



Overview of Funding for Programs Targeted to Students At-risk of Academic Failure

PRESENTED TO

**SENATE FINANCE
SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION**

JUNE 7, 2007

**Kent C. Dickey
Assistant Superintendent for Finance**



Background on Funding for At-risk Students

- ❑ State at-risk funding established in the Standards of Quality (SOQ) and as incentive funding. Title I is the primary source of federal funding for at-risk students. These funds are provided to school divisions through the Direct Aid budget.
- ❑ Several of the funding programs began in the mid-1990's in support of Virginia's standards-based reform focusing on strengthened accountability for student achievement.
- ❑ These programs recognize the additional costs and services necessary for at-risk students to meet high academic standards.
- ❑ Participation in and local match of funds for SOQ programs are mandatory.
- ❑ Voluntary incentive programs go beyond the SOQ; in order to receive state funds for incentive programs, school divisions must agree to meet requirements such as:
 - certify they will offer the specific program;
 - meet requirements established for the program; and
 - provide a local match of funds for most programs.
- ❑ These programs fall into two categories based on the needs of at-risk students at different points along the K-12 continuum:
 - Prevention/Early Intervention – attempt to address a potential problem before a learning gap occurs; target students in pre-kindergarten through grade 3 (e.g., Early Reading Intervention)

Background on Funding for At-risk Students

- Intervention/Remediation – focus on closing the gap between the student’s current level of achievement and the achievement goals established for all Virginia’s students (e.g., At-risk Add-on).
- ❑ The funding formulas for several of these programs use a poverty adjustment based on free lunch eligibility rates as a proxy for students at-risk, as well as enrollments, staffing standards, and the composite index.
- ❑ This briefing overviews the following funding streams targeting at-risk students:

Prevention/Early Intervention Programs

- Virginia Preschool Initiative
- K-3 Class Size Reduction
- Early Reading Intervention

Intervention/Remediation Programs

- SOQ Prevention, Intervention, and Remediation
- SOQ English as a Second Language
- SOQ Remedial Summer School
- At-risk Add-on
- SOL Algebra Readiness
- Alternative Education
- Project Graduation
- Education for a Lifetime Programs
- Federal Title I Program

- ❑ State funding for these programs totals \$339.9 million in FY07 and \$354.4 million in FY08 based on the Chapter 847 budget, or 5.83% of total Direct Aid state funds in FY07 and 5.89% in FY08.

Summary of Direct Aid Funding Targeted to At-risk Students

Program Name	Funding Source	Funding Category	FY Funding Began	At-risk Indicator	Allocation Method	Local Match	FY 2007 Funding	FY 2008 Funding
Virginia Preschool Initiative	State Incentive	Prev./Early Interv.	FY96	Free lunch eligibility	Formula allocation	Comp. Index	\$46.2 million	\$53.1 million
K-3 Class Size Reduction	State Incentive	Prev./Early Interv.	FY95	Free lunch eligibility	Formula allocation	Comp. Index	\$83.0 million	\$84.6 million
Early Reading Intervention	State Incentive	Prev./Early Interv.	FY98	PALS assessment data	Formula allocation	Comp. Index	\$10.2 million	\$14.3 million
SOQ Prevention, Intervention, and Remediation	State SOQ	Interv./Remediation	FY81	Free lunch eligibility; SOL test scores	Formula allocation	Comp. Index	\$61.5 million (incl. Lottery funds)	\$61.5 million (incl. Lottery funds)
SOQ English as a Second Language	State SOQ	Interv./Remediation	FY91	Limited English proficient	Formula allocation based on actual LEP count	Comp. Index	\$30.5 million	\$36.5 million
SOQ Remedial Summer School	State SOQ	Interv./Remediation	FY89	SOL test scores; academic performance	Formula allocation based on actual students served	None	\$24.0 million	\$25.2 million
At-Risk Add-on	State Incentive	Interv./Remediation	FY93	Free lunch eligibility	Formula allocation	Comp. Index	\$63.0 million	\$60.3 million
SOL Algebra Readiness	State Incentive	Interv./Remediation	FY02	Free lunch eligibility	Formula allocation	Comp. Index	\$8.2 million	\$8.2 million
Alternative Education	State Incentive	Interv./Remediation	FY94-FY97 start-ups; FY98 continuation	Certain violations, expulsion, L-T suspension, return from DJJ	Formula allocation	None	\$6.2 million	\$6.8 million
Project Graduation	State Incentive	Interv./Remediation	FY05	Risk of not meeting diploma requirements	discretionary grants	None	\$2.8 million	\$2.8 million
Education for a Lifetime programs	State Incentive	Interv./Remediation	FY05	Schools not meeting st./federal standards; Hard-to-staff schools	discretionary grants	Comp. Index (where applicable)	\$4.3 million	\$3.8 million
Federal Title I Program	Federal	Interv./Remediation	1965	Student poverty	Formula allocation	Supplement-No Supplant	\$208.0 million	\$204.7 million

Overview of At-risk Funding in Direct Aid

**1. Prevention/Early Intervention Program
Funding**

Virginia Preschool Initiative (VPI)

❑ **Background**

The 1993 General Assembly required a study of current early childhood programs for at-risk children in Virginia. Research from this study defined the criteria for a quality preschool program.

In 1994, the Commission on Equity in Public Education recommended the establishment of state-funded, quality preschool programs for unserved at-risk four-year-olds.

The 1995 General Assembly, through passage of the Omnibus Education Act and the appropriation act, determined a need for an initiative for at-risk four-year-olds.

State funding for the VPI program began in FY96 to serve 30% of eligible unserved children. Funding was increased in FY97 to increase the percentage served to 60%, to 90% in FY05, and to 100% in FY06. Title I preschool students were no longer deducted from the pool of unserved at-risk four-year-olds as of FY05.

The 2006 General Assembly increased the per pupil funding from \$5,400 to \$5,700 for 2006-2008 and authorized the DOE to provide one-time start-up or expansion grants out of balances in the program resulting from non-participation.

The 2007 General Assembly approved \$2.6 million for FY08 to implement preschool pilot projects targeting unserved at-risk preschool students in divisions with existing public-private partnerships.

Virginia Preschool Initiative (VPI)

❑ **Program Purpose**

- Establish quality preschool education programs in public schools and community-based organizations for at-risk four-year-olds not served by federal programs;
- Provide comprehensive services;
- Increase school readiness and reduce disparities among young children upon kindergarten entry; and
- Reduce or eliminate risk factors that lead to early academic failure.

❑ **Program Components/Requirements**

To obtain state funding, local VPI programs must include five components as specified in the 1993 legislative study document, A Study of Programs Serving At-Risk Four-Year-Old Children:

1. Elements of a quality preschool education program:
 - Curriculum designed to address the learning needs of young children;
 - Group size limit of 18, child/staff ratio of 9:1;
 - Qualified staff trained in early childhood development;
 - Minimum of half-day, school year length program;
 - Plan for staff development;
 - Plan for home-school communication; and
 - Assessment procedures.
2. Parental involvement and information, including activities to promote family literacy.

Virginia Preschool Initiative (VPI)

3. Health and nutrition services.
4. Social services to support families.
5. Transportation services.

Other requirements:

- Coordinate resources and funding streams to serve the greatest number of children;
- Demonstrate the coordination of comprehensive services among governmental and community-based entities;
- Operate programs in public schools or through community-based organizations;
- Develop selection criteria based on the community's definition of at-risk; and
- Develop the program around Virginia's Foundation Blocks for Early Learning: Comprehensive Standards for Four-year-olds.

❑ **Funding Formula**

Projected number of four-year-olds X percent of students eligible for free lunch = estimated number of four-year-olds at-risk (minus) the number of four-year-olds served by Head Start programs = 100 percent of unserved at-risk four-year-olds.

Estimated number of unserved at-risk four-year-olds X \$5,700 (or \$2,850 for half-day programs) X (1 - Composite Index) = State Share of Funding.

Virginia Preschool Initiative (VPI)

❑ **Funding/Participation Levels**

- FY07 state funding = \$46.2 million
- FY08 state funding = \$53.1 million (includes funding for pilots)
- 101 divisions receiving funds in FY07; 12,501 at-risk four-year-olds served in FY07

K-3 Class Size Reduction Program

□ **Background**

This incentive program began in the 1994-1996 biennium with the first appropriation made in fiscal year 1995. The objective was to provide additional funding for school divisions to reduce their class sizes in grades K-3 below the required class sizes in the SOQ.

The SOQ divisionwide student to teacher ratios at the time were 25 to 1 with no class being larger than 30, and an aide for any kindergarten class that was larger than 25 students.

The program was initiated from recommendations of the Commission on Educational Opportunities for All Virginians. The Commission based its recommendations largely on research regarding lower class sizes, especially the STAR longitudinal study conducted in Tennessee.

This study found long-term exposure to small classes generated substantially higher levels of achievement, especially for students at-risk of educational failure.

