

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

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

For reporting on
School Year 2008-09

NORTH CAROLINA



PART I DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 18, 2009
PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 12, 2010

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202

INTRODUCTION

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

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

The *NCLB* Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2008-09 consists of two Parts, Part I and Part II.

PART I

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

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

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

PART II

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

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

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 2008-09 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, December 18, 2009**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 12, 2010**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2008-09, unless otherwise noted.

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

TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

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

Initially, a state user will log onto EDEN and be provided with an option that takes him or her to the "SY 2008-09 CSPR". The main CSPR screen will allow the user to select the section of the CSPR that he or she needs to either view or enter data. After selecting a section of the CSPR, the user will be presented with a screen or set of screens where the user can input the data for that section of the CSPR. A user can only select one section of the CSPR at a time. After a state has included all available data in the designated sections of a particular CSPR Part, a lead state user will certify that Part and transmit it to the Department. Once a Part has been transmitted, ED will have access to the data. States may still make changes or additions to the transmitted data, by creating an updated version of the CSPR. Detailed instructions for transmitting the SY 2008-09 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

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

		OMB Number: 1810-0614
		Expiration Date: 10/31/2010
<p>Consolidated State Performance Report For State Formula Grant Programs under the Elementary And Secondary Education Act as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001</p>		
Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2008-09 <input type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2008-09		
Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report: NC Department of Public Instruction		
Address: 6301 Mail Service Center Raleigh, NC 27699-6301		
Person to contact about this report:		
Name: Karl R. Pond		
Telephone: 919-807-3241		
Fax: 919-807-4300		
e-mail: kpond@dpi.state.nc.us		
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): June St. Clair Atkinson		
		Friday, March 12, 2010, 11:41:31 AM
Signature		Date

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART I**

For reporting on
School Year 2008-09



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 18, 2009
5PM EST**

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT**STANDARDS OF ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT**

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

1.1.1 Academic Content Standards

In the space below, provide a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Responses should focus on actions taken or planned since the State's content standards were approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. Indicate specifically in what school year your State expects the changes to be implemented.

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

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

The State is continuing to administer assessments aligned to the current State Board of Education adopted content standards in mathematics, English language arts, and science. However, the State is in the process of adopting new content standards in all content areas. In September 2009, the North Carolina State Board of Education (SBE) adopted new content standards for mathematics and grade 10 English language arts. The SBE will adopt new content standards for science in spring 2010 and for the other grades in English language arts in June 2010. The new content standards will be implemented on the same timeline as the implementation of new assessments aligned to these standards. In 2011-12, schools will begin teaching these content standards and students will be administered new assessments in mathematics (Algebra I and grades 3-8), English Grade 10, and biology. Likewise, in 2012-13 teachers will begin teaching content standards and students will be administered new assessments in ELA grades 3-8 and grades 5 and 8 science. Until the new assessments are implemented, the State will continue to administer assessments aligned to the current content standards.

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

1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts

In the space below, provide a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's assessments and/or academic achievement standards in mathematics or reading/language arts required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA. Responses should focus on actions taken or planned since the State's assessment system was approved through ED's peer review process. Responses also should indicate specifically in what school year your State expects the changes to be implemented.

As applicable, include any assessment (e.g., alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards, alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards, native language assessments, or others) implemented to meet the assessment requirements under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA as well as alternate achievement standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities and modified academic achievement standards for certain students with disabilities implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA. Indicate specifically in what year your state expects the changes to be implemented.

If the State has not made or is not planning to make revisions or changes, respond "No revisions or changes to assessments and/or academic achievement standards taken or planned."

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The State is planning to develop new assessments for the newly adopted mathematics content standards. These assessments, general and alternates, will be operational in 2011-12. The alternate assessments will include an extended content standards assessment and a modified achievement standards assessment.

Assessments for the newly adopted grade 10 English content standards will be operational in 2011-12. In addition to a general assessment, there will also be an extended content standards assessment and a modified achievement standards assessment.

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

1.1.4 Assessments in Science

If your State's assessments and academic achievement standards in science required under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* have been approved through ED's peer review process, provide in the space below a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's assessments and/or academic achievement standards in science required under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*. Responses should focus on actions taken or planned since the State's assessment system was approved through ED's peer review process. Responses also should indicate specifically in what school year your State expects the changes to be implemented.

As applicable, include any assessment (e.g., alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards, alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards, native language assessments, or others) implemented to meet the assessment requirements under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* as well as alternate achievement standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities and modified academic achievement standards for certain students with disabilities implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*.

If the State has not made or is not planning to make revisions or changes, respond "No revisions or changes to assessments and/or academic achievement standards taken or planned."

If the State's assessments in science required under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* have not been approved through ED's peer review process, respond "State's assessments and academic achievement standards in science not yet approved."

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

The State plans to adopt K-12 science standards in spring 2010. The State will develop biology assessments (administered in high school), general and alternates, for implementation in 2011-12. The State will develop physical science (also administered in high school), grade 5, and grade 8 assessments, general and alternates, for implementation in 2012-13. The alternate assessments will include an extended content standards assessment and a modified achievement standards assessment. Until the new assessments are implemented, the State will continue to administer assessments, both general and alternates, in biology, physical science, grade 5, and grade 8.

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

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

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

1.2.1 Participation of all Students in Mathematics Assessment

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

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	754,965	748,660	99.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	10,890	10,707	98.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	18,301	18,203	99.5
Black, non-Hispanic	206,974	204,123	98.6
Hispanic	76,115	75,494	99.2
White, non-Hispanic	414,808	412,431	99.4
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	94,913	92,112	97.0
Limited English proficient (<i>LEP</i>) students	50,405	49,952	99.1
Economically disadvantaged students	356,008	352,349	99.0
Migratory students	609	602	98.8
Male	385,260	381,432	99.0
Female	369,705	367,228	99.3
Comments:			

Source – The table above is produced through *EDFacts*. The SEA submits the data in file N/X081 that includes data group 588, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F, and subtotal 1. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Mathematics Assessment

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	19,494	21.2
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	48,653	52.8
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	253	0.3
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	17,815	19.3
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	5,897	6.4
Total	92,112	
Comments: These numbers come from 2 different files. There is only a difference of 10 students.		

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	757,012	752,259	99.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	10,903	10,806	99.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	18,209	18,117	99.5
Black, non-Hispanic	207,428	205,309	99.0
Hispanic	75,926	75,407	99.3
White, non-Hispanic	416,566	414,777	99.6
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	94,984	92,325	97.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	49,781	49,359	99.2
Economically disadvantaged students	356,006	353,117	99.2
Migratory students	598	590	98.7
Male	386,233	383,350	99.2
Female	370,779	368,909	99.5
Comments: These numbers come from 2 different files.			

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

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

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	19,908	21.6
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	46,305	50.2
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	321	0.4
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	19,898	21.6
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	5,893	6.4
Total	92,325	
Comments: These numbers come from 2 different files. There is only a difference of 33 students		

1.2.5 Participation of All Students in the Science Assessment

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	218,517	217,800	99.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	3,194	3,179	99.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	5,236	5,221	99.7
Black, non-Hispanic	60,072	59,788	99.5
Hispanic	21,736	21,632	99.5
White, non-Hispanic	120,455	120,194	99.8
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	28,540	28,325	99.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	13,611	13,534	99.4
Economically disadvantaged students	103,383	102,940	99.6
Migratory students	149	148	99.3
Male	112,028	111,597	99.6
Female	106,489	106,203	99.7
Comments: These numbers come from 2 different files.			

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

1.2.6 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Science Assessment

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	7,602	22.5
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	16,596	49.2
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	101	0.3
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	6,495	19.3
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	2,919	8.7
Total	33,713	
Comments: These numbers come from 2 different files.		

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

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

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

1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics

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

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

1.3.1.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	115,610	94,087	81.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,748	1,296	74.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,846	2,623	92.2
Black, non-Hispanic	30,687	20,289	66.1
Hispanic	13,772	10,488	76.2
White, non-Hispanic	61,382	55,198	89.9
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	14,861	8,818	59.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	11,045	7,945	71.9
Economically disadvantaged students	58,781	42,463	72.2
Migratory students	116	79	68.1
Male	59,026	47,867	81.1
Female	56,584	46,220	81.7

Comments: Retest scores (first retest only) for students who scored below the Achievement Level III standard on EOG reading and mathematics assessments in grades 3 through 8 and science in grades 5 and 8 were used in calculations of AYP and the ABCs performance composites. Students in grades 3-8 who scored Achievement Level II on the first administration of the EOG reading, mathematics and/or science assessments and/or their alternate assessments were required to take a retest. (Students who scored Level I could "opt in" to take the retest at their parents' request.) The higher of the original score or the first retest score was used in the calculation of the ABCs performance composites and AYP.

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

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

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	115,474	75,718	65.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,747	937	53.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,803	2,147	76.6
Black, non-Hispanic	30,671	14,518	47.3
Hispanic	13,707	6,437	47.0
White, non-Hispanic	61,371	48,205	78.6
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	14,854	5,762	38.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	10,918	4,033	36.9
Economically disadvantaged students	58,696	29,842	50.8
Migratory students	116	41	35.3
Male	58,947	37,077	62.9
Female	56,527	38,641	68.4

Comments: Retest scores (first retest only) for students who scored below the Achievement Level III standard on EOG reading and mathematics assessments in grades 3 through 8 and science in grades 5 and 8 were used in calculations of AYP and the ABCs performance composites. Students in grades 3-8 who scored Achievement Level II on the first administration of the EOG reading, mathematics and/or science assessments and/or their alternate assessments were required to take a retest. (Students who scored Level I could "opt in" to take the retest at their parents' request.) The higher of the original score or the first retest score was used in the calculation of the ABCs performance composites and AYP.

