CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT:
Parts I and II

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

For reporting on
School Year 2014-15

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

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202

INTRODUCTION

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

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

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

PART I

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

- **Performance Goal 1:** By SY 2014-15, 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 EDFacts submission.
3. The information will provide valid evidence of program outcomes or results.

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

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

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

TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

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

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

	OMB Number: 1810-0724
	Expiration Date: 5/31/2018

Consolidated State Performance Report
For
State Formula Grant Programs
under the
Elementary And Secondary Education Act
as amended in 2001

Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting:
__X__Part I, 2014-15 ___Part II, 2014-15

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

_____ __Wednesday, December 9, 2015, 4:51:46 PM__
Signature Date

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART I

For reporting on

School Year 2014-15

☒

PART I DUE DECEMBER 17, 2015
5PM EST

1.1 Standards and Assessment Development

STANDARDS OF ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

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

1.1.1 Academic Content Standards

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

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

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

	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Academic Content Standards	SY 2013-14	SY 2013-14	SY 2013-14

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

The response is limited to 1,000 characters.

The revisions were implemented in 2012-13, which is not a choice in the drop-down box.

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

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

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

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

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

Academic Achievement Standards for	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Regular Assessments in Grades 3-8	SY 2013-14	SY 2013-14	SY 2013-14
Regular Assessments in High School	SY 2013-14	SY 2013-14	SY 2013-14
Alternate Assessments Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards (if applicable)	N/A	N/A	N/A
Alternate Assessments Based on Modified Achievement Standards (if applicable)	N/A	N/A	N/A
Alternate Assessments Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	SY 2013-14	SY 2013-14	SY 2013-14

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

The response is limited to 1,000 characters.

The revisions were implemented in 2012-13, which is not a choice in the drop-down box.

1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts and Science

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

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

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

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

Academic Assessments	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Regular Assessments in Grades 3-8	SY 2013-14	SY 2013-14	SY 2013-14
Regular Assessments in High School	SY 2013-14	SY 2013-14	SY 2013-14
Alternate Assessments Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards (if applicable)	N/A	N/A	N/A
Alternate Assessments Based on Modified Achievement Standards (if applicable)	N/A	N/A	N/A
Alternate Assessments Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	SY 2013-14	SY 2013-14	SY 2013-14

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

The response is limited to 1,000 characters.

The revisions were implemented in 2012-13, which is not a choice in the drop-down box.

1.1.3 Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities

1.1.3.1 Percentages of Funds Used for Standards and Assessment Development and Other Purposes

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

Purpose	Percentage (rounded to the nearest ten percent)
To pay the costs of the development of the State assessments and standards required by Section 1111(b)	80.00
To administer assessments required by Section 1111(b) or to carry out other activities described in section 6111 and other activities related to ensuring that the State's schools and local educational agencies are held accountable for the results	20.00
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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

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

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

1.2 Participation in State Assessments

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

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

1.2.1 Participation of all Students in Mathematics Assessment

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

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	800,353	796,356	99.50
American Indian or Alaska Native	10,332	10,275	99.45
Asian or Pacific Islander	23,667	23,546	99.49
Asian	22,760	22,644	99.49
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	907	902	99.45
Black or African American	206,030	204,611	99.31
Hispanic or Latino	123,230	122,570	99.46
White	406,739	405,129	99.60
Two or more races	30,355	30,225	99.57
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	107,817	106,760	99.02
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	42,348	41,954	99.07
Economically disadvantaged students	395,333	393,181	99.46
Migratory students	890	881	98.99
Male	410,224	407,932	99.44
Female	390,129	388,424	99.56
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

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

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

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

Type of Assessment	**# Children with Disabilities (*IDEA*) Participating**	**Percentage of Children with Disabilities (*IDEA*) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment**
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	20,584	19.28
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	77,529	72.62
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	717	0.67
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	7,930	7.43
Total	106,760	//
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The 717 students on the modified is not for 2014-15 administrations but rather banked scores for previous years' administrations. The banked scores are used for the federal reporting of students who have a Math I score by the end of 10th grade.		