As a result, Virginia's program initially focused on reducing class sizes in schools with high and moderate concentrations of at-risk students. The Commission also recommended that free lunch eligibility was the best indicator for estimating the number of at-risk students.

The General Assembly codified the reduced class size program in the SOQ (§22.1-253.13:2 M.), although it was a voluntary or optional program.

K-3 Class Size Reduction Program

The 1998 General Assembly made significant changes to the program based on widespread participation in the program:

- the program was expanded to make it available to all K-3 schools; and
- the range of pupil-teacher ratios was expanded from three levels to eight levels to soften the transition from one tier to the next and to include a tier for all schools regardless of the free lunch rate.

In 1999, recognizing that all schools were participating at a reduced class size of at least 24 to 1, the General Assembly reduced the SOQ required pupil-teacher ratio to 24 to 1 for grades K-3. This action eliminated the highest ratio tier of 24 to 1 in the program. As a result, schools with free lunch eligibility rates below 16 percent are not eligible for class size reduction below the SOQ standard of 24 to 1.

□ Program Purpose

State funding is provided to school divisions as an incentive to reduce class sizes in grades K-3 below the required SOQ standard of a 24:1 pupil-teacher ratio, with no class larger than 29, particularly in schools having high concentrations of at-risk students indicated by high free lunch eligibility.

K-3 Class Size Reduction Program

❑ Program Components/Requirements

In order to receive state funding, school divisions must meet pupil-teacher ratio and class size requirements in each eligible school as follows:

Percentage of Students Approved Eligible for Free Lunch	Grades K-3 School Ratio	Maximum Class Size
16% but less than 30%	20 to 1	25
30% but less than 45%	19 to 1	24
45% but less than 55%	18 to 1	23
55% but less than 65%	17 to 1	22
65% but less than 70%	16 to 1	21
70% but less than 75%	15 to 1	20
75% or more	14 to 1	19

School divisions demonstrate compliance with the reduced ratios and maximum class sizes in eligible schools through an annual data submission to the DOE.

School divisions are allowed to count the time spent by resource teachers (e.g., art, music, physical education, etc.) in grades K-3 when calculating the pupil-teacher ratios. Special education teachers are not allowed to be counted as stipulated in the SOQ.

K-3 Class Size Reduction Program

School divisions are allowed to participate at a higher ratio, with a commensurate reduction in state and required local funds, if local circumstances (e.g., lack of classroom space) do not allow participation at the eligible ratio and class size.

A local match of funds based on the composite index is required.

□ Funding Formula

Payments for each division are based on the incremental cost of the lower pupil-teacher ratios and class sizes based on the lower of the statewide average per pupil cost or the actual division per pupil cost. Funding for the applicable ratio and maximum class sizes are calculated at the school level based on the free lunch eligibility percentage of each school, excluding schools with rates below 16 percent. The funded ratios range from 20:1, with no class larger than 25, to 14:1, with no class larger than 19. State funds are distributed to school divisions as follows:

$([\text{K-3 funded fall membership for eligible schools} \times \text{eligible per pupil amount}] \times [1 - \text{Composite Index}]) = \text{State Share of Funding}$

□ Funding/Service Levels

- FY07 state funding = \$83.0 million
- FY08 state funding = \$84.6 million
- 129 divisions receiving funds in FY07 based on 875 eligible schools

Early Reading Intervention Program

❑ **Background**

Proposed by Governor Allen in 1997. Funding began in FY98 to serve kindergarten or first grade students. The 2000 General Assembly expanded the program for the 2000-2002 biennium to serve kindergarten through third-grade students.

The 2007 General Assembly approved the Governor's recommendation to further expand the program in FY08 by funding 100% of first- and second-grade students identified under the funding formula. This action added \$4.1 million to the program.

❑ **Program Purpose**

To significantly reduce the number of students with reading problems through early diagnosis and immediate intervention. The reading skills of identified students will be improved by the end of each grade level, as a result of the intervention. Also, to reduce the need for Title I and special education referrals, student retention in first grade, and the number of students requiring later remediation. Reading on grade level by the end of grade three is critical to future academic success.

❑ **Program Components/Requirements**

Program funds are used by school divisions for:

- one-on-one or small groups with a reading specialist;
- trained instructional assistants;

Early Reading Intervention Program

- volunteer tutors under the supervision of a qualified teacher;
- computer-based reading tutorial programs;
- extended instructional time in the school day or year; and
- school division designed models of reading intervention.

The Phonological Assessment and Literacy Screening (PALS) reading diagnostic instrument is available to school divisions participating in the program. Participating school divisions administer the PALS assessment to all K-3 students at the beginning of each school year. Results are used to identify students who will receive reading intervention services. Students receiving services are assessed again at the end of the school year.

Results of the annual PALS assessment are reported to the Department of Education.

A local match of funds based on the composite index is required.

❑ Funding Formula

Funding for FY07 is based on a pupil-teacher ratio of 5:1 in grades K-3 at 100% of the estimated kindergarten students, 50% of the estimated students in grades 1 and 2, and 25% of the estimated students in grade 3. Funding for FY08 is based on the 5:1 pupil-teacher ratio, but the estimated number of students in grades 1 and 2 is funded at 100%. The number of estimated students is based on the percentage of students needing services as determined by the PALS diagnostic or free lunch eligibility in the absence of PALS data.

Early Reading Intervention Program

The full formula is:

5:1 pupil-teacher ratio applied to the estimated student population = number of positions; number of positions multiplied by 36 weeks and 2.5 hours per week = hours of instruction provided; hours of instruction multiplied by teacher hourly rate and 1 - Composite Index = State Share of Funding.

❑ Funding/Service Levels

- FY07 state funding = \$10.2 million
- FY08 state funding = \$14.3 million
- 136 divisions receiving funds in FY07

Overview of At-risk Funding in Direct Aid

**2. Intervention/Remediation Program
Funding**

SOQ Prevention, Intervention, and Remediation Program

□ **Background**

The Standards of Quality (§22.1-253.13:1 C of the Code) require local school boards to provide programs of prevention, intervention, or remediation for students who are educationally at-risk. The previous remedial program funding standard in the SOQ was 9 instructional positions per 1,000 students scoring in the bottom national quartile on Virginia's former standardized tests. State funding based on this standard began in FY81.

§22.1-253.13:1 C has been amended to require any student who fails all of the SOL assessments in grades three through eight to attend programs of prevention, intervention, or remediation, which can include a summer school program or another form of remediation. Students who fail at least one grade level or end-of-course SOL test may be required to attend a remedial program.

The Board of Education adopted a new funding standard for SOQ remediation in 2003 to reflect new SOQ requirements for remediation and to recognize free lunch eligibility as an at-risk indicator. The General Assembly provided funding based on the new standard beginning in FY05.

\$19.5 million in Lottery funds are used to fund a portion of the state cost in FY07 and FY08.

SOQ Prevention, Intervention, and Remediation Program

❑ Program Purpose

SOQ Prevention, Intervention, and Remediation funding supports remedial services to students who need additional instruction to meet SOL standards, to increase the number of students who earn a diploma, and to prevent students from dropping out of school.

❑ Program Components/Requirements

- Specific programs and staffing are not mandated, but services required under the Code must be provided
- Required local match based on the composite index

❑ Funding Formula

Funding is provided to school divisions for the state share of additional instructional positions to support one hour of instruction per day at a pupil-teacher ratio ranging from 10:1 to 18:1 based on the division failure rate on the SOL English and mathematics tests for all students identified as at-risk based on a three-year average of free lunch eligibility percentages. The pupil-teacher ratio is funded on a sliding scale with the 10:1 ratio assigned to divisions with the highest SOL failure rates and the 18:1 ratio to divisions with the lowest SOL failure rates.

SOQ Prevention, Intervention, and Remediation Program

The cost of the calculated instructional positions is funded as a per pupil amount. State funds are distributed to divisions based on the following formula:

$([\text{Per Pupil Amount} \times \text{Unadjusted ADM}] \times [1 - \text{Composite Index}]) = \text{State Share of Funding}$

❑ Funding/Participation Levels

- FY07 state funding = \$61.5 million (includes Lottery funds)
- FY08 state funding = \$61.5 million (includes Lottery funds)
- 136 divisions receiving funds in FY07

SOQ English as a Second Language

□ **Background**

Funding for English as a Second Language (ESL) was a recommendation from the Governor's Commission on Educational Opportunity for All Virginians (1991).

Prior to FY05, state funding for ESL instructional services was provided to school divisions as a categorical program outside of the SOQ. State funding based on a staffing standard of nine instructional positions per 1,000 ESL students began in FY91; the staffing standard was later increased to 10 instructional positions per 1,000 ESL students. In 2003, the Standards of Quality (§22.1-253.13:1) were amended to require the identification of students with limited English proficiency and the enrollment of ESL students in appropriate instructional programs. The funding standard of 10 instructional positions per 1,000 ESL students was also codified in the SOQ.