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: We only test science in grades 5 and 8.			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

1.3.1.2 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	112,032	91,389	81.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,657	1,244	75.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,663	2,403	90.2
Black, non-Hispanic	29,940	19,809	66.2
Hispanic	12,490	9,722	77.8
White, non-Hispanic	60,488	54,222	89.6
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	15,333	8,754	57.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	7,801	5,412	69.4
Economically disadvantaged students	56,138	40,581	72.3
Migratory students	104	82	78.8
Male	57,202	46,277	80.9
Female	54,830	45,112	82.3

Comments: Retest scores (first retest only) for students who scored below the Achievement Level III standard on EOG reading and mathematics assessments in grades 3 through 8 and science in grades 5 and 8 were used in calculations of AYP and the ABCs performance composites. Students in grades 3-8 who scored Achievement Level II on the first administration of the EOG reading, mathematics and/or science assessments and/or their alternate assessments were required to take a retest. (Students who scored Level I could "opt in" to take the retest at their parents' request.) The higher of the original score or the first retest score was used in the calculation of the ABCs performance composites and AYP.

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

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

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	111,892	77,354	69.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,657	949	57.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,603	2,044	78.5
Black, non-Hispanic	29,934	15,384	51.4
Hispanic	12,418	6,745	54.3
White, non-Hispanic	60,487	48,797	80.7
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	15,334	6,079	39.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	7,657	2,968	38.8
Economically disadvantaged students	56,055	31,017	55.3
Migratory students	103	47	45.6
Male	57,127	38,009	66.5
Female	54,765	39,345	71.8

Comments: Retest scores (first retest only) for students who scored below the Achievement Level III standard on EOG reading and mathematics assessments in grades 3 through 8 and science in grades 5 and 8 were used in calculations of AYP and the ABCs performance composites. Students in grades 3-8 who scored Achievement Level II on the first administration of the EOG reading, mathematics and/or science assessments and/or their alternate assessments were required to take a retest. (Students who scored Level I could "opt in" to take the retest at their parents' request.) The higher of the original score or the first retest score was used in the calculation of the ABCs performance composites and AYP.

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: We only test science in grades 5 and 8.			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

1.3.1.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	109,966	88,168	80.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,641	1,171	71.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,703	2,450	90.6
Black, non-Hispanic	29,184	18,956	65.0
Hispanic	11,703	8,794	75.1
White, non-Hispanic	60,363	53,233	88.2
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	14,697	8,057	54.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	7,257	4,842	66.7
Economically disadvantaged students	54,070	38,047	70.4
Migratory students	74	47	63.5
Male	56,145	44,794	79.8
Female	53,821	43,374	80.6

Comments: Retest scores (first retest only) for students who scored below the Achievement Level III standard on EOG reading and mathematics assessments in grades 3 through 8 and science in grades 5 and 8 were used in calculations of AYP and the ABCs performance composites. Students in grades 3-8 who scored Achievement Level II on the first administration of the EOG reading, mathematics and/or science assessments and/or their alternate assessments were required to take a retest. (Students who scored Level I could "opt in" to take the retest at their parents' request.) The higher of the original score or the first retest score was used in the calculation of the ABCs performance composites and AYP.

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

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

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	109,854	75,260	68.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,641	911	55.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,662	2,041	76.7
Black, non-Hispanic	29,176	14,782	50.7
Hispanic	11,645	6,126	52.6
White, non-Hispanic	60,358	48,340	80.1
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	14,702	5,777	39.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	7,137	2,603	36.5
Economically disadvantaged students	54,008	29,154	54.0
Migratory students	73	22	30.1
Male	56,089	36,996	66.0
Female	53,765	38,264	71.2

Comments: Retest scores (first retest only) for students who scored below the Achievement Level III standard on EOG reading and mathematics assessments in grades 3 through 8 and science in grades 5 and 8 were used in calculations of AYP and the ABCs performance composites. Students in grades 3-8 who scored Achievement Level II on the first administration of the EOG reading, mathematics and/or science assessments and/or their alternate assessments were required to take a retest. (Students who scored Level I could "opt in" to take the retest at their parents' request.) The higher of the original score or the first retest score was used in the calculation of the ABCs performance composites and AYP.

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	109,887	67,141	61.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,641	741	45.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,702	1,987	73.5
Black, non-Hispanic	29,149	10,818	37.1
Hispanic	11,697	5,231	44.7
White, non-Hispanic	60,332	45,645	75.7
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	14,666	6,031	41.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	7,251	2,338	32.2
Economically disadvantaged students	54,019	24,241	44.9
Migratory students	74	23	31.1
Male	56,097	36,527	65.1
Female	53,790	30,614	56.9
Comments: Retest scores (first retest only) for students who scored below the Achievement Level III standard on EOG reading and mathematics assessments in grades 3 through 8 and science in grades 5 and 8 were used in calculations of AYP and the ABCs performance composites. Students in grades 3-8 who scored Achievement Level II on the first administration of the EOG reading, mathematics and/or science assessments and/or their alternate assessments were required to take a retest. (Students who scored Level I could "opt in" to take the retest at their parents' request.) The higher of the original score or the first retest score was used in the calculation of the ABCs performance composites and AYP.			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

1.3.1.4 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	107,802	84,265	78.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,525	1,052	69.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,682	2,436	90.8
Black, non-Hispanic	29,624	18,227	61.5
Hispanic	10,809	7,706	71.3
White, non-Hispanic	59,097	51,634	87.4
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	13,762	7,253	52.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	7,418	4,722	63.7
Economically disadvantaged students	51,854	34,759	67.0
Migratory students	102	69	67.6
Male	55,115	42,298	76.7
Female	52,687	41,967	79.6
Comments: Retest scores (first retest only) for students who scored below the Achievement Level III standard on EOG reading and mathematics assessments in grades 3 through 8 and science in grades 5 and 8 were used in calculations of AYP and the ABCs performance composites. Students in grades 3-8 who scored Achievement Level II on the first administration of the EOG reading, mathematics and/or science assessments and/or their alternate assessments were required to take a retest. (Students who scored Level I could "opt in" to take the retest at their parents' request.) The higher of the original score or the first retest score was used in the calculation of the ABCs performance composites and AYP.			

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

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

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	107,716	76,496	71.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,525	878	57.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,649	2,163	81.6
Black, non-Hispanic	29,614	15,823	53.4
Hispanic	10,757	6,194	57.6
White, non-Hispanic	59,106	48,453	82.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	13,770	5,338	38.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	7,321	3,235	44.2
Economically disadvantaged students	51,792	29,543	57.0
Migratory students	96	45	46.9
Male	55,074	37,276	67.7
Female	52,642	39,220	74.5
Comments: Retest scores (first retest only) for students who scored below the Achievement Level III standard on EOG reading and mathematics assessments in grades 3 through 8 and science in grades 5 and 8 were used in calculations of AYP and the ABCs performance composites. Students in grades 3-8 who scored Achievement Level II on the first administration of the EOG reading, mathematics and/or science assessments and/or their alternate assessments were required to take a retest. (Students who scored Level I could "opt in" to take the retest at their parents' request.) The higher of the original score or the first retest score was used in the calculation of the ABCs performance composites and AYP.			

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: We only test science in grades 5 and 8.			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

1.3.1.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	106,200	83,478	78.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,580	1,092	69.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,612	2,368	90.7
Black, non-Hispanic	29,223	18,463	63.2
Hispanic	10,445	7,559	72.4
White, non-Hispanic	58,683	51,075	87.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	13,048	6,698	51.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,743	4,316	64.0
Economically disadvantaged students	49,692	33,722	67.9
Migratory students	96	59	61.5
Male	54,287	41,731	76.9
Female	51,913	41,747	80.4

Comments: Retest scores (first retest only) for students who scored below the Achievement Level III standard on EOG reading and mathematics assessments in grades 3 through 8 and science in grades 5 and 8 were used in calculations of AYP and the ABCs performance composites. Students in grades 3-8 who scored Achievement Level II on the first administration of the EOG reading, mathematics and/or science assessments and/or their alternate assessments were required to take a retest. (Students who scored Level I could "opt in" to take the retest at their parents' request.) The higher of the original score or the first retest score was used in the calculation of the ABCs performance composites and AYP.

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

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

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	106,107	69,044	65.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,580	759	48.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,570	1,974	76.8
Black, non-Hispanic	29,239	13,327	45.6
Hispanic	10,381	5,315	51.2
White, non-Hispanic	58,682	45,153	77.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	13,057	4,614	35.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,621	2,363	35.7
Economically disadvantaged students	49,642	24,590	49.5
Migratory students	96	36	37.5
Male	54,250	34,116	62.9
Female	51,857	34,928	67.4

Comments: Retest scores (first retest only) for students who scored below the Achievement Level III standard on EOG reading and mathematics assessments in grades 3 through 8 and science in grades 5 and 8 were used in calculations of AYP and the ABCs performance composites. Students in grades 3-8 who scored Achievement Level II on the first administration of the EOG reading, mathematics and/or science assessments and/or their alternate assessments were required to take a retest. (Students who scored Level I could "opt in" to take the retest at their parents' request.) The higher of the original score or the first retest score was used in the calculation of the ABCs performance composites and AYP.