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

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	807,608	804,056	99.56
American Indian or Alaska Native	10,377	10,322	99.47
Asian or Pacific Islander	24,445	24,355	99.63
Asian	23,512	23,425	99.63
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	933	930	99.68
Black or African American	206,987	205,803	99.43
Hispanic or Latino	125,759	125,021	99.41
White	409,544	408,201	99.67
Two or more races	30,496	30,354	99.53
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	108,018	107,146	99.19
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	45,703	45,310	99.14
Economically disadvantaged students	398,347	396,221	99.47
Migratory students	933	925	99.14
Male	413,894	411,717	99.47
Female	393,714	392,339	99.65
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

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

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

Recently Arrived LEP Students	#
Recently arrived LEP students who took an assessment of English language proficiency in lieu of the State's reading/language arts assessment	3,182

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

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

The data provided should include reading/language arts participation data from all students with disabilities as defined under the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)*. Do not include former students with disabilities (*IDEA*). Do not include students only covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.
Note: For this question only, report on students with disabilities (IDEA) who are also LEP students in the U.S. less than 12 months who took the ELP in lieu of the statewide reading/language arts assessment.

Type of Assessment	**# Children with Disabilities (*IDEA*) Participating**	**Percentage of Children with Disabilities (*IDEA*) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment**
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	22,672	21.16
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	76,371	71.28
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	126	0.12
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	7,939	7.41
LEP < 12 months, took ELP	38	0.04
Total	107,146	//
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The 126 students on the modified is not for 2014-15 administrations but rather banked scores for previous years' administrations. The banked scores are used for the federal reporting of students who have an English II score by the end of 10th grade.		

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	325,315	322,591	99.16
American Indian or Alaska Native	4,232	4,190	99.01
Asian or Pacific Islander	9,403	9,313	99.04
Asian	9,075	8,990	99.06
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	328	323	98.48
Black or African American	83,477	82,543	98.88
Hispanic or Latino	45,466	45,022	99.02
White	170,423	169,312	99.35
Two or more races	12,314	12,211	99.16
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	41,667	41,010	98.42
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	11,871	11,612	97.82
Economically disadvantaged students	149,980	148,529	99.03
Migratory students	311	304	97.75
Male	166,130	164,553	99.05
Female	159,185	158,038	99.28
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

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

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (*IDEA*) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (*IDEA*) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	7,897	19.26
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	28,690	69.96
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	973	2.37
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	3,450	8.41
Total	41,010	//
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The 973 students on the modified is not for 2014-15 administrations but rather banked scores for previous years' administrations. The banked scores are used for the federal reporting of students who have a Biology score by the end of 11th grade.		

1.3 Student Academic Achievement

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

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

1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics

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

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

1.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts

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

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

1.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science

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

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

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

1.3.1.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 3

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	117,600	57,381	48.79
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,468	487	33.17
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,756	2,787	74.20
Asian	3,581	2,693	75.20
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	175	94	53.71
Black or African American	30,031	8,922	29.71
Hispanic or Latino	20,513	7,853	38.28
White	57,291	35,120	61.30
Two or more races	4,541	2,212	48.71
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	16,086	3,341	20.77
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	13,182	4,148	31.47
Economically disadvantaged students	61,659	21,459	34.80
Migratory students	167	49	29.34
Male	60,273	29,140	48.35
Female	57,327	28,241	49.26
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

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	117,572	54,709	46.53
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,468	461	31.40
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,751	2,474	65.96
Asian	3,576	2,384	66.67
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	175	90	51.43
Black or African American	30,028	8,764	29.19
Hispanic or Latino	20,493	6,207	30.29
White	57,291	34,581	60.36
Two or more races	4,541	2,222	48.93
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	16,088	2,957	18.38
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	13,165	2,585	19.64
Economically disadvantaged students	61,649	19,486	31.61
Migratory students	167	32	19.16
Male	60,257	26,169	43.43
Female	57,315	28,540	49.79
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Asian			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. North Carolina does not offer Grade 3 Science Assessment			

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	115,060	55,867	48.55
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,434	459	32.01
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,486	2,560	73.44
Asian	3,359	2,492	74.19
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	127	68	53.54
Black or African American	29,096	7,949	27.32
Hispanic or Latino	19,325	7,550	39.07
White	57,411	35,319	61.52
Two or more races	4,308	2,030	47.12
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	16,063	3,090	19.24
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,905	1,233	17.86
Economically disadvantaged students	58,535	19,692	33.64
Migratory students	146	43	29.45
Male	58,866	28,831	48.98
Female	56,194	27,036	48.11
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