In 2004, the SOQ was further amended to increase the ESL staffing standard to 17 instructional positions per 1,000 ESL students. The General Assembly provided state funding based on this new standard beginning in FY05. ESL positions became an SOQ staffing requirement and a part of required local effort beginning in FY05.

Over 86,000 ESL students were reported enrolled by school divisions in the fall of 2006.

SOQ English as a Second Language

❑ **Program Purpose**

SOQ English as a Second Language funding provides additional instruction to students for whom English is not their native language to improve their English language proficiency.

❑ **Program Components/Requirements**

- Specific programs are not mandated, but services required under the Code must be provided
- Required local match based on the composite index

❑ **Funding Formula**

The funding supports the salary and benefits cost of instructional positions at a standard of 17 positions per 1,000 ESL students. State funds are distributed to divisions based on the following formula:

$([Seventeen\ teachers\ per\ 1,000\ ESL\ students\ X\ Average\ salary\ and\ fringe\ benefits] X [1 - Composite\ Index]) = State\ Share\ of\ Funding$

❑ **Funding/Participation Levels**

- FY07 state funding = \$30.5 million
- FY08 state funding = \$36.5 million
- 129 divisions receiving funds in FY07

SOQ Remedial Summer School Program

❑ **Background**

The Standards of Quality (§22.1-253.13:1 C) requires local school boards to provide programs of prevention, intervention, or remediation for students who are educationally at-risk. Any student who fails all of the Standards of Learning assessments in grades three through eight is required to attend a summer school program or another form of remediation. Students who fail at least one grade level or end-of-course SOL test may be required to attend remedial summer school.

State funding for remedial summer school began in FY89.

❑ **Program Purpose**

These funds are available to school divisions for the operation of programs designed to remediate students who are required to attend such programs during a summer school session or during an intersession in the case of year-round schools.

❑ **Program Components/Requirements**

- Programs are tuition-free and non-credit earning.
- The funds may be used with other sources of state funding for remediation or intervention.
- School divisions have flexibility in the use of these funds and in the types of remediation programs offered.

SOQ Remedial Summer School Program

- A local match of funds is not required and this program is not part of required local effort for the SOQ.

❑ **Funding Formula**

The state share of per pupil funding is provided to support a 30-day summer program. The per pupil amount is based on one-sixth of the full-year (approximately 30 days) SOQ Basic Aid and SOQ Remediation instructional salary cost. State funds are distributed to school divisions based on the following formula:

$$([\text{Per Pupil Amount} \times \text{Eligible Number of Students}] \times [1 - \text{Composite Index}]) = \text{State Share of Funding}$$

❑ **Funding/Participation Levels**

- FY07 state funding = \$24.0 million
- FY08 state funding = \$25.2 million
- 129 divisions receiving funds in FY07; approximately 99,000 students served

At-risk Add-on Program

❑ **Background**

This program was initiated as a result of recommendations of the Commission on Educational Opportunities for All Virginians (1991). The Commission noted that the cost of educating at-risk students exceeds the level funded by the SOQ and that student poverty, particularly in high concentrations, is strongly correlated to educational risk of students. Free lunch eligibility was recommended as an appropriate indicator to target resources to at-risk students.

State funding for the At-risk Add-on program began in FY93. The 2007 General Assembly adopted two changes to the funding formula for FY08 (reduced the minimum add-on percentage from two percent to one percent and removed the 96% proration on full funding).

❑ **Program Purpose**

This program provides incentive funds to school divisions above the SOQ to support programs that address the needs of students educationally at-risk. It recognizes that at-risk students cost more to educate than other students in order to meet rigorous standards using free lunch eligibility as an indicator of at-risk.

❑ **Program Components/Requirements**

- Specific programs are not mandated.
- The funds may be used with other sources of state funding for remediation or intervention.

At-risk Add-on Program

- School divisions have flexibility in the use of funds and in the types of remediation programs offered, but divisions must certify that the funds will be used to support a broad array of approved programs listed in the Act.
- For FY08, school divisions must provide information to the DOE on the planned uses of these funds, with this information reported to the General Assembly by November 15, 2007.
- A local match of funds based on the composite index is required.

❑ **Funding Formula**

State funds are distributed as a percentage add-on to the division's Basic Aid per pupil amount. Divisions with a higher percentage of students eligible for free lunch receive a greater percentage add-on to the Basic Aid per pupil amount (i.e., sliding scale). The detailed formula is:

In FY07, the percentage of students eligible for free lunch X ADM = estimated number of students eligible for free lunch X (add-on weight ranging from 2% to 12% based on free lunch eligibility rate) X Basic Aid per pupil amount X (1 - Composite Index) X 96% = State Share of Funding. In FY08, the percentage of students eligible for free lunch X ADM = estimated number of students eligible for free lunch X (add-on weight ranging from 1% to 12% based on free lunch eligibility rate) X Basic Aid per pupil amount X (1 - Composite Index) X 100% = State Share of Funding.

At-risk Add-on Program

- ❑ **Funding/Participation Levels**
 - FY07 state funding = \$63.0 million
 - FY08 state funding = \$60.3 million
 - 136 divisions receiving funds in FY07

SOL Algebra Readiness Program

❑ **Background**

The SOL Algebra Readiness Program was recommended by Governor Gilmore and approved by the 2000 General Assembly for implementation in the 2001-2002 school year.

State funding was initially based on the division failure rate on the 8th grade SOL mathematics test. The at-risk indicator used in the funding formula was changed to free lunch eligibility by the General Assembly beginning in FY05 to eliminate funding reductions resulting from improvements in student test scores.

The Governor's 2007 introduced budget recommended expanding the program in FY08 to include 6th graders in the funding formula. The proposed funding increase for this expansion was \$3.9 million. This amendment was not approved by the 2007 General Assembly.

❑ **Program Purpose**

The Algebra Readiness Program provides funding for mathematics intervention services to students in grades 6, 7, 8, and 9 who are at-risk of failing the Algebra I end-of-course test, as demonstrated by their individual performance on approved diagnostic tests. The program provides needed resources for teachers as they assist at-risk students in meeting verified credit requirements in mathematics.

SOL Algebra Readiness Program

❑ **Program Components/Requirements**

- Specific programs are not mandated but school divisions must certify to the DOE that an intervention program will be offered to identified students and that each student who receives an intervention will be assessed again at the end of the school year.
- The Algebra Readiness Diagnostic Test (ARDT) is provided to school divisions and administered to 7th and 8th grade students at the beginning of the school year to identify students to receive intervention services. School divisions must report the results of the diagnostic tests to DOE each year.
- A local match of funds based on the composite index is required.

❑ **Funding Formula**

Funding is based on the estimated number of 7th and 8th grade students who are at-risk of failing the Algebra I end-of-course test based on the free lunch eligibility percentage for the school division. State funds are distributed to school divisions based on the following formula:

([Total number of students in eligible grades X division free lunch percentage] / 10 [pupil-teacher ratio of 10 to 1]) X 36 week school year X 2.5 hours of instruction per week = hours of service X hourly teacher cost X (1 - Composite Index) = State Share of Funding.

SOL Algebra Readiness Program

- ❑ **Funding/Participation Levels**
 - FY07 state funding = \$8.2 million
 - FY08 state funding = \$8.2 million
 - 136 divisions receiving funds in FY07

Alternative Education Program

❑ **Background**

The 1993 General Assembly passed legislation requiring the Board of Education to create a program of alternative education for school-age students facing weapons, drug, or alcohol charges, expulsion, long-term suspension, or release from the Department of Juvenile Justice. With funds appropriated by the General Assembly, DOE provided competitive grants for four pilot projects beginning in FY94. The pilot projects were established on a regional basis for economy of scale.

State funding for start-up and continuation costs continued between FY95 and FY97, supporting the creation of 29 regional programs statewide. The 1998 General Assembly continued state funding for continuation costs.

The number of student slots in programs was last increased in FY01. The General Assembly funded an 8.5% increase in student slots across all programs.

Currently, there are 30 regional programs statewide offering 1,822 student slots facilitating access to a regional program for all divisions.

❑ **Program Purpose**

State funds for regional alternative education programs provide an educational option for expelled students, students receiving long-term suspensions, students returning to the community from the Department of Juvenile Justice, and

Alternative Education Program

students whose needs are not addressed by other local programs. Emphasis is on preparing students to return to the regular education program in the student's school division.

□ Program Components/Requirements

- Specific programs are not mandated.
- Small student/staff ratio (pupil-teacher ratio 10:1); staff include education, mental health, health, and law enforcement professionals.
- Focus on remediation in core subjects through tutoring and small group instruction.
- Offer career counseling and vocational training.
- Parent/community involvement.
- Service delivery through classroom instruction, distance learning, and regular day, after school, and evening programs.
- The 2006 General Assembly included language requiring a reallocation procedure of unused student slots; a reallocation procedure was implemented beginning in FY07.
- A local match of funds based on the composite index is not required.