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: We only test science in grades 5 and 8.			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

1.3.1.6 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	107,180	86,465	80.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,524	1,026	67.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,508	2,311	92.2
Black, non-Hispanic	30,328	20,146	66.4
Hispanic	9,902	7,467	75.4
White, non-Hispanic	59,503	52,746	88.6
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	12,975	6,922	53.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,272	4,160	66.3
Economically disadvantaged students	48,576	34,125	70.2
Migratory students	74	49	66.2
Male	55,012	43,220	78.6
Female	52,168	43,245	82.9

Comments: Retest scores (first retest only) for students who scored below the Achievement Level III standard on EOG reading and mathematics assessments in grades 3 through 8 and science in grades 5 and 8 were used in calculations of AYP and the ABCs performance composites. Students in grades 3-8 who scored Achievement Level II on the first administration of the EOG reading, mathematics and/or science assessments and/or their alternate assessments were required to take a retest. (Students who scored Level I could "opt in" to take the retest at their parents' request.) The higher of the original score or the first retest score was used in the calculation of the ABCs performance composites and AYP.

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

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

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	107,060	71,479	66.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,524	716	47.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,468	1,833	74.3
Black, non-Hispanic	30,321	14,233	46.9
Hispanic	9,824	5,040	51.3
White, non-Hispanic	59,509	47,265	79.4
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	12,974	4,590	35.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,145	1,985	32.3
Economically disadvantaged students	48,497	24,571	50.7
Migratory students	71	23	32.4
Male	54,965	35,244	64.1
Female	52,095	36,235	69.6

Comments: Retest scores (first retest only) for students who scored below the Achievement Level III standard on EOG reading and mathematics assessments in grades 3 through 8 and science in grades 5 and 8 were used in calculations of AYP and the ABCs performance composites. Students in grades 3-8 who scored Achievement Level II on the first administration of the EOG reading, mathematics and/or science assessments and/or their alternate assessments were required to take a retest. (Students who scored Level I could "opt in" to take the retest at their parents' request.) The higher of the original score or the first retest score was used in the calculation of the ABCs performance composites and AYP.

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.3.6 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	107,060	72,679	67.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,523	703	46.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,504	1,990	79.5
Black, non-Hispanic	30,269	13,423	44.4
Hispanic	9,883	5,428	54.9
White, non-Hispanic	59,473	48,751	82.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	12,945	5,595	43.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,259	2,606	41.6
Economically disadvantaged students	48,504	25,128	51.8
Migratory students	73	33	45.2
Male	54,943	37,971	69.1
Female	52,117	34,708	66.6
<p>Comments: Retest scores (first retest only) for students who scored below the Achievement Level III standard on EOG reading and mathematics assessments in grades 3 through 8 and science in grades 5 and 8 were used in calculations of AYP and the ABCs performance composites. Students in grades 3-8 who scored Achievement Level II on the first administration of the EOG reading, mathematics and/or science assessments and/or their alternate assessments were required to take a retest. (Students who scored Level I could "opt in" to take the retest at their parents' request.) The higher of the original score or the first retest score was used in the calculation of the ABCs performance composites and AYP.</p>			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

1.3.1.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - High School

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	89,870	65,706	73.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,032	664	64.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,189	1,864	85.2
Black, non-Hispanic	25,137	13,921	55.4
Hispanic	6,373	4,165	65.4
White, non-Hispanic	52,915	43,397	82.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	7,436	3,166	42.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,416	1,821	53.3
Economically disadvantaged students	33,238	19,966	60.1
Migratory students	36	15	41.7
Male	44,645	32,585	73.0
Female	45,225	33,121	73.2
Comments: These numbers come from two different files.			

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

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

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	94,156	62,164	66.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,132	546	48.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,362	1,752	74.2
Black, non-Hispanic	26,354	12,827	48.7
Hispanic	6,675	3,373	50.5
White, non-Hispanic	55,264	41,986	76.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	7,634	1,948	25.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,560	1,020	28.6
Economically disadvantaged students	34,427	16,841	48.9
Migratory students	35	10	28.6
Male	46,898	28,219	60.2
Female	47,258	33,945	71.8
Comments: These numbers come from two different files.			

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Science - High School

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	853	395	46.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	15	5	33.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	15	4	26.7
Black, non-Hispanic	370	179	48.4
Hispanic	52	17	32.7
White, non-Hispanic	389	182	46.8
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	714	338	47.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	24	4	16.7
Economically disadvantaged students	417	214	51.3
Migratory students	1	0	0.0
Male	557	257	46.1
Female	296	138	46.6
Comments: Our data is better this year than in previous years.			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY

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

1.4.1 All Schools and Districts Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public elementary and secondary schools and districts in the State, including charters, and the total number of those schools and districts that made AYP based on data for the SY 2008-09. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2008-09	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2008-09
Schools	2,515	1,787	71.0
Districts	115	12	10.4
Comments: We used retest to count for AYP which increased the number of schools meeting AYP.			

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

1.4.2 Title I School Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public Title I schools by type and the total number of those schools that made AYP based on data for the SY 2008-09 school year. Include only public Title I schools. Do not include Title I programs operated by local educational agencies in private schools. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2008-09	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2008-09
All Title I schools	1,133	894	78.9
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	980	758	77.4
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	153	136	88.9
Comments: We allowed retest 1 scores for AYP purposes.			

Source – The table above is produced through *EDFacts*. The SEA submits the data in N/X129 for data group 22 and N/X103 for data group 32.

1.4.3 Accountability of Districts That Received Title I Funds

In the table below, provide the total number of districts that received Title I funds and the total number of those districts that made AYP based on data for SY 2008-09. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2008-09	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2008-09
180	12	6.7
Comments:		

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk.

Note: DG 582 is not collected from the SEA, rather it comes from the Title I funding data.

1.4.4 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

1.4.4.1 List of Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

In the following table, provide a list of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 for the SY 2009-10 based on the data from SY 2008-09. For each school on the list, provide the following:

- District Name
- District NCES ID Code
- School Name
- School NCES ID Code
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the school met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY <> (Use one of the following improvement status designations: School Improvement û Year 1, School Improvement û Year 2, Corrective Action, Restructuring Year 1 (planning), or Restructuring Year 2 (implementing)¹)
- Whether (yes or no) the school is or is not a Title I school (*This column **must be completed** by States that choose to list all schools in improvement. Column is optional for States that list only Title I schools.*)
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003(a).
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003 (g).

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter school data.

Download template: [Question 1.4.4.1 \(Get MS Excel Viewer\)](#)

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

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

1.4.4.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for schools in corrective action, provide the number of schools for which the listed corrective actions under *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2008-09 (based on SY 2007-08 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2008-09
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	6
Extension of the school year or school day	22
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	7
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	36
Replacement of the principal	0
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	23
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	31
Comments:	

1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2

In the table below, for schools in restructuring – year 2 (implementation year), provide the number of schools for which the listed restructuring actions under *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2008-09 (based on SY 2007-08 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Restructuring Action	# of Title I Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	13
Reopening the school as a public charter school	0
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	0
Take over the school by the State	0
Other major restructuring of the school governance	35
Comments:	

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Learning Communities: Teachers focus on students with disabilities in mathematics to promote a continuum of learning for grades K-5. An effective cycle of curriculum/instruction/assessment was created along with developmentally appropriate practices that are age, individually and culturally appropriate. Grade configurations were restructured to K-1, 2-3, 4-5, with an Academy Leader (from the LEA) assigned to each configuration. The Academy Leader leads efforts in the curriculum/instruction/assessment cycle, models teaching strategies, provides coaching and co-teaching; and facilitates accountability data discussion. These leaders are an integral part of the individualized support needed by teachers to effect instructional change. To support this program, a parent engagement model has been incorporated around the Teaching the Whole Child philosophy. Attention to the cognitive, social/emotional and physical domains of child development have been targeted. Parent Academies encourage parents to become a positive force in this development as they provide training to assist parents in working with each child.

Academy Leaders /Instructional Teams - The restructuring plan establishes instructional teams within the school setting across grade levels/subject areas. The instructional team conferences on a daily/weekly schedule with a configuration that includes the Teacher (T), Grade Level Teacher Teams (GLTT), Instructional Facilitator (IF), Principal (P), and Director (D). Weekly meetings take place using various support personnel and interview protocols. The protocols to be used are aligned with the Student Growth Indicator.

Total Quality Teaching and Learning (TQL) - Model is used to administer the revised school improvement and restructuring plans that focus on Professional Learning Communities. Teams implement and monitor initiatives (validated best practices) needed to meet academic standards for all subgroups. Efforts focus on teaching and learning, as well as leadership development.

Magnet Schools Assistance Program (MSAP) - A restructuring governance arrangement implementing a magnet school for math and science. The plan includes a clearly defined management protocol, activities aligned to state and national standards, enhanced math and science instructional strategies and professional development geared toward magnet curricula.

Middle School Turnaround Model - A governance arrangement that makes fundamental reforms to improve student academic achievement. With assistance from the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction (NCDPI), the LEA/School plan includes initial assessment, professional development for leadership and instructional improvement, targeted strategic planning through the NCDPI "Framework for Action", and leadership coaching. A leadership coach was contracted through the Leadership Group for the Carolinas (LGC) to provide on-site assistance to the principal and to act as an advocate on behalf of the school.

1.4.5 Districts That Received Title I Funds Identified for Improvement

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

In the following table, provide a list of districts that received Title I funds and were identified for improvement or corrective action under Section 1116 for the SY 2009-10 based on the data from SY 2008-09. For each district on the list, provide the following:

- District Name
- District NCES ID Code
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the district met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2009-10 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: Improvement or Corrective Action²)
- Whether the district is a district that received Title I funds. Indicate "Yes" if the district received Title I funds and "No" if the district did not receive Title I funds. (**This column must be completed by States that choose to list all districts or all districts in improvement.** This column is optional for States that list only districts in improvement that receive Title I funds.)

