique challenges especially for students with disabilities, minority students, and limited English proficient students; and
- The need to increase the number of students taking more rigorous courses in high school, especially in light of the rapid growth in technology and other career/technical fields that threatens to create a generation of underskilled and underemployed workers if students are not prepared to meet those challenges.

Prescribed Changes to the Standards of Quality

To further address the condition and needs of the public schools, the Board of Education has prescribed amendments to the Standards of Quality and will recommend these changes to the 2007 session of the General Assembly for its consideration. Amendments, estimated to have a fiscal impact on the state for FY 2008 of \$173 million, were adopted by the Board on November 29, 2006, as follows:

Standard 1: Instructional programs supporting the Standards of Learning and other educational objectives

- Clarify that the program of instruction offered by local school divisions includes the knowledge and skills needed for gainful employment to prepare students to achieve economic self-sufficiency.
- Add a requirement that the programs of prevention, intervention, and remediation offered by the school division include components that are research-based.
- Clarify that remediation is required if a student fails to achieve a passing score on all Standards of Learning tests in the grade, or who fails an end-of-course Standards of Learning test required for the award of a verified credit. Remediation may be required if the student fails to achieve a passing score on one or more, but not all, Standards of Learning tests in grades three through eight.
- Add a requirement for the early identification, diagnosis, and assistance for students with problems with mathematics, and provision of instructional strategies and practices that benefit the development of mathematics skills for all students.

Standard 2. Instructional, administrative, and support personnel.

- Require one full-time principal in each elementary school.
- Require one full-time assistant principal for each 400 students in each elementary, middle, and secondary school.
- Require one full-time instructional position for each 1,000 students to serve as the reading

specialist.

- Require one full-time instructional position for each 1,000 students in grades kindergarten through eight to serve as the mathematics teacher specialist.
- Reduce the state required speech language pathologist caseload from 68 to 60 students.
- Require one full-time position per 1,000 students licensed by the Board of Education to serve as the data manager/test coordinator.
- Require local school boards to maintain pupil-teacher ratios for students who are blind or vision-impaired at not less than the following levels: Level I, resource teacher, 24 to one; Level II, self-contained with an aide, 10 to one; self-contained without an aide, eight to one, or Level II, self-contained student weight of 2.5.

Standard 3. Accreditation, other standards and evaluation

- Add language specifying that the cumulative eighth grade history and social science Standards of Learning test will be eliminated after the 2007-2008 school year. Instead, all school divisions must administer the United States History to 1877, United States History: 1877 to the Present, and Civics and Economics Standards of Learning tests.
- Clarify that the School Performance Report Card must include Standards of Learning test results disaggregated by student subgroups.

Standard 4. Student achievement and graduation requirements

- Clarify that provisions be made to facilitate the transfer and appropriate grade placement of students from other public secondary schools, from nonpublic schools, and from home instruction.
- Require that school divisions notify parents of secondary students of not just the number of standard and verified credits needed for graduation, but also the subject area requirements.

Standard 5. Teacher quality and educational leadership

- Add a requirement that the local school board provide teachers and principals with professional development programs in effective classroom management.

Standard 6. Planning and public involvement

- Clarify that the strategies for improving student achievement in the Board of Education's comprehensive plan, as well as the local school board's comprehensive plan, focus attention on the achievement of educationally at-risk students.

Standard 7. School board policies

- Clarify that the current school division policies made available to the public include the Student Conduct Policy.
- Require that the school division policies be posted on the school division's Web site.

2006 Annual Report on the Condition and Needs of Public Schools in Virginia

Education for Virginia's Future: The Board of Education's Vision for Our Public Schools

The vision of the Board of Education and the Superintendent of Public Instruction, in cooperation with local school boards and other partners, is to create an excellent statewide system of public education that equips all students with the knowledge and skills to excel in postsecondary education and careers and to become capable, responsible, and self-reliant citizens.

To that end, the Board of Education and the Superintendent of Public Instruction, in cooperation with local school divisions, provides leadership, assistance, and oversight for Virginia's public schools in order to improve the achievement of all students by advocating for proven strategies to address the individual and diverse learning needs of students, establishing high standards for learning, measuring student performance, providing accountability to the public, and increasing opportunities for lifelong learning.

The Board of Education's Comprehensive Plan: 2005-2010

The need to tackle the challenges confronting our schools and their students is evident. The Board of Education's comprehensive plan contains objectives and strategies that set forth the antecedents of student success—firmly planting the expectation that every child will learn at a high level, that the traditional excuses for failure will be swept off the table, and that objective assessments will be used to guide and evaluate student progress.

The Board of Education has set forth a comprehensive plan of action for the coming years. More details for the plan of action may be found in the Board of Education's Comprehensive Plan: 2005-2010, which may be viewed on the Board of Education's Web site at the following address: http://www.doe.virginia.gov/VDOE/VA_Board/comprehensiveplan.pdf. The plan outlines eight objectives, along with strategies and activities that will provide the framework for the Board of Education's focus for the near future.

Meeting the objectives in the Board's comprehensive plan takes enormous human energy and fiscal resources marshaled together in a thoughtful, well coordinated, student-centered plan of action that requires the support and talent of many partners—educators, community advocates, government leaders, elected officials, parents, and students. And it requires the commitment that when we say *all* students can achieve at high levels, we really mean *all* students. The Board of Education, working with its many partners, has a responsibility to help localities provide the best possible public education system for all students – regardless of wealth, race, ethnicity, disability or place of birth.

Based upon the needs of the public schools, the Board of Education's plan of action is as follows:

Objective 1: The Board of Education will improve the quality standards for all public schools in Virginia.

Objective 2: The Board of Education will provide leadership to help schools and school divisions close the achievement gap and increase the academic success of all students.

Objective 3: The Board of Education will work to ensure meaningful, ongoing professional development for teachers, administrators, and professional educational personnel.

Objective 4: The Board of Education will support accountability for all schools, with a focus on assisting chronically low-performing schools and school divisions.

Objective 5: The Board of Education will work cooperatively with partners to help ensure that young children are ready for school.

Objective 6: The Board of Education will assist teachers to improve the reading skills of all students, kindergarten through grade 12.

Objective 7: The Board of Education will continue efforts to enhance the training, recruitment, and retention of highly qualified teachers, educational support personnel, and administrators, with a focus on the needs of hard-to-staff schools.

Objective 8: The Board of Education will provide leadership for implementing the provisions of state and federal laws and regulations smoothly and with minimal disruption to local divisions.

By carefully following the plan of action set forth in the Board's comprehensive plan and by committed and intense collaboration with our many partners in this effort, the Board of Education's goal is to ensure that all students achieve standards of excellence, no matter what community they reside in or what challenges they face.

Measurable Progress for Virginia's Schools and Students

Virginia's public schools have made solid, measurable progress within the past few years. The challenges faced and the solutions sought are daunting—but achieving the best results motivates teachers and education leaders and drives our effort. Results from both statewide and national assessment tests show that our students are climbing rapidly on the achievement scale. Just look at the numbers:

- Nine out of 10 Virginia public schools are fully accredited and meeting state standards for student achievement in English, mathematics, history/social science, and science based on 2005-2006 assessment results.

- The percentage of Virginia students who graduated from high school with an Advanced Studies Diploma increased for a third consecutive year in 2006. The annual increases in the number of students earning an Advanced Studies Diploma show that more students are setting educational goals that will help them and the commonwealth compete in the global economy.
- The number of Virginia high school students who took Advanced Placement (AP) examinations jumped by nearly 12 percent this year, according to 2005-2006 test results reported by the College Board. The number of AP exams taken by Virginia high school students who qualified for college credit by earning a score of 3 or above also rose significantly. More African-American and Hispanic students took AP tests, although the participation rate lags behind that of their white peers. Virginia is poised to join a select group of states in which 20 percent or more of high school seniors earn a grade of 3 or more on an AP examination.
- Virginia continued to have one of the highest participation rates in the nation on the SAT Reasoning Test with 73 percent of high school seniors overall and 67 percent of seniors in public high schools taking the test. While overall participation in SAT testing was relatively flat, the number of Hispanic public school students in Virginia taking the test increased by 8.3 percent, and participation by Asian students in the Commonwealth increased by 7.6 percent.
- The average ACT composite score among Virginia high school graduates increased significantly this year as the number of test-takers in the state continued to rise. The state's 2006 graduates earned an average that was higher than any previous year since 1994.
- Virginia's academic standards in world history are among the best in the nation, according to a report released by the Thomas B. Fordham Institute. The influential research and policy institute gives Virginia an "A" for its coverage of world history in the History and Social Science Standards of Learning (SOL) and praises the standards as "a model of clarity." Virginia was one of only eight states to receive an "A" from the Fordham Institute,
- Virginia students achieved at significantly higher levels on last year's national science tests, bucking a national trend of flat or declining achievement since the previous administration of the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) science tests in 2000. Virginia was one of only five states that saw significant increases in overall science achievement in both grades 4 and 8 on the 2005 NAEP. And the Commonwealth was the only state in the nation in which students in both tested grades increased their level of achievement on all three subcomponents of the test (Earth Science, Physical Science, and Life Science).

- *Education Week*, a prominent education journal, ranked Virginia as a national leader in the use of technology and data to improve instruction and raise student achievement. Only one state, West Virginia, received a higher grade in the magazine's report. *Education Week* cited Virginia's low student-to-computer ratios, online assessment program, and technology standards for students and teachers in ranking Virginia as a national leader.

The Challenges Confronting Virginia's Public Schools

Virginia's students and public schools have made great progress, but they undoubtedly still have a long way to go. Nagging problems persist, and we must do more to help schools and divisions that are struggling to meet higher standards for their students. Virginians cannot be satisfied with *competent* levels of achievement; rather, we must focus on moving to *excellent* levels of achievement.


While many objective measures show that the academic performance of Virginia's students is steadily improving, all of Virginia's schools face significant challenges in the next five to ten years. Among the most pressing challenges are the following:

- The need for students to have ever-increasing levels of skills and knowledge—including career and technical skills—for all students, which presents the particular challenge to address the needs of students for whom achievement gaps persist: children of poverty, students who possess limited English proficiency, and students at-risk of academic failure;
- The need to increase the percentage of young students reading on grade level by grade three and to work to ensure that their reading and literacy skills remain up to par throughout their schooling;
- The need to increase the percentage of fully accredited schools and to provide meaningful, ongoing technical assistance to school divisions that are struggling to meet state's academic standards and the federal No Child Left Behind requirements;
- The need to help schools that are struggling to improve student achievement need additional help to use classroom instructional time effectively and to monitor the implementation of effective programs. Teachers and administrators also need additional assistance in using data to improve classroom instruction;
- The need to increase the graduation rate, which presents unique challenges especially for students with disabilities, minority students, and limited English proficient students; and
- The need to increase the number of students taking more rigorous courses in high school, especially in light of the rapid growth in technology and other career/technical fields that threatens to create a generation of underskilled and underemployed workers if students are not prepared to meet those challenges


The Achievement Gap

A common theme running through the entire spectrum of challenges listed above is the persistent achievement gap among groups of students. Overall, student achievement is up in Virginia and fewer students are performing at the lowest level of achievement. However, there are disparities in performance among racial or ethnic minorities, limited English proficient students, students with disabilities, and low-income students when compared with many of their white or economically-advantaged peers. Thus, achievement gaps are identified not only by race and ethnicity, but also by income levels, language background, and disability status. Moreover, one student can have gaps in more than one area (i.e., a limited English proficient student with a disability who is also low-income)—a real rubric’s cube of challenges for our educational system.

2005-2006 Statewide Pass Rates: English Performance



2005-2006 Statewide Pass Rates: Mathematics Performance



As shown on the above two charts of the 2005-2006 statewide Standards of Learning test results for English and mathematics, the performance of black students, Hispanic students, students with disabilities, students identified as disadvantaged, and limited English proficient students lags behind that of white students. Specifically, in English performance, the achievement gap ranges from 16 to 25 percent point difference in the pass rates of the various student subgroups. Likewise, for mathematics performance, the achievement gap ranges from 15 to 28 percentage points difference in the pass rates for the subgroups.

Undoubtedly there are many reasons for the disparities, some of which are well beyond the scope of the public schools to remedy. Nonetheless, the Board of Education, working with its many partners, has a responsibility to help localities provide the best possible public education system for all students – regardless of wealth, race, ethnicity, disability or place of birth.

Education, it has been said, is the great equalizer. Hence, the Board of Education’s goal is to ensure that all students achieve standards of excellence, no matter what community they reside in or what challenges they face.

Additional SOL test results may be viewed in Appendix A.

From Competence to Excellence

The achievements shown by students in Virginia's public schools have been substantial, strengthening foundations for learning and positioning our teachers and school leaders to continue to build a better future for all students. As encapsulated in the description above, Virginia's public schools have made great progress, but they undoubtedly still have a long way to go. Nagging problems persist, and we must do more to help schools and divisions that are struggling to meet higher standards for their students. In short, we cannot be satisfied with *competent* levels of achievement; rather, we must focus on moving to *excellent* levels of achievement.

As a springboard for action, the President of the Board of Education, Dr. Mark Emblidge, established four new committees to focus attention on priorities for action. The committees consist of members of the Board, and the chairs of the respective committees have set an agenda for action that will move the Board closer to meeting its objectives. The following is a brief description of the Board's new committees, followed by an overview of the work of the Committee on the Standards of Quality, which has led the Board in the SOQ revision process for the past several years.

School and Division Accountability Committee

The School and Division Accountability Committee was established to study chronically low-performing schools and school divisions and make recommendations on increasing accountability for effective instruction and achievement. The committee initially will focus on schools that lose state accreditation because of low student achievement and schools and divisions that have yet to meet annual benchmarks in reading and mathematics under the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001* (NCLB).

This committee will take a close look at these schools and divisions and make recommendations on additional tools and interventions that may be needed to ensure that all children in the Commonwealth attend schools that at the very least meet minimum state and federal proficiency standards and objectives.

Dr. Emblidge named Board of Education member David L. Johnson of Richmond as chairman of the committee. Board members Thomas M. Brewster of Tazewell County and Kelvin L. Moore of Lynchburg, will also serve on the panel, which will build on the work of previous committees that oversaw the initial implementation of NCLB, studied low-performing school divisions, and revised the Commonwealth's Standards of Quality and school accreditation standards.

The Board of Education needs to know how well our current statewide system of support for schools is working. By focusing on the schools and divisions that have not shared in the success most of our schools have enjoyed under the Standards of Learning (SOL) program, this committee will be able to determine whether new programs and policies are needed.

Committee on Literacy

The Committee on Literacy will develop strategies to raise the level of literacy of children, adolescents, and adults in the Commonwealth. The committee includes Board members Isis Castro of Fairfax, who will serve as chair, and Dr. Thomas Brewster of Tazewell. Other Board members will also participate. The committee will consider ways to:

- Increase the number of students reading on grade level by the third grade;
- Sustain literacy and a love of reading among students as they move from the elementary school environment to middle school and high school;
- Assist limited English proficient (LEP) students in obtaining an education; and
- Strengthen literacy programs and policies for adult learners.

Success in our society and economy requires an ever higher level of literacy. The Board's literacy committee will monitor the effectiveness of Virginia's efforts and recommend policies to increase literacy for Virginia's citizens. The committee will review data and monitor the progress of the Commonwealth's public schools and adult education programs in addressing literacy at all levels. The committee also will advise the Board on issues and policy considerations related to the instruction and assessment of limited English proficient (LEP) students.

Literacy is the foundation for student achievement in all subject areas. We must ensure that all children are reading on grade level by the third grade and that they continue to build on their reading skills throughout their academic careers. Last year, approximately 16 percent of Virginia's third-grade students were unable to demonstrate proficiency on the Standards of Learning (SOL) reading tests and required remedial instruction. The potential impact of effective reading instruction on future literacy is illustrated by a Virginia Department of Education analysis that showed approximately 95 percent of students who pass the grade 3 SOL reading test go on to pass the grade 5 reading test as well.

The growing number of students taking the SAT from groups that include significant numbers of English-language learners underscores the importance of the work the Board of Education is doing through its committee on literacy. The literacy committee's tasks include a review of proposed revisions in the state's Standards for English Language Proficiency and a review of issues related to the instruction and assessment of limited-English proficient students.

In Virginia, more than 1 million adults do not have a high school diploma or its equivalent, limiting their earnings potential. During 2004-2005, more than 25,000 adults with below ninth-grade-level English literacy were enrolled in Adult Basic Education or English for Speakers of Other Languages programs throughout Virginia, and nearly 70,000 LEP students were enrolled in Virginia public schools. The literacy committee will receive reports on the effectiveness of all state-level reading programs and initiatives and advise the full Board.

Among the literacy committee's first tasks will be a review of proposed revisions in the state's Standards for English Language Proficiency and a review of issues related to the instruction and assessment of LEP students.

Committee on Early Childhood Education

The Committee on Early Childhood Education is chaired by Board member Eleanor B. Saslaw of Fairfax County. Board member Kelvin Moore of Lynchburg serves on the committee. Other Board members will also participate as the committee:

- Establishes guidelines for school divisions for developing, selecting, and evaluating preschool curricula for quality and alignment with Virginia's *Foundation Blocks for Early Learning*, which constitutes the Commonwealth's standards for appropriate early childhood education in English, mathematics, science, and social science;
- Develops a plan to increase the number of licensed preschool teachers and qualified teacher assistants in Virginia for current and future needs; and
- Collaborates with school divisions, community colleges, and higher education to assess the current and future need for preschool teachers and qualified teacher assistants.

The Board of Education has a critical role to play along with the Governor and General Assembly in determining how best to strengthen early childhood education in the Commonwealth. It is the Board's responsibility to ensure that state-supported preschool programs are academically sound and that young learners are taught by qualified teachers. Preschool provides a foundation for achievement for thousands of Virginia children.

The Virginia Preschool Initiative (VPI), which was established by the General Assembly in 1995, provides funding for early childhood education programs for "at-risk" four-year-olds not served by federal programs, such as Head Start. In 2005, the General Assembly expanded the initiative to provide funding for 100 percent of at-risk children who otherwise would not have access to preschool. Initiative-funded preschool programs now serve approximately 11,000 children in 92 of the Commonwealth's 132 school divisions. Instruction in all VPI programs must be aligned with the state's standards for early childhood education.

The Board of Education adopted Virginia's *Foundation Blocks for Early Learning* in 2005. The preschool-standards define the skills and knowledge essential for success for children entering kindergarten and provide early childhood educators with a set of minimum objectives and research-based indicators of kindergarten readiness.

The work of the early childhood education committee will be supported by a \$15,000 grant from the National Association of State Boards of Education (NASBE) to help improve early learning experiences for children. Virginia was one of six states to receive early childhood education grants from NASBE. The grant program was funded by the W.K. Kellogg Foundation.