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

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	115,049	54,238	47.14
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,434	464	32.36
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,482	2,219	63.73
Asian	3,355	2,160	64.38
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	127	59	46.46
Black or African American	29,100	8,714	29.95
Hispanic or Latino	19,310	5,942	30.77
White	57,415	34,837	60.68
Two or more races	4,308	2,062	47.86
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	16,066	2,644	16.46
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,898	550	7.97
Economically disadvantaged students	58,537	18,850	32.20
Migratory students	145	30	20.69
Male	58,859	25,818	43.86
Female	56,190	28,420	50.58
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.3.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Asian			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. North Carolina does not administer Grade 4 Science Assessment			

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	107,721	55,303	51.34
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,320	430	32.58
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,277	2,555	77.97
Asian	3,168	2,499	78.88
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	109	56	51.38
Black or African American	26,563	8,102	30.50
Hispanic or Latino	17,036	7,164	42.05
White	55,088	34,803	63.18
Two or more races	4,437	2,249	50.69
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	15,811	2,654	16.79
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,031	916	18.21
Economically disadvantaged students	53,271	19,187	36.02
Migratory students	136	37	27.21
Male	55,420	27,831	50.22
Female	52,301	27,472	52.53
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

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	107,703	45,453	42.20
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,321	354	26.80
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,271	1,962	59.98
Asian	3,162	1,917	60.63
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	109	45	41.28
Black or African American	26,562	5,910	22.25
Hispanic or Latino	17,020	4,317	25.36
White	55,092	30,941	56.16
Two or more races	4,437	1,969	44.38
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	15,818	2,130	13.47
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,021	262	5.22
Economically disadvantaged students	53,271	13,953	26.19
Migratory students	136	22	16.18
Male	55,408	21,960	39.63
Female	52,295	23,493	44.92
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

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	107,718	58,279	54.10
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,318	576	43.70
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,278	2,426	74.01
Asian	3,169	2,364	74.60
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	109	62	56.88
Black or African American	26,560	9,169	34.52
Hispanic or Latino	17,036	6,808	39.96
White	55,087	36,761	66.73
Two or more races	4,439	2,539	57.20
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	15,813	3,538	22.37
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,031	742	14.75
Economically disadvantaged students	53,266	20,742	38.94
Migratory students	136	37	27.21
Male	55,416	30,659	55.33
Female	52,302	27,620	52.81
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

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	115,656	47,466	41.04
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,527	355	23.25
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,472	2,437	70.19
Asian	3,350	2,386	71.22
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	122	51	41.80
Black or African American	29,174	6,099	20.91
Hispanic or Latino	17,956	5,542	30.86
White	58,919	31,246	53.03
Two or more races	4,608	1,787	38.78
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	15,878	1,643	10.35
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,330	402	9.28
Economically disadvantaged students	58,251	14,674	25.19
Migratory students	115	21	18.26
Male	59,406	23,673	39.85
Female	56,250	23,793	42.30
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

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	115,645	53,946	46.65
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,529	430	28.12
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,469	2,261	65.18
Asian	3,347	2,205	65.88
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	122	56	45.90
Black or African American	29,180	7,918	27.14
Hispanic or Latino	17,940	5,631	31.39
White	58,919	35,574	60.38
Two or more races	4,608	2,132	46.27
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	15,882	2,091	13.17
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,322	235	5.44
Economically disadvantaged students	58,254	17,799	30.55
Migratory students	115	20	17.39
Male	59,411	26,297	44.26
Female	56,234	27,649	49.17
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

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			
Asian			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. North Carolina does not offer Grade 6 Science Assessment			

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	115,784	46,281	39.97
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,497	389	25.99
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,346	2,395	71.58
Asian	3,208	2,338	72.88
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	138	57	41.30
Black or African American	30,040	6,162	20.51
Hispanic or Latino	17,496	5,257	30.05
White	59,068	30,440	51.53
Two or more races	4,337	1,638	37.77
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	15,552	1,246	8.01
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,839	376	7.77
Economically disadvantaged students	57,402	13,800	24.04
Migratory students	148	25	16.89
Male	59,515	22,751	38.23
Female	56,269	23,530	41.82
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