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter district data.

Download template: [Question 1.4.5.1 \(Get MS Excel Viewer\)](#)

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

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Districts identified for improvement were reviewed as part of the screening process within the statewide system of support to determine districts that would receive the most intensive support from the state. All districts identified for corrective action were required to utilize a portion of the LEA Improvement reservation to participate in a one-week training focusing on increasing the capacity of school leaders and central office staff to support planning for improved teaching and learning in the schools, Self-Evaluation for Better School Improvement Planning. Participants were surveyed to determine how the state could continue to expand support for districts in improvement.

1.4.5.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for districts in corrective action, provide the number of districts in corrective action in which the listed corrective actions under ESEA were implemented in SY 2008-09 (based on SY 2007-08 assessments under Section 1111 of ESEA).

Corrective Action	# of Districts receiving Title I funds in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2008-09
Implementing a new curriculum based on State standards	0
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	0
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	39
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	0
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	0
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	0
Restructured the district	0
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2007-08 and beginning of SY 2008-09 as a corrective action)	0
Comments:	

1.4.7 Appeal of AYP and Identification Determinations

In the table below, provide the number of districts and schools that appealed their AYP designations based on SY 2008-09 data and the results of those appeals.

	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts	0	0
Schools	0	0
Comments: Since the Date below does not apply, we have left it blank.		

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2008-09 data was complete	06/30/09
---	----------

1.4.8 School Improvement Status

In the section below, "Schools in Improvement" means Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of *ESEA* for SY 2008-09.

1.4.8.1 Student Proficiency for Schools Receiving Assistance Through Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Funds

The table below pertains only to schools that received assistance through section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2008-09.

Instructions for States that during SY 2008-09 administered assessments required under section 1116 of ESEA after fall 2008 (i.e., non fall-testing states):

- In the **SY 2008-09 column**, provide the total number and percentage of students in schools receiving School Improvement funds in SY 2008-09 who were:
 - Proficient in mathematics as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* that were administered in SY 2008-09.
 - Proficient in reading/language arts as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* in SY 2008-09.
 - In SY 2007-08 column, provide the requested data for the same schools whose student proficiency data are reported for SY 2008-09.

States that in SY 2008-09 administered assessments required under section 1116 of ESEA during fall 2008 (i.e., fall-testing states):

- In the **SY 2008-09 column**, provide the total number and percentage of students in schools receiving School Improvement funds in SY 2008-09 who were:
 - Proficient in mathematics as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* that were administered in fall 2009.
 - Proficient in reading/language arts as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* that were administered in fall 2009.
 - In the **SY 2007-08 column**, provide the requested data for the same schools whose student proficiency data are reported in the SY 2008-09 column.

Category	SY 2008-09	SY 2007-08
Total number of students who completed the mathematics assessment and for whom proficiency level was assigned and were enrolled in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09	60,077	63,868
Total number of students who were proficient or above in mathematics in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09	40,941	34,259
Percentage of students who were proficient or above in mathematics in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09	68.2	53.6
Total number of students who completed the reading/language arts assessment and for whom proficiency level was assigned and were enrolled in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09	60,011	63,903
Total number of students who were proficient or above in reading/language arts in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09	31,147	24,426
Percentage of students who were proficient in reading/language arts in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09	51.9	38.2
Comments:		

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

1.4.8.2 School Improvement Status and School Improvement Assistance

In the table below, indicate the number of schools receiving assistance through section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2008-09 that:

- Made adequate yearly progress
- Exited improvement status
- Did not make adequate yearly progress

Category	# of Schools
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2008-09 that made adequate yearly progress based on testing in SY 2008-09	133
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2008-09 that exited improvement status based on testing in SY 2008-09	7
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2008-09 that did not make adequate yearly progress based on testing in SY 2008-09	58
Comments:	

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

1.4.8.3 Effective School Improvement Strategies

In the table below, indicate the effective school improvement strategies used that were supported through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds.

For fall-testing States, responses for this item would be based on assessments administered in fall 2009. For all other States the responses would be based on assessments administered during SY 2008-09.

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4	Column 5	Column 6	Column 7
Effective Strategy or Combination of Strategies Used (See response options in "Column 1 Response Options Box" below.) If your State's response includes a "5" (other strategies), identify the specific strategy(s) in Column 2.	Description of "Other Strategies" This response is limited to 500 characters.	Number of schools in which the strategy(s) was used	Number of schools that used the strategy(s), made AYP, and exited improvement status based on testing after the schools received this assistance	Number of schools that used the strategy(s), made AYP based on testing after the schools received this assistance, but did not exit improvement status	Most common other Positive Outcome from the Strategy (See response options in "Column 6 Response Options Box" below)	Description of "Other Positive Outcome" if Response for Column 6 is "D" This response is limited to 500 characters.

Comments: North Carolina has not collected the data needed to complete 1.4.8.3 The current data collection system for federal program reporting was not enhanced to capture the additional elements required for CSPR due to delays in the development of the system. Additionally, the 2009-2010 application for Title I and School Improvement funding has been revised to include some data items that will not be part of the more comprehensive data collection system; however, applications have not been submitted to the SEA for 2009-10.

Column 1 Response Options Box
1 = Provide customized technical assistance and/or professional development that is designed to build the capacity of LEA and school staff to improve schools and is informed by student achievement and other outcome-related measures.
2 = Utilize research-based strategies or practices to change instructional practice to address the academic achievement problems that caused the school to be identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.
3 = Create partnerships among the SEA, LEAs and other entities for the purpose of delivering technical assistance, professional development, and management advice.
4 = Provide professional development to enhance the capacity of school support team members and other technical assistance providers who are part of the Statewide system of support and that is informed by student achievement and other outcome-related measures.
5 = Implement other strategies determined by the SEA or LEA, as appropriate, for which data indicate the strategy is likely to result in improved teaching and learning in schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.
6 = Combination 1: Schools using a combination of strategies from above. Please use Column 2 to indicate which of the above strategies comprise this combination.
7 = Combination 2: Schools using a combination of strategies from above. Please use Column 2 to indicate which of the above strategies comprise this combination.
8 = Combination 3: Schools Using a combination of strategies from above. Please use Column 2 to indicate which of the above strategies comprise this combination.

Column 6 Response Options Box

A = Improvement by at least five percentage points in two or more AYP reporting cells

B = Increased teacher retention

C = Improved parental involvement

D = Other

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

1.4.8.4 Sharing of Effective Strategies

In the space below, describe how your State shared the effective strategies identified in item 1.4.8.3 with its LEAs and schools. Please exclude newsletters and handouts in your description.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Title I Section Chief along with agency fiscal staff conducted a statewide meeting focusing on ARRA funds in April, 2009. Title I consultants conducted four meetings throughout the year in each of the eight regions across the state. Technical assistance meetings focused on enhanced collaboration with the Parent Information and Resource Center, Title I funded early education programs (e.g., preschool and kindergarten), allowable uses of Title I funds to enhance program quality, and effective school improvement planning. Updates and best practice sessions were also provided through a statewide conference held in the fall of 2008. Three sessions were held during the year specifically for 37 new Title I directors across the state.

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

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

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2008 (SY 2008-09) Title I, Part A allocation that the SEA reserved in accordance with Section 1003(a) of *ESEA* and §200.100(a) of ED's regulations governing the reservation of funds for school improvement under Section 1003(a) of *ESEA*: 4.0 %

Comments:

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

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

For SY 2008-09 there is no need to upload a spreadsheet to answer this question in the CSPR.

1.4.8.5.2 will be answered automatically using data submitted to ED Facts in Data Group 694, School improvement funds allocation table, from File Specification N/X132. You may review data submitted to ED Facts using the report named "Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Allocations to LEAs and Schools - CSPR 1.4.8.5.2 (EDEN012)" from the ED Facts Reporting System.

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

Section 1003(g)(8) of *ESEA* allows States to reserve up to five percent of Section 1003(g) funds for administration and to meet the evaluation and technical assistance requirements for this program. In the space below, identify and describe the specific Section 1003(g) evaluation and technical assistance activities that your State conducted during SY 2008-09.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Section 1003(g) funds were used to support agency efforts within the Statewide System of Support including Comprehensive Needs Assessment training and implementation. Selected LEAs and schools received intensive support services that include placement of district and school transformation coaches, instructional review coaches, and instructional facilitators. Core initiatives included:

- Screening schools and districts to determine priority and need for support;
- Assessing school and district needs through either self-assessment or supported self-assessment;
- Deploying or brokering support programs / personnel to develop the capacity in transformation districts or schools to sustain high student achievement;
- Establishing statewide service delivery to all districts to support and sustain high student achievement through the coordination of personnel and programs; and
- Monitoring and evaluating program / personnel effectiveness.

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

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

In the space below, describe actions (if any) taken by your State in SY 2008-09 that were supported by **funds other than Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) funds** to address the achievement problems of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of *ESEA*.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

N/A

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

1.4.9 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

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

1.4.9.1 Public School Choice

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

1.4.9.1.2 Public School Choice – Students

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

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

The number of students who applied to transfer should include:

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

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

	# Students
Eligible for public school choice	238,385
Applied to transfer	9,348
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	10,490

1.4.9.1.3 Funds Spent on Public School Choice

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

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$ 3,649,529

1.4.9.1.4 Availability of Public School Choice Options

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

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

	# LEAs
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	23

FAQs about public school choice:

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

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

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

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

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

1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

1.4.9.2.2 Supplemental Educational Services – Students

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

	# Students
Eligible for supplemental educational services	151,518
Applied for supplemental educational services	29,008
Received supplemental educational services	27,425
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk.