□ Funding Formula

Funding is provided on a per pupil basis. The per pupil amount is based on the incremental cost (above Basic Aid) of a program staffing model serving 50 students. The staffing model includes a project director, five teachers at a 10:1 pupil-teacher ratio, two instructional aides, and one counselor, administrative support position, and one security position.

Alternative Education Program

The Basic Aid per pupil amount for each division is deducted from the per pupil cost of the staffing model, to determine an “add-on” per pupil amount for each division for alternative education. The number of alternative education slots per division is then multiplied by the add-on per pupil amount and adjusted for the composite index for the state share of funding.

The total per pupil amount for FY07 is \$10,565 (before deducting the Basic Aid per pupil amount or adjusting for the composite index).

State funds are paid to the division serving as fiscal agent for the regional program. Students attending regional alternative education programs are counted in the ADM of their school division for state funding purposes.

❑ **Funding/Participation Levels**

- FY07 state funding = \$6.2 million
- FY08 state funding = \$6.8 million
- 117 divisions received an allocation of funds in FY07

Project Graduation Program

❑ Background

Project Graduation provides remedial instruction through special academies and online tutorials to students at-risk of not meeting Virginia's diploma requirements. The Career Prep Academy component provides an opportunity for students who did not graduate from high school to earn a diploma as well as an industry credential. State funding began in FY05.

❑ Program Purpose

Project Graduation provides funding for school division programs that assist 10th, 11th, and 12th grade students with passing end-of-course SOL tests in all subject areas in order to graduate with at least a standard diploma.

❑ Program Components/Requirements

- Specific programs are not mandated.
- Remedial instruction is provided through targeted academies and online tutorials for Algebra I, geometry, reading, and writing.
- A local match of funds based on the composite index is not required.

Project Graduation Program

❑ **Funding Formula**

Grant funds are provided to school divisions on an individual and regional basis to support the Senior Year, Summer, and Career Prep Academy components of the program.

❑ **Funding/Participation Levels**

- FY07 state funding = \$2.8 million
- FY08 state funding = \$2.8 million
- 6,338 students statewide participated in at least one Project Graduation or Career Prep Academy activity in FY06

Education for a Lifetime Initiative Programs

□ **Background**

The federal *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001* (NCLB) requires states to develop a comprehensive statewide system of support to facilitate meeting the extensive requirements of the Act. The statewide system of support encompasses areas such as standards and instructional resources, assessment and data-based decisionmaking, accountability mechanisms, interventions and instructional support, and teacher quality. The Education for a Lifetime initiatives are a primary component of Virginia's statewide system of support.

Four components of the Education for a Lifetime initiative focus on serving at-risk students and schools:

- Teacher Incentives in Hard-to-Staff Schools
- Mentor Teacher Program in Hard-to-Staff Schools
- Virginia Middle School Teacher Corps
- Virginia School Turnaround Specialist

Two of these programs use the eight criteria developed to identify "hard-to-staff" schools as an alternative to free lunch as an indicator of at-risk:

1. Accredited with Warning
2. Average Daily Attendance is Two Percentage Points Below The Statewide Average
3. Percent of Special Education Students Exceeds 150% of the Statewide Average
4. Percent of Limited English Proficient Students Exceeds 150% of the Statewide Average
5. Percent of the Teachers with Provisional Licenses Exceeds 150% of the Statewide Average

Education for a Lifetime Initiative Programs

6. Percent of the Special Education Teachers with Conditional Licenses Exceeds 150% of the Statewide Average
7. Percent of Inexperienced Teachers Hired to Total Teachers Exceeds 150% of the Statewide Average
8. School Has One or More Inexperienced Teachers in a Critical Shortage Area.

State fund appropriations for these programs began in FY05.

❑ Program Purpose

Teacher Incentives in Hard-to-Staff Schools

To improve student achievement by attracting and retaining licensed, highly qualified, and experienced teachers in hard-to-staff middle or high schools through an incentives-based program.

Mentor Teacher Program in Hard-to-Staff Schools

To reduce teacher attrition by providing support and guidance to new teachers in schools designated as hard-to-staff.

Virginia Middle School Teacher Corps

Provides the structure and funding incentives for school divisions to hire experienced, qualified mathematics teachers for middle schools that have been designated as “at-risk” in mathematics as a result of being accredited with warning in mathematics or not meeting the annual measurable objectives in mathematics required for Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) under NCLB. The goal is to increase the quality of mathematics instruction throughout the school and increase student mathematics skills needed for high school.

Education for a Lifetime Initiative Programs

Virginia School Turnaround Specialist

To train cadres of successful, experienced principals to turn around consistently low-performing schools. The program provides funding to support turnaround activities in the school and offers financial incentives to specialists that meet performance targets.

□ Program Components/Requirements

Teacher Incentives in Hard-to-Staff Schools

- Program activities governed by a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) agreement with DOE
- Three-year funding cycle
- Local match of funds not required until the third year to facilitate transition to a locally-funded initiative
- Petersburg, Franklin City, and Caroline County were funded for FY07

Mentor Teacher Program in Hard-to-Staff Schools

- Hard-to-staff schools are determined on the basis of eight criteria.
- In order to receive funds, school divisions must use one of the three mentor programs currently being piloted in Virginia.
- Funds used for incentive payments to teachers serving as mentors and to operate mentoring programs.
- Local match of funds not required.

Virginia Middle School Teacher Corps

- Three-year state funding cycle.
- Teachers must meet criteria and attend training.

Education for a Lifetime Initiative Programs

- Funding also provided to increase the number of teachers with mathematics endorsements who can then apply for the program.
- Local match of funds not required.

Virginia School Turnaround Specialist

- Specialists must receive training and be credentialed prior to being placed in an eligible school for a three year period.
- Turnaround process in the school governed by a MOU agreement with DOE.
- Three cohorts of specialists are currently placed in 15 schools in 2006-2007 (Cohort I – FY05-FY07; Cohort II – FY06-FY08; Cohort III – FY07-FY09).
- Cohort I Turnaround Specialists will be deployed at the end of the 2006-2007 school year to other eligible schools on an optional basis and will continue to receive incentive funds.
- A local match of funds based on the composite index is required for the performance incentive.

❑ Funding Formula

Teacher Incentives in Hard-to-Staff Schools

- Relocation incentive of 30% of average teacher salary in the division for eligible teachers.
- Retention incentive of 10% of average teacher salary in the division for eligible teachers.
- Per teacher training stipend, per teacher training and materials support, and per pupil funding support provided.
- 100% state funded in years one and two; state share of payment based on the composite index and required local share in year three.

Education for a Lifetime Initiative Programs

Mentor Teacher Program in Hard-to-Staff Schools

- Payments are based on the state share of approximately \$2,000 for each first-year teacher in a hard-to-staff school.

Virginia Middle School Teacher Corps

- \$10,000 relocation salary differential per eligible teacher.
- \$5,000 retention salary differential per eligible teacher.

Virginia School Turnaround Specialist

- \$5,000 incentive bonus provided to specialist upon successful completion of training and credentialing.
- State share of \$50 per pupil (based on the composite index and student enrollment) to support turnaround activities (e.g., professional development) in the school where the specialist is placed.
- Performance incentive for meeting performance targets provided based on the state share (based on the composite index) of 10% of the average principal salary in the division in year one and 15% of the average principal salary in years two and three.

❑ Funding/Participation Levels

Teacher Incentives in Hard-to-Staff Schools

- FY07 state funding = \$1.6 million
- FY08 state funding = \$644,375
- Petersburg and Caroline County are participating in FY07.

Education for a Lifetime Initiative Programs

Mentor Teacher Program in Hard-to-Staff Schools

- FY07 state funding = \$1.4 million
- FY08 state funding = \$1.6 million
- In 2006-2007, 168 of 175 eligible schools and 60 of 65 eligible divisions participated. Eight hundred ninety-nine (899) beginning teachers in participating schools were served.

Virginia Middle School Teacher Corps

- FY07 state funding = \$720,056
- FY08 state funding = \$1.0 million

Virginia School Turnaround Specialist

- FY07 state funding = \$613,439
- FY08 state funding = \$613,439
- In 2006-2007, 15 schools in eight divisions are participating (six elementary, eight middle, and one high school).

Federal Title I Funding

- ❑ The federal Title I program is the primary source of federal funds targeted to at-risk students and schools.
- ❑ The Title I program is authorized under the NCLB law.
- ❑ The latest grant award to Virginia for the 2007-2008 school-year is \$204.7 million.
- ❑ The goal of the Title I program is to help school districts and individual schools “improve the teaching and learning of children failing, or most at-risk of failing, to meet challenging state academic standards.” The funds are used for instructional programs, services, and materials divisionwide and in targeted schools.
- ❑ Allocations are determined based on school-age population and childhood poverty rates. All Virginia school divisions receive an allocation.
- ❑ Most of the funding is distributed to divisions; 1% is used to administer the program at the state level.