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	115,785	53,850	46.51
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,498	459	30.64
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,342	2,204	65.95
Asian	3,203	2,152	67.19
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	139	52	37.41
Black or African American	30,049	8,208	27.32
Hispanic or Latino	17,480	5,814	33.26
White	59,076	35,104	59.42
Two or more races	4,340	2,061	47.49
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	15,562	2,029	13.04
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,825	286	5.93
Economically disadvantaged students	57,424	17,670	30.77
Migratory students	148	24	16.22
Male	59,509	26,127	43.90
Female	56,276	27,723	49.26
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

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			
Asian			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. North Carolina does not offer Grade 7 Science Assessment			

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	118,053	42,303	35.83
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,553	284	18.29
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,278	2,158	65.83
Asian	3,165	2,124	67.11
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	113	34	30.09
Black or African American	31,114	5,337	17.15
Hispanic or Latino	16,942	4,355	25.71
White	60,869	28,736	47.21
Two or more races	4,297	1,433	33.35
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	15,412	1,139	7.39
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,991	365	7.31
Economically disadvantaged students	57,028	11,919	20.90
Migratory students	102	30	29.41
Male	60,449	21,135	34.96
Female	57,604	21,168	36.75
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

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	118,065	49,138	41.62
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,553	352	22.67
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,279	1,993	60.78
Asian	3,166	1,952	61.66
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	113	41	36.28
Black or African American	31,125	7,558	24.28
Hispanic or Latino	16,928	4,893	28.90
White	60,881	32,565	53.49
Two or more races	4,299	1,777	41.34
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	15,416	1,640	10.64
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,982	255	5.12
Economically disadvantaged students	57,031	15,028	26.35
Migratory students	102	27	26.47
Male	60,463	22,361	36.98
Female	57,602	26,777	46.49
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

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	117,955	75,168	63.73
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,556	759	48.78
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,275	2,657	81.13
Asian	3,163	2,593	81.98
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	112	64	57.14
Black or African American	31,068	13,617	43.83
Hispanic or Latino	16,929	9,094	53.72
White	60,838	46,202	75.94
Two or more races	4,289	2,839	66.19
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	15,387	4,311	28.02
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,994	1,135	22.73
Economically disadvantaged students	56,953	28,280	49.65
Migratory students	102	55	53.92
Male	60,379	38,864	64.37
Female	57,576	36,304	63.05
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

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	106,482	44,084	41.40
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,476	442	29.95
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,931	1,874	63.94
Asian	2,813	1,826	64.91
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	118	48	40.68
Black or African American	28,593	6,346	22.19
Hispanic or Latino	13,302	4,220	31.72
White	56,483	29,743	52.66
Two or more races	3,697	1,459	39.46
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	11,958	1,314	10.99
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,676	146	5.46
Economically disadvantaged students	47,035	12,513	26.60
Migratory students	67	14	20.90
Male	54,003	22,400	41.48
Female	52,479	21,684	41.32
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. There was a significant difference in the population of 10th graders (113,586) and 11th graders (102,00) in NC in the 2014-15 SY. Since Science is assessed in 11th grade, this would explain the significant difference.			

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	111,055	57,177	51.49
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,511	536	35.47
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,239	2,081	64.25
Asian	3,107	2,024	65.14
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	132	57	43.18
Black or African American	29,553	9,714	32.87
Hispanic or Latino	13,730	5,593	40.74
White	59,208	37,198	62.83
Two or more races	3,814	2,055	53.88
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	12,276	1,661	13.53
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,915	134	4.60
Economically disadvantaged students	48,142	17,099	35.52
Migratory students	75	17	22.67
Male	56,128	25,715	45.81
Female	54,927	31,462	57.28
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. There was a significant difference in the population of 10th graders (113,586) and 11th graders (102,00) in NC in the 2014-15 SY. Since Science is assessed in 11th grade, this would explain the significant difference.			