1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services

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

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$ 13,681,953
Comments:	

1.5 TEACHER QUALITY

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

1.5.1 Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified

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

School Type	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are <u>NOT</u> Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are <u>NOT</u> Highly Qualified
All classes	78,160	76,690	98.1	1,470	1.9
All elementary classes	41,217	40,849	99.1	368	0.9
All secondary classes	36,943	35,841	97.0	1,102	3.0

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

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

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

--

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Full day, self-contained classroom equals one class.
--

FAQs about highly qualified teachers and core academic subjects:

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

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

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

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

	Percentage
Elementary School Classes	
Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	27.6
Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	3.5
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	44.9
Other (please explain in comment box below)	24.0
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Expired License, No Payroll or License on File

	Percentage
Secondary School Classes	
Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	35.0
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	17.0
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	38.2
Other (please explain in comment box below)	9.7
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Expired License, No Payroll or License on File

1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

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

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

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

School Type	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified
Elementary Schools			
High Poverty Elementary Schools	8,121	8,034	98.9
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	11,054	11,001	99.5
Secondary Schools			
High Poverty secondary Schools	1,566	1,459	93.2
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	12,244	11,970	97.8

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

	High-Poverty Schools (more than what %)	Low-Poverty Schools (less than what %)
Elementary schools	79.4	42.8
Poverty metric used	Percent free and reduced lunch students in elementary school.	
Secondary schools	63.9	33.4
Poverty metric used	Percent free and reduced lunch in secondary school.	

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

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

1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

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

1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

1. **Types of Programs** = Types of programs described in the subgrantee's local plan (as submitted to the State or as implemented) that is closest to the descriptions in http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/files/uploads/5/Language_Instruction_Educational_Programs.pdf.
2. **Other Language** = Name of the language of instruction, other than English, used in the program.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Dual Language Programs are Two-Way programs.
Co-Teaching is also an ESL program model.

1.6.2 Student Demographic Data**1.6.2.1 Number of ALL LEP Students in the State**

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

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

Number of ALL LEP students in the State	106,085
Comments:	

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

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

	#
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	104,619
Comments: This number is not correct. Need to check which EDEN report populates this field.	

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

1.6.2.3 Most Commonly Spoken Languages in the State

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

Language	# LEP Students
Spanish; Castilian	87,954
Hmong	2,315
Vietnamese	1,731
Arabic	1,628
Chinese	1,359

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

These numbers are inflated, likely as a result of inaccurate number in previous item.

1.6.3 Student Performance Data

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

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

In the table below, please provide the number of ALL LEP students tested on annual State English language proficiency assessment (as defined in 1.6.2.1).

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	106,085
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	
Total	106,085
Comments: A score of NA was assigned to any student who did not complete all four parts of the ELP assessment. Of the 1184 NA scores, 35 are students with disabilities who could not access the test, 5 are invalid due to a problem with test administration, and 1144 are coded absent as a result of moving before or during the testing window.	

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

	#
Number proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	12,935
Percent proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	12.2
Comments: This number is incorrect. Check EDEN file.	

1.6.3.2.1 Title III LEP Students Tested on the State Annual English Language Proficiency (ELP) Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of Title III LEP students tested on annual State English language proficiency assessment.

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	104,619
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	
Total	104,619
Comments: *These numbers are not correct. Check EDEN report populating these fields.	
In the table below, provide the number of Title III Students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time and whose progress cannot be determined. Report this number ONLY if the State did not include these students in establishing AMAO1/making progress target and did not include them in the calculations for AMAO1/making progress(# and % making progress).	
	#
Number of Title III LEP with one data point whose progress can not be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO1.	16,660

1.6.3.2.2

Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:

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

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

	Results		Targets	
	#	%	#	%
Making progress	68,869	58.3	81,924	65.00
ELP attainment	9,651	8.2	104,619	14.00
Comments: The total number of ELP scores must be checked; 104619 seems reasonable. Note the percent making progress in incorrect - should be ~80%.				

1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments

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

1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language

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

State offers the State reading/language arts content tests in the students' native language(s).	<u>No</u>
State offers the State mathematics content tests in the students' native language(s).	<u>No</u>
State offers the State science content tests in the students' native language(s).	<u>No</u>
Comments: The variety of languages and extremely low incidence of bilingual education programs represented in NC prohibits the development of native language content assessments.	

1.6.3.5.2 Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given

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

Language(s)
English Only
Comments: Not applicable

1.6.3.5.3 Native Language of Reading/Language Arts Tests Given

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

Language(s)
English Only
Comments: Not applicable

1.6.3.5.4 Native Language of Science Tests Given

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

Language(s)
English Only
Comments: Not applicable

1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students

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

1.6.3.6.1 Title III Served MFLEP Students by Year Monitored

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

Monitored Former LEP students include:

- Students who have transitioned out of a language instruction educational program funded by Title III into classrooms that are not tailored for LEP students.
- Students who are no longer receiving LEP services and who are being monitored for academic content achievement for 2 years after the transition.

Table 1.6.3.6.1 Definitions:

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

# Year One	# Year Two	Total
6,275	5,338	11,613
Comments:		

1.6.3.6.2 In the table below, report the number of MFLEP students who took the annual mathematics assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned into classrooms not designed for LEP students and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
5,531	5,290	95.6	241
Comments:			

1.6.3.6.3 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Reading/Language Arts

In the table below, report the number of MFLEP students who took the annual mathematics assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned into classrooms not designed for LEP students and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

Table 1.6.3.6.3 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
5,533	4,809	86.9	724
Comments:			

1.6.3.6.4 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Science

In the table below, report results for monitored former LEP students who took the annual science assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned into classrooms not designed for LEP students and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

Table 1.6.3.6.4 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
549	541	98.5	8
Comments:			

1.6.4 Title III Subgrantees

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

1.6.4.1 Title III Subgrantee Performance

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

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

	#
# - Total number of subgrantees for the year	88
# - Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	18
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	88
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	25
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	64
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	0
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2007-08 and 2008-09)	30
# - Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2008-09 for not meeting Title III AMAOs	43
# - Number of subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2005-06, 2006-07, 2007-08, and 2008-09)	8
Comments: Subgrantees not meeting Title III AMAOs for two, three, and four consecutive years must submit an improvement plan.	

1.6.4.2 State Accountability

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

Note: Meeting all three Title III AMAOs means meeting each State-set target for each objective: Making Progress, Attaining Proficiency, and Making AYP for the LEP subgroup. This section collects data that will be used to determine State AYP, as required under Section 6161.

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

1.6.4.3 Termination of Title III Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

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

1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students

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

1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students

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

Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:

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

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants
16,345	16,345	17

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Northeast Consortium, comprised of 12 LEAs, is counted as one subgrantee.

Source – Initially populated from ED*Facts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED*Facts* Data Crosswalk.

1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development

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

1.6.6.1 Teacher Information

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

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

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

	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	1,702
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	612

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

There were approximately 1770 ESL teachers, 101 Two-Way Dual Language and Transitional Bilingual teachers, and 345 Heritage Language teachers. Identifying these teachers through EDEN x067 is problematic due to teacher coding. Dual Language teachers are generally certified in Elementary Education, as North Carolina does not recognize Bilingual Teacher credentials; Heritage Language teachers are generally certified in Foreign Language. In addition, there are ESL certified teachers who may be teaching in another content area.

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

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

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

Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:

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

Type of Professional Development Activity	# Subgrantees	
Instructional strategies for LEP students	93	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	97	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	91	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	69	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	75	
Other (Explain in comment box)	0	
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	68	7,765
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	82	2,388
PD provided to principals	69	779
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	58	558
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	47	991
PD provided to community based organization personnel	22	247
Total	346	12,728

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Each of the 12 LEAs in the Northeast Consortium are counted separately for this section.
--

1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities

This section collects data on State grant activities.

1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process

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

Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:

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

Example: State received SY 2008-09 funds July 1, 2008, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2008, for SY 2008-09 programs. Then the "# of days/\$\$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
07-14-09	09-22-09	30
Comments: The funds were also distributed to LEAs on October 17 and October 21, 2009. Due to the October, 2008 guidance concerning Supplement/Supplant, the Title III application approval process was lengthy; virtually all LEAs resubmitted at least twice before the application and budget were approved.		

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Title III Application approval process was very lengthy due to SEA changes designed to meet the federal supplement/supplant requirements. LEAs were required to explicitly describe the basic/core language development program for ELLs, and how Title III services supplemented state and OCR requirements for basic services. This paradigm shift required many personal conversations with LEP program coordinators, finance officers, and other district administrative staff. Given the intense, individual training and coaching that occurred we anticipate the application process to completed in a more timely manner in 2009-2010.

1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS

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

	#
Persistently Dangerous Schools	
Comments: NC does not have any Persistently Dangerous Schools.	

1.8 GRADUATION RATES AND DROPOUT RATES

This section collects graduation and dropout rates.