Committee on Graduation and Dropout Rates

The task of the Committee on Graduation and Dropout Rates is to research and recommend policies to reduce the number of students who drop out of high school and to improve graduation rates, especially among minority students. Vice President Ella P. Ward of Chesapeake and Board member Andrew J. Rotherham of Earlysville will co-chair the committee. The Board's Committee on Graduation and Dropout Rates will:

- Examine policies and data related to middle-to-high school transition, ninth-grade retention, truancy, and dropout and graduation rates;
- Identify best practices to reduce ninth-grade retention and increase the percentage of students who complete high school by earning a diploma; and
- Recommend policies to incorporate the raising of graduation rates into the Commonwealth's accountability system.

Most of Virginia's high school students are meeting or exceeding the Commonwealth's diploma standards but we must redouble our efforts to address the issues that historically have caused students to dropout or complete high school without earning a diploma. Many Virginia schools are implementing programs to reduce ninth-grade retention and increase the likelihood that students will be successful and earn a diploma. The committee will look at these programs and identify practices that should become part of the instructional and guidance programs of every high school in Virginia.

It is vital that Virginia get a handle on the best data we can to better understand the extent of our dropout problem and develop the best interventions we can to better serve our students.

In revising Virginia's school accreditation standards this year, the Board added increasing graduation rates as an objective for high schools. In 2008, Virginia's new education information management system will be able to calculate graduation rates for every school and school division based on longitudinal, student-level data using a formula recommended by the National Governors Association.

Revisions to the Standards of Quality

The Board began its 2006 review of the Standards of Quality at its April 27, 2006, planning session. On May 23, 2006, the Standards of Quality Committee held a forum to hear comments from educational organizations on potential changes to the Standards of Quality, including the: Virginia Association of School Superintendents, Virginia School Boards Association and the VSBA Limited English Proficiency Caucus, Virginia Education Association, Virginia Association of Elementary School Principals, Virginia Association of Secondary School Principals, Virginia Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development, Virginia Municipal League, and Virginia PTA. The Board's Standards of Quality Committee met on June 27, 2006 and July 25, 2006 to hear staff presentations and to consider possible recommendations. On November 29, 2006, the Board adopted amendments to the SOQ, as summarized below. The full text of the SOQ and the Board's amendments may be seen in Appendix C.

Standard 1: Instructional programs supporting the Standards of Learning and other educational objectives

- Clarify that the program of instruction offered by local school divisions includes the knowledge and skills needed for gainful employment to prepare students to achieve economic self-sufficiency.
- Add a requirement that the programs of prevention, intervention, and remediation offered by the school division include components that are research-based.

- Clarify that remediation is required if a student fails to achieve a passing score on all Standards of Learning tests in the grade, or who fails an end-of-course Standards of Learning test required for the award of a verified credit. Remediation may be required if the student fails to achieve a passing score on one or more, but not all, Standards of Learning tests in grades three through eight.
- Add a requirement for the early identification, diagnosis, and assistance for students with problems with mathematics, and provision of instructional strategies and practices that benefit the development of mathematics skills for all students.

Standard 2. Instructional, administrative, and support personnel.

- Require one full-time principal in each elementary school.
- Require one full-time assistant principal for each 400 students in each elementary, middle, and secondary school.
- Require one full-time instructional position for each 1,000 students to serve as the reading specialist.
- Require one full-time instructional position for each 1,000 students in grades kindergarten through eight to serve as the mathematics teacher specialist.
- Reduce the state required speech language pathologist caseload from 68 to 60 students.
- Require one full-time position per 1,000 students licensed by the Board of Education to serve as the data manager/test coordinator.
- Require local school boards to maintain pupil-teacher ratios for students who are blind or vision-impaired at not less than the following levels: Level I, resource teacher, 24 to one; Level II, self-contained with an aide, 10 to one; self-contained without an aide, eight to one, or Level II, self-contained student weight of 2.5.

Standard 3. Accreditation, other standards and evaluation

- Add language specifying that the cumulative eighth grade history and social science Standards of Learning test will be eliminated after the 2007-2008 school year. Instead, all school divisions must administer the United States History to 1877, United States History: 1877 to the Present, and Civics and Economics Standards of Learning tests.
- Clarify that the School Performance Report Card must include Standards of Learning test results disaggregated by student subgroups.

Standard 4. Student achievement and graduation requirements

- Clarify that provisions be made to facilitate the transfer and appropriate grade placement of students from other public secondary schools, from nonpublic schools, and from home instruction.
- Require that school divisions notify parents of secondary students of not just the number of standard and verified credits needed for graduation, but also the subject area requirements.

Standard 5. Teacher quality and educational leadership

- Add a requirement that the local school board provide teachers and principals with professional development programs in effective classroom management.

Standard 6. Planning and public involvement

- Clarify that the strategies for improving student achievement in the Board of Education's comprehensive plan, as well as the local school board's comprehensive plan, focus attention on the achievement of educationally at-risk students.

Standard 7. School board policies

- Clarify that the current school division policies made available to the public include the Student Conduct Policy.
- Require that the school division policies be posted on the school division's Web site.

Fiscal Impact on State Funds

The impact on state funds for the Board's recommended amendments is estimated to be \$173.2 million in Fiscal Year 2008, based on Chapter 10, the 2006 Appropriation Act.

Proposed Recommendations	FY 2008 Estimated State Cost
Elementary principal – One full-time principal in every elementary school	\$7.3 million
Assistant principal – One full-time assistant principal per 400 students	\$53.0 million
Reading specialist – One reading specialist for every 1,000 students in K-12	\$39.3 million
Speech-language pathologist – Reduce caseload from 68 to 60	\$4.2 million
Mathematics specialist – One mathematics specialist for every 1,000 students in K-8	\$26.9 million
Data manager/test coordinator – One data manager/test coordinator for every 1,000 students in K-12	\$39.3 million
Instructional positions for students who are blind or vision impaired.	\$3.2 million ¹
Total	\$173.2 million

Compliance with the Requirements of the Standards of Quality 2005-2006

Each year, staff members of the Department of Education collect self-assessment data from school divisions on their compliance with the provisions of § 22.1-253.13:1 through 22.1-253.13:8 of the *Code of Virginia* (Standards of Quality). The chairman of the school board and division superintendent certify compliance with the standards and the individual indicators within each standard to the Department of Education via a newly developed electronic data collection system.

Where divisions indicate less than full compliance with the standards, corrective action plans for the noncompliance items are required. See Appendix E for a listing of the information and data used by the Department of Education staff to monitor and verify compliance.

Of the divisions that were not in full compliance, all have filed a corrective action plan. Listed below are the school divisions that reported noncompliance with provisions of the SOQ. The data are for the 2005-2006 school year and for the Standards of Quality that were in effect as of July 1, 2005.

Divisions Reporting Non-Compliance with Certain Provisions of the Standards of Quality for 2005-2006

§ 22.1-253.13:1. Standard 1. Instructional programs supporting the Standards of Learning and other educational objectives.

Orange County	The division's program of instruction does not emphasize proficiency in the use of computers and related technology. (C.1.c.)
Petersburg City	All instructional personnel are not qualified in the relevant subject areas. (B.1.)

§ 22.1-253.13:2. Standard 2. Instructional, administrative, and support personnel.

Accomack County	All instructional personnel are not qualified in the relevant subject areas. (B.1.)
Appomattox County	The school board did not, on or before January 1, report actual pupil-teacher ratios in the elementary schools and the pupil-teacher ratios for resource teachers. (M.1.)
Arlington County	All instructional personnel are not qualified in the relevant subject areas. (B.1.)
Augusta County	The school board did not employ two full-time equivalent positions per 1,000 students in grades K-12 for technology support and instructional technology (one each). (J.1.)
Bath County	All instructional personnel are not qualified in the relevant subject areas. (B.1.)
Bedford County	Guidance positions requirement not met at one elementary school. (H.1.4.)
Charlotte County	Guidance counselor ratios not met. (H.1.4.)
Essex County	All instructional personnel are not qualified in the relevant subject areas. (B.1.)
Frederick County	The school board did not employ two full-time equivalent positions per 1,000 students in grades K-12 for technology support and instructional technology (one each). (J.1.)

Grayson County	All instructional personnel are not qualified in the relevant subject areas. (B.1.) Required LEP instructional positions requirement not met. (F.1.)
Greensville County	All instructional personnel are not qualified in the relevant subject areas. (B.1.)
Highland County	All instructional personnel are not qualified in the relevant subject areas. (B.1.)
Madison County	The school board did not, on or before January 1, report actual pupil–teacher ratios in the elementary schools and the pupil-teacher ratios for resource teachers. (M.1.)
New Kent County	Guidance counselor ratios not met. (H.1.4.) Clerical staffing requirements not met. (H.1.5.)
Rappahannock County	All instructional personnel are not qualified in the relevant subject areas. (B.1.)
Russell County	All instructional personnel are not qualified in the relevant subject areas. (B.1.)
Smyth County	The requirements for elementary resource teachers in art, music and physical education not met. (I.1)
Surry County	All instructional personnel are not qualified in the relevant subject areas. (B.1.) Required LEP instructional positions requirement not met. (F.1.)
Buena Vista City	All instructional personnel are not qualified in the relevant subject areas. (B.1.)
Charlottesville City	All instructional personnel are not qualified in the relevant subject areas. (B.1.)
Hampton City	The school board did not employ two full-time equivalent positions per 1,000 students in grades K-12 for technology support and instructional technology (one each). (J.1.)
Harrisonburg City	The school board did not, on or before January 1, report actual pupil –teacher ratios in the elementary schools and the pupil-teacher ratios for resource teachers. (M.1.)
Hopewell City	All instructional personnel were not qualified in the relevant subject areas. (B.1.) Staffing requirements for librarians not met. (H.1.3.) Staffing requirements for combined schools in the division not met. (K.1.)

§ 22.1-253.13:3. Standard 3. Accreditation, other standards and evaluation. The following school divisions reported that not all schools were fully accredited:

Accomack County	Fairfax County	Russell County
Amherst County	Fauquier County	Smyth County
Arlington County	Grayson County	Surry County
Augusta County	Greensville County	Sussex County
Bland County	Henrico County	Tazewell County
Brunswick County	King and Queen County	Washington County
Buchanan County	Lancaster County	Westmoreland County
Buckingham County	Lee County	Wythe County
Caroline County	Lunenburg County	Alexandria City
Carroll County	Montgomery County	Charlottesville City
Charles City County	Northampton County	Danville City
Chesterfield County	Nottoway County	Hampton City
Cumberland County	Prince Edward County	Harrisonburg City
Dinwiddie County	Pulaski County	Hopewell City
Essex County	Rockbridge County	Martinsville City

Newport News City

Portsmouth City

Staunton City

Norfolk City

Richmond City

Franklin City

Petersburg City

Roanoke City

§ 22.1-253.13:4. Standard 4. Student achievement and graduation requirements.

Staunton City

The school board did not provide notification of the right to a free public education for students who have not reached 20 years of age on or before August 1 of the school year to the parents of students who failed to graduate. (C.2.)

§ 22.1-253.13:5. Standard 5. Quality of classroom instruction and educational leadership.

Bath County

Each member of the school board did not participate in high-quality professional development activities as required. (D.1.)

§ 22.1-253.13:6. Standard 6. Planning and public involvement.

Bland County

The school board did not hold a public hearing on the division's comprehensive long-range plan to solicit public comment. (B.3.)

Madison County

The school board did not report to the public on the extent to which the objectives of the divisionwide plan had been met in the previous two years. (B.5.)

The school board had not revised, extended, or adopted a current division-wide comprehensive, unified, long-range plan with all the required components or held a public hearing to solicit public comment. (B.1., B.3., B.4.(iv), B.4.(vii))

Orange County

The school board did not report to the public on the extent to which the objectives of the divisionwide plan had been met in the previous two years. (B.5.)

Each school in the division prepares a comprehensive, unified, long-range plan that was considered by the board in developing the divisionwide comprehensive plan or the schools have not developed such plans. (C.1.)

§ 22.1-253.13:7. Standard 7. School board policies.

Bland County

No announcement of the availability of the division's policy manual was made at the beginning of the school year to parents. (C.3.)

Frederick County

The school board policy manual did not contain information about procedures for addressing concerns with the school division and recourse available for parents for a judicial review of a school board action as provided for in § 22.1-87 of the Code. (B.1.6.)

Washington County

The school board policy manual did not contain information about procedures for addressing concerns with the school division and recourse available for parents for a judicial review of a school board action as provided for in § 22.1-87 of the Code. (B.1.6.)

§ 22.1-253.13:8. Compliance.

Madison County

The division did not meet all applicable reporting deadlines required by Standards 2 and 6. (A.1.)

Compliance with the Requirements of the Standards of Accreditation

Based on 2005-2006 assessment results, nine out of ten Virginia public schools are fully accredited and meeting state standards for student achievement in English, mathematics, history/social science, and science. The percentage of schools meeting or exceeding state standards was little changed from the previous year, despite the introduction of rigorous new Standards of Learning (SOL) assessments in English and mathematics in grades 4, 6, and 7, which were previously untested. The accreditation ratings also reflect the achievement of elementary and middle school students on the United States History to 1877 test, which was introduced in 2005.

The introduction of grade level testing in English and mathematics and the inclusion of the U.S. History scores represent an increase in expectations for Virginia's students and schools. The fact that more than 90 percent of Virginia's public schools still earned full accreditation reflects the commitment of thousands of teachers, principals, and other educators to helping students meet high standards.

Schools Fully Accredited

Students in 1,670, or 92 percent of the 1,822 schools that were open during 2005-2006 and are open this year met or exceeded state achievement objectives on SOL tests and other statewide assessments in the four core academic areas. Ninety-six percent of Virginia's elementary schools and 97 percent of the Commonwealth's high schools are now fully accredited, compared with 95 percent and 94 percent, respectively, last year.

Factors Influencing Middle School Accreditation

The increased rigor of mathematics testing in grades at the middle school level resulted in a decrease in the percentage of middle schools achieving full accreditation, although nine middle schools that were accredited with warning during 2005-2006 are now fully accredited. The introduction of these tests has provided a shared lesson for educators at every level on the importance of understanding the goal implicit in the mathematics SOL of preparing students for success in Algebra I by grade 8 and by grade 9 at the latest.

Seventy-one percent, or 219 of the 307 middle schools open during 2005-2006 are fully accredited. Of the 86 middle schools that are accredited with warning, 63 are warned solely because of mathematics achievement, including 44 middle schools that were fully accredited last year. Last year, 83 percent of Virginia middle schools were fully accredited based on 2004-2005 achievement.

Schools Accredited with Warning

Forty-seven schools that were on academic warning last year achieved full accreditation, including 24 elementary schools, 9 middle schools, 12 high schools, and 2 combined schools. The number of schools accredited with warning rose to 138, compared with 129 at the close of last year. Seventy-four schools slipped from full accreditation to accredited with warning. A list of schools rated accredited with warning is shown in Appendix D.

Schools Rated “Accreditation Denied”

Six schools were denied state accreditation because of persistently low achievement in the four core content areas. These are the first schools to lose state accreditation since Virginia began rating schools based on student achievement in 1998. The schools denied accreditation, with areas of deficiency indicated, are:

- A.P. Hill Elementary, Petersburg (English, mathematics, history/social science, science)
- Peabody Middle, Petersburg (English, mathematics, history/social science, science)
- J.E.B. Stuart Elementary, Petersburg (English, mathematics)
- Petersburg High, Petersburg (mathematics, history/social science, science)
- Annie B. Jackson Elementary, Sussex County (English, mathematics, science)
- Ellen W. Chambliss Elementary, Sussex County (English, mathematics, science)

Of the six schools in Virginia denied accreditation, four are in Petersburg, the other two in Sussex County. School boards in Petersburg and Sussex must submit a corrective action plan to the state within 45 days of receiving the rating. The divisions will also be required to sign a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), which is drawn up jointly by the Board of Education and the local school board and sets forth the steps that must be taken by the local division. Because more than one-third of Petersburg's nine schools and Sussex's five schools were denied accreditation, their boards also must evaluate their school superintendents and submit copies of the evaluations to the state by December 1, 2006.

A school is denied accreditation if it fails to meet the requirements for full accreditation after being accredited with warning for three consecutive years. Schools that have been denied accreditation are subject to corrective actions prescribed by the Board of Education and agreed to by the local school board through a signed memorandum of understanding. A school board within 45 days of receiving notice of a school being denied accreditation must submit a corrective action plan to the Board of Education describing the steps to be taken to raise achievement to state standards. The Board of Education will consider the plan in developing the memorandum of understanding, which must be in force by November 1 of the year for which the school has been denied accreditation. Schools that are denied accreditation also must provide the following to parents and other interested parties:

- Written notice of the school's accreditation rating within 30 calendar days of the announcement of the rating by the Department of Education;
- A copy of the school division's proposed corrective action plan, including a timeline for implementation, to improve the school's accreditation rating; and
- An opportunity to comment on the division's proposed corrective action plan prior to its adoption and the signing of a memorandum of understanding between the local school board and the Board of Education.

As an alternative to the memorandum of understanding, a local school board may choose to reconstitute a school rated “Accreditation Denied” and apply to the Board of Education for a rating of “Conditionally Accredited.” If granted conditional accreditation, the school would have a maximum of three years to raise student achievement to state standards.

Schools Rated “Accreditation Withheld—Improving School”

Two schools, Pocahontas Combined in Tazewell County and Robert E. Lee Elementary in Petersburg, are rated as “Accreditation Withheld – Improving School.” This rating is for schools that are making substantial progress toward full accreditation. To earn this rating, which is only available this year, schools must meet each of the following criteria:

- At least 70 percent of its students must have passed the applicable English assessments except at third and fifth grade where the requirement is 75 percent;
- At least 60 percent of its students must have passed statewide assessments in the other three core academic areas; and
- In areas in which the pass rate is below the rate required for full accreditation, the school’s pass rate must have increased by at least 25 percentage points since 1999.

Schools Rated “Conditionally Accredited” or “To be Determined”

Seventeen newly opened schools are rated as conditionally accredited and the accreditation status of six schools remains to be determined.