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	96,918	47,193	48.69
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,316	480	36.47
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,760	1,828	66.23
Asian	2,658	1,787	67.23
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	102	41	40.20
Black or African American	24,915	6,975	28.00
Hispanic or Latino	11,057	4,159	37.61
White	53,387	32,067	60.07
Two or more races	3,483	1,684	48.35
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	9,810	1,683	17.16
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,587	84	5.29
Economically disadvantaged students	38,310	12,602	32.89
Migratory students	66	13	19.70
Male	48,758	24,280	49.80
Female	48,160	22,913	47.58

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. There was a significant difference in the population of 10th graders (113,586) and 11th graders (102,00) in NC in the 2014-15 SY. Since Science is assessed in 11th grade, this would explain the significant difference.

1.4 School and District Accountability

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

1.4.1 All Schools and Districts Accountability

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

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

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2014-15	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2014-15
Schools			
Districts			
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. N/A			

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

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

Entity	Total #	Total # that Met All AMOs, 95 Percent Participation Rate, and Other Academic Indicator in SY 2014-15	Percentage that Met All AMOs, 95 Percent Participation Rate and Other Academic Indicator in SY 2014-15
Schools	2,483	438	17.64
Districts	115	2	1.74
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. North Carolina implemented new assessments aligned to Common Core State Standards in 2012-13. The AMO targets were re-set based on the new academic achievement standards in 2012-13 and fewer schools met targets in 2014-15 due to the increased rigor.			

[3] For a high school, the other academic indicator is always graduation rate.

1.4.2 Title I School Accountability

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

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

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2014-15	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2014-15
All Title I schools			
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools			
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools			
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. N/A			

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

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

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools that Met All AMOs, 95 Percent Participation Rate, and Other Academic Indicator in SY 2014-15	Percentage of Title I Schools that Met All AMOs, 95 Percent Participation Rate, and Other Academic Indicator in SY 2014-15
All Title I schools	1,362	137	10.06
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	1,324	118	8.91
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	38	19	50.00
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. North Carolina implemented new assessments aligned to Common Core State Standards in 2012-13. The AMO targets were re-set based on the new academic achievement standards in 2012-13 and fewer schools met targets in 2014-15 due to the increased rigor.			

[4] For a high school, the other academic indicator is always graduation rate.

1.4.3 Accountability of Districts That Received Title I Funds

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

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

# Districts That		

Received Title I Funds in SY 2014-15	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2014-15	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2014-15
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. N/A		

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

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

# Districts That Received Title I Funds in SY 2014-15	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Met All AMOs, 95 percent Participation Rate, and Other Academic Indicator in SY 2014-15	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Met All AMOs, 95 percent Participation Rate, and Other Academic Indicator in SY 2014-15
115	2	1.74
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. North Carolina implemented new assessments aligned to Common Core State Standards in 2012-13. The AMO targets were re-set based on the new academic achievement standards in 2012-13 and fewer schools met targets in 2014-15 due to the increased rigor.		

[5] For a high school, the other academic indicator is always graduation rate.

1.4.4.3 Corrective Action

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

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2014-15
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	
Extension of the school year or school day	
Replacement of staff members, not including the principal, relevant to the school's low performance	
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	
Replacement of the principal	
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Through its ESEA Flexibility Request, North Carolina has an approved waiver to the requirements in ESEA section 1111 for an SEA to identify for improvement or corrective action, as appropriate, a school that, for two consecutive years or more, fails to make AYP, and for a school so identified to take certain corrective actions. The waiver was initially approved on May 29, 2012 and extended for four years on March 31, 2015. Therefore no schools were identified for corrective action in 2014-15.	

1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2

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

Restructuring Action	# of Title I Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	
Reopening the school as a public charter school	
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	
Takeover the school by the State	
Other major restructuring of the school governance	
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Through its ESEA Flexibility Request, North Carolina has an approved waiver to the requirements in ESEA section 1111 for an SEA to identify for improvement or corrective action, as appropriate, a school that, for two consecutive years or more, fails to make AYP, and for a school so identified to take certain corrective actions. The waiver was initially approved on May 29, 2012 and extended for four years on March 31, 2015. Therefore no schools were identified for corrective action in 2014-15.	

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.

N/A

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.