1.8.1 Graduation Rates

In the table below, provide the graduation rates calculated using the methodology that was approved as part of the State's accountability plan for the **previous school year** (SY 2007-08). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	70.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	53.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	81.0
Black, non-Hispanic	62.7
Hispanic	56.4
White, non-Hispanic	75.7
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	56.6
Limited English proficient	49.9
Economically disadvantaged	59.2
Migratory students	
Male	66.1
Female	74.6
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

FAQs on graduation rates:

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

1.8.2 Dropout Rates

In the table below, provide the dropout rates calculated using the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's (NCES) Common Core of Data (CCD) for the **previous school year** (SY 2007-08). Below the table is a FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Dropout Rate
All Students	3.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	5.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	1.5
Black, non-Hispanic	5.0
Hispanic	4.4
White, non-Hispanic	3.1
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	7.3
Limited English proficient	4.3
Economically disadvantaged	3.1
Migratory students	6.3
Male	4.3
Female	3.0
Comments:	

FAQ on dropout rates:

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

1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS PROGRAM

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

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

	#	# LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	90	90
LEAs with subgrants	25	25
Total	115	115
Comments:		

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

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

1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youths

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

Age/Grade	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	0	51
K	670	1,035
1	655	1,122
2	606	1,211
3	558	1,165
4	563	1,086
5	492	994
6	441	879
7	449	894
8	456	871
9	543	1,092
10	308	681
11	295	561
12	374	641
Ungraded	0	0
Total	6,410	12,283
Comments:		

1.9.1.2 Primary Nighttime Residence of Homeless Children and Youths

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

	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	602	923
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	3,831	5,081
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	136	356
Hotels/Motels	416	570
Total	4,985	6,930
Comments: The numbers do not match because some of the children do not qualify for one of the categories provided. This is an area in the data collection to expand upon.		

1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

1.9.2.1 Homeless Children and Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

Age/Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	51
K	1,713
1	1,788
2	1,824
3	1,732
4	1,665
5	1,502
6	1,327
7	1,350
8	1,333
9	1,646
10	998
11	863
12	1,023
Ungraded	
Total	18,815

Comments: The total number of children identified in K - 12 grade has increased since last year. In the past, NC PreK students were not included in the data collection however, this needs to be included in future data collection.

Source – Initially populated from ED*Facts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED*Facts* Data Crosswalk.

1.9.2.2 Subgroups of Homeless Students Served

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

	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied youth	1,484
Migratory children/youth	59
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	2,787
Limited English proficient students	1,259

Comments: The above category represent specific areas of needs and / or exceptional children who were identified as being homeless.

Source – Initially populated from ED*Facts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED*Facts* Data Crosswalk.

1.9.2.3 Educational Support Services Provided by Subgrantees

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

	# McKinney-Vento Subgrantees That Offer
Tutoring or other instructional support	15
Expedited evaluations	8
Staff professional development and awareness	10
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	14
Transportation	21
Early childhood programs	13
Assistance with participation in school programs	15
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	15
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	12
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	17
Coordination between schools and agencies	17
Counseling	13
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	9
Clothing to meet a school requirement	19
School supplies	20
Referral to other programs and services	18
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	15
Other (optional – in comment box below)	20
Other (optional – in comment box below)	
Other (optional – in comment box below)	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Transportation and costs, developing programs in the schools and community, training staff to understand the identification process of homeless children and youth, implementing appropriate services are particular areas of needed increase in services.

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

1.9.2.4 Barriers To The Education Of Homeless Children And Youth

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

	# Subgrantees Reporting
Eligibility for homeless services	4
School Selection	5
Transportation	8
School records	4
Immunizations	3
Other medical records	0
Other Barriers – in comment box below	9

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Issues faced with LEA's who receive subgrants consist of transportation and the cost involved, obtaining medical records when students come from other states, countries, and issues with the foster care system of identifying children and youth and which agency should be responsible for various costs.

1.9.2.5 Academic Progress of Homeless Students

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

1.9.2.5.1 Reading Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Reading Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	1,318	568
4	1,323	621
5	1,146	527
6	1,000	446
7	994	377
8	976	385
High School	502	242
Comments:		

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk.

1.9.2.5.2 Mathematics Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Mathematics Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	1,323	810
4	1,328	823
5	1,155	711
6	1,001	559
7	993	539
8	984	561
High School	458	250
Comments:		

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk.

1.10 MIGRANT CHILD COUNTS

This section collects the Title I, Part C, Migrant Education Program (MEP) child counts which States are required to provide and may be used to determine the annual State allocations under Title I, Part C. The child counts should reflect the reporting period of September 1, 2008 through August 31, 2009. This section also collects a report on the procedures used by States to produce true, accurate, and valid child counts.

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

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

FAQs on Child Count:

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

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

1.10.1 Category 1 Child Count

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number by age/grade of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, resided in your State for one or more days during the reporting period of September 1, 2008 through August 31, 2009. This figure includes all eligible migrant children who may or may not have participated in MEP services. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

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

Age/Grade	12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	565
K	320
1	315
2	263
3	244
4	216
5	172
6	186
7	166
8	139
9	147
10	102
11	73
12	38
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	2,135
Total	5,081

Comments: There were no children enrolled as Ungraded in 2008-09.

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk.

1.10.1.1 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

N/A

1.10.2 Category 2 Child Count

In the table below, enter by age/grade the unduplicated statewide number of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, were served for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods that occurred within the reporting period of September 1, 2008 through August 31, 2009. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. Count a child who moved to different schools within the State and who was served in both traditional summer and year-round school intersession programs only once. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

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

Age/Grade	Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	236
K	190
1	156
2	133
3	113
4	92
5	91
6	90
7	86
8	64
9	55
10	40
11	29
12	13
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	746
Total	2,134
Comments: There were no children enrolled as Ungraded in 2008-09.	

Source – Initially populated from ED*Facts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED*Facts* Data Crosswalk.

1.10.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

N/A

1.10.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures

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

1.10.3.1 Student Information System

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

NC uses the MIS2000 system to compile and generate the Category 1 and Category 2 child counts.

This is the same system used for the last reporting period.

1.10.3.2 Data Collection and Management Procedures

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

How was the child count data collected?

The child count data is collected in MIS2000 through its main two windows, COE data and Student data. The COE data is collected from the paper COE completed during the eligibility interview. From the second year of eligibility and on, the student data is collected from schools, migrant families and migrant OSY through the enrollment verification process and through the on-going process of reporting services provided to migrant children.

What data were collected?

The Certificate of Eligibility (COE) data collected is standardized for the entire state. The sections of the COE contain the following data: Section I: Family Data; Section II: Child/Youth Data; Section III: Qualifying move & work; Section IV: Comments; Section V: Paren/Guardian/Spouse/Worker Signature; Section VI: Eligibility Data Certification; Section VII: Release of Records; Section VIII. OSY Pre-MEP Information. Data collection is done year round. All information collected in the handwritten COE is loaded into MIS2000.

Section II: Child/Youth data is used to enroll the child/youth in the migrant program. The information in this section includes: child/youth full name (Paternal, Maternal, First, Middle), Suffix, Mother's maiden name, "Race", "Sex", Date of Birth, Age, DOB Verification, Birth Place (City, State, Country), Current School, Enrollment Date, Grade, and Residency Date.

Section III: Qualifying move & work data is used specifically to determine eligibility. The information in this section includes: The child listed moved From (District, City, State, Country) and To (District, City, State); Qualifying Arrival Date; The child moved With, To Join, or On his/her own; Qualifying worker moved in order to obtain Qualifying work, Any work, or Qualifying work but didn't find it. Qualifying work is/was: Temporary, Seasonal, Agricultural Related, Fishing Related; Qualifying Activity; Worker's Name, and Relationship to the child(ren).

The School History panel collects school/migrant program enrollment information. This panel contains the following enrollment data: School Name, Enroll Date, Withdraw Date, Residency Only Verification Date, Type, Grade, Termination Type, Termination Date, and Immunization flag. This information is collected through the handwritten COE the first year of eligibility. For the second and third year of eligibility, this information is collected from schools, families, and out-of-school youth during the enrollment verification process conducted in the beginning of the school year and in the beginning of the summer period.

Services provided to migrant children are also loaded into MIS2000. This information is provided by the local migrant program to each data specialist and it is entered in the Supplemental Program Panel. This panel collects Service Code, Service Name, Start Date, End Date, Funding, Schedule, and Provider.

What activities were conducted to collect the data?

In North Carolina the COE is the legal document used to enroll migrant children into the Migrant Education Program (MEP). A North Carolina MEP recruiter or any other assigned person must be trained and authorized by the State Educational Agency (SEA) or by the Local Educational Agency (LEA) to conduct eligibility interviews and to complete a COE.

Each LEA develops and implements an annual Identification and Recruitment (ID&R) plan. The local ID&R plan targets the recruitment and services of: Out-of-School pre-kindergarten children; Students attending schools; Out-of-school youth. The ID&R plan will focus its intervention in three major areas: local school systems; community agencies and business; county employment opportunities.

Recruiters know seasonal timelines for specific crops and migrant activities in their counties and recruit accordingly. Migrant recruitment and identification is done year round. In addition, some counties have health fairs that provide services and also serve as a forum for identification and recruitment of new families.

A North Carolina MEP data specialist or any other assigned person must be trained and authorized by the SEA to enter data into MIS2000. The data specialist is responsible for entering each COE, MEP/school enrollment information, and services provided into MIS2000.

The MEP/School enrollment information is verified every year, twice a year (regular school term and summer term), by the data specialist and recruiter with schools, migrant families, and/or Out-of-School youths through the "Enrollment Verification" process. This process verifies eligibility/services and residency of every migrant child in the state. Every year, the child is re-enrolled in the migrant program if the child is still eligible or is receiving services after the end of eligibility and if he/she is still residing in the LEA.

On an on-going basis LEAs report into MIS2000 all services provided to migrant children paid in part or whole with migrant funds. The information is provided at least monthly by the recruiter, tutor, or service coordinator to the data specialist, who keeps this data updated into MIS2000.

When were the data collected for use in the student information system?