Overview of At-risk Funding in Direct Aid

**Appendix: FY07 and Projected FY08 Division
Funding Distributions for Formula-based Programs**

Direct Aid to Public Education (197)
Total General Fund Distribution by School Division for Selected At-risk/Remedial Accounts (Actual)
Fiscal Year 2007

DIV. NUM.	DIVISION	COMP. INDEX	FREE LUNCH % (Oct. '04)	SOQ PREV., INTERV., & REMEDIATION	REMEDIAL SUM. SCHOOL	ESL	EARLY READING INTERVENTION	VPI (AT-RISK 4 YR. OLDS)	K-3 PRIMARY CLASS SIZE	SOL ALGEBRA READINESS	AT-RISK ADD-ON	ALTERNATIVE EDUCATION	TOTAL FY07 DISTRIBUTION
001	ACCOMACK	0.3255	53.10%	665,973	56,135	265,882	81,493	307,572	873,275	81,721	926,781	37,661	3,296,493
002	ALBEMARLE	0.6095	15.61%	211,756	153,485	296,630	51,469	249,295	344,809	32,954	146,636	0	1,487,034
003	ALLEGHANY	0.2423	29.26%	212,536	39,334	5,651	29,128	77,740	258,443	25,576	203,456	11,400	863,264
004	AMELIA	0.3431	29.79%	121,147	44,385	4,899	23,449	26,210	193,987	14,783	111,150	37,177	577,187
005	AMHERST	0.2870	31.03%	329,822	99,583	3,418	43,072	292,615	379,408	46,177	332,240	29,033	1,555,368
006	APPOMATTOX	0.2696	30.68%	181,875	79,444	778	16,045	124,898	247,074	22,650	158,431	18,979	850,177
007	ARLINGTON	0.8000	31.78%	385,347	352,837	909,843	60,921	433,200	446,494	50,031	372,904	0	3,011,574
008	AUGUSTA	0.3320	20.41%	432,794	241,640	113,868	89,879	258,917	753,798	65,811	341,305	97,223	2,395,235
009	BATH	0.8000	20.60%	10,098	4,367	320	1,098	3,420	9,860	1,125	8,142	2,784	41,214
010	BEDFORD	0.3632	22.77%	440,923	247,669	28,155	75,189	355,716	487,678	66,320	354,851	95,393	2,151,894
011	BLAND	0.3059	25.11%	60,470	6,577	0	7,624	0	71,709	7,810	46,719	16,478	217,387
012	BOTETOURT	0.3957	11.01%	97,063	30,624	9,335	34,846	41,334	111,493	13,599	51,121	9,278	398,693
013	BRUNSWICK	0.2540	58.09%	397,603	159,516	10,332	24,581	263,636	441,785	46,266	529,883	80,616	1,954,218
014	BUCHANAN	0.3205	57.60%	557,825	66,629	0	48,512	244,008	591,930	61,347	720,480	10,549	2,301,280
015	BUCKINGHAM	0.2591	43.18%	240,735	107,448	2,763	28,482	228,049	235,265	33,445	288,050	39,837	1,204,074
016	CAMPBELL	0.2612	25.48%	510,933	229,507	40,142	85,204	736,953	829,764	74,815	442,203	0	2,949,521
017	CAROLINE	0.3495	31.50%	325,056	76,114	44,354	35,724	111,236	446,361	34,723	364,042	30,625	1,368,235
018	CARROLL	0.2842	38.57%	395,653	120,028	89,987	43,241	367,205	486,636	48,324	424,446	92,553	2,068,073
019	CHARLES CITY	0.4128	33.10%	72,100	0	3,128	6,450	40,164	69,203	9,911	61,878	8,061	270,895
020	CHARLOTTE	0.2234	40.14%	194,479	52,473	13,238	19,192	101,812	258,036	30,583	265,481	43,328	978,622
021	CHESTERFIELD	0.3616	16.86%	1,806,474	1,359,291	1,110,666	473,305	0	2,314,725	278,390	1,210,277	0	8,553,128
022	CLARKE	0.5580	11.00%	33,994	27,133	23,538	4,902	20,155	0	5,022	17,440	6,692	138,876
023	CRAIG	0.3184	19.88%	28,980	31,171	0	7,486	0	59,859	3,835	24,201	9,874	165,406
024	CULPEPER	0.4062	23.87%	351,018	65,810	225,846	47,285	132,002	474,487	46,769	260,015	9,461	1,612,693
025	CUMBERLAND	0.2859	47.27%	181,238	122,979	16,357	11,765	187,237	190,554	22,048	227,347	38,466	997,991
026	DICKENSON	0.2344	45.29%	288,010	21,134	0	29,432	24,438	283,174	38,867	388,333	67,967	1,141,355
027	DINWIDDIE	0.2669	29.98%	155,171	126,856	23,821	50,325	133,717	377,685	51,604	318,505	11,282	1,408,966
028	ESSEX	0.4019	37.96%	145,838	41,152	12,425	32,846	61,365	191,135	15,182	141,588	33,547	675,078
029	FAIRFAX	0.7456	14.87%	1,890,091	739,035	7,471,162	659,831	1,031,007	2,170,272	286,874	1,183,535	50,304	15,482,111
030	FAUQUIER	0.6443	11.72%	144,894	71,955	137,570	47,343	36,495	158,161	20,207	74,073	81,125	771,823
031	FLOYD	0.3212	25.26%	110,512	26,568	25,311	13,047	69,645	163,110	15,276	100,043	10,115	533,627
032	FLUVANNA	0.3749	14.39%	98,312	58,719	4,995	24,030	110,455	62,048	14,067	57,587	9,975	440,188
033	FRANKLIN	0.3950	31.15%	406,591	168,001	72,835	59,806	458,651	552,455	59,524	439,259	9,431	2,226,553
034	FREDERICK	0.3925	13.36%	312,281	0	272,803	126,778	0	496,082	46,180	172,776	0	1,426,900
035	GILES	0.2755	24.27%	160,913	34,327	1,158	43,767	0	247,532	20,380	118,431	11,407	637,915
036	GLOUCESTER	0.3323	20.40%	258,191	97,658	9,248	33,002	0	409,486	39,487	191,310	74,916	1,113,298
037	GOOCHLAND	0.8000	16.85%	21,627	16,645	4,581	4,943	9,120	38,224	3,376	15,806	11,394	125,716
038	GRAYSON	0.2780	40.75%	220,597	49,974	17,692	19,825	144,039	144,968	28,433	268,293	9,944	903,765
039	GREENE	0.3334	19.72%	124,703	31,584	61,431	21,965	94,991	220,640	15,001	83,821	10,121	664,257
040	GREENSVILLE	0.2199	51.34%	246,794	138,845	7,064	19,279	226,775	302,180	28,579	320,247	86,875	1,376,638
041	HALIFAX	0.2380	47.34%	659,147	251,469	26,790	66,956	647,167	766,846	96,405	962,398	11,720	3,488,898
042	HANOVER	0.4352	9.62%	298,275	205,007	79,428	80,646	0	261,759	46,112	143,819	33,183	1,148,229
043	HENRICO	0.4604	22.08%	1,663,362	659,387	1,103,480	367,459	267,588	2,074,577	254,930	1,389,623	44,782	7,825,188
044	HENRY	0.2553	39.63%	672,021	137,761	261,818	92,019	840,468	1,068,388	96,461	856,113	50,603	4,075,652
045	HIGHLAND	0.6380	30.79%	9,594	2,834	1,350	994	4,127	5,625	2,037	12,871	4,025	43,457
046	ISLE OF WIGHT	0.3753	27.30%	300,846	97,546	19,966	29,161	252,816	419,699	40,459	260,345	6,481	1,427,319
047	JAMES CITY	0.5499	20.58%	250,908	115,901	63,537	79,099	119,299	417,262	39,219	197,920	37,974	1,321,119
048	KING GEORGE	0.4034	17.36%	136,989	30,233	26,378	31,126	0	248,765	16,782	81,662	9,201	581,136
049	KING QUEEN	0.4073	52.76%	87,379	29,791	4,420	8,137	121,622	74,586	13,338	134,640	29,867	503,780
050	KING WILLIAM	0.3267	22.70%	98,296	40,778	1,076	18,488	69,081	158,261	15,152	79,078	76,655	556,865
051	LANCASTER	0.6844	41.78%	64,103	13,783	504	4,333	57,565	82,086	8,011	75,232	4,859	310,476
052	LEE	0.1769	54.33%	560,931	0	3,946	42,943	0	608,432	69,461	861,989	128,478	2,276,180
053	LOUDOUN	0.6895	8.89%	417,367	0	1,142,362	145,148	0	335,005	63,308	201,071	0	2,304,261
054	LOUISA	0.5542	30.57%	191,938	65,019	12,586	29,379	200,744	271,983	30,096	188,522	51,431	1,041,698