Divisions in which All Schools are Fully Accredited or Conditionally Accredited

Sixty-three of Virginia’s 132 school divisions have no schools on the state’s academic warning list. The school divisions with all schools either fully or conditionally accredited are:

Albemarle County	Louisa County
Alleghany County	Madison County
Amelia County	Manassas Park
Appomattox County	Mathews County
Bath County	Middlesex County
Bedford County	Nelson County
Botetourt County	New Kent County
Buckingham County	Northumberland County
Buena Vista	Norton
Carroll County	Nottoway County
Charlotte County	Orange County
Clarke County	Patrick County
Colonial Heights	Poquoson
Culpeper County	Powhatan County
Cumberland County	Prince George County
Fairfax County	Radford
Falls Church	Rappahannock County
Floyd County	Richmond County
Fluvanna County	Roanoke County
Franklin County	Russell County
Giles County	Salem
Gloucester County	Scott County
Goochland County	Shenandoah County
Hanover County	Stafford County
Harrisonburg	Virginia Beach
Highland County	Warren County

Hopewell
King William County
Lancaster County
Lee County
Lexington
Loudoun County

Waynesboro
West Point
Winchester
Wise County
York County

Explanation of the Accreditation Rating System for Virginia's Public Schools

The accreditation ratings are based on the achievement of students on SOL assessments and approved substitute tests in English, mathematics, history/social science, and science administered during the summer and fall of 2005 and the spring of 2006, or on overall achievement during the three most recent academic years. The results of tests administered in each subject area are combined to produce overall passing percentages in English, mathematics, history, and science.


In middle schools and high schools, an adjusted pass rate of at least 70 percent in all four subject areas is required for full accreditation. In elementary schools, a combined accreditation pass rate of at least 75 percent on English tests in grades 3 and 5, and 70 percent in grade 4 is required for full accreditation. Elementary schools also must achieve accreditation pass rates of at least 70 percent in mathematics, grade 5 science, and grade 5 history, and pass rates of at least 50 percent in grade 3 science and grade 3 history.

Accreditation ratings also may reflect adjustments made for schools that successfully remediate students who previously failed reading or mathematics tests. Adjustments also may be made for students with limited English proficiency, and for students who have recently transferred into a Virginia public school.

The Board of Education adopted the Standards of Learning in 1995. A program of annual assessments in English, mathematics, history/social science, and science in grades 3, 5, 8, and at the end of high school-level courses began in the 1997-98 school year. The department introduced new reading and mathematics tests for grades 4, 6, and 7 during 2005-2006, as required by the federal *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001*.

It is important to remember that in 1998, the first year of SOL testing, only 2 percent of Virginia's public schools met the standard for full accreditation. The percentage of schools meeting the state's accreditation standards increased to 6.5 percent in 1999, 22 percent in 2000, 40 percent in 2001, 64 percent in 2002, 78 percent in 2003, and 84 percent in 2004. Last year, 1,685 or 92 percent of Virginia's schools were rated as fully accredited based on achievement during 2004-2005.

**Percent of Public Schools Rated Fully Accredited:
1998-2006**



**Condition and Needs of Virginia's
Lowest Performing Schools and School Divisions**

Findings for the School-level Academic Review Process for 2005-2006

There were 132 schools Accredited with Warning in 2005-2006. Ninety-four schools were assigned a school support team; 13 schools were identified for a Tier I review; 11 schools were identified for a Tier 2 review; and 14 schools were identified for a Tier 3 review. The tiers refer to the extent of the review, which is based on criteria set by the Board of Education.

For the 132 schools Accredited with Warning in 2005-2006, 92 were warned in English; 33 were warned in mathematics; 49 were warned in science; and 46 were warned in History/Social Sciences. (Note: Schools may be Accredited with Warning in more than one area.)

Twenty-eight schools received school support through either the Partnership for Achieving Successful Schools (PASS) initiative or Reading First. Twenty-three schools were assigned a PASS coach who served as the school support team leader. Five schools were assigned a Reading First coach from the Office of Elementary Instruction who served as the school support team leader.

Those schools warned in the previous year were provided assistance through the school support team. Team leaders followed the school's implementation of the school improvement plan throughout the year. The team leaders cited the following critical needs for these schools most often:

- Professional development is needed to improve instruction.
- Effective data analysis and frequent benchmarking assessment programs need to be improved.
- Recruiting and maintaining highly qualified staff presents a significant problem.
- Leadership at the school and district level needs to be data driven.
- The school improvement plan needs to be aligned with No Child Left Behind (NCLB) and the findings of the academic review.

For those schools in the Tier I, II, or III review, team leaders cited the following critical needs most often:

- Professional development needs to be linked to the strategies in the school improvement plan.
- Remediation programs do not use student data from assessment classroom or SOL assessment.
- Professional development is needed in the areas of instructional techniques, use of instructional time, student engagement and differentiated instruction.
- The school improvement plan needs to be aligned with NCLB and the findings of the academic review.

Condition and Needs of Virginia's Schools as Identified by Adequate Yearly Progress Results

Virginia and 73 percent of Virginia's public schools met or exceeded No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) achievement objectives during the 2005-2006 school year. It was the second consecutive year in which Virginia made what the federal law calls Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in reading and mathematics.

How is Adequate Yearly Progress Determined?

The *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001* (NCLB) requires states to set annual measurable objectives of proficiency in reading and mathematics, participation in testing, and graduation and attendance. These objectives are in addition to the high standards for learning and achievement required under Virginia's Standards of Learning (SOL) program. Schools and school divisions that meet the annual objectives required by the federal education law are considered to have made adequate yearly progress (AYP) toward the goal of 100 percent proficiency of all students in reading and mathematics by 2014.

A key point is that for a school, school division or the Commonwealth to make AYP, it must meet or exceed 29 benchmarks for participation in statewide testing, achievement in reading and mathematics, and attendance or science (elementary and middle schools) or graduation (high schools). Missing a single benchmark may result in a school or school division not making AYP.

Annual Measurable Objectives

The yearly achievement benchmarks in reading and mathematics established by the Board of Education as part of Virginia’s implementation of NCLB are known as annual measurable objectives (AMOs).

The following table shows Virginia’s AMOs for reading and language arts. For a school or school division to have made AYP during 2005-2006 at least 69 percent of students overall and students in each subgroup must have demonstrated proficiency on Standards of Learning (SOL) tests and other approved assessments in reading and language arts.

AYP: Annual Measurable Objectives for Reading and Language Arts

2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
Starting Point			Initial Goal			Initial Goal			Initial Goal			Goal
60.7%	61%		65%	69%	71%	75%	79%	83%	87%	91%	95%	100%

AYP: Annual Measurable Objectives for Mathematics

2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
Starting Point			Initial Goal			Initial Goal			Initial Goal			Goal
58.4%	59%	59%	63%	67%	71%	75%	79%	83%	87%	91%	95%	100%

In addition to meeting annual measurable objectives in reading and mathematics, Virginia schools and school divisions must meet annual objectives for attendance or science (elementary and middle schools) and graduation (high schools), or show improvement. School divisions decide prior to the beginning of the school year whether to use attendance or achievement in science as another academic indicator for elementary and middle schools.

Schools Making AYP

Of the 1,822 schools that earned AYP ratings based on tests taken in 2005-2006, at least 1,336, or 73 percent, met the federal education law's requirements for increased student achievement. Those schools included 47 Title I schools that improved significantly by making AYP for a second consecutive year, despite higher benchmarks in reading and mathematics and the introduction of testing in grades 4, 6, and 7.

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) for Virginia Public Schools

	Made AYP	Did Not Make AYP	To Be Determined	Total
Schools	1,336 (73%)	400 (22%)	86 (5%)	1,822

The shift from cumulative assessments in reading and mathematics in elementary and middle school to annual testing in grades 3-8 increased the rigor of Virginia's assessment program, especially in middle school mathematics, by assessing deeper into the content at each grade level. Virginia's Standards of Learning (SOL) for middle school mathematics are designed to prepare students for Algebra I by grade 8, and at the latest, grade 9. The federal benchmarks increased by four points in both reading and mathematics, to 69 percent in reading and 67 percent in mathematics.

Of the 400 schools that did not make AYP during 2005-2006, 130 met all but one of the federal law's 29 objectives for participation in statewide testing and achievement in reading and mathematics, and 105 met all but two AYP benchmarks. The AYP status of 86 schools remains to be determined.

Last year, 80 percent of Virginia's schools were initially reported as having made AYP based on preliminary 2004-2005 data. Appeals and the submission of additional data eventually increased the percentage to 83 percent. Of the schools that made AYP last year, 1,190 also made AYP based on tests administered during 2005-2006, while 245 did not. The schools that made AYP based on achievement during the 2005-2006 school year include 136 schools that did not make AYP last year based on 2004-2005 tests.

More School Divisions Make AYP

Seventy-two of Virginia's 132 school divisions made AYP during 2005-2006, compared with 68 last year. Of the 52 school divisions that did not make AYP, 26 met all but one of the 29 objectives for achievement and participation in testing. The AYP ratings of 8 divisions remain to be determined.

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) for Virginia School Divisions

	Made AYP	Did Not Make AYP	To Be Determined	Total
Divisions	72 (55%)	52 (39%)	8 (6%)	132

In 24 school divisions, all schools made AYP. These divisions include Alleghany County, Bath County, Botetourt County, Buena Vista, Charlotte County, Clarke County, Craig County, Dinwiddie County, Gloucester County, Goochland County, Highland County, Hopewell, Lexington, Manassas Park, Northampton County, Norton, Nottoway County, Patrick County, Roanoke County, Rockingham County, Salem, Scott County, Surry County, and West Point.

Eight Out of Ten of Virginia's Title I Schools Made AYP

Forty-seven Title I schools made AYP for a second consecutive year, and by doing so, exited school improvement status. The success of these schools in raising student achievement resulted in the number of sanctioned Title I schools in Virginia falling from 111 to 64.

Title I schools receive funding under Title I of NCLB to provide educational services to low-income children and are the focus of most of the accountability provisions of the law. Under the law, Title I schools that do not make AYP in the same subject area for two or more consecutive years are identified for improvement. School improvement sanctions increase in severity if a school fails to make AYP in the same subject area for additional consecutive years. A Title I school escapes federal sanctions by making AYP for two consecutive years.

Eight out of ten, or 573, of Virginia's 732 Title I schools made AYP during 2005-2006. Of the Title I schools that did not make AYP, 38 met all but one of the 29 AYP objectives. The AYP status of 33 Title I schools remains to be determined.

Nineteen Title I schools entered or remained in "year one" of improvement based on achievement in 2005-2006 and must offer students the option of transferring to a higher-performing public school for the 2006-2007 school year. Twenty-nine Title I schools entered or remained in "year two" of improvement status, and in addition to offering transfers, must also provide supplemental educational services or tutoring free-of-charge to children who request these services. Eleven Title I schools entered or remained in "year three" of improvement status. These schools must offer transfers, tutoring, and take at least one of several corrective actions specified in the law to raise student achievement.

Two Title I schools, Elkhardt Middle in Richmond and Westview Elementary in Petersburg, entered "year four" of improvement status. Richmond and Petersburg must begin developing alternative governance plans for these schools while continuing to offer transfers and tutoring, and continuing to implement corrective action.

Two schools, Chandler Middle in Richmond and Vernon Johns Middle in Petersburg, entered "year five" of Title I school improvement. These schools must take one of the following actions:

- Reopen as a charter school;
- Replace all or most of the school staff relevant to the school's failure to make AYP;
- Turn the management of the school over to a private educational management company or another entity with a demonstrated record of success; or
- Any other major restructuring of school governance.

AYP ratings are based primarily on the achievement of students on statewide assessments in reading, mathematics, and, in some cases, science. In Virginia, these assessments include SOL

tests, substitute tests of equal or greater rigor such as Advanced Placement examinations, English-language proficiency tests taken by students learning English, and assessments taken by some students with disabilities.

Virginia's AYP objectives based on 2005-2006 achievement were among the highest in the nation because of the progress students have made since 1995 under the SOL program. For a Virginia school or school division to have made AYP this year, at least 69 percent of students overall and of students in all subgroups (white, black, Hispanic, limited English, students with disabilities, and economically disadvantaged) must have demonstrated proficiency on statewide tests in reading, and 67 percent of students overall and in all subgroups must have demonstrated proficiency in mathematics.

Schools, school divisions, and states also must meet annual objectives for participation in testing and for attendance (elementary and middle schools) and graduation (high schools). Schools, school divisions, and states that meet or exceed these objectives are considered to have satisfied the law's definition of AYP toward the goal of 100 percent proficiency of all students in reading and mathematics by 2014.

Condition and Needs of Virginia's Public Schools as Identified by Standards of Learning Test Results for 2005-2006

Reading Achievement

Overall achievement in reading increased with 84 percent of Virginia students passing SOL and other tests in reading during 2005-2006 compared with 81 percent during 2004-2005. The increase in reading achievement was especially noteworthy in grade 3. Eighty-four percent of third-grade students passed statewide tests in reading last year, an increase of 7 points over 2004-2005. All student subgroups improved in reading during 2005-2006:

- Hispanic reading achievement increased three points, from 73 percent in 2004-2005 to 76 percent in 2005-2006.
- Black students achieved a 73 percent pass rate in reading, compared with 70 percent during the previous year.
- The reading achievement of disadvantaged students increased four points, from 69 percent to 73 percent.
- Limited English proficient students demonstrated a two-point increase in reading proficiency by achieving a 72 percent pass rate in 2005-2006, compared with 70 percent during the previous year.
- White students achieved an 89 percent pass rate in reading, a two-point increase from 87 percent during 2004-2005.
- Students with disabilities raised their reading achievement by 7 points, to 63 percent compared with 56 percent in 2004-2005.

Mathematics Achievement

Pass rates in mathematics were impacted by the introduction of new mathematics tests in previously untested grade levels of 4, 6, and 7. Student achievement often is low on new tests and many middle school students were challenged by the new mathematics assessments. The grade 6

and grade 7 mathematics assessments test deeply into content that is designed to prepare students for success in Algebra I in the eighth grade. The new eighth-grade mathematics test also is more rigorous than the previously administered cumulative grade-8 test that surveyed knowledge of three years of SOL content.

The new tests mean that Virginia is now expecting middle school students to demonstrate a stronger command of rigorous mathematics content sooner than what was required before, and whenever standards are raised, there is a period of adjustment. While many students did not do as well on the new mathematics tests as anticipated, the data from these assessments will be invaluable as teachers adjust instruction to help students meet these new higher expectations.

Fifty-one percent of the students who took the new grade-6 mathematics test passed, and 44 percent tested on the new seventh-grade assessment passed. Achievement in previously assessed grades and in grade 4 was much higher.

- Ninety percent of third graders passed in mathematics.
- Seventy-seven percent of tested fourth graders passed in mathematics.
- Seventy-six percent of tested eighth graders passed in mathematics.
- Eighty-five percent of students who took end-of-course assessments in Algebra I, Algebra II, and Geometry passed.

Overall, seventy-six percent of Virginia students tested last year in mathematics passed, compared with 84 percent in 2004-2005.

- Sixty-two percent of black students passed assessments in mathematics, compared with 73 percent during 2004-2005.
- The mathematics pass rate for disadvantaged students was 62 percent, compared with 74 percent during 2004-2005.
- Sixty-five percent of limited English students passed in mathematics, compared with 77 percent during 2004-2005.
- Sixty-six percent of Hispanic students passed in mathematics, compared with 77 percent during the previous year.
- Eighty-one percent of white students passed in mathematics, compared with 89 percent last year.
- Fifty-two percent of students with disabilities passed in mathematics, compared with 61 percent during 2004-2005.

Science Achievement

Science achievement factors into calculating AYP for elementary and middle schools that select achievement in science as an “other academic indicator.” Science also is a factor for high schools that make AYP through the “safe harbor” provision of NCLB. A school, division, or state makes AYP through safe harbor by reducing the failure rate in a subject area by 10 percent. Safe harbor may be invoked for all students or for students in one or more subgroups. Eighty-five percent of Virginia students passed tests in science, compared with 84 percent last year.

- Black students achieved a 73 percent pass rate in 2005-2006, compared with 72 percent during 2004-2005.

- Seventy-four percent of economically disadvantaged students passed science tests, compared with 73 percent during the previous year.
- Limited English students achieved a pass rate of 69 percent in science, which was the same as the previous year.
- The percentage of Hispanic students demonstrating proficiency in science increased by one point to 74 percent.
- The achievement of white students in science was unchanged, with 91 percent passing state science tests.
- The achievement of students with disabilities in science increased by one point to 65 percent.

Statewide Standards of Learning Test Results

English: Pass Rates

SOL Test: English	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	Change: 1998- 2006
Grade 3	55%	61%	61%	65%	72%	72%	71%	77%	84%	29
Grade 4									86%	N/A
Grade 5	68%	69%	68%	73%	78%	83%	85%	85%	87%	19
Grade 5 Writing	65%	81%	81%	84%	84%	85%	88%	91%	88%	23
Grade 6									83%	N/A
Grade 7									81%	N/A
Grade 8	65%	67%	70%	73%	69%	69%	72%	76%	78%	13
Grade 8 Writing	67%	70%	76%	75%	76%	74%	77%	74%	91%	24
English EOC	72%	75%	78%	82%	84%	92%	89%	88%	90%	18
Writing EOC	71%	81%	85%	84%	84%	90%	88%	88%	88%	17

Science: Pass Rates

SOL Test: Science	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	Change: 1998-2006
Grade 3	63%	68%	73%	74%	78%	82%	86%	89%	90%	27
Grade 5	59%	67%	64%	75%	76%	80%	84%	81%	85%	26
Grade 8	71%	78%	82%	84%	85%	84%	88%	87%	87%	16
Earth Science	58%	65%	70%	73%	66%	75%	75%	80%	82%	24
Biology	72%	81%	79%	81%	82%	83%	83%	83%	83%	11
Chemistry	54%	64%	64%	74%	78%	84%	87%	88%	87%	33

Mathematics : Pass Rates

SOL Test: Math	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	Change: 1998- 2006
Grade 3	63%	68%	71%	77%	80%	83%	87%	88%	90%	27
Grade 4									77%	N/A
Grade 5	47%	51%	63%	67%	71%	74%	78%	81%	83%	36
Grade 6									51%	N/A
Grade 7									44%	N/A
Grade 8	53%	60%	61%	68%	71%	75%	80%	81%	76%	23
Algebra I	40%	56%	65%	74%	75%	79%	82%	86%	88%	48
Algebra II	31%	51%	58%	74%	76%	81%	87%	88%	85%	54
Geometry	52%	62%	67%	73%	75%	79%	83%	83%	83%	31

History and Social Science: Pass Rates

SOL Test: History/Soc Science	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	Change: 1998-2006
Grade 3	49%	62%	65%	72%	76%	82%	87%	89%	91%	42
Grade 5	33%	46%	51%	63%	72%	79%	87%	85%	85%	52
Grade 8	35%	40%	50%	56%	78%	80%	83%	82%	81%	46
World History and Geography to 1500**	62%	68%	75%	83%	83%	87%	84%	85%	84%	22
World History and Geography 1500 to Present**	41%	47%	60%	65%	77%	83%	83%	88%	89%	48
World Geography	n/a*	n/a*	76%	77%	72%	77%	72%	75%	77%	N/A
Va & US History	30%	32%	39%	47%	70%	76%	87%	90%	92%	62

* Test first administered in 2000.