The COE is reviewed by the LEA MEP COE reviewer to verify that based on the recorded data, the child/youth is eligible for MEP services. Once the COE is signed by the COE reviewer, the data specialist enters the data to his/her local database in the MIS2000 software.

The Enrollment Verification process is done twice a year. First, in the beginning of the regular school year and then, in the beginning of summer. After each child's eligibility/services and residency in the LEA is verified, the child's re-enrollment information is entered by the data specialist into MIS2000.

Services provided to migrant children are uploaded into MIS2000 on an on-going basis.

The data collected from each LEA MEP is then uploaded to the state migrant server. This server maintains the statewide migrant database, which is then used to generate the Migrant Child Count and Consolidated State Performance Reports.

Participant migrant counties have access to search and download students from the state server. Each county is responsible for maintaining and updating COEs and their databases with school history information, credit accrual, test data, health, supplemental programs, student profile and family data. Data collected from COEs is loaded to the migrant server in its entire form. The upload process to the state server is maintained all year long.

Data specialists are required to enter COEs and school enrollment information into MIS2000 within 2 weeks after the day the families are interviewed. Data specialists are instructed to upload any data changes in their local databases to the state server the same day changes are made. School enrollments for students identified in any previous terms coincide with regular school enrollments. In North Carolina,

schools typically start late August and end in mid June. Summer enrollment begins in mid June and depending on the length of summer school. Withdrawals are done on or before August 31. The data manager runs a preliminary report in the middle of September to confirm the activities done by each LEA. The report is given to each county for comparison of data between the state server and local databases. LEAs have two (2) weeks to verify the preliminary report and to modify or update their data. A copy of the state database is created by the data manager at end of September and used to generate the final Child Count and Consolidated State Performance Reports.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Each LEA MEP data specialist enters eligible migrant children data into their local copy of the MIS2000 software. The data specialist keys COEs into the MIS2000 software from a handwritten COE (hard copy). Data from the hard copy is entered item by item into the software and it is checked by the reviewer. This reviewer is typically a director or program coordinator. The data specialist is able to print a COE from MIS2000 to be filed along with the handwritten COE as the legal document. COEs are an electronic document with a hard copy backup.

A unique identification number is created for each migrant student in MIS2000. Before entering any new student, the software assists users to do a student search. This feature prevents users from duplicating students. Any duplicates that are created by mistake can be identified by running local reports that check for potential duplicated records. Records can be matched by checking same DOB, close DOB, Matching DOB + Last Name or First Name, Matching DOB Last Name + First Name, or Matching DOB or Last + First Name.

Data specialists were instructed to run all the reports that find potential duplicates six times during the 08-09 year. The reports were sent to the state office and duplicate records were merged into one. The criteria used to match duplicates are: find the same student's last name, student's first name, middle initial, DOB, mother's last name and mother's first name. The merge job is done in the state migrant server and then propagated to the LEAs with duplicate records.

Uploads are done frequently to the state database to synchronize databases with the state migrant server. COE data is loaded to MIS2000 within 2 weeks of identifying students. Data entry personnel upload data to the state server as soon as changes are made to the LEA MEP database in order to keep the rest of the state with the latest student information available. In addition, frequently uploading allows North Carolina to recover local database information in case of hard drive failure at the LEA.

Once data is entered into MIS2000 it is available to be used, edited and deleted by the LEA MEP. After uploading changes to the server, data is available at state level for the same purposes. Every time that new information need to be added or current information need to be modified, the data specialist access to the COE or Student record in MIS2000 and update the data as needed. Records can be accessed by student Id, COE Id, student name, parents' name, district, school, birthday, or birth city. When the record is uploaded to the server, the updated data is available at the state level.

LEAs are required to conduct an enrollment verification process every year, twice a year (it is part of the ID&R plan components). LEAs develop and implement their own procedure. The most common practice is to conduct enrollment verification during the first months of the new school year for K-12 migrant students. Enrollment verification for OS migrant students, pre-k or youth, takes place throughout the year, usually during the peak season. A second verification is done during summer.

The data specialist runs the enrollment verification report from MIS2000 and gets all students that resided in his/her LEA during the past period. For K-12 students, the data specialist contacts schools or check the school computer system to get enrollment information on students that are still in school. If the student is enrolled in the school and is still eligible or receiving MEP services, a new school history line is added to the student's record in MIS2000 and the student information is updated if needed. If the student is not enrolled in school or he/she is an OS pre-k or youth, the recruiter contacts the family to verify they are still in the county. The recruiter reports the findings to the data specialist, who will make the needed changes in the student's record in MIS2000, for example, enroll date, withdrawal date, type of enrollment, grade, address, family information, etc.

NCMEP implemented a new procedure to verify that the enrollment verification was done in each of our LEAs during the 08-09 year. This new procedure consisted of a Certification signed by the local MEP Director and Data Specialist from each LEA and submitted to NCMEP. The Certification confirmed that all children records were reviewed and that eligible children were re-enrolled in the program.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

N/A

1.10.3.3 Methods Used To Count Children

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Children who were between age 3 through 21

The student's age must be between 3 and 21 years during the reporting year. MIS2000 computes the fields "Student ThirdBDay" is less than the end date of the report period and the "Student Twenty.SecondBDay" is greater than the start date of the reporting period.

A child will be counted if they turn 3 or 22 during the reporting period.

Children who met the program eligibility criteria (e.g., were within 3 years of a last qualifying move, had a qualifying activity)

The End of Eligibility date must be greater than the beginning of the reporting period.

The Qualifying Arrival Date must be equal to or greater than 09/01/05 and be within 36 month of the Residency date.

The End of Eligibility date must be greater than the date qualifying the student (i.e. Enroll Date). The exceptions are Withdraw and Supplemental Program End dates. (Withdraw is defined as ending an enrollment period in a school history line). In MIS2000 the supplemental program section has a field named "End Date". This date can be the same as the Withdraw date from a history line, but it can stand on its own if the Local Educational Agency wants to end a supplemental program before they are withdrawn from a school history enrollment line. End of Eligibility is not the same as Program End Date. End of Eligibility means the student has ended the 36 months of eligibility, has graduated, or has died.

A child will be counted in the A1 count if the qualifying arrival date plus 36 months is equal or greater than the beginning of the reporting period and if any of the following dates falls between the reporting range period: enroll date, withdraw date, supplemental program start date, or supplemental program end date. Also, the interview date has to be before or equal to the last date of the reporting period.

A child will be counted in the A2 count if in addition to the criteria for the A1 count the child's end of eligibility is equal to or after the beginning of the summer program and if the child's summer services were paid in whole or part with MEP funds.

For this purpose, the reporting period for the A1 count and for Intersession in the A2 count goes from 09/01/08 to 08/31/09. The reporting period for Summer in the A2 count goes from 06/16/08 to 08/31/08.

Children who were resident in your State for at least 1 day during the eligibility period (September 1 through August 31)

For a child to be counted, one of the following dates must be between 09/01 and 08/31 of the reporting year: Enroll, Withdraw, Supplemental Program Start or End dates. Enrollment means the student has a school history line in MIS2000 showing enrollment in a school or in the migrant program (for out-of-school children). Supplemental Programs are defined in North Carolina as services above and beyond the basic educational programs provided by the local school district. Students who were resident in North Carolina for at least one day during the reporting period and who have activity in MIS2000 in any of the fields listed above will be counted in category 1 count.

Children who—in the case of Category 2—received a MEP-funded service during the summer or intersession term

For a child to be counted in category 2 count the enrollment type must be either: summer, intersession or participant. Any of these three can be paid in whole or in part with migrant funds. Summer term is defined as any organized academic program by the school district during 06/16 and 08/31 of the reporting period. Intersession term is defined as any organized intersession program by the school district in a year round school. Enrollment as intersession can occur any time between 09/01- 08/31 of the reporting year. Summer participants are defined as children receiving supplemental programs either as services or basic educational programs provided by the local school district during 06/16 - 08/31. Children served as participants include out of school youth or children that are not currently enrolled in a Regular or Summer school program.

For a child with a summer or participant enrollment type to be counted, one of the following dates must fall within the specified summer time frame (default is 06/16 to 08/31): Enroll or Withdraw and Supplemental Program Start or End date. Children in schools whose regular term program ends after June 16 are not included in this count. The default summer enrollment date begins after the end of the regular program.

For a child with an intersession enrollment type to be counted, one of the following dates must fall within the specified intersession time frame (default is 09/01 to 08/31): Enroll or Withdraw and Supplemental Program Start or End date.

Students who were residents in North Carolina for at least one day and have eligibility during the summer/intersession reporting period, and have supplemental services received for at least one day during the summer/intersession reporting period, and MIS2000 confirms activity in any of the fields named above will be counted in category 2.

Children once per age/grade level for each child count category.

Each student is counted only one time for the state regardless of the number of school history lines on the student's record for the state. Migrant children are assigned a unique ID. Throughout the year duplicate records are merged in to one to make sure there are no duplicates in the state and local database. Student's duplicate records are merged if the student's last name, student's first name, student's middle initial, student's DOB, mother's last name and mother's first name match more than one record.

The data manager runs the Potential Duplicate Students report to find students with more than one record among different LEAs. If the six fields named above match, the records are merged. If any of those fields are different, the data manager contacts each LEA involved with the duplicated records to verify the information.

If the student has been in more than one LEA during the same reporting period, the student is counted in the last LEA he/she resided during that time.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

N/A

1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The N.C. MEP ID&R quality control system includes the following components that address child eligibility before the data is entered into MIS2000:

1. Using a Standardized Certificate of Eligibility (COE)

N.C. MEP uses a standardized COE. The COE has been revised as needed to reflect changes in eligibility law interpretation.