Direct Aid to Public Education (197)
Total General Fund Distribution by School Division for Selected At-risk/Remedial Accounts (Actual)
Fiscal Year 2007

DIV. NUM.	DIVISION	COMP. INDEX	FREE LUNCH % (Oct. '04)	SOQ PREV., INTERV., & REMEDIATION	REMEDIAL SUM. SCHOOL	ESL	EARLY READING INTERVENTION	VPI (AT-RISK 4 YR. OLDS)	K-3 PRIMARY CLASS SIZE	SOL ALGEBRA READINESS	AT-RISK ADD-ON	ALTERNATIVE EDUCATION	TOTAL FY07 DISTRIBUTION
055	LUNENBURG	0.2399	50.84%	264,029	50,106	28,343	18,784	164,638	289,091	27,846	320,232	42,274	1,205,343
056	MADISON	0.4362	17.54%	56,263	68,989	13,215	4,644	0	89,899	7,892	40,477	8,224	289,603
057	MATHEWS	0.4701	16.69%	38,721	6,331	0	8,730	0	64,721	4,507	23,734	29,115	175,859
058	MECKLENBURG	0.3056	47.80%	526,684	147,338	28,482	43,855	387,892	638,938	74,319	713,970	155,387	2,716,865
059	MIDDLESEX	0.5923	28.82%	47,961	12,766	3,258	5,598	0	70,170	8,055	47,312	22,697	217,817
060	MONTGOMERY	0.3737	26.81%	559,285	160,240	119,771	104,905	514,067	849,064	66,946	445,324	49,650	2,869,252
062	NELSON	0.4874	29.35%	107,930	54,276	20,479	18,298	49,671	133,114	12,943	96,206	20,246	513,163
063	NEW KENT	0.4044	11.03%	60,227	28,220	4,442	19,625	0	0	8,417	27,354	33,944	182,229
065	NORTHAMPTON	0.3925	58.16%	231,665	68,830	66,016	15,013	176,600	265,798	29,091	361,879	31,769	1,246,661
066	NORTHUMBERLAND	0.6517	40.73%	67,244	42,763	12,988	5,738	22,831	102,124	8,795	86,339	20,647	369,469
067	NOTTOWAY	0.2429	44.10%	228,198	91,394	22,585	45,736	233,035	315,202	31,894	325,430	41,907	1,372,232
068	ORANGE	0.4323	22.88%	207,306	100,340	41,732	35,853	0	348,034	27,109	163,233	8,626	932,233
069	PAGE	0.2882	30.99%	251,423	49,561	37,917	56,681	308,352	296,201	38,091	245,598	0	1,283,824
070	PATRICK	0.2592	38.09%	147,111	147,111	73,793	38,649	139,344	285,311	31,307	275,612	18,987	1,238,312
071	PITTSYLVANIA	0.2573	31.72%	715,883	206,851	96,929	99,930	474,140	965,804	96,102	685,318	89,835	3,430,792
072	POWHATAN	0.3722	9.38%	76,406	52,248	20,400	39,649	0	0	12,320	37,147	70,356	308,526
073	PRINCE EDWARD	0.2776	62.80%	384,220	49,406	10,390	15,869	448,827	552,748	52,931	686,494	40,757	2,241,642
074	PRINCE GEORGE	0.2304	20.08%	283,956	66,903	27,877	71,850	372,871	508,328	43,297	216,360	11,870	1,603,312
075	PRINCE WILLIAM	0.4287	18.77%	2,447,418	1,663,870	6,651,725	871,830	58,615	3,069,804	346,086	1,718,526	191,413	17,019,287
077	PULASKI	0.2995	31.69%	360,384	176,338	19,777	75,017	215,614	496,121	49,309	348,855	168,977	1,910,392
078	RAPPAHANNOCK	0.7463	11.08%	9,050	3,449	405	2,787	0	0	1,427	4,546	27,706	49,370
079	RICHMOND	0.3593	32.72%	75,113	31,676	27,304	17,593	51,128	103,081	10,814	84,193	39,111	440,013
080	ROANOKE	0.3757	11.05%	285,979	71,762	153,309	94,285	270,447	423,159	47,457	154,797	33,313	1,534,508
081	ROCKBRIDGE	0.4546	23.98%	109,596	38,200	2,905	19,469	111,916	184,707	13,844	94,064	13,946	588,647
082	ROCKINGHAM	0.3299	21.73%	465,493	322,187	467,255	119,602	668,425	813,117	71,628	389,493	0	3,317,200
083	RUSSELL	0.2292	40.47%	405,725	118,771	821	42,331	276,794	496,545	56,374	506,656	324,286	2,228,303
084	SCOTT	0.1962	38.72%	354,403	180,154	15,843	50,765	0	526,224	54,265	476,585	110,934	1,769,173
085	SHENANDOAH	0.3419	20.29%	246,205	220,706	152,144	59,634	210,066	470,154	36,936	184,336	10,355	1,590,536
086	SMYTH	0.2184	37.18%	482,426	125,265	39,137	49,362	316,314	597,597	66,063	530,346	12,134	2,218,644
087	SOUTHAMPTON	0.2671	33.82%	250,578	140,409	0	28,175	129,503	294,092	35,096	238,978	14,954	1,131,785
088	SPOTSYLVANIA	0.3455	14.94%	732,442	217,071	497,816	225,043	335,759	896,003	104,194	432,093	24,552	3,464,973
089	STAFFORD	0.3503	10.34%	561,325	568,545	575,594	194,568	0	519,035	84,889	257,491	120,124	2,881,571
090	SURRY	0.7842	39.57%	32,630	5,601	0	3,555	18,451	41,905	4,264	35,158	0	141,564
091	SUSSEX	0.2912	61.48%	235,031	99,289	8,307	25,302	0	275,039	25,967	352,274	6,908	1,028,117
092	TAZEWELL	0.2500	40.47%	695,694	162,225	1,998	76,199	572,850	862,776	94,887	788,011	325,073	3,579,713
093	WARREN	0.3956	19.69%	227,683	45,569	75,751	56,982	117,133	342,920	27,468	139,733	0	1,033,239
094	WASHINGTON	0.3351	31.93%	472,870	129,573	22,314	27,386	310,774	706,723	67,421	484,064	46,520	2,267,645
095	WESTMORELAND	0.4076	44.07%	198,546	61,993	59,011	19,520	50,650	202,272	21,703	212,111	33,198	859,004
096	WISE	0.2036	41.64%	711,348	90,888	12,303	76,539	290,527	922,004	96,384	864,018	128,443	3,192,454
097	WYTHE	0.3086	31.20%	330,990	39,880	5,156	56,955	200,990	434,673	40,796	287,382	73,053	1,469,875
098	YORK	0.3749	8.40%	189,762	101,986	80,915	56,643	0	162,156	31,651	88,560	72,089	783,762
101	ALEXANDRIA	0.8000	41.41%	335,749	187,048	431,920	52,477	215,460	410,088	37,071	346,834	13,394	2,030,041
102	BRISTOL	0.3366	44.91%	220,482	48,924	6,714	18,216	0	241,255	31,590	292,106	45,493	904,780
103	BUENA VISTA	0.2172	21.37%	70,105	33,864	2,085	17,196	0	91,989	8,808	47,987	8,010	280,044
104	CHARLOTTEVILLE	0.6061	44.90%	262,861	80,858	111,208	20,551	179,618	314,695	28,809	293,705	0	1,272,305
106	COLONIAL HEIGHTS	0.4565	17.13%	72,177	53,070	55,008	22,386	0	85,655	12,231	53,107	5,873	359,507
107	COVINGTON	0.2918	34.29%	76,754	28,303	755	17,502	100,919	122,063	7,969	72,098	0	426,363
108	DANVILLE	0.2655	54.57%	967,857	425,475	115,813	112,944	498,211	1,339,239	113,685	1,275,040	52,297	4,900,561
109	FALLS CHURCH	0.8000	5.48%	6,754	15,574	31,250	1,810	0	0	1,236	2,435	0	59,059
110	FREDERICKSBURG	0.7538	44.16%	91,500	26,576	44,630	10,923	25,260	124,188	11,189	112,024	2,704	448,994
111	GALAX	0.2944	42.83%	130,058	40,699	137,567	17,438	0	191,462	17,911	154,713	15,487	705,335
112	HAMPTON	0.2410	34.94%	1,784,707	942,189	268,867	227,171	2,119,887	2,692,291	266,625	1,996,615	51,891	10,350,243
113	HARRISONBURG	0.4361	41.90%	309,496	161,467	840,474	71,227	183,211	503,778	39,693	406,295	33,186	2,548,827
114	HOPEWELL	0.2515	52.10%	516,512	93,748	48,644	69,880	354,115	741,183	65,220	724,364	27,811	2,641,477