** 2004 end-of-course tests for Virginia & U.S. History, World History & Geography to 1500. World History & Geography 1500 to Present, and World Geography based on 2001 revision of History/Social Science Standards of Learning. World Geography end-of-course test first administered in 2000.

Content Specific History: Pass Rates

SOL Test: Content History	2004	2005	2006	Change: 2004-2006
Civics and Economics	81%	84%	84%	3
United States History from 1877 to Present	76%	84%	85%	9
United States History to 1877	59%	63%	65%	6

Notes:

Beginning in 2002, assessments from the prior year summer and fall administrations are also included. For example, 2002 includes assessments from the summer 2001, fall 2001 and spring 2002 administrations.

Beginning in 2002, the pass rates are calculated using the rules for calculating AYP passing rates. Beginning in 2002, grade level test passing rates include the results of the VAAP assessment.

Beginning in 2003, the English grade level tests also include the results of the SELP assessment where it was determined the student could use the SELP as a proxy for the SOL.

Beginning in 2004, grade level test passing rates include the results of the VGLA assessment.

Beginning in 2005, EOC test passing rates include the results of the VSEP assessment.

Closing Statement by the Virginia Board of Education

The condition and needs of Virginia's public schools described in this report should be viewed as guideposts for action. The information in this report points toward critical areas of need that will undermine Virginia's future success if not addressed quickly and effectively. The point that cannot be missed is this: Public education benefits everyone. It is the key to ensuring quality of life for Virginia's citizens both now and in the future. The members of the Board of Education pledge to remain focused on providing the best educational opportunities and the brightest future for the young people enrolled in Virginia's public schools.

The encouraging results, however, should not mask the realities of schooling for some children who may face difficult personal circumstances such as high poverty, high crime in their neighborhoods, and other circumstances that obstruct their learning at school. Moreover, the condition and needs of schools surely reflect the condition and needs found in their communities. While the achievement gaps that exist among groups of students are narrowing, the gaps persist and provide a huge challenge to our public schools.

The Board of Education is bold in its expectations, the recommendations from its committees, and the actions taken as a result. It also acknowledges the challenges our students will face as they grow into productive adult citizens of the global economy—the rapid growth in technology, the changing demographics of our communities, and greater demands for skills for all citizens.

With its comprehensive plan of action as its roadmap and the work of its newly established committees as its navigator, the Board is focused on critical areas of concern: finding new and effective ways to help struggling schools and divisions, emphasizing the benefits of early learning programs, improving reading and literacy at every grade and for every subgroup of students, and finding solutions to dropout problems, and keeping young people in school until they graduate.

For the Board of Education, the goal is clear: All children can achieve at high levels. In short, *all* means *all*.

APPENDICES

**Appendix A:
Statewide Standards of Learning Test Results: 1998-2006**

**Appendix B:
Virginia's Public Schools: Demographic and Statistical Data**

**Appendix C:
Standards of Quality, as Adopted by the Board of Education on
November 29, 2006**

**Appendix D:
List of Public Schools Rated Accredited with Warning**

**Appendix E:
List of Data and Reports Used to Document the Condition and Needs of the
Public Schools in Virginia and Compliance with the
Standards of Quality**

Appendix A: Statewide Standards of Learning Test Results

Percentage of Students Passing/Tested/Not Tested

Schools, school divisions, and states are rated according to the progress toward the goals of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB). This federal law requires states to set annual benchmarks for achievement in reading and mathematics leading to 100 percent proficiency by 2014. Schools, school divisions, and states that meet or exceed all annual benchmarks toward this goal are rated as having made adequate yearly progress (AYP). Schools, school divisions, states must test at least 95 percent of students overall, and 95 percent of students in each of the following subgroups: white, black, Hispanic, students with disabilities, limited English proficient students, and students identified as disadvantaged. Annual accountability ratings are based on achievement during the previous academic year or combined achievement from the three most recent years. Only student subgroups represented are listed.

Percentage of Students Passing/Tested/Not Tested										
Student Subgroup	Type	2003-2004			2004-2005			2005-2006		
		Passed	Tested	Not Tested	Passed	Tested	Not Tested	Passed	Tested	Not Tested
English Performance										
All Students	State	79	99	1	81	99	1	84	100	0
Black Students	State	66	98	2	70	99	1	73	99	1
Hispanic Students	State	69	100	0	73	100	0	76	100	0
White Students	State	85	99	1	87	99	1	89	100	0
Students with Disabilities	State	51	97	3	56	98	2	64	100	0
Students Identified as Disadvantaged	State	64	98	2	69	99	1	73	99	1
Limited English Proficient Students	State	65	100	0	70	100	0	72	100	0
Mathematics Performance										
All Students	State	83	98	2	84	99	1	76	100	0
Black Students	State	70	98	2	73	98	2	62	99	1
Hispanic Students	State	76	98	2	77	99	1	66	99	1
White Students	State	87	99	1	89	99	1	81	100	0
Students with Disabilities	State	57	97	3	61	98	2	53	100	0
Students Identified as Disadvantaged	State	72	98	2	74	99	1	62	99	1
Limited English Proficient Students	State	76	98	2	77	99	1	65	99	1
Key: < = A group below state definition for personally identifiable results - = No data for group * = Data not yet available										

Other Academic Indicators

NCLB also requires schools, school divisions and states to make progress in an additional area, such as science or attendance for elementary and middle schools, and graduation for high schools. Annual accountability ratings are based on achievement during the previous academic year or combined achievement from the three most recent years. **Only student subgroups represented are listed.**

Other Academic Indicators				
Student Subgroup	Type	2003-2004 Percentage	2004-2005 Percentage	2005-2006 Percentage
Science Performance				
All Students	State	84	84	85
Black Students	State	70	72	73
Hispanic Students	State	72	73	74
White Students	State	90	91	91
Students with Disabilities	State	64	64	65
Students Identified as Disadvantaged	State	71	73	74
Limited English Proficient Students	State	66	69	69
Attendance Rate				
All Students	State	95	95	95
Black Students	State	95	95	95
Hispanic Students	State	95	95	95
White Students	State	95	95	95
Students with Disabilities	State	94	94	94
Students Identified as Disadvantaged	State	94	94	94
Limited English Proficient Students	State	95	95	95
Graduation Rate				
All Students	State	82	80	79
Notes:				
Science Performance: the percentage of students passing science				
Attendance Rate: average daily attendance percentage				
Graduation Rate: the percentage of students achieving a regular high school diploma (rate from previous school year is used for AYP)				
Key: < = A group below state definition for personally identifiable results				
- = No data for group				
* = Data not yet available				

Assessment Results at each Proficiency Level by Subgroup

The Virginia Assessment Program includes Standards of Learning (SOL) tests and other statewide assessments in English, history/social science, mathematics, and science. The tables below provide information for the three most recent years on the achievement of students on these tests, including percentages of students who demonstrate proficiency and advanced proficiency. Annual accountability ratings are based on achievement during the previous academic year or combined achievement from the three most recent years. Only student subgroups represented are listed.

Assessment Results at each Proficiency Level by Subgroup													
Student Subgroup	Type	2003-2004				2004-2005				2005-2006			
		Adv	Prof	Pass	Fail	Adv	Prof	Pass	Fail	Adv	Prof	Pass	Fail
English: RLR													
Grade 3													
All Students	State	14	58	71	29	19	58	77	23	39	45	84	16
Female Students	State	16	59	76	24	21	59	80	20	40	45	85	15
Male Students	State	12	56	68	32	16	57	73	27	37	45	82	18
Black Students	State	6	50	56	44	10	56	67	33	24	49	73	27
Hispanic Students	State	5	57	62	38	9	59	68	32	22	57	79	21
White Students	State	18	61	79	21	23	59	82	18	47	41	88	12
Asian Students	State	18	62	81	19	26	58	84	16	44	46	90	10
American Indian Students	State	13	59	71	29	18	58	76	24	40	46	86	14
Other Students	State	14	59	73	27	20	60	80	20	41	43	84	16
Students with Disabilities	State	7	40	47	53	9	44	54	46	25	45	71	29
Students Identified as Disadvantaged	State	6	50	57	43	9	56	65	35	23	51	74	26
Limited English Proficient Students	State	4	56	60	40	8	59	68	32	17	60	77	23
Students Identified as Migrant	State	4	66	70	30	9	55	65	35	12	59	71	29
Mathematics													
Grade 3													
All Students	State	49	38	87	13	52	36	88	12	52	38	90	10
Female Students	State	48	39	87	13	52	36	88	12	51	39	90	10
Male Students	State	49	38	87	13	53	35	88	12	52	37	89	11
Black Students	State	28	49	77	23	33	46	79	21	32	50	82	18
Hispanic Students	State	35	48	84	16	37	45	82	18	38	47	85	15
White Students	State	58	34	92	8	61	31	92	8	61	33	93	7
Asian Students	State	66	28	95	5	66	28	94	6	68	27	95	5
American Indian Students	State	49	37	86	14	50	38	88	12	55	37	92	8
Other Students	State	50	38	88	12	57	34	90	10	57	34	91	9
Students with Disabilities	State	29	45	74	26	31	42	73	27	32	43	75	25
Students Identified as Disadvantaged	State	31	47	79	21	35	45	80	20	35	48	83	17
Limited English Proficient Students	State	36	48	84	16	37	45	82	18	38	47	85	15
Students Identified as Migrant	State	40	38	78	22	39	41	80	20	31	53	83	17
Science													
Grade 3													
All Students	State	38	48	86	14	42	47	89	11	40	50	90	10
Female Students	State	37	49	85	15	40	49	89	11	38	52	90	10
Male Students	State	40	47	86	14	44	45	89	11	42	48	90	10
Black Students	State	18	55	73	27	23	56	80	20	21	60	81	19
Hispanic Students	State	21	56	77	23	26	54	81	19	23	61	84	16
White Students	State	48	44	92	8	51	42	93	7	50	45	95	5
Asian Students	State	44	47	91	9	48	45	93	7	44	50	94	6
American Indian Students	State	40	47	87	13	42	48	90	10	41	50	91	9
Other Students	State	39	48	87	13	45	46	91	9	43	50	92	8
Students with Disabilities	State	24	49	73	27	28	48	76	24	27	50	77	23
Students Identified as Disadvantaged	State	20	55	75	25	25	55	80	20	23	59	82	18
Limited English Proficient Students	State	17	58	75	25	24	57	80	20	18	64	82	18
Students Identified as Migrant	State	10	60	70	30	19	58	77	23	20	67	87	13
History and Social Sciences													
Grade 3													
All Students	State	51	37	87	13	52	38	89	11	57	34	91	9
Female Students	State	49	38	87	13	51	39	90	10	57	35	92	8
Male Students	State	52	36	88	12	53	36	89	11	57	33	91	9
Black Students	State	36	43	79	21	35	47	82	18	41	44	85	15
Hispanic Students	State	38	44	82	18	36	47	83	17	42	43	85	15
White Students	State	57	34	91	9	60	33	93	7	65	29	94	6
Asian Students	State	64	29	93	7	62	32	94	6	67	28	95	5
American Indian Students	State	47	40	87	13	55	33	89	11	55	38	93	7
Other Students	State	53	36	89	11	56	36	92	8	61	31	92	8
Students with Disabilities	State	29	43	72	28	32	44	76	24	35	42	78	22
Students Identified as Disadvantaged	State	33	45	78	22	34	48	81	19	39	45	84	16

Assessment Results at each Proficiency Level by Subgroup													
Student Subgroup	Type	2003-2004				2004-2005				2005-2006			
		Adv	Prof	Pass	Fail	Adv	Prof	Pass	Fail	Adv	Prof	Pass	Fail
Limited English Proficient Students	State	36	44	80	20	35	47	82	18	38	46	85	15
Students Identified as Migrant	State	36	37	73	27	28	54	82	18	39	50	89	11
English: RLR													
Grade 4													
All Students	State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	42	45	86	14
Female Students	State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	43	45	88	12
Male Students	State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	40	45	85	15
Black Students	State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	27	51	78	22
Hispanic Students	State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	24	56	80	20
White Students	State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	50	41	90	10
Asian Students	State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	48	44	92	8
American Indian Students	State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	41	46	86	14
Other Students	State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	45	43	88	12
Students with Disabilities	State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	26	46	72	28
Students Identified as Disadvantaged	State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	25	53	77	23
Limited English Proficient Students	State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	20	59	79	21
Students Identified as Migrant	State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	70	75	25
Mathematics													
Grade 4													
All Students	State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	34	44	77	23
Female Students	State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	32	45	77	23
Male Students	State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	35	43	78	22
Black Students	State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	18	46	64	36
Hispanic Students	State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	20	45	65	35
White Students	State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	41	43	84	16
Asian Students	State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	49	37	87	13
American Indian Students	State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	33	44	78	22
Other Students	State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	37	44	80	20
Students with Disabilities	State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	20	38	59	41
Students Identified as Disadvantaged	State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	18	45	64	36
Limited English Proficient Students	State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	20	44	63	37
Students Identified as Migrant	State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	51	57	43
English: RLR													
Grade 5													
All Students	State	31	53	85	15	29	56	85	15	42	45	87	13
Female Students	State	35	53	88	12	33	55	88	12	44	45	89	11
Male Students	State	27	54	81	19	26	56	83	17	40	45	85	15
Black Students	State	17	57	74	26	15	60	75	25	24	53	77	23
Hispanic Students	State	17	62	79	21	15	66	81	19	26	55	81	19
White Students	State	39	51	89	11	37	53	90	10	50	41	91	9
Asian Students	State	38	53	91	9	35	57	92	8	51	42	93	7
American Indian Students	State	30	55	85	15	32	58	90	10	41	48	89	11
Other Students	State	35	51	86	14	33	55	88	12	46	43	89	11
Students with Disabilities	State	11	50	62	38	13	52	65	35	23	49	72	28
Students Identified as Disadvantaged	State	16	58	74	26	14	61	75	25	25	53	78	22
Limited English Proficient Students	State	13	65	78	22	11	68	80	20	22	58	81	19
Students Identified as Migrant	State	17	61	78	22	10	56	65	35	17	50	67	33
Mathematics													
Grade 5													
All Students	State	20	58	78	22	25	55	81	19	45	38	83	17
Female Students	State	19	61	80	20	25	57	82	18	46	39	84	16
Male Students	State	21	56	77	23	26	54	79	21	44	37	82	18
Black Students	State	8	57	66	34	12	57	69	31	30	44	74	26
Hispanic Students	State	11	58	69	31	15	57	72	28	33	41	74	26
White Students	State	25	59	84	16	31	55	86	14	52	36	87	13
Asian Students	State	34	56	90	10	42	49	90	10	61	30	91	9
American Indian Students	State	16	66	81	19	25	56	81	19	44	41	85	15
Other Students	State	20	58	78	22	29	53	82	18	46	39	85	15
Students with Disabilities	State	8	44	52	48	11	44	55	45	25	38	63	37
Students Identified as Disadvantaged	State	9	56	65	35	13	56	69	31	30	43	73	27
Limited English Proficient Students	State	13	55	67	33	16	54	70	30	32	40	72	28
Students Identified as Migrant	State	11	56	67	33	12	48	60	40	38	27	65	35
Science													
Grade 5													
All Students	State	22	62	84	16	15	66	81	19	23	62	85	15

2006 Annual Report on the Condition and Needs of the Public Schools in Virginia

Assessment Results at each Proficiency Level by Subgroup													
Student Subgroup	Type	2003-2004				2004-2005				2005-2006			
		Adv	Prof	Pass	Fail	Adv	Prof	Pass	Fail	Adv	Prof	Pass	Fail
Female Students	State	19	64	83	17	14	67	80	20	20	63	83	17
Male Students	State	25	60	86	14	17	66	82	18	26	61	86	14
Black Students	State	9	62	71	29	6	61	67	33	10	62	72	28
Hispanic Students	State	11	63	74	26	7	63	70	30	11	64	75	25
White Students	State	28	63	91	9	20	68	88	12	29	61	91	9
Asian Students	State	29	61	90	10	19	69	88	12	31	60	91	9
American Indian Students	State	23	65	88	12	13	74	87	13	20	66	86	14
Other Students	State	23	62	85	15	16	67	83	17	22	64	87	13
Students with Disabilities	State	11	55	66	34	10	52	62	38	15	51	66	34
Students Identified as Disadvantaged	State	10	62	71	29	7	61	68	32	11	62	73	27
Limited English Proficient Students	State	8	60	69	31	6	61	67	33	10	62	72	28
Students Identified as Migrant	State	9	60	68	32	9	50	59	41	9	55	64	36
History and Social Sciences													
Grade 5													
All Students	State	39	48	87	13	44	41	85	15	45	40	85	15
Female Students	State	36	50	86	14	42	43	84	16	41	43	84	16
Male Students	State	41	46	87	13	47	39	86	14	48	38	86	14
Black Students	State	24	55	79	21	28	49	76	24	28	47	75	25
Hispanic Students	State	27	53	80	20	31	45	76	24	30	46	75	25
White Students	State	45	45	90	10	52	37	89	11	52	37	90	10
Asian Students	State	50	42	92	8	56	35	92	8	57	35	92	8
American Indian Students	State	40	48	88	12	38	46	84	16	43	44	87	13
Other Students	State	42	48	90	10	49	39	88	12	50	37	87	13
Students with Disabilities	State	22	47	69	31	27	39	66	34	27	41	68	32
Students Identified as Disadvantaged	State	23	55	78	22	27	48	74	26	27	47	74	26
Limited English Proficient Students	State	24	53	77	23	29	45	75	25	28	46	74	26
Students Identified as Migrant	State	18	57	75	25	31	23	54	46	15	50	65	35
English: RLR													
Grade 6													
All Students	State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	38	45	83	17
Female Students	State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	41	46	86	14
Male Students	State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	35	45	80	20
Black Students	State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	19	52	71	29
Hispanic Students	State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	23	52	75	25
White Students	State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	46	42	89	11
Asian Students	State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	51	41	91	9
American Indian Students	State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	35	49	84	16
Other Students	State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	44	42	86	14
Students with Disabilities	State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	20	40	60	40
Students Identified as Disadvantaged	State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	19	51	70	30
Limited English Proficient Students	State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	18	52	71	29
Students Identified as Migrant	State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	13	41	54	46
Mathematics													
Grade 6													
All Students	State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	17	35	51	49
Female Students	State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	16	35	52	48
Male Students	State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	17	34	51	49
Black Students	State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7	27	34	66
Hispanic Students	State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	30	39	61
White Students	State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	21	39	60	40
Asian Students	State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	34	39	73	27
American Indian Students	State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15	38	52	48
Other Students	State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	23	34	57	43
Students with Disabilities	State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10	20	30	70
Students Identified as Disadvantaged	State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7	27	34	66
Limited English Proficient Students	State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	11	29	39	61
Students Identified as Migrant	State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	27	36	64
History and Social Sciences													
Grade 6													
All Students	State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	60	16	76	24
Female Students	State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	59	15	74	26
Male Students	State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	61	16	77	23
Black Students	State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	56	17	74	26
Hispanic Students	State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	71	12	84	16