A guide including instructions on how to complete the COE is also available for training and reference purposes.

N.C. MEP requires a handwritten COE for all enrollments. The recruiter's signature indicates that he or she gathered the data directly from the parent, guardian or youth in a face-to-face interview. An MIS2000 electronic COE is also kept for all N.C. MEP students.

2. Training

A N.C. MEP recruiter or any other assigned person must be trained and authorized by the SEA or by the LEA to conduct eligibility interviews and to complete a COE. The LEA must inform the SEA of any new recruiter or any other assigned person trained to recruit in the LEA.

The SEA MEP staff provides training at four different levels:

One-on-one - Upon the LEA request to the SEA, the statewide recruitment coordinator, state data manager, or both provided one-on-one basic training to new recruiters and data specialists.

Service Area Meetings - A Service Area Meeting was conducted in September 2008. The agenda of that meeting included training and updates on ID&R and data collection.

Statewide - Statewide Training was provided in November 2008 and May 2009 to all NC MEP staff on ID&R and Data Collection.

Webinars - Trainings through Webinars were conducted year-round on various topics that included ID&R and Data Collection.

List Server - The List Server is a forum for follow-up training questions year-round.

3. Determining Accuracy of Written Eligibility Documentation

The LEA must assign an authorized and qualified MEP staff member to review and sign each COE. The COE reviewer must be a person other than the recruiter/interviewer who originally made the eligibility determination.

The COE reviewer must sign each COE after completing the COE Review Form. His or her signature certifies that the COE was reviewed and that he/she verified, based on the recorded data, that the child or youth is eligible for MEP services. The COE Review Form is attached to the original COE and kept on file for a period of 11 years.

A COE should be included in the MIS2000 software only when the COE includes all the information necessary to verify the child or youth's eligibility.

4. Resolving Eligibility Questions

The State ID&R Plan established a process for resolving eligibility questions, which establishes the order in which MEP staff should be contacted when questions arise. It includes three components: reviewing written documentation and guidance on eligibility, discussing any questions with local MEP staff (the local COE reviewer or the director) and consulting the ID&R coordinator or data manager. SEA staff is available as needed by phone, e-mail, list serve, or by visiting the site.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

State-level re-interviews:

ID&R Prospective Re-Interviews are conducted using a random sample of students statewide.

The goal is to re-interview 75 families. The re-interviews are conducted by the State ID&R Coordinator and by the State Program

Specialist. The SEA can use the re-interviews for quality control and to identify problems early.

To conduct the re-interviews, two (2) random samples, with 76 children each (152 children in total), are taken from the system. The number of randomly selected children is greater than the number of children to be re-interviewed in case some of the children randomly selected have left the LEAs by the time the re-interview is done. If a child selected in the random sample is not residing in the LEA, the next child on the list is verified.

Thirty-seven LEAs were visited during the 08-09 school year. Re-interview specifications and outcomes are shown on the following table:

Re-interview

Date 08-09 A1 Count # of children re-interviewed # of children found not eligible # of siblings not eligible

LEA 10	6/3/09	24	1	0	0
LEA 30	8/2/09	23	3	0	0
LEA 80	6/17/09	18	2	0	0
LEA 90	7/22/09	344	4	0	0
LEA 100	8/5/09	65	2	0	0
LEA 110	7/31/09	76	6	0	0
LEA 240	7/24/09				
	8/4/09	274	22	0	0
LEA 310	7/16/09	46	1	0	0
LEA 400	8/4/09	8	5	0	0
LEA 430	6/11/09	65	5	0	0
LEA 440	8/6/09	52	1	0	0
LEA 470	6/12/09				
	10/1/09	153	14	0	0
LEA 520	7/19/09	2	1	0	0
LEA 530	6/11/09	38	3	0	0
LEA 540	8/26/09				
	9/25/09	104	8	0	0
LEA 640	8/13/09				
	10/1/09	323	11	0	0
LEA 660	5/28/09	34	3	0	0
LEA 710	7/27/09				
	9/10/09	170	16	0	0
LEA 740	7/8/09	133	5	1	3
LEA 760	5/28/09	45	3	0	0
LEA 790	6/3/09				
	6/5/09				
	7/7/09				
	9/25/09	222	31	0	0
LEA 800	5/28/09	54	4	0	0
LEA 820	7/16/09				
	7/22/09				
	8/28/09	275	24	0	0
LEA 860	7/7/09	85	4	0	0
LEA 900	9/9/09	5	1	0	0
LEA 241	8/14/09	207	23	0	0
Total		2,845	203	1	3

All these children have been removed from the state and local database.

In the 06-07 monitoring, 28% of the children that were interviewed were found ineligible. In the 07-08 monitoring, 6% of the children that were interviewed were found ineligible. The 08-09 Prospective Re-Interviews found 2% of the children indelible.

Local level re-interviews:

Re-interviewing workers/families at the local level was a requirement issued by the SEA during the 08-09 year.

Each LEA randomly selected and re-interviewed 5% or 5 students, whichever is greater, of the previous year's A1 count. LEAs were required to submit a Re-Interview Outcome Report to the state office.

According to the LEAs notification during the 08-09 funding year, 5 migrant children out of 214 students were found not eligible during re-interviews. Improvement has been shown if compared to the 06-07 LEAs notification where 70 children were found ineligible and 07-08 reports where 8 migrant children were found ineligible. These students were removed from the state and local database upon notification.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1. Before adding a student to each local database a search is done at the state server to avoid duplicate records. Six times a year each LEA runs reports that allow it to check for possible duplicated students. The criteria used are: same student's last name, student's first name, student's middle initial, student's DOB, mother's last name and mother's first name. Two records or more matching these criteria

will be considered duplicates. Duplicates are merged into a single record once the state database manager executes the merge job from the state server. The job does not run automatically based on the description of the matching fields. Individual COEs are checked by the data specialist to ensure the merge report names match respective hard copies of COEs and that we are not deleting students by mistake. In addition, the data specialist makes sure the fields for the merge criteria are the same in any records found to be duplicated. School history is not checked in the determination of duplicated records but histories from both records are kept in the merged record.

2. Throughout the year the state MEP take four more steps to verify accuracy of data in MIS2000:

1. Desk Monitoring: student records are formally revised once a year. The MEP data manager verifies that data in the system is accurate and updated. This process is done by visually revising a random sample of 50 student's records. Revising records in the system allow us to verify if data is accurate and updated. Some of the data monitored during this process are: school history, test, credit accrual, family, supplemental programs, and eligibility data. The COE Comments Report is also used to verify eligibility data in COEs.

2. Eligibility data check: every LEA verifies once a year that the eligibility information of every current family is correct. This is done by running the COE Summary Report and reviewing the data displayed there. The report shows eligibility data of current families. A formal report is sent to the state ID&R coordinator indicating corrections and action plan.

3. Site visit: throughout the year the MEP monitoring team visits LEAs and interviews local MEP staff in order to learn how they collect and enter data into MIS2000. Some reports are run from the system to verify data status and evaluate them along with local staff.

4. On going basis: the state MEP data manager is available to LEAs on an ongoing basis to meet LEA needs and resolve questions. Webinars are scheduled as needed. Data manager has to opportunity to verify how data is being entering into MIS2000 by talking to data specialists, visually revising records in the system, and running reports.

3. In addition to those reports, the state has implemented the Enrollment Verification Procedure since this 07-08 year. LEAs are required to run this report from the system, verify the eligibility and residency of every child in the report, and to re-enroll them in MIS2000 if they meet the requirements. In this way, this report helps LEAs in verifying that only children who need to be re-enrolled are re-enrolled and that every child who has to be re-enrolled is re-enrolled.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1. A copy of the state database is made before getting the final counts from the system. In this way, if the counts need to be obtained again, they will be gotten from the same data. In NC this process is called "freezing the data". Before freezing the data, the state data manager gets the preliminary category 1 and 2 counts from the state server. These counts are sent to each LEAs for comparison. Each LEA is instructed to get the same preliminary counts from the local database, compare the local counts to the state counts, and correct the students' records or report to the state any discrepancy between the local and state counts.

2. Also, the preliminary category 1 and category 2 counts are manually revised at the state level for possible duplicate records. If duplicate records are found, they are merged into one record and the counts are obtained again from the system.

3. After freezing the data, the final category 1 and 2 are taken from the system. Because there is a lapse in time of approximately one month between when the data is frozen and when the counts are submitted to ED, these counts are reviewed one more time. In this way, every duplicate record merged or student deleted from the server after freezing the data is removed from the final file.

Finally, some random students are selected from the counts and their records are reviewed in MIS2000. This action allows us to make sure that every child who is being counted meets the categories criteria.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

NC will take the following actions to improve the accuracy of our MEP eligibility determinations:

1. Focus on training for interviewing and re-interviewing, and assist programs in collaborating with other nearby programs to carryout re-interviewing.

2. Provide training on completing the COE Review Form and the Re-Interview Form in order to increase consistency. Update the forms according to Federal Regulations and Guidance.

3. Update the ID&R Manual and provide training to MEP Staff on its contents.

4. Work closely with recruiters to refine skills in interviewing and determining eligibility.

Develop online training reviews to keep skills fresh through continued practice with difficult eligibility questions.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

NC MEP does not have any concerns about the accuracy of the reported child counts.

For eligibility determinations, we recommend additional training of ID&R staff regarding determinations:

- where the worker and the child(ren) do not come together ("to join")
- that refer to the worker's prior history
- of a qualifying activity
- of the residence the child(ren) moved from