Direct Aid to Public Education (197)
Total General Fund Distribution by School Division for Selected At-risk/Remedial Accounts (Projected)
Fiscal Year 2008

DIV. NUM.	DIVISION	COMP. INDEX	FREE LUNCH % (Oct. '04)	SOQ PREV., INTERV., & REMEDIATION	REMEDIAL SUM. SCHOOL	ESL	EARLY READING INTERVENTION	VPI (AT-RISK 4 YR. OLDS)	K-3 PRIMARY CLASS SIZE	SOL ALGEBRA READINESS	AT-RISK ADD-ON	ALTERNATIVE EDUCATION	TOTAL FY08 DISTRIBUTION
001	ACCOMACK	0.3255	53.10%	662,182	59,879	356,408	120,387	661,280	975,354	81,721	938,199	41,015	3,896,425
002	ALBEMARLE	0.6095	15.61%	211,826	159,212	342,235	71,842	336,103	350,324	32,954	119,302	0	1,623,798
003	ALLEGHANY	0.2423	29.26%	213,678	58,857	8,016	45,773	142,523	261,959	25,576	190,898	12,327	959,607
004	AMELIA	0.3431	29.79%	126,713	50,487	5,486	28,861	26,210	203,859	16,587	109,022	40,465	607,690
005	AMHERST	0.2870	31.03%	331,574	110,184	3,970	64,608	317,000	386,388	46,177	315,297	31,629	1,606,827
006	APPOMATTOX	0.2696	30.68%	180,682	82,253	1,220	24,067	129,062	248,768	22,650	148,492	20,637	857,831
007	ARLINGTON	0.8000	31.78%	380,358	373,270	951,322	85,652	730,740	450,090	50,031	349,121	0	3,370,584
008	AUGUSTA	0.3320	20.41%	435,836	273,175	126,460	115,558	514,026	769,473	65,811	298,775	105,678	2,704,792
009	BATH	0.8000	20.60%	9,790	4,685	334	1,648	7,980	9,782	1,125	6,865	3,057	45,266
010	BEDFORD	0.3632	22.77%	445,743	266,436	40,421	106,664	362,976	498,930	66,320	319,544	103,452	2,210,486
011	BLAND	0.3059	25.11%	60,826	5,706	0	9,530	11,869	74,397	7,810	42,860	18,029	231,027
012	BOTETOURT	0.3957	11.01%	97,601	33,778	10,767	48,121	96,446	114,079	13,599	37,669	10,100	462,160
013	BRUNSWICK	0.2540	58.09%	400,212	159,129	12,046	32,775	263,636	448,254	46,266	549,626	88,132	2,000,076
014	BUCHANAN	0.3205	57.60%	546,543	75,963	0	70,902	251,755	589,679	59,390	724,889	11,471	2,330,592
015	BUCKINGHAM	0.2591	43.18%	236,183	127,894	2,888	42,723	232,272	233,808	33,445	280,854	43,512	1,233,579
016	CAMPBELL	0.2612	25.48%	506,096	242,006	52,655	121,720	762,220	835,439	74,815	399,287	0	2,994,238
017	CAROLINE	0.3495	31.50%	339,966	62,294	56,503	53,586	111,236	469,807	36,596	261,663	33,259	1,424,910
018	CARROLL	0.2842	38.57%	394,592	123,856	105,618	53,069	391,686	494,546	48,324	413,890	100,641	2,126,222
019	CHARLES CITY	0.4128	33.10%	69,501	8,930	3,923	9,674	40,164	68,083	9,911	56,956	8,864	276,006
020	CHARLOTTE	0.2234	40.14%	191,580	52,346	15,567	25,590	106,239	258,345	30,583	257,027	47,189	984,466
021	CHESTERFIELD	0.3616	16.86%	1,805,948	1,450,188	1,361,416	662,627	1,779,412	2,396,249	281,981	1,024,705	0	10,762,526
022	CLARKE	0.5580	11.00%	36,372	29,066	27,990	7,461	20,155	0	5,096	13,435	7,428	147,003
023	CRAIG	0.3184	19.88%	29,891	35,577	0	9,358	0	62,525	3,835	21,487	10,799	173,472
024	CULPEPER	0.4062	23.87%	385,424	72,727	271,688	73,506	138,771	507,874	51,345	253,510	10,567	1,765,412
025	CUMBERLAND	0.2859	47.27%	184,780	170,814	32,604	15,687	187,237	197,761	22,048	233,290	42,174	1,086,395
026	DICKENSON	0.2344	45.29%	286,101	21,082	0	39,943	30,547	285,990	38,867	385,488	74,127	1,162,145
027	DINWIDDIE	0.2669	29.98%	319,020	126,548	28,573	68,443	188,040	388,521	51,604	303,016	12,270	1,486,035
028	ESSEX	0.4019	37.96%	149,382	43,756	14,653	42,700	64,774	198,802	15,182	141,204	36,580	707,033
029	FAIRFAX	0.7456	14.87%	1,890,032	864,384	7,930,729	959,056	2,578,242	2,203,993	286,874	950,141	54,502	17,717,953
030	FAUQUIER	0.6443	11.72%	148,031	76,751	202,521	64,046	40,550	163,658	21,505	57,348	89,690	864,100
031	FLOYD	0.3212	25.26%	109,460	27,341	30,236	16,775	96,729	164,291	15,276	90,099	11,041	561,248
032	FLUVANNA	0.3749	14.39%	103,973	58,577	5,917	34,329	114,018	64,803	14,067	49,467	10,835	455,986
033	FRANKLIN	0.3950	31.15%	418,176	176,421	85,227	84,725	472,445	574,030	62,927	427,044	10,255	2,311,250
034	FREDERICK	0.3925	13.36%	330,241	0	387,128	188,005	266,632	521,347	50,820	142,025	0	1,886,198
035	GILES	0.2755	24.27%	162,612	37,817	1,210	53,714	0	252,456	20,380	107,922	12,389	648,500
036	GLOUCESTER	0.3323	20.40%	256,425	103,458	10,781	45,836	68,506	412,048	37,654	165,152	81,526	1,181,386
037	GOOCHLAND	0.8000	16.85%	22,392	20,468	6,682	6,590	18,240	39,929	3,376	13,551	12,393	143,621
038	GRAYSON	0.2780	40.75%	212,547	49,853	20,502	27,756	168,731	141,756	28,433	254,902	10,921	915,401
039	GREENE	0.3334	19.72%	128,922	31,507	96,502	31,117	98,790	230,731	16,832	74,861	11,021	720,283
040	GREENSVILLE	0.2199	51.34%	244,228	150,692	9,556	25,705	231,222	305,408	28,579	321,015	94,238	1,410,643
041	HALIFAX	0.2380	47.34%	658,742	250,859	43,277	94,157	651,510	777,192	96,405	966,412	12,749	3,551,303
042	HANOVER	0.4352	9.62%	303,864	239,561	83,023	116,316	193,162	270,578	47,663	102,607	35,997	1,392,771
043	HENRICO	0.4604	22.08%	1,691,482	694,158	1,281,416	537,853	2,435,970	2,220,806	259,519	1,250,210	48,694	10,420,108
044	HENRY	0.2553	39.63%	666,128	139,263	307,255	124,737	865,937	1,070,271	94,316	832,892	54,979	4,155,778
045	HIGHLAND	0.6380	30.79%	9,304	2,827	1,411	994	4,127	5,453	2,037	11,755	4,498	42,406
046	ISLE OF WIGHT	0.3753	27.30%	310,366	97,309	22,957	42,884	249,255	439,886	42,174	247,974	7,049	1,459,854
047	JAMES CITY	0.5499	20.58%	263,356	115,619	66,413	119,885	177,024	440,441	40,515	180,242	41,388	1,444,883
048	KING GEORGE	0.4034	17.36%	145,077	35,309	31,226	44,232	30,606	267,808	18,501	72,203	10,018	654,980
049	KING QUEEN	0.4073	52.76%	82,206	33,617	4,950	11,392	141,892	71,699	13,338	129,387	32,788	521,269
050	KING WILLIAM	0.3267	22.70%	100,987	48,981	1,125	24,035	115,134	165,116	15,152	72,185	83,365	626,080
051	LANCASTER	0.6844	41.78%	63,951	13,749	527	6,066	73,756	83,947	8,011	74,175	5,292	329,474
052	LEE	0.1769	54.33%	552,296	1,691	19,707	61,024	0	605,649	69,461	866,468	140,701	2,316,997
053	LOUDOUN	0.6895	8.89%	443,409	0	1,513,699	227,554	376,978	361,151	67,145	145,470	0	3,135,406
054	LOUISA	0.5542	30.57%	193,820	73,839	13,404	39,172	203,285	280,397	30,096	179,222	55,913	1,069,148