Assessment Results at each Proficiency Level by Subgroup													
Student Subgroup	Type	2003-2004				2004-2005				2005-2006			
		Adv	Prof	Pass	Fail	Adv	Prof	Pass	Fail	Adv	Prof	Pass	Fail
White Students	State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	63	15	78	22
Asian Students	State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	73	12	85	15
Other Students	State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	45	18	64	36
Students with Disabilities	State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	60	16	76	24
Students Identified as Disadvantaged	State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	59	16	75	25
Limited English Proficient Students	State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	72	19	91	9
Students Identified as Migrant	State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	<	<	<	<
English: RLR													
Grade 7													
All Students	State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	38	44	81	19
Female Students	State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	41	44	84	16
Male Students	State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	35	44	78	22
Black Students	State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	20	49	69	31
Hispanic Students	State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	22	48	70	30
White Students	State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	47	41	88	12
Asian Students	State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	48	41	89	11
American Indian Students	State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	39	45	84	16
Other Students	State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	44	41	85	15
Students with Disabilities	State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	18	37	55	45
Students Identified as Disadvantaged	State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	19	48	67	33
Limited English Proficient Students	State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	14	48	62	38
Students Identified as Migrant	State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	53	62	38
Mathematics													
Grade 7													
All Students	State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	11	33	44	56
Female Students	State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	11	33	44	56
Male Students	State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	11	32	43	57
Black Students	State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	22	26	74
Hispanic Students	State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	25	31	69
White Students	State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15	38	53	47
Asian Students	State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	21	43	64	36
American Indian Students	State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10	32	42	58
Other Students	State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	16	35	51	49
Students with Disabilities	State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10	16	26	74
Students Identified as Disadvantaged	State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	22	28	72
Limited English Proficient Students	State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	24	30	70
Students Identified as Migrant	State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7	32	38	62
Science													
Grade 7													
All Students	State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	<	<	<	<
Male Students	State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	<	<	<	<
Black Students	State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	<	<	<	<
Students with Disabilities	State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	<	<	<	<
History and Social Sciences													
Grade 7													
All Students	State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	63	15	78	22
Female Students	State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	65	15	80	20
Male Students	State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	62	15	78	22
Black Students	State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	59	17	76	24
Hispanic Students	State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	56	17	72	28
White Students	State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	67	14	82	18
Asian Students	State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	73	7	80	20
Other Students	State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	72	0	72	28
Students with Disabilities	State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	63	15	78	22
Students Identified as Disadvantaged	State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	61	18	79	21
Limited English Proficient Students	State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	78	10	88	12
Students Identified as Migrant	State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	<	<	<	<
English: RLR													
Grade 8													
All Students	State	22	50	72	28	24	53	76	24	27	51	78	22
Female Students	State	25	51	76	24	26	54	80	20	29	52	81	19
Male Students	State	20	48	68	32	21	52	73	27	25	50	75	25
Black Students	State	10	46	56	44	11	52	63	37	13	51	64	36
Hispanic Students	State	11	48	59	41	12	53	66	34	13	49	63	37
White Students	State	28	51	80	20	30	53	83	17	34	51	85	15


Assessment Results at each Proficiency Level by Subgroup													
Student Subgroup	Type	2003-2004				2004-2005				2005-2006			
		Adv	Prof	Pass	Fail	Adv	Prof	Pass	Fail	Adv	Prof	Pass	Fail
Asian Students	State	31	52	83	17	31	55	86	14	34	51	85	15
American Indian Students	State	21	47	68	32	24	49	73	27	28	53	81	19
Other Students	State	24	46	71	29	25	51	76	24	32	49	81	19
Students with Disabilities	State	6	31	36	64	8	35	42	58	14	36	50	50
Students Identified as Disadvantaged	State	9	46	54	46	10	51	61	39	13	51	64	36
Limited English Proficient Students	State	7	43	50	50	9	52	61	39	10	45	54	46
Students Identified as Migrant	State	7	41	48	52	0	39	39	61	5	36	41	59
Mathematics													
Grade 8													
All Students	State	22	58	80	20	22	59	81	19	36	40	76	24
Female Students	State	22	61	82	18	21	61	83	17	37	42	79	21
Male Students	State	23	55	78	22	23	56	79	21	36	38	74	26
Black Students	State	8	59	67	33	8	59	67	33	20	42	63	37
Hispanic Students	State	13	60	73	27	14	59	73	27	24	39	64	36
White Students	State	27	58	85	15	27	59	86	14	43	40	83	17
Asian Students	State	46	47	93	7	45	48	93	7	59	30	89	11
American Indian Students	State	20	53	73	27	18	61	79	21	33	42	76	24
Other Students	State	26	52	78	22	28	53	81	19	47	34	81	19
Students with Disabilities	State	7	38	45	55	9	41	50	50	16	29	45	55
Students Identified as Disadvantaged	State	9	58	67	33	9	58	67	33	20	42	62	38
Limited English Proficient Students	State	16	53	70	30	18	52	70	30	21	37	58	42
Students Identified as Migrant	State	16	43	59	41	16	49	65	35	9	48	57	43
Science													
Grade 8													
All Students	State	28	60	88	12	28	59	87	13	30	57	87	13
Female Students	State	24	64	88	12	25	62	87	13	26	60	86	14
Male Students	State	31	57	88	12	31	57	87	13	33	54	88	12
Black Students	State	10	67	77	23	11	65	76	24	12	63	75	25
Hispanic Students	State	14	67	81	19	14	63	77	23	16	60	77	23
White Students	State	36	57	93	7	36	57	92	8	38	55	93	7
Asian Students	State	40	55	95	5	36	57	93	7	43	50	93	7
American Indian Students	State	26	63	89	11	30	58	87	13	29	61	90	10
Other Students	State	30	60	90	10	31	57	88	12	32	57	89	11
Students with Disabilities	State	10	56	66	34	11	53	65	35	14	50	64	36
Students Identified as Disadvantaged	State	11	66	77	23	11	64	75	25	13	62	75	25
Limited English Proficient Students	State	11	65	76	24	11	61	72	28	16	56	72	28
Students Identified as Migrant	State	16	45	61	39	7	56	62	38	12	52	64	36
History and Social Sciences													
Grade 8													
All Students	State	29	54	83	17	29	53	82	18	28	53	81	19
Female Students	State	25	58	83	17	25	56	81	19	24	56	80	20
Male Students	State	33	50	83	17	32	50	82	18	31	50	82	18
Black Students	State	16	59	75	25	16	55	71	29	17	56	72	28
Hispanic Students	State	18	54	72	28	15	53	68	32	14	53	67	33
White Students	State	36	51	87	13	36	52	88	12	36	52	88	12
Asian Students	State	40	50	90	10	36	52	88	12	33	51	83	17
American Indian Students	State	25	56	81	19	18	57	75	25	28	52	79	21
Other Students	State	26	53	79	21	21	58	79	21	30	46	76	24
Students with Disabilities	State	18	46	63	37	23	41	64	36	31	32	63	37
Students Identified as Disadvantaged	State	15	58	72	28	16	55	71	29	17	55	72	28
Limited English Proficient Students	State	10	51	62	38	9	47	55	45	15	45	60	40
Students Identified as Migrant	State	50	33	83	17	25	35	60	40	14	57	71	29
English: RLR													
High School													
All Students	State	30	60	89	11	28	60	88	12	42	48	90	10
Female Students	State	32	59	91	9	30	60	90	10	45	47	92	8
Male Students	State	28	60	88	12	25	61	87	13	39	50	89	11
Black Students	State	13	67	80	20	12	66	78	22	21	62	83	17
Hispanic Students	State	18	65	83	17	15	66	81	19	26	57	83	17
White Students	State	37	57	93	7	34	58	92	8	52	42	94	6
Asian Students	State	35	57	92	8	31	59	90	10	47	44	91	9
American Indian Students	State	26	61	87	13	30	60	90	10	40	48	88	12
Other Students	State	29	58	87	13	27	59	86	14	40	50	90	10
Students with Disabilities	State	14	54	68	32	11	55	66	34	18	51	69	31

Appendix B: Virginia's Public Schools: Demographic and Statistical Data

Enrollment in the Public Schools Statewide (September 30 fall membership report)

2005-2006: 1,213,767
2004-2005: 1,205,847
2003-2004: 1,192,076
2002-2003: 1,177,229

Enrollment in Limited English Proficient (LEP) Programs



Career and Technical Education (CTE) Programs: Number of Industry Certifications, State Licenses Earned, and National Occupational Competency Testing Institute Assessments Passed by Students 2005-2006

Industry Certifications: 7,977
State Licensures: 1,172
NOCTI Assessments: 1,009
TOTAL: 10,158

Enrollment in Special Education Programs

2005-2006: 175,730
 2004-2005: 175,577
 2003-2004: 172,525
 2002-2003: 169,303
 2001-2002: 164,878

Enrollment in Gifted Education Programs

2005-2006: 172,978
 2004-2005: 173,195
 2003-2004: 173,207
 2002-2003: 147,832

Number of Students Eligible for Free and Reduced-Price Lunch Program

Year	Eligible Students	Percent of Statewide Enrollment
2001-2002	348,880	31.30 percent
2002-2003	362,477	31.81 percent
2003-2004	374,437	32.63 percent
2004-2005	387,554	33.48 percent
2005-2006	387,847	33.11 percent

Percent of Students Enrolled in Advanced Programs

Program Type	2003-2004	2004-2005
Governor's School enrollment	.95%	.96%
Seniors enrolled in International Baccalaureate programs	.24%	.24%
Students taking one or more Advanced Placement courses	11.24%	12.39%
Dual enrollment courses taken	3.88%	4.45%

Program Completion Information
Shown as percent of total number of graduates

Percent of Diplomas Awarded						
School Year	Advanced Studies Diploma	Standard Diploma	Advanced Studies and Standard Diplomas	Special Diploma	Modified Standard Diploma	General Achievement Diploma
2003-2004	47.6%	46.8%	94.4%	3.6%	2.0%	0.0%
2004-2005	49.4%	44.8%	94.2%	3.5%	2.3%	0.0%
2005-2006	50.7%	43.3%	94.1%	3.3%	2.5%	0.0%

School Safety Data

Violation Type	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05
Fights	25,084	26,258	22,425	11,981
Firearms	71	82	110	49
Other Weapons	1,813	1,824	2,244	2,402
Serious Violence	7,301	7,493	7,241	7,882

Statewide Dropout Information by Ethnic Subgroup
Shown as a percent of total enrollment

Year	All Students	American Indian	Asian	Black	Hispanic	Unspecified	White
2000-01	2.5%	4.9%	1.9%	3.5%	4.6%	NA	1.9%
2001-02	2.0%	2.8%	1.5%	2.8%	3.9%	NA	1.6%
2002-03	2.2%	2.9%	1.6%	3.4%	4.9%	1.1%	1.5%
2003-04	2.0%	1.8%	1.6%	3.2%	5.4%	2.9%	1.3%
2004-05	1.81%	2.05%	1.47%	2.36%	5.27%	1.56%	1.29%

Professional Qualifications of Teachers
Shown as a percentage of core academic classes taught by
teachers not meeting the federal definition of Highly Qualified

	2003-2004	2004-2005	2005-2006
Statewide	6%	5%	5%
In High Poverty Schools	8%	6%	6%
In Low Poverty Schools	4%	3%	3%

Notes:

- High Poverty means schools in the top quartile of poverty in the state.
- Low poverty means schools in the bottom quartile in the state.
- NCLB defines core academic subjects as: English, reading or language arts, mathematics, science, foreign language, civics and government, economics, art, history, and geography.

Highest Degrees Held by Teachers in Virginia
(2005-06 school year)

- 52 percent hold bachelor's degrees (compared to 56.3 in 2002-03 school year)
- 46 percent hold master's degrees (compared to 42.3 in the 2002-03 school year)
- 1 percent hold doctorate degrees (compared to 0.6 in the 2002-03 school year)

Provisional and Special Education Conditional Licenses
(2005-2006 school year)

- 7.0 percent of teachers were teaching on provisional licenses (compared to 9.2 the 2002-03 school year).
- 2.0 percent of teachers were teaching on special education conditional licenses (compared to 2.5 percent in the 2002-03 school year).

Total Number of Teachers and Administrators in
Virginia's Public Schools: 2005-2006

Teachers = 98,415
Administrators = 4,153
Total = 102,568

Number of Initial Teaching Licenses Issued by the
Virginia Department of Education: 2005-2006

Total number of licenses issued to in-state applicants between July 1, 2005 and June 30, 2006: 6,259
Total number of licenses issued to out-of-state applicants between July 1, 2005 and June 30, 2006: 4,577
Total number of licenses issued between July 1, 2005 and June 30, 2006: 10,836

Total Number of Home-Schooled Students in Virginia

2005-2006: 18,693
 2004-2005: 17,448
 2003-2004: 18,102
 2002-2003: 16,542

Statewide Average Daily Attendance Percentages

2005-2006: 95.0 percent
 2004-2005: 95.0 percent
 2003-2004: 95.0 percent
 2002-2003: 94.9 percent
 2001-2002: 95.0 percent

General Fund (GF) Legislative Appropriations— Total State, Total K-12, Total Direct Aid to Public Education: FY 1995 through 2006

Fiscal Year	Total GF Appropriation for Operating Expenses	Total K-12 GF Appropriation	Total K-12 GF Appropriation as a % of Total Operating	Total Direct Aid to Public Education GF Appropriation	Total Direct Aid to Public Education GF Appropriation as a % of Total Operating
1995	7,355,695,733	2,547,067,019	34.6%	2,514,736,974	34.2%
1996	7,597,249,960	2,686,990,223	35.4%	2,658,572,757	35.0%
1997	8,134,360,672	2,930,985,574	36.0%	2,895,766,099	35.6%
1998	8,715,476,981	3,082,072,592	35.4%	3,046,807,462	35.0%
1999	9,967,431,115	3,534,978,628	35.5%	3,489,301,374	35.0%
2000	11,093,396,991	3,720,945,765	33.5%	3,673,762,807	33.1%
2001	12,283,610,813	4,007,068,597	32.6%	3,942,411,254	32.1%
2002	12,013,820,347	3,959,806,011	33.0%	3,895,682,317	32.4%
2003	12,105,186,620	3,980,489,954	32.9%	3,923,268,185	32.4%
2004	12,370,158,175	4,129,120,033	33.4%	4,069,907,268	32.9%
2005	13,781,896,827	4,719,699,883	34.2%	4,653,203,619	33.8%
2006	15,111,251,632	5,071,605,259	33.6%	4,998,052,047	33.1%
2007	16,779,048,401	5,770,433,215	34.4%	5,695,619,782	33.9
2008	16,982,495,713	5,933,601,634	34.9%	5,859,840,675	34.5%

Notes:

(Total For Part 1: Operating Expenses) in the appropriation act.

"Total K-12 GF Appropriation" is the total legislative general fund appropriation for Department of Education Central Office, Direct Aid to Public Education, and the two schools for the deaf and the blind.

"Total Direct Aid GF Appropriation" is the total legislative general fund appropriation for Direct Aid to Public Education.

The general fund appropriation for Comprehensive Services Act (CSA) is deducted from the Direct Aid totals for FY 1995 and FY 1996 since CSA was appropriated within Direct Aid for those years but outside Direct Aid in subsequent years.

For FY 1997 through FY 2006, CSA appropriations are not included.

The Direct Aid appropriation for FY 1999 and FY 2000 includes \$55.0 million per year for school construction grants appropriated under Item 554 of Chapter 1072.

Appendix C:
STANDARDS OF QUALITY:
As Amended by the Board of Education on
November 29, 2006
(Rationale for amendments shown as footnotes)

§ 22.1-253.13:1. Standard 1. Instructional programs supporting the Standards of Learning and other educational objectives.

A. The General Assembly and the Board of Education believe that the fundamental goal of the public schools of this Commonwealth must be to enable each student to develop the skills that are necessary for success in school, preparation for life, and reaching their full potential. The General Assembly and the Board of Education find that the quality of education is dependent upon the provision of (i) the appropriate working environment, benefits, and salaries necessary to ensure the availability of high-quality instructional personnel; (ii) the appropriate learning environment designed to promote student achievement; (iii) quality instruction that enables each student to become a productive and educated citizen of Virginia and the United States of America; and (iv) the adequate commitment of other resources. In keeping with this goal, the General Assembly shall provide for the support of public education as set forth in Article VIII, Section 1 of the Constitution of Virginia.

B. The Board of Education shall establish educational objectives known as the Standards of Learning, which shall form the core of Virginia's educational program, and other educational objectives, which together are designed to ensure the development of the skills that are necessary for success in school and for preparation for life in the years beyond. At a minimum, the Board shall establish Standards of Learning for English, mathematics, science, and history and social science. The Standards of Learning shall not be construed to be regulations as defined in [§ 2.2-4001](#).

The Board shall seek to ensure that the Standards of Learning are consistent with a high-quality foundation educational program. The Standards of Learning shall include, but not be limited to, the basic skills of communication (listening, speaking, reading, and writing); computation and critical reasoning including problem solving and decision making; proficiency in the use of computers and related technology; and the skills to manage personal finances and to make sound financial decisions.

The English Standards of Learning for reading in kindergarten through grade three shall be based on components of effective reading instruction, to include, at a minimum, phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary development, and text comprehension.

The Standards of Learning in all subject areas shall be subject to regular review and revision to maintain rigor and to reflect a balance between content knowledge and the application of knowledge in preparation for eventual employment and lifelong learning. The Board of Education shall establish a regular schedule, in a manner it deems appropriate, for the review, and revision as may be necessary, of the Standards of Learning in all subject areas. Such review of each subject area shall occur at least once every seven years. Nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit the Board from conducting such review and revision on a more frequent basis.

To provide appropriate opportunity for input from the general public, teachers, and local school boards, the Board of Education shall conduct public hearings prior to establishing revised Standards of Learning. Thirty days prior to conducting such hearings, the Board shall give notice of the date, time, and place of the hearings to all local school boards and any other persons requesting to be notified of the hearings and publish notice of its intention to revise the Standards of Learning in the Virginia Register of Regulations. Interested parties shall be given reasonable opportunity to be heard and present information prior to final adoption of any revisions of the Standards of Learning.