Direct Aid to Public Education (197)
Total General Fund Distribution by School Division for Selected At-risk/Remedial Accounts (Projected)
Fiscal Year 2008

DIV. NUM.	DIVISION	COMP. INDEX	FREE LUNCH % (Oct. '04)	SOQ PREV., INTERV., & REMEDIATION	REMEDIAL SUM. SCHOOL	ESL	EARLY READING INTERVENTION	VPI (AT-RISK 4 YR. OLDS)	K-3 PRIMARY CLASS SIZE	SOL ALGEBRA READINESS	AT-RISK ADD-ON	ALTERNATIVE EDUCATION	TOTAL FY08 DISTRIBUTION
055	LUNENBURG	0.2399	50.84%	252,795	49,984	38,937	25,046	160,305	286,495	27,846	312,229	46,061	1,199,698
056	MADISON	0.4362	17.54%	55,987	68,821	20,719	7,741	12,855	90,794	7,892	33,804	8,995	307,608
057	MATHEWS	0.4701	16.69%	39,183	6,316	0	11,640	0	66,988	5,962	19,930	31,738	181,757
058	MECKLENBURG	0.3056	47.80%	519,233	154,115	29,771	61,016	490,802	640,272	74,319	707,663	168,943	2,846,134
059	MIDDLESEX	0.5923	28.82%	48,748	12,735	3,859	7,833	13,943	72,854	8,055	44,818	24,733	237,582
060	MONTGOMERY	0.3737	26.81%	563,737	159,851	140,536	147,899	571,186	866,797	66,946	413,034	53,906	2,983,892
062	NELSON	0.4874	29.35%	108,749	65,942	24,260	23,928	52,593	136,322	12,943	90,789	22,099	537,625
063	NEW KENT	0.4044	11.03%	61,784	28,151	8,954	27,803	20,370	0	20,518	36,944	212,941	36,944
065	NORTHAMPTON	0.3925	58.16%	241,640	68,663	72,387	20,018	190,451	266,333	29,091	388,547	34,729	1,311,859
066	NORTHUMBERLAND	0.6517	40.73%	70,876	48,242	25,017	7,651	85,368	106,578	8,795	89,461	22,578	464,566
067	NOTTOWAY	0.2429	44.10%	254,252	91,172	48,900	68,604	233,035	309,436	31,894	310,873	45,663	1,393,829
068	ORANGE	0.4323	22.88%	217,392	107,329	73,650	54,560	0	371,814	28,744	152,397	9,408	1,015,294
069	PAGE	0.2882	30.99%	255,572	49,441	59,846	78,181	312,409	300,636	38,091	236,136	0	1,330,312
070	PATRICK	0.2592	38.09%	227,987	154,670	101,882	61,025	152,012	288,589	31,307	268,737	20,657	1,306,866
071	PITTSYLVANIA	0.2573	31.72%	723,462	206,349	111,241	136,638	546,107	984,709	96,102	656,965	76,348	3,537,921
072	POWHATAN	0.3722	9.38%	74,727	52,121	40,549	58,612	14,314	0	12,320	26,083	76,668	355,394
073	PRINCE EDWARD	0.2776	62.80%	385,409	49,286	12,469	21,820	452,945	558,178	52,931	713,332	44,341	2,290,711
074	PRINCE GEORGE	0.2304	20.08%	282,474	66,740	42,851	92,983	412,352	517,866	43,297	186,589	12,906	1,658,058
075	PRINCE WILLIAM	0.4287	18.77%	2,541,648	1,774,181	8,419,516	1,268,116	2,373,923	3,428,661	360,205	1,521,241	207,537	21,895,028
077	PULASKI	0.2995	31.69%	362,095	218,232	21,062	100,022	207,628	506,173	49,309	332,379	183,510	1,980,410
078	RAPPAHANNOCK	0.7463	11.08%	9,416	3,441	989	4,180	0	0	1,427	3,461	30,218	53,132
079	RICHMOND	0.3593	32.72%	75,436	31,599	28,539	24,630	54,780	104,814	10,814	80,439	42,601	453,652
080	ROANOKE	0.3757	11.05%	287,159	71,588	192,228	128,570	427,021	431,785	47,457	114,014	36,134	1,735,956
081	ROCKBRIDGE	0.4546	23.98%	106,909	44,832	3,644	25,459	115,025	184,228	13,844	82,645	15,173	591,759
082	ROCKINGHAM	0.3299	21.73%	475,575	321,405	552,578	158,242	668,425	840,617	71,628	350,821	0	3,439,291
083	RUSSELL	0.2292	40.47%	407,431	118,483	858	61,380	276,794	506,310	56,374	500,530	352,694	2,280,854
084	SCOTT	0.1962	38.72%	383,763	179,717	20,588	179,717	5,582	544,889	54,265	478,721	121,107	1,842,675
085	SHENANDOAH	0.3419	20.29%	249,354	220,170	234,149	84,933	255,080	484,130	36,936	162,097	11,252	1,738,101
086	SMYTH	0.2184	37.18%	483,507	124,961	53,094	66,532	320,769	606,724	66,063	520,971	13,197	2,255,818
087	SOUTHAMPTON	0.2671	33.82%	251,149	144,285	0	44,274	129,503	298,167	35,096	229,521	16,279	1,148,274
088	SPOTSYLVANIA	0.3455	14.94%	765,577	236,451	674,720	318,557	589,443	930,058	107,662	360,202	27,118	4,009,788
089	STAFFORD	0.3503	10.34%	589,730	522,304	848,797	279,663	0	536,709	86,139	191,165	132,473	3,186,980
090	SURRY	0.7842	39.57%	31,085	5,588	0	5,333	17,221	40,849	4,264	33,106	0	137,446
091	SUSSEX	0.2912	61.48%	242,341	108,661	8,683	36,980	8,080	277,960	25,967	375,440	7,550	1,091,662
092	TAZEWELL	0.2500	40.47%	694,518	135,014	3,341	102,971	577,125	870,176	92,828	774,853	352,411	3,603,237
093	WARREN	0.3956	19.69%	234,103	45,459	91,375	78,219	203,260	352,641	27,873	123,920	0	1,156,850
094	WASHINGTON	0.3351	31.93%	474,959	130,352	34,800	38,341	318,354	719,182	67,421	461,708	50,419	2,295,536
095	WESTMORELAND	0.4076	44.07%	189,478	65,495	66,629	27,653	270,134	198,201	21,703	202,628	36,411	1,078,332
096	WISE	0.2036	41.64%	719,325	90,668	12,860	102,781	567,435	941,619	96,384	863,372	139,243	3,533,687
097	WYTHE	0.3086	31.20%	334,342	39,783	10,394	68,347	208,872	443,124	42,787	274,388	79,331	1,501,368
098	YORK	0.3749	8.40%	189,453	101,739	84,578	77,241	3,563	164,274	31,651	59,008	78,319	789,826
101	ALEXANDRIA	0.8000	41.41%	327,440	201,596	451,611	69,366	901,740	433,372	36,468	334,246	14,491	2,770,330
102	BRISTOL	0.3366	44.91%	220,118	53,168	7,018	23,681	181,506	275,448	29,769	289,108	49,374	1,129,190
103	BUENA VISTA	0.2172	21.37%	74,582	33,782	2,179	23,644	0	97,579	8,808	44,171	8,716	293,461
104	CHARLOTTESVILLE	0.6061	44.90%	257,025	66,214	139,928	27,040	314,332	312,920	28,809	286,687	0	1,432,955
106	COLONIAL HEIGHTS	0.4565	17.13%	72,873	66,790	57,498	28,356	99,134	87,568	12,231	44,587	6,369	475,406
107	COVINGTON	0.2918	34.29%	79,034	38,130	789	23,336	104,955	127,603	9,913	71,522	0	455,282
108	DANVILLE	0.2655	54.57%	932,426	431,990	124,327	155,298	477,278	1,312,165	109,553	1,254,224	78,387	4,875,648
109	FALLS CHURCH	0.8000	5.48%	6,762	15,536	32,674	2,413	6,840	0	1,236	1,375	0	66,836
110	FREDERICKSBURG	0.7538	44.16%	93,232	26,511	53,233	15,238	43,504	128,018	11,354	113,746	2,979	487,815
111	GALAX	0.2944	42.83%	127,879	40,600	162,259	23,250	68,373	192,292	17,911	150,846	16,751	800,161
112	HAMPTON	0.2410	34.94%	1,760,472	1,007,595	293,292	327,210	2,119,887	2,696,483	262,354	1,896,768	56,360	10,420,421
113	HARRISONBURG	0.4361	41.90%	316,655	162,002	950,730	97,550	494,991	522,934	39,693	411,005	26,178	3,021,738
114	HOPEWELL	0.2515	52.10%	512,621	93,521	58,764	98,655	358,382	749,252	65,220	730,413	30,180	2,697,008