In addition, the Department of Education shall make available and maintain a ~~website-Web site~~, either separately or through an existing ~~website-Web site~~ utilized by the Department of Education, enabling public elementary, middle, and high school educators to submit recommendations for improvements relating to the Standards of Learning, when under review by the Board according to its established schedule, and related assessments required by the Standards of Quality pursuant to this chapter. Such ~~website-Web site~~ shall facilitate the submission of recommendations by educators.

School boards shall implement the Standards of Learning or objectives specifically designed for their school divisions that are equivalent to or exceed the Board's requirements. Students shall be expected to achieve the educational objectives established by the school division at appropriate age or grade levels. The curriculum adopted by the local school division shall be aligned to the Standards of Learning.

The Board of Education shall include in the Standards of Learning for history and social science the study of contributions to society of diverse people. For the purposes of this subsection, "diverse" shall include consideration of disability, ethnicity, race, and gender.

With such funds as are made available for this purpose, the Board shall regularly review and revise the competencies for career and technical education programs to require the full integration of English, mathematics, science, and history and social science Standards of Learning. Career and technical education programs shall be aligned with industry and professional standard certifications, where they exist.

C. Local school boards shall develop and implement a program of instruction for grades K through 12 that is aligned to the Standards of Learning and meets or exceeds the requirements of the Board of Education. The program of instruction shall emphasize reading, writing, speaking, mathematical concepts and computations, proficiency in the use of computers and related technology, and scientific concepts and processes; essential skills and concepts of citizenship, including knowledge of Virginia history and world and United States history, economics, government, foreign languages, international cultures, health and physical education, environmental issues and geography necessary for responsible participation in American society and in the international community; fine arts, which may include, but need not be limited to, music and art, and practical arts; knowledge and skills needed to qualify for further education, gainful employment, or training in a career or technical field ; and development of the ability to apply such skills and knowledge in preparation for eventual employment, and lifelong learning and to achieve economic self-sufficiency.¹

Local school boards shall also develop and implement [~~with a demonstrated record of effectiveness~~]² research-based programs of prevention, intervention, or remediation ³ for students who are educationally at risk including, but not limited to, those who fail to achieve a passing score on any Standards of Learning assessment in grades three through eight or who fail an end-of-course test required for the award of a verified unit of credit⁴

Any student who achieves a passing score on one or more, but not all, of the Standards of Learning assessments for the relevant grade level in grades three through eight may be required to attend a remediation program.

Any student who fails to achieve a passing score on all of the Standards of Learning assessments for the relevant grade level in grades three through eight or who fails an end-of-course test required for the award of a verified unit of credit⁵ shall be required to attend a remediation program or to participate in another form of remediation. Division superintendents shall require such students to take special programs of prevention, intervention, or remediation, which may include attendance in public summer school programs, in accordance with clause (ii) of subsection A of § [22.1-254](#) and § [22.1-254.01](#).

1 Public comment.

2 Public comment: "Research-based" was added, and "a demonstrated record of effectiveness" was stricken so as not to eliminate those innovative programs that are research-based but do not yet have a demonstrated record of effectiveness.

3 Public comment.

4 Public comment.

5 Public comment.

Remediation programs shall include, when applicable, a procedure for early identification of students who are at risk of failing the Standards of Learning assessments in grades three through eight or who fail an end-of-course test required for the award of a verified unit of credit .6 Such programs may also include summer school for all elementary and middle school grades and for all high school academic courses, as defined by regulations promulgated by the Board of Education, or other forms of remediation. Summer school remediation programs or other forms of remediation shall be chosen by the division superintendent to be appropriate to the academic needs of the student. Students who are required to attend such summer school programs or to participate in another form of remediation shall not be charged tuition by the school division.

The requirement for remediation may, however, be satisfied by the student's attendance in a program of prevention, intervention or remediation that has been selected by his parent, in consultation with the division superintendent or his designee, and is either (i) conducted by an accredited private school or (ii) a special program that has been determined to be comparable to the required public school remediation program by the division superintendent. The costs of such private school remediation program or other special remediation program shall be borne by the student's parent.

The Board of Education shall establish standards for full funding of summer remedial programs that shall include, but not be limited to, the minimum number of instructional hours or the equivalent thereof required for full funding and an assessment system designed to evaluate program effectiveness. Based on the number of students attending and the Commonwealth's share of the per pupil instructional costs, state funds shall be provided for the full cost of summer and other remediation programs as set forth in the appropriation act, provided such programs comply with such standards as shall be established by the Board, pursuant to § [22.1-199.2](#).

D. Local school boards shall also implement the following:

1. Programs in grades K through three that emphasize developmentally appropriate learning to enhance success.
2. Programs based on prevention, intervention, or remediation designed to increase the number of students who earn a high school diploma and to prevent students from dropping out of school. Such programs shall include components that ~~have a demonstrated record of effectiveness~~ are research-based.⁷
3. Career and technical education programs incorporated into the K through 12 curricula that include:
 - a. Knowledge of careers and all types of employment opportunities including, but not limited to, apprenticeships, entrepreneurship and small business ownership, the military, and the teaching profession, and emphasize the advantages of completing school with marketable skills;
 - b. Career exploration opportunities in the middle school grades; and
 - c. Competency-based career and technical education programs that integrate academic outcomes, career guidance and job-seeking skills for all secondary students. Programs must be based upon labor market needs and student interest. Career guidance shall include counseling about available employment opportunities and placement services for students exiting school. Each school board shall develop and implement a plan to ensure compliance with the provisions of this subdivision. Such plan shall be developed with the input of area business and industry representatives and local community colleges and shall be submitted to the Superintendent of Public Instruction in accordance with the timelines established by federal law.
4. Early identification of students with disabilities and enrollment of such students in appropriate instructional programs consistent with state and federal law.
5. Early identification of gifted students and enrollment of such students in appropriately differentiated instructional programs.

⁶ Public comment.

⁷Public comment.

6. Educational alternatives for students whose needs are not met in programs prescribed elsewhere in these standards. Such students shall be counted in average daily membership (ADM) in accordance with the regulations of the Board of Education.
 7. Adult education programs for individuals functioning below the high school completion level. Such programs may be conducted by the school board as the primary agency or through a collaborative arrangement between the school board and other agencies.
 8. A plan to make achievements for students who are educationally at risk a divisionwide priority that shall include procedures for measuring the progress of such students.
 9. A plan to notify students and their parents of the availability of dual enrollment and advanced placement classes, the International Baccalaureate Program, and Academic Year Governor's School Programs, the qualifications for enrolling in such classes and programs, and the availability of financial assistance to low-income and needy students to take the advanced placement and International Baccalaureate examinations.
 10. Identification of students with limited English proficiency and enrollment of such students in appropriate instructional programs.
 11. Early identification, diagnosis, and assistance for students with reading and mathematics problems and provision of instructional strategies and reading and mathematics practices that benefit the development of reading and mathematics skills for all students.⁸
 12. Incorporation of art, music, and physical education as a part of the instructional program at the elementary school level.
 13. A program of student services for grades kindergarten through 12 that shall be designed to aid students in their educational, social, and career development.
 14. The collection and analysis of data and the use of the results to evaluate and make decisions about the instructional program.
- E. From such funds as may be appropriated or otherwise received for such purpose, there shall be established within the Department of Education a unit to (i) conduct evaluative studies; (ii) provide the resources and technical assistance to increase the capacity for school divisions to deliver quality instruction; and (iii) assist school divisions in implementing those programs and practices that will enhance pupil academic performance and improve family and community involvement in the public schools. Such unit shall identify and analyze effective instructional programs and practices and professional development initiatives; evaluate the success of programs encouraging parental and family involvement; assess changes in student outcomes prompted by family involvement; and collect and disseminate among school divisions information regarding effective instructional programs and practices, initiatives promoting family and community involvement, and potential funding and support sources. Such unit may also provide resources supporting professional development for administrators and teachers. In providing such information, resources, and other services to school divisions, the unit shall give priority to those divisions demonstrating a less than 70 percent passing rate on the Standards of Learning assessments.

⁸ Comment from the Virginia Mathematics and Science Coalition and several individual commenters.

§ 22.1-253.13:2. Standard 2. Instructional, administrative, and support personnel.

A. The Board shall establish requirements for the licensing of teachers, principals, superintendents, and other professional personnel.

B. School boards shall employ licensed instructional personnel qualified in the subject areas in which they are teaching.⁹

C. Each school board shall assign licensed instructional personnel in a manner that produces divisionwide ratios of students in average daily membership to full-time equivalent teaching positions, excluding special education teachers, principals, assistant principals, counselors, and librarians, that are not greater than the following ratios: (i) 24 to one in kindergarten with no class being larger than 29 students; if the average daily membership in any kindergarten class exceeds 24 pupils, a full-time teacher's aide shall be assigned to the class; (ii) 24 to one in grades one, two, and three with no class being larger than 30 students; (iii) 25 to one in grades four through six with no class being larger than 35 students; and (iv) 24 to one in English classes in grades six through 12.

Within its regulations governing special education programs, the Board shall seek to set pupil/teacher ratios for pupils with mental retardation that do not exceed the pupil/teacher ratios for self contained classes for pupils with specific learning disabilities.

Further, school boards shall assign instructional personnel in a manner that produces schoolwide ratios of students in average daily memberships to full-time equivalent teaching positions of 21 to one in middle schools and high schools. School divisions shall provide all middle and high school teachers with one planning period per day or the equivalent, unencumbered of any teaching or supervisory duties.

D. Each local school board shall employ with state and local basic, special education, gifted, and career and technical education funds a minimum number of licensed, full-time equivalent instructional personnel for each 1,000 students in average daily membership (ADM) as set forth in the appropriation act. Calculations of kindergarten positions shall be based on full-day kindergarten programs. Beginning with the March 31 report of average daily membership, those school divisions offering half-day kindergarten with pupil/teacher ratios that exceed 30 to one shall adjust their average daily membership for kindergarten to reflect 85 percent of the total kindergarten average daily memberships, as provided in the appropriation act.

E. In addition to the positions supported by basic aid and in support of regular school year programs of prevention, intervention, and remediation, state funding, pursuant to the appropriation act, shall be provided to fund certain full-time equivalent instructional positions for each 1,000 students in grades K through 12 who are identified as needing prevention, intervention, and remediation services. State funding for prevention, intervention, and remediation programs provided pursuant to this subsection and the appropriation act may be used to support programs for educationally at-risk students as identified by the local school boards.

F. In addition to the positions supported by basic aid and those in support of regular school year programs of prevention, intervention, and remediation, state funding, pursuant to the appropriation act, shall be provided to support 17 full-time equivalent instructional positions for each 1,000 students identified as having limited English proficiency.

G. In addition to the full-time equivalent positions required elsewhere in this section, each local school board shall employ ~~the following~~ one full-time equivalent instructional position for each 1,000 students in Average Daily Membership to serve as reading specialists in elementary schools, one full-time in each elementary school at the discretion of the local school board for the school division.¹⁰

⁹ Public comment.

¹⁰ Language previously recommended by the Board.

H. Each local school board shall employ, at a minimum, the following full-time equivalent positions for any school that reports fall membership, according to the type of school and student enrollment:

1. Principals in elementary schools, ~~one half-time to 299 students, one full-time at 300 students; principals in middle schools, one full-time, to be employed on a 12-month basis; principals in~~ and high schools, one full-time, to be employed on a 12-month basis;¹¹

2. Assistant principals in elementary schools, ~~one half-time at 600 students, one full-time at 900 students; assistant principals in middle schools, one full-time for each 600 students; assistant principals in~~ and high schools, one full-time for each ~~600~~ 400 students;¹²

3. Librarians in elementary schools, one part-time to 299 students, one full-time at 300 students; librarians in middle schools, one-half time to 299 students, one full-time at 300 students, two full-time at 1,000 students; librarians in high schools, one half-time to 299 students, one full-time at 300 students, two full-time at 1,000 students.

4. Guidance counselors in elementary schools, one hour per day per 100 students, one full-time at 500 students, one hour per day additional time per 100 students or major fraction thereof; guidance counselors in middle schools, one period per 80 students, one full-time at 400 students, one additional period per 80 students or major fraction thereof; guidance counselors in high schools, one period per 70 students, one full-time at 350 students, one additional period per 70 students or major fraction thereof; and

5. Clerical personnel in elementary schools, part-time to 299 students, one full-time at 300 students; clerical personnel in middle schools, one full-time and one additional full-time for each 600 students beyond 200 students and one full-time for the library at 750 students; clerical personnel in high schools, one full-time and one additional full-time for each 600 students beyond 200 students and one full-time for the library at 750 students.

I. Local school boards shall employ five full-time equivalent positions per 1,000 students in grades kindergarten through five to serve as elementary resource teachers in art, music, and physical education.

J. Local school boards shall employ two full-time equivalent positions per 1,000 students in grades kindergarten through 12, one to provide technology support and one to serve as an instructional technology resource teacher. K. Local school boards shall employ speech-language pathologists in sufficient numbers to ensure a caseload that does not exceed 60 students per position.¹³

L. Local school boards shall employ one full-time equivalent position per 1,000 students in grades kindergarten through eight to serve as a mathematics teacher specialist.¹⁴

M. Local school boards shall employ one full-time equivalent position per 1,000 students in grades kindergarten through 12 to [serve as a data analyst/assessment coordinator. provide schools support in data management and utilization and the administration of state assessments. The data manager/test coordinator shall hold a license issued by the Board of Education and serve as a resource to principals and classroom teachers in analyzing and interpreting data for instructional purposes.]¹⁵

N. Local school boards shall employ instructional and paraprofessional staff to ensure the following maximum pupil-teacher ratios for students who are blind or vision impaired: Level I, resource teacher, 24 to one; Level II, self-contained with an aide, 10 to one; self-contained without an aide, eight to one; or Level II, self-contained, student

11 Language previously recommended by the Board.

12 Language previously recommended by the Board.

13 Language previously recommended by the Board.

14 Mathematics specialists recommended by the Virginia Mathematics and Science Coalition.

15 Assessment coordinators recommended by the Virginia School Counselors Association and others. Language clarifies the role of this position, and requires that the person in this position hold a license issued by the Board of Education.

weight of 2.5.16

~~K~~ O. Local school boards may employ additional positions that exceed these minimal staffing requirements. These additional positions may include, but are not limited to, those funded through the state's incentive and categorical programs as set forth in the appropriation act.

~~H~~ P. A combined school, such as kindergarten through 12, shall meet at all grade levels the staffing requirements for the highest grade level in that school; this requirement shall apply to all staff, except for guidance counselors, and shall be based on the school's total enrollment; guidance counselor staff requirements shall, however, be based on the enrollment at the various school organization levels, i.e., elementary, middle, or high school. The Board of Education may grant waivers from these staffing levels upon request from local school boards seeking to implement experimental or innovative programs that are not consistent with these staffing levels.

~~M~~ Q. School boards shall, however, annually, on or before January 1, report to the public the actual pupil/teacher ratios in elementary school classrooms by school for the current school year. Such actual ratios shall include only the teachers who teach the grade and class on a full-time basis and shall exclude resource personnel. School boards shall report pupil/teacher ratios that include resource teachers in the same annual report. Any classes funded through the voluntary kindergarten through third grade class size reduction program shall be identified as such classes. Any classes having waivers to exceed the requirements of this subsection shall also be identified. Schools shall be identified; however, the data shall be compiled in a manner to ensure the confidentiality of all teacher and pupil identities.

~~N~~ R. Students enrolled in a public school on a less than full-time basis shall be counted in ADM in the relevant school division. Students who are either (i) enrolled in a nonpublic school or (ii) receiving home instruction pursuant to § 22.1-254.1, and who are enrolled in public school on a less than full-time basis in any mathematics, science, English, history, social science, career and technical education, fine arts, foreign language, or health education or physical education course shall be counted in the ADM in the relevant school division on a pro rata basis as provided in the appropriation act. Each such course enrollment by such students shall be counted as 0.25 in the ADM; however, no such nonpublic or home school student shall be counted as more than one-half a student for purposes of such pro rata calculation. Such calculation shall not include enrollments of such students in any other public school courses.

~~Θ~~ S. Each local school board shall provide those support services that are necessary for the efficient and cost-effective operation and maintenance of its public schools.

For the purposes of this title, unless the context otherwise requires, "support services" shall include services provided by the school board members; the superintendent; assistant superintendents; student services (including guidance counselors, social workers, and homebound, improvement, principal's office, and library-media positions); attendance and health positions; administrative, technical, and clerical positions; operation and maintenance positions; educational technology positions; school nurses; and pupil transportation positions.

Pursuant to the appropriation act, support services shall be funded from basic school aid on the basis of prevailing statewide costs.

16 Item 128.C of Chapter 3, 2006 Acts of Assembly, states, "The Board of Education shall consider the inclusion of instructional positions needed for blind and vision impaired students enrolled in public schools and shall consider developing a caseload requirement for those instructional positions as part of its review of the Standards of Quality...."

§ 22.1-253.13:3. Standard 3. Accreditation, other standards and evaluation.

A. The Board of Education shall promulgate regulations establishing standards for accreditation pursuant to the Administrative Process Act (§ [2.2-4000](#) et seq.), which shall include, but not be limited to, student outcome measures, requirements and guidelines for instructional programs and for the integration of educational technology into such instructional programs, administrative and instructional staffing levels and positions, including staff positions for supporting educational technology, student services, auxiliary education programs such as library and media services, course and credit requirements for graduation from high school, community relations, and the philosophy, goals, and objectives of public education in Virginia.

The Board shall review annually the accreditation status of all schools in the Commonwealth.

Each local school board shall maintain schools that are fully accredited pursuant to the standards for accreditation as prescribed by the Board of Education. Each local school board shall review the accreditation status of all schools in the local school division annually in public session. Within the time specified by the Board of Education, each school board shall submit corrective action plans for any schools within its school division that have been designated as not meeting the standards as approved by the Board.

When the Board of Education has obtained evidence through the school academic review process that the failure of schools within a division to achieve full accreditation status is related to division level failure to implement the Standards of Quality, the Board may require a division level academic review. After the conduct of such review and within the time specified by the Board of Education, each school board shall submit for approval by the Board a corrective action plan, consistent with criteria established by the Board and setting forth specific actions and a schedule designed to ensure that schools within its school division achieve full accreditation status. Such corrective action plans shall be part of the relevant school division's comprehensive plan pursuant to § [22.1-253.13:6](#).

With such funds as are appropriated or otherwise received for this purpose, the Board shall adopt and implement an academic review process, to be conducted by the Department of Education, to assist schools that are accredited with warning. The Department shall forward a report of each academic review to the relevant local school board, and such school board shall report the results of such academic review and the required annual progress reports in public session. The local school board shall implement any actions identified through the academic review and utilize them for improvement planning.

B. The Superintendent of Public Instruction shall develop and the Board of Education shall approve criteria for determining and recognizing educational performance in the Commonwealth's public school divisions and schools. Such criteria, when approved, shall become an integral part of the accreditation process and shall include student outcome measurements. The Superintendent of Public Instruction shall annually identify to the Board those school divisions and schools that exceed or do not meet the approved criteria. Such identification shall include an analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of public education programs in the various school divisions in Virginia and recommendations to the General Assembly for further enhancing student learning uniformly across the Commonwealth. In recognizing educational performance in the school divisions, the Board shall include consideration of special school division accomplishments, such as numbers of dual enrollments and students in Advanced Placement and International Baccalaureate courses, and participation in academic year Governor's Schools.

The Superintendent of Public Instruction shall assist local school boards in the implementation of action plans for increasing educational performance in those school divisions and schools that are identified as not meeting the approved criteria. The Superintendent of Public Instruction shall monitor the implementation of and report to the Board of Education on the effectiveness of the corrective actions taken to improve the educational performance in such school divisions and schools.

C. With such funds as are available for this purpose, the Board of Education shall prescribe assessment methods to determine the level of achievement of the Standards of Learning objectives by all students. Such assessments shall evaluate knowledge, application of knowledge, critical thinking, and skills related to the Standards of Learning being assessed. The Board shall (i) in consultation with the chairpersons of the eight regional superintendents' study groups, establish a timetable for administering the Standards of Learning assessments to ensure genuine end-of-course and

end-of-grade testing and (ii) with the assistance of independent testing experts, conduct a regular analysis and validation process for these assessments.

In prescribing such Standards of Learning assessments, the Board shall provide local school boards the option of administering tests for United States History to 1877, United States History: 1877 to the Present, and Civics and Economics. The last administration of the cumulative grade eight history test will be the 2007-2008 school year. Beginning with the 2008-2009 school year, all school divisions shall administer the United States History to 1877, United States History: 1877 to the Present, and Civics and Economics tests.¹⁷ The Board of Education shall make publicly available such assessments in a timely manner and as soon as practicable following the administration of such tests, so long as the release of such assessments does not compromise test security or deplete the bank of assessment questions necessary to construct subsequent tests, or limit the ability to test students on demand and provide immediate results in the ~~web-based~~ Web-based assessment system.

The Board shall include in the student outcome measures that are required by the Standards for Accreditation end-of-course or end-of-grade tests for various grade levels and classes, as determined by the Board, in accordance with the Standards of Learning. These Standards of Learning assessments shall include, but need not be limited to, end-of-course or end-of-grade tests for English, mathematics, science, and history and social science.

In addition, to assess the educational progress of students, the Board of Education shall (i) develop appropriate assessments, which may include criterion-referenced tests and alternative assessment instruments that may be used by classroom teachers and (ii) prescribe and provide measures, which may include nationally normed tests to be used to identify students who score in the bottom quartile at selected grade levels.

The Standard of Learning requirements, including all related assessments, shall be waived for any student awarded a scholarship under the Brown v. Board of Education Scholarship Program, pursuant to § [30-231.2](#), who is enrolled in a preparation program for the General Education Development (GED) certificate or in an adult basic education program to obtain the high school diploma.

The Board of Education may adopt special provisions related to the administration and use of any SOL test or tests in a content area as applied to accreditation ratings for any period during which the SOL content or assessments in that area are being revised and phased in. Prior to statewide administration of such tests, the Board of Education shall provide notice to local school boards regarding such provisions.

D. The Board of Education may pursue all available civil remedies pursuant to § 22.1-19.1 or administrative action pursuant to § 22.1-292.1 for breaches in test security and unauthorized alteration of test materials or test results.

The Board may initiate or cause to be initiated a review or investigation of any alleged breach in security, unauthorized alteration, or improper administration of tests by local school board employees responsible for the distribution or administration of the tests.

Records and any other information furnished to or prepared by the Board during the conduct of a review or investigation may be withheld pursuant to subdivision 12 of § 22.1-2705.3. However, this section shall not prohibit the disclosure of records to (i) a local school board or division superintendent for the purpose of permitting such board or superintendent to consider or to take personnel action with regard to an employee or (ii) any requester, after the conclusion of a review or investigation, in a form that (a) does not reveal the identity of any person making a complaint or supplying information to the Board on a confidential basis and (b) does not compromise the security of any test mandated by the Board. Any local school board or division superintendent receiving such records or other information shall, upon taking personnel action against a relevant employee, place copies of such records or information relating to the specific employee in such person's personnel file.

Notwithstanding any other provision of state law, no test or examination authorized by this section, including the

¹⁷ The cumulative grade eight history test is being phased out.

Standards of Learning assessments, shall be released or required to be released as minimum competency tests, if, in the judgment of the Board, such release would breach the security of such test or examination or deplete the bank of questions necessary to construct future secure tests.

E. With such funds as may be appropriated, the Board of Education may provide, through an agreement with vendors having the technical capacity and expertise to provide computerized tests and assessments, and test construction, analysis, and security, for (i) ~~web-based~~ Web-based computerized tests and assessments for the evaluation of student progress during and after remediation and (ii) the development of a remediation item bank directly related to the Standards of Learning.

F. To assess the educational progress of students as individuals and as groups, each local school board shall require the use of Standards of Learning assessments and other relevant data to evaluate student progress and to determine educational performance. Each local school shall require the administration of appropriate assessments to all students for grade levels and courses identified by the Board of Education, which may include criterion-referenced tests, teacher-made tests and alternative assessment instruments and shall include the Standards of Learning Assessments and the National Assessment of Educational Progress state-by-state assessment. Each school board shall analyze and report annually, in compliance with any criteria that may be established by the Board of Education, the results from the Stanford Achievement Test Series, Ninth Edition (Stanford Nine) assessment, if administered, industry certification examinations, and the Standards of Learning Assessments to the public.

The Board of Education shall not require administration of the Stanford Achievement Test Series, Ninth Edition (Stanford Nine) assessment, except as may be selected to facilitate compliance with the requirements for home instruction pursuant to § [22.1-254.1](#).

The Board shall include requirements for the reporting of the Standards of Learning assessment scores and averages for each year as part of the Board's requirements relating to the School Performance Report Card. Such scores shall be disaggregated for each school by student subgroups on the Virginia assessment program as appropriate¹⁸, and shall be reported to the public within three months of their receipt. These reports (i) shall be posted on the portion of the Department of Education's website relating to the School Performance Report Card, in a format and in a manner that allows year-to-year comparisons, and (ii) may include the National Assessment of Educational Progress state-by-state assessment.

G. Each local school division superintendent shall regularly review the division's submission of data and reports required by state and federal law and regulations to ensure that all information is accurate and submitted in a timely fashion. The Superintendent of Public Instruction shall provide a list of the required reports and data to division superintendents annually. The status of compliance with this requirement shall be included in the Board of Education's annual report to the Governor and the General Assembly as required by § [22.1-18](#).

§ 22.1-253.13:4. Standard 4. Student achievement and graduation requirements.

A. Each local school board shall award diplomas to all secondary school students, including students who transfer from nonpublic schools or from home instruction, who earn the units of credit prescribed by the Board of Education, pass the prescribed tests, and meet such other requirements as may be prescribed by the local school board and approved by the Board of Education. Provisions shall be made to facilitate the transfer and appropriate grade placement of students from other public¹⁹ secondary schools, from nonpublic schools or from home instruction as outlined in the standards for accreditation. Further, reasonable accommodation to meet the requirements for diplomas shall be provided for otherwise qualified students with disabilities as needed.

In addition, each local school board may devise, vis-à-vis the award of diplomas to secondary school students, a mechanism for calculating class rankings that takes into consideration whether the student has taken a required class more than one time and has had any prior earned grade for such required class expunged.

Each local school board shall notify the ~~parent~~ parents of rising eleventh and twelfth grade students of (i) the number

¹⁸ Changed to match Standards for Accreditation language.

¹⁹ To ensure that transfer students are enrolled and appropriately placed.

and subject area requirements²⁰ of standard and verified units of credit required for graduation pursuant to the standards for accreditation and (ii) the remaining number and subject area requirements²¹ of such units of credit the individual student requires for graduation.

B. Students identified as disabled who complete the requirements of their individualized education programs shall be awarded special diplomas by local school boards.

Each local school board shall notify the parent of such students with disabilities who have an individualized education program and who fail to meet the requirements for a standard or advanced studies diploma²² of the student's right to a free and appropriate education to age 21, inclusive, pursuant to Article 2 (§ [22.1-213](#) et seq.) of Chapter 13 of this title.

C. Students who have completed a prescribed course of study as defined by the local school board shall be awarded certificates of program completion by local school boards if they are not eligible to receive a standard, advanced studies, modified standard, special ²³ or general achievement diploma.

Each local school board shall provide notification of the right to a free public education for students who have not reached 20 years of age on or before August 1 of the school year, pursuant to Chapter 1 (§ [22.1-1](#) et seq.) of this title, to the parent of students who fail to graduate or who have failed to achieve the number of verified units of credit required for graduation as provided in the standards for accreditation. If such student who does not graduate or achieve such verified units of credit is a student for whom English is a second language, the local school board shall notify the parent of the student's opportunity for a free public education in accordance with § [22.1-5](#).

D. In establishing course and credit requirements for a high school diploma, the Board shall:

1. Provide for the selection of integrated learning courses meeting the Standards of Learning and approved by the Board to satisfy graduation credit requirements, which shall include Standards of Learning testing, as necessary;
2. Establish the requirements for a standard, modified standard, or advanced studies high school diploma, which shall include one credit in fine or performing arts, or career and technical education²⁴ and one credit in United States and Virginia history. The requirements for a standard high school diploma shall, however, include at least two sequential electives chosen from a concentration of courses selected from a variety of options that may be planned to ensure the completion of a focused sequence of elective courses. Students may take such focused sequence of elective courses in consecutive years or any two years of high school. Such focused sequence of elective courses shall provide a foundation for further education or training or preparation for employment and shall be developed by the school division, consistent with Board of Education guidelines and as approved by the local school board;
3. Provide, in the requirements for the verified units of credit stipulated for obtaining the standard or advanced studies diploma, that students completing elective classes into which the Standards of Learning for any required course have been integrated may take the relevant Standards of Learning test for the relevant required course and receive, upon achieving a satisfactory score on the specific Standards of Learning assessment, a verified unit of credit for such elective class that shall be deemed to satisfy the Board's requirement for verified credit for the required course;
4. Establish a procedure to facilitate the acceleration of students that allows qualified students, with the recommendation of the division superintendent, without completing the 140-hour class, to obtain credit for such class upon demonstration of mastery of the course content and objectives. Having received credit for the course, the student shall be permitted to sit for the relevant Standards of Learning assessment and, upon receiving a passing score, shall earn a verified credit. Nothing in this section shall preclude relevant school division personnel from

²⁰ Public comment.

²¹ Public comment.

²² Public comment.

²³ Public comment.

²⁴ Clarification.

enforcing compulsory attendance in public schools; and

5. Provide for the award of verified units of credit for passing scores on industry certifications, state licensure examinations, and national occupational competency assessments approved by the Board of Education.

School boards shall report annually to the Board of Education the number of industry certifications obtained and state licensure examinations passed, and the number shall be reported as a category on the School Performance Report Card.

In addition, the Board may:

a. For the purpose of awarding verified units of credit, approve the use of additional or substitute tests for the correlated Standards of Learning assessment, such as academic achievement tests, industry certifications or state licensure examinations; and

b. Permit students completing career and technical education programs designed to enable such students to pass such industry certification examinations or state licensure examinations to be awarded, upon obtaining satisfactory scores on such industry certification or licensure examinations, the appropriate verified units of credit for one or more career and technical education classes into which relevant Standards of Learning for various classes taught at the same level have been integrated. Such industry certification and state licensure examinations may cover relevant Standards of Learning for various required classes and may, at the discretion of the Board, address some Standards of Learning for several required classes.

E. In the exercise of its authority to recognize exemplary academic performance by providing for diploma seals, the Board of Education shall develop criteria for recognizing exemplary performance in career and technical education programs by students who have completed the requirements for a standard or advanced studies diploma and shall award seals on the diplomas of students meeting such criteria.

In addition, the Board shall establish criteria for awarding a diploma seal for advanced mathematics and technology for the standard and advanced studies diplomas. The Board shall consider including criteria for (i) technology courses; (ii) technical writing, reading, and oral communication skills; (iii) technology-related 25 training; and (iv) industry, professional, and trade association national certifications.

The Board shall also establish criteria for awarding a diploma seal for excellence in civics education and understanding of our state and federal constitutions and the democratic model of government for the standard and advanced studies diplomas. The Board shall consider including criteria for (i) successful completion of history, government, and civics courses, including courses that incorporate character education; (ii) voluntary participation in community service or extracurricular activities; and (iii) related requirements as it deems appropriate.

F. The Board shall establish, by regulation, requirements for the award of a general achievement diploma for those persons who have (i) achieved a passing score on the GED examination; (ii) successfully completed an education and training program designated by the Board of Education; and (iii) satisfied other requirements as may be established by the Board for the award of such diploma.

G. To ensure the uniform assessment of high school graduation rates, the Board shall collect, analyze, and report high school graduation and dropout data using a formula prescribed by the Board

The Board may promulgate such regulations as may be necessary and appropriation for the collection, analysis, and reporting of such data.

25 Clarification.

§ 22.1-253.13:5. Standard 5. Quality of classroom instruction and educational leadership.

A. Each member of the Board of Education shall participate in high-quality professional development programs on personnel, curriculum and current issues in education as part of his or her service on the Board.

B. Consistent with the finding that leadership is essential for the advancement of public education in the Commonwealth, teacher, administrator, and superintendent evaluations shall be consistent with the performance objectives included in the Guidelines for Uniform Performance Standards and Evaluation Criteria for Teachers, Administrators, and Superintendents. Teacher evaluations shall include regular observation and evidence that instruction is aligned with the school's curriculum. Evaluations shall include identification of areas of individual strengths and weaknesses and recommendations for appropriate professional activities.

C. The Board of Education shall provide guidance on high-quality professional development for (i) teachers, principals, supervisors, division superintendents and other school staff; (ii) administrative and supervisory personnel in the evaluation and documentation of teacher and administrator performance based on student academic progress and the skills and knowledge of such instructional or administrative personnel; (iii) school board members on personnel, curriculum and current issues in education; and (iv) programs in Braille for teachers of the blind and visually impaired, in cooperation with the Virginia Department for the Blind and Vision Impaired.

The Board shall also provide technical assistance on high-quality professional development to local school boards designed to ensure that all instructional personnel are proficient in the use of educational technology consistent with its comprehensive plan for educational technology.

D. Each local school board shall require (i) its members to participate annually in high-quality professional development activities at the state, local, or national levels on governance, including, but not limited to, personnel policies and practices; curriculum and instruction; use of data in planning and decision making; and current issues in education as part of their service on the local board and (ii) the division superintendent to participate annually in high-quality professional development activities at the local, state or national levels.

E. Each local school board shall provide a program of high-quality professional development (i) in the use and documentation of performance standards and evaluation criteria based on student academic progress and skills for teachers and administrators to clarify roles and performance expectations and to facilitate the successful implementation of instructional programs that promote student achievement at the school and classroom levels; (ii) as part of the license renewal process, to assist teachers and principals in acquiring the skills needed to work with gifted students, students with disabilities, and students who have been identified as having limited English proficiency and to increase student achievement and expand the knowledge and skills students require to meet the standards for academic performance set by the Board of Education; (iii) in educational technology for all instructional personnel which is designed to facilitate integration of computer skills and related technology into the curricula, and (iv) for administrative personnel designed to increase proficiency in instructional leadership and management, including training in the evaluation and documentation of teacher and administrator performance based on student academic progress and the skills and knowledge of such instructional or administrative personnel.

In addition, each local school board shall also provide teachers and principals with high-quality professional development programs each year in (i) instructional content; (ii) the preparation of tests and other assessment measures; (iii) methods for assessing the progress of individual students, including Standards of Learning assessment materials or other criterion-referenced tests that match locally developed objectives; (iv) instruction and remediation techniques in English, mathematics, science, and history and social science; (v) interpreting test data for instructional purposes; (vi) technology applications to implement the Standards of Learning; and (vii) effective classroom management.²⁶

F. Schools and school divisions shall include as an integral component of their comprehensive plans required by § [22.1-253.13:6](#), high-quality professional development programs that support the recruitment, employment, and retention of qualified teachers and principals. Each school board shall require all instructional personnel to participate

²⁶Public comment.

each year in these professional development programs.

G. Each local school board shall annually review its professional development program for quality, effectiveness, participation by instructional personnel, and relevancy to the instructional needs of teachers and the academic achievement needs of the students in the school division.

§ 22.1-253.13:6. Standard 6. Planning and public involvement.

A. The Board of Education shall adopt a statewide comprehensive, unified, long-range plan based on data collection, analysis, and evaluation. Such plan shall be developed with statewide participation. The Board shall review the plan biennially and adopt any necessary revisions. The Board shall post the plan on the Department of Education's ~~website~~ Web site if practicable, and, in any case, shall make a hard copy of such plan available for public inspection and copying.

This plan shall include the objectives of public education in Virginia, including strategies for improving student achievement, particularly the achievement of educationally at-risk students,²⁷ then maintaining high levels of student achievement; an assessment of the extent to which these objectives are being achieved; a forecast of enrollment changes; and an assessment of the needs of public education in the Commonwealth. In the annual report required by § 22.1-18, the Board shall include an analysis of the extent to which these Standards of Quality have been achieved and the objectives of the statewide comprehensive plan have been met. The Board shall also develop, consistent with, or as a part of, its comprehensive plan, a detailed comprehensive, long-range plan to integrate educational technology into the Standards of Learning and the curricula of the public schools in Virginia, including career and technical education programs. The Board shall review and approve the comprehensive plan for educational technology and may require the revision of such plan as it deems necessary.

B. Each local school board shall adopt a divisionwide comprehensive, unified, long-range plan based on data collection, an analysis of the data, and how the data will be utilized to improve classroom instruction and student achievement. The plan shall be developed with staff and community involvement and shall include, or be consistent with, all other divisionwide plans required by state and federal laws and regulations. Each local school board shall review the plan biennially and adopt any necessary revisions. Prior to the adoption of any divisionwide comprehensive plan or revisions thereto, each local school board shall post such plan or revisions on the division's Internet ~~website~~ Web site if practicable, and, in any case, shall make a hard copy of the plan or revisions available for public inspection and copying and shall conduct at least one public hearing to solicit public comment on the divisionwide plan or revisions.

The divisionwide comprehensive plan shall include, but shall not be limited to, (i) the objectives of the school division, including strategies for improving student achievement, particularly the achievement of educationally at-risk students,²⁸ then maintaining high levels of student achievement; (ii) an assessment of the extent to which these objectives are being achieved; (iii) a forecast of enrollment changes; (iv) a plan for projecting and managing enrollment changes including consideration of the consolidation of schools to provide for a more comprehensive and effective delivery of instructional services to students and economies in school operations; (v) an evaluation of the appropriateness of establishing regional programs and services in cooperation with neighboring school divisions; (vi) a plan for implementing such regional programs and services when appropriate; (vii) a technology plan designed to integrate educational technology into the instructional programs of the school division, including the school division's career and technical education programs, consistent with, or as a part of, the comprehensive technology plan for Virginia adopted by the Board of Education; (viii) an assessment of the needs of the school division and evidence of community participation, including parental participation, in the development of the plan; (ix) any corrective action plan required pursuant to § 22.1-253.13:3; and (x) a plan for parent and family involvement to include building successful school and parent partnerships that shall be developed with staff and community involvement, including participation by parents.

A report shall be presented by each school board to the public by November 1 of each odd-numbered year on the

²⁷ Public comment.

²⁸ Public comment.

extent to which the objectives of the divisionwide comprehensive plan have been met during the previous two school years.

C. Each public school shall also prepare a comprehensive, unified, long-range plan, which the relevant school board shall consider in the development of its divisionwide comprehensive plan.

D. The Board of Education shall, in a timely manner, make available to local school boards information about where current Virginia school laws, Board regulations and revisions, and copies of relevant Opinions of the Attorney General of Virginia may be located online.

§ 22.1-253.13:7. Standard 7. School board policies.

A. Each local school board shall maintain and follow up-to-date policies. All school board policies shall be reviewed at least every five years and revised as needed.

B. Each local school board shall ensure that policies are developed giving consideration to the views of teachers, parents, and other concerned citizens and addressing the following:

1. A system of two-way communication between employees and the local school board and its administrative staff whereby matters of concern can be discussed in an orderly and constructive manner;

2. The selection and evaluation of all instructional materials purchased by the school division, with clear procedures for handling challenged controversial materials;

3. The standards of student conduct and attendance and enforcement procedures designed to provide that public education be conducted in an atmosphere free of disruption and threat to persons or property and supportive of individual rights;

4. School-community communications and community involvement;

5. Guidelines to encourage parents to provide instructional assistance to their children in the home, which may include voluntary training for the parents of children in grades K through three;

6. Information about procedures for addressing concerns with the school division and recourse available to parents pursuant to § [22.1-87](#);

7. A cooperatively developed procedure for personnel evaluation appropriate to tasks performed by those being evaluated; and

8. Grievances, dismissals, etc., of teachers, and the implementation procedure prescribed by the General Assembly and the Board of Education, as provided in Article 3 (§ [22.1-306](#) et seq.) of Chapter 15 of this title, and the maintenance of copies of such procedures.

A current copy of the school division policies, including the Student Conduct Policy, shall be posted on the division's Internet Web site and²⁹ ~~kept in the library of each school and in any public library in that division~~³⁰ and shall be available to employees and to the public. If such policies are maintained online, school boards shall ensure that printed copies of such policies are available as needed to citizens who do not have online access.

C. An annual announcement shall be made in each division at the beginning of the school year and, for parents of students enrolling later in the academic year, at the time of enrollment, advising the public that the policies are

²⁹To ensure that parents have adequate access to all of the school division policies, including via the Internet.

³⁰ This clarifies that hard copies of the policies do not have to be kept in the school and public libraries, so long as the policies are available online and that printed copies are available to citizens who do not have online access.

available in such places.

§ 22.1-253.13:8. Compliance.

The Standards of Quality prescribed in this chapter shall be the only standards of quality required by Article VIII, Section 2 of the Constitution of Virginia.

Each local school board shall provide, as a minimum, the programs and services, as provided in the Standards of Quality prescribed above, with state and local funds as apportioned by the General Assembly in the appropriation act and to the extent funding is provided by the General Assembly.

Each local school board shall report its compliance with the Standards of Quality to the Board of Education annually. The report of compliance shall be submitted to the Board of Education by the chairman of the local school board and the division superintendent.

Noncompliance with the Standards of Quality shall be included in the Board of Education's annual report to the Governor and the General Assembly as required by § [22.1-18](#).

As required by § [22.1-18](#), the Board of Education shall submit to the Governor and the General Assembly a report on the condition and needs of public education in the Commonwealth and shall identify any school divisions and the specific schools therein that have failed to establish and maintain schools meeting the existing prescribed Standards of Quality.

The Board of Education shall have authority to seek school division compliance with the foregoing Standards of Quality. When the Board of Education determines that a school division has failed or refused, and continues to fail or refuse, to comply with any such Standard, the Board may petition the circuit court having jurisdiction in the school division to mandate or otherwise enforce compliance with such standard, including the development or implementation of any required corrective action plan that a local school board has failed or refused to develop or implement in a timely manner.

Appendix D: List of Public Schools Rated Accredited with Warning

Accomack County	Arcadia Middle	Accredited with Warning
Alexandria City	George Washington Middle	Accredited with Warning
Alexandria City	Jefferson-Houston Elementary	Accredited with Warning
Amherst County	Amherst Middle School	Accredited with Warning
Arlington County	Gunston Middle	Accredited with Warning
Augusta County	Beverly Manor Middle	Accredited with Warning
Bland County	Rocky Gap Elementary	Accredited with Warning
Bristol City	Virginia Middle	Accredited with Warning
Brunswick County	Brunswick High	Accredited with Warning
Brunswick County	Totaro Elementary	Accredited with Warning
Buchanan County	Hurley Middle	Accredited with Warning
Buchanan County	Russell Prater Elementary	Accredited with Warning
Buchanan County	Twin Valley Elem/Middle	Accredited with Warning
Campbell County	Rustburg Middle	Accredited with Warning
Caroline County	Caroline Middle	Accredited with Warning
Charles City County	Charles City Co. Middle	Accredited with Warning
Charlottesville City	Buford Middle	Accredited with Warning
Charlottesville City	Walker Upper Elementary	Accredited with Warning
Chesapeake City	Oscar Smith Middle	Accredited with Warning
Chesterfield County	Falling Creek Middle	Accredited with Warning
Chesterfield County	Salem Church Middle	Accredited with Warning
Colonial Beach	Colonial Beach Elementary	Accredited with Warning
Covington City	Jeter-Watson Intermediate	Accredited with Warning
Craig County	Craig County High	Accredited with Warning
Danville City	Edwin A. Gibson Middle	Accredited with Warning
Danville City	Fresh Start Academy	Accredited with Warning
Danville City	O. Trent Bonner Middle School	Accredited with Warning
Danville City	Westwood Middle	Accredited with Warning
Danville City	Woodberry Hills Elementary	Accredited with Warning
Dickenson County	Ervinton Elementary	Accredited with Warning
Dinwiddie County	Dinwiddie County Middle	Accredited with Warning
Essex County	Essex Int.	Accredited with Warning
Fauquier County	Cedar Lee Middle	Accredited with Warning
Franklin City	Joseph P. King Jr. Middle	Accredited with Warning
Frederick County	Admiral Richard E. Byrd Middle	Accredited with Warning
Fredericksburg City	Lafayette Upper Elementary	Accredited with Warning
Fredericksburg City	Walker-Grant Middle	Accredited with Warning
Galax City	Galax Middle	Accredited with Warning
Grayson County	Baywood Elementary	Accredited with Warning
Grayson County	Fries Middle School	Accredited with Warning
Grayson County	Mt. Rogers Comb.	Accredited with Warning
Grayson County	Providence Elementary	Accredited with Warning
Greene County	William Monroe Middle	Accredited with Warning
Greensville County	Belfield Elementary	Accredited with Warning

Greensville County	Edward W. Wyatt Middle	Accredited with Warning
Halifax County	Halifax County Middle	Accredited with Warning
Hampton City	Aberdeen Elementary	Accredited with Warning
Hampton City	C. Alton Lindsay Middle	Accredited with Warning
Hampton City	C. Vernon Spratley Middle	Accredited with Warning
Hampton City	Cesar Tarrant Elementary	Accredited with Warning
Hampton City	Francis Mallory Elementary	Accredited with Warning
Hampton City	Jane H. Bryan Elementary	Accredited with Warning
Henrico County	Brookland Middle	Accredited with Warning
Henrico County	Fairfield Middle	Accredited with Warning
Henrico County	L. Douglas Wilder Middle	Accredited with Warning
Henrico County	Rolfe Middle	Accredited with Warning
Henry County	Laurel Park Middle School	Accredited with Warning
Isle Of Wight County	Westside Elementary	Accredited with Warning
King and Queen County	Central High	Accredited with Warning
King George County	Potomac Elementary	Accredited with Warning
Lunenburg County	Lunenburg Middle	Accredited with Warning
Lynchburg City	Paul L. Dunbar Mid. For Innov.	Accredited with Warning
Lynchburg City	Sandusky Middle	Accredited with Warning
Manassas City	Grace E. Metz Middle School	Accredited with Warning
Martinsville City	Martinsville Middle School	Accredited with Warning
Mecklenburg County	Park View Middle	Accredited with Warning
Montgomery County	Auburn Middle	Accredited with Warning
Montgomery County	Belview Elementary	Accredited with Warning
Montgomery County	Christiansburg Middle	Accredited with Warning
Montgomery County	Shawsville Middle	Accredited with Warning
Newport News City	Achievable Dream Academy	Accredited with Warning
Newport News City	Crittenden Middle	Accredited with Warning
Newport News City	Homer L. Hines Middle	Accredited with Warning
Newport News City	Huntington Middle	Accredited with Warning
Newport News City	Mary Passage Middle	Accredited with Warning
Norfolk City	Blair Middle	Accredited with Warning
Norfolk City	Lafayette-Winona Middle	Accredited with Warning
Norfolk City	Lake Taylor Middle	Accredited with Warning
Norfolk City	Northside Middle	Accredited with Warning
Norfolk City	Norview Middle	Accredited with Warning
Norfolk City	P. B. Young Sr. Elementary	Accredited with Warning
Norfolk City	Ruffner Middle	Accredited with Warning
Northampton County	Northampton Middle	Accredited with Warning
Page County	Grove Hill Elementary	Accredited with Warning
Petersburg City	Blandford Elementary School	Accredited with Warning
Petersburg City	Vernon Johns School	Accredited with Warning
Petersburg City	Westview Elementary	Accredited with Warning
Pittsylvania County	Chatham Middle	Accredited with Warning
Pittsylvania County	Gretna Middle	Accredited with Warning
Portsmouth City	Brighton Elementary School	Accredited with Warning
Portsmouth City	Churchland Middle	Accredited with Warning
Portsmouth City	Cradock Middle	Accredited with Warning

Portsmouth City	Douglass Park Elementary	Accredited with Warning
Portsmouth City	Westhaven Elementary	Accredited with Warning
Portsmouth City	Wm. E. Waters Middle	Accredited with Warning
Prince Edward County	Prince Edward Middle	Accredited with Warning
Prince William County	Fred M. Lynn Middle	Accredited with Warning
Prince William County	Stuart M. Beville Middle	Accredited with Warning
Pulaski County	Dublin Middle	Accredited with Warning
Pulaski County	Pulaski Middle	Accredited with Warning
Richmond City	Adult Career Dev. Ctr.	Accredited with Warning
Richmond City	Binford Middle	Accredited with Warning
Richmond City	Chandler Middle	Accredited with Warning
Richmond City	Elkhardt Middle	Accredited with Warning
Richmond City	G. H. Reid Elementary	Accredited with Warning
Richmond City	Martin Luther King, Jr. Middle School	Accredited with Warning
Richmond City	Thomas C. Boushall Middle	Accredited with Warning
Roanoke City	Addison Aerospace Magnet Middle	Accredited with Warning
Roanoke City	Forest Park Magnet	Accredited with Warning
Roanoke City	Garden City Elementary	Accredited with Warning
Roanoke City	Hurt Park Elementary	Accredited with Warning
Roanoke City	Patrick Henry High	Accredited with Warning
Roanoke City	Roanoke Acadmy/Math & Sc	Accredited with Warning
Roanoke City	Stonewall Jackson Middle	Accredited with Warning
Roanoke City	William Fleming High	Accredited with Warning
Roanoke City	William Ruffner Middle	Accredited with Warning
Rockbridge County	Maury River Middle	Accredited with Warning
Rockingham County	Elkton Middle	Accredited with Warning
Smyth County	Marion Middle	Accredited with Warning
Smyth County	Northwood Middle	Accredited with Warning
Southampton County	Southampton Middle	Accredited with Warning
Spotsylvania County	Post Oak Middle	Accredited with Warning
Staunton City	Shelburne Middle	Accredited with Warning
Suffolk City	Elephant`s Fork Elementary	Accredited with Warning
Suffolk City	John F. Kennedy Middle	Accredited with Warning
Suffolk City	King`s Fork Middle	Accredited with Warning
Surry County	Luther P. Jackson Middle	Accredited with Warning
Sussex County	Sussex Central High	Accredited with Warning
Sussex County	Sussex Central Middle	Accredited with Warning
Tazewell County	Graham Middle	Accredited with Warning
Tazewell County	Richlands Middle	Accredited with Warning
Tazewell County	Tazewell Middle	Accredited with Warning
Washington County	Damascus Middle	Accredited with Warning
Washington County	Glade Spring Middle	Accredited with Warning

Washington County	Wallace Middle	Accredited with Warning
Westmoreland County	Montross Middle	Accredited with Warning
Williamsburg-James City County	Toano Middle	Accredited with Warning
Wythe County	Jackson Memorial Elementary	Accredited with Warning

Appendix E:
List of Data and Reports Used to Document the Condition and Needs of the Public Schools in Virginia and Compliance with the Standards of Quality

Standard	Data Available to Document Compliance
<p>1. Instructional programs supporting the Standards of Learning and other educational objectives. Program of instruction requirements for school boards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implement Standards of Learning • Develop and implement a program of instruction for grades K-12, emphasizing essential knowledge and skills, concepts and processes, and the ability to apply the skills and knowledge in preparation for eventual employment and lifelong learning. • Local school boards must develop and implement programs of prevention, intervention, or remediation for students who are educationally at-risk. • Implement other programs, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Career and technical education programs ○ Drop out prevention programs ○ Special education services ○ Programs for gifted students ○ Programs for limited English proficient students 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual Report on Compliance with the SOQ (self assessment) • SOL test results by ethnicity, gender, disability status, and English proficiency: statewide, division-level, and school-level • Standardized test results for: NAEP, SAT, AP • Statistics on student enrollment in remedial, special education, career and technical, and gifted programs • Division-level and school-level AYP reports • Results of the academic review of schools rated “Accredited with Warning” • Federal program monitoring self-assessments-special education and career and technical education report • Special education child count
<p>2. Instructional, administrative, and support personnel.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Licensed instructional personnel in subject areas • Staffing ratios for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Students in average daily membership ○ Educable mentally retarded students ○ Gifted, career and technical education, and special education students ○ At-risk students ○ Limited English proficient students ○ Reading specialists • Planning periods for middle and high school teachers • Public reporting of pupil/teacher ratios • Support services 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual Report on Compliance with the SOQ (self-assessment) • Annual School Report • Programs for the gifted report • English language proficiency assessment results • Number of limited English proficiency, immigrant, and refugee students by language and county • Instructional personnel survey • Supply and demand survey

<p>3. Accountability, accreditation, and assessments. Accountability requirements including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fully accredited schools • Public meetings to review accreditation status • Academic reviews and reporting requirements • Requirements for corrective action plans • SOL Assessment program requirements • NAEP assessment requirements • SOL test security provisions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual Report on Compliance with the SOQ (self- assessment) • SOL test results by ethnicity, gender, disability status, and English proficiency: statewide, division-level, and school-level • Standardized test results for NAEP, SAT, AP • Statewide and school-level accreditation ratings report. • Statewide, division-level, and school-level AYP results and list of Title I schools identified for improvement • Academic reviews (school and division-wide) • Report on the PASS program
<p>4. Student achievement and graduation achievement and graduation requirements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Types of diplomas • Diploma requirements • Provision for diploma seals • Notification to parents of rising eleventh- and twelfth-grade students of (i) the number of standard and verified units of credit required for graduation and the remaining number of such units of credit the individual student requires for graduation. • Notification of the right to a free public education for students who have not reached 20 years of age to the parent of students who fail to graduate or who have failed to achieve the number of verified units of credit required for graduation If such student who does not graduate or achieve such verified units of credit is a student for whom English is a second language, the local school board shall notify the parent of the student's opportunity for a free public education in accordance with § 22.1-5. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual Report on Compliance with the SOQ (self-assessment) • SOL test results by ethnicity, gender, disability status, and English proficiency: statewide, division-level, and school-level • Standardized test results for NAEP, SAT, AP • Statewide and division-level: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Graduation rates ○ Dropout rates ○ AYP results
<p>5. Teacher quality and educational leadership.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requirements for high-quality professional development: local board, division superintendent, and teachers • Local six-year plan: requirement to include recruitment, employment, and retention of high-quality personnel 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual Report on Compliance with the SOQ (self-assessment) • Statewide and division-level percentage of teachers meeting “highly qualified” requirements
<p>6. Planning and public involvement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requirements for adoption and revision of a division six-year plan • Requirement for technology plan • Requirement for each school to prepare a biennial plan • Public participation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual Report on Compliance with the SOQ (self-assessment) • Annual Local School Division Technology Plan report

<p>7. School board policies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requirements for maintaining, reviewing, and revising policy manual • Policy manual developed with public participation • Requirements for content of policy manual: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ System of two-way communication ○ Selection and evaluation of all instructional materials purchased by the school division, with clear procedures for handling challenged controversial materials ○ Standards of student conduct and attendance and enforcement procedures ○ School-community communications and community involvement ○ Guidelines to encourage parents to provide instructional assistance to children in the home ○ Procedures for addressing concerns with the school division and recourse available to parents ○ Cooperatively developed procedure for personnel evaluation ○ Grievances, dismissals, etc., of teachers, and the implementation procedure ○ Copy of manual must be on file in each school library 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual Report on Compliance with the SOQ (self-assessment)
<p>8. Compliance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Each school board shall provide as a minimum, the programs and services provided in the SOQ. • The Board of Education may petition the circuit court to mandate or otherwise enforce school division compliance with the SOQ, including implementation of a corrective action plan. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual Report on Compliance with the SOQ (self-assessment) • Statewide and school-level accreditation ratings report including the names of schools “Accredited with Warning” • School-level AYP reports and list of Title I schools “in improvement” • Results of division-level Academic Reviews and Academic Reviews of schools rated “Accredited with Warning”