Through its ESEA Flexibility Request, North Carolina has an approved waiver to the requirements in ESEA section 1116(c) for an SEA to identify for improvement or corrective action, as appropriate, an LEA that, for two consecutive years or more, fails to make AYP, and for an LEA so identified and its SEA to take certain improvement actions. The waiver was initially approved on May 29, 2012 and extended for four additional years on March 31, 2015 . Therefore no districts were identified for corrective action in 2014-15.

1.4.5.3 Corrective Action

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

Corrective Action	# of Districts receiving Title I funds in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2014-15
Implemented a new curriculum based on State standards	
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	
Restructured the district	
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2013-14 and beginning of SY 2014-15 as a corrective action)	
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Through its ESEA Flexibility Request, North Carolina has an approved waiver to the requirements in ESEA section 1111 for an SEA to identify for improvement or corrective action, as appropriate, a school that, for two consecutive years or more, fails to make AYP, and for a school so identified to take certain corrective actions. The waiver was initially approved on May 29, 2012 and extended for four years on March 31, 2015. Therefore no schools were identified for corrective action in 2014-15.	

1.4.7 Appeal of AYP and Identification Determinations

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

Entity	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts	0	0
Schools	0	0
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. N/A		

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

Processing Appeals completion	Date
Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2014-15 data was complete	0

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

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

1.4.8.5 Use of Sections 1003(a) and (g) School Improvement Funds.

1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations

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

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Under ESEA Flexibility, no schools were identified under Section 1116 of ESEA.

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

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

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

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

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

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The North Carolina Department of Public Instruction (NCDPI) reserved five (5) percent of the School Improvement Grant for administration, evaluation, and monitoring of its SIG funded implementation. Funds were used as follows:

1. The provision of technical assistance to LEAs to assist with plan development including two statewide meetings with current and potential Priority/SIG schools. The statewide meetings included presentations from SEA specialists on topics such as English Language Learners, Exceptional Children, and Parent Engagement.
2. An increase in resources to support the application review process and monitoring requirements including contracts with outside experts. North Carolina contracted with a retired state Title I Director (and former United States Department of Education monitor), and a retired North Carolina Associate State Superintendent with significant experience regarding the statewide system of support.
3. The enhancement of existing DPI data systems to include required SIG data reporting elements. NCDPI is currently working with the Center on Innovation and Improvement to implement the Indistar School Improvement Grants Online Planning Tool (NC Indistar) for all SIG/Priority schools.
4. Completion of the evaluation process for each LEA receiving SIG funds. In addition to monitoring visits conducted for SIG schools in year one of implementation, LEAs/Schools submitted revisions to their initial grant in June 2014. Revisions were reviewed and approved in the fall of 2014.
5. An increase in direct services to LEAs determined to have low capacity for implementing interventions in coordination with the Statewide System of Support and the Race to the Top initiative.

School Transformation Coaches from NCDPI work with identified schools.

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

North Carolina has an approved waiver to the requirements in ESEA section 1116(b) for an LEA to identify for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring, as appropriate, a Title I school that fails, for two consecutive years or more, to make AYP, and for a school so identified and its LEA to take certain improvement actions. NC received approval on May 29, 2012, so no Title I schools were identified for improvement in 2014-15, the same as last year.

Title I schools not receiving funds under 1003(a) or 1003(g) are supported through a Statewide System of Support. North Carolina's statewide system of support is coordinated and monitored through three interlocking roundtables. The roundtable structure includes a Strategic Roundtable, an Agency Roundtable, and eight Regional Roundtables.

The Strategic Roundtable is comprised of NCDPI senior leadership and meets quarterly to manage the selection of districts and schools that will receive the most intensive support as well as monitoring progress toward the State's priority objectives.

The Agency Roundtable is comprised of all NCDPI division directors and meets monthly to facilitate ongoing initiatives within the statewide system of support. The state's Title I Director serves on this roundtable. The Roundtable identifies current initiatives being provided to the region by the agency; reviews comprehensive needs assessment outcomes; identifies gaps and redundancies; targets available resources to identified needs; and routes continued services through NCDPI staff assigned to regions, districts, and schools.

The eight Regional Roundtables are comprised of regional NCDPI staff and representatives of the Regional Education Services Areas (RESAs). The Regional Roundtables meet monthly to identify current initiatives underway in each district in the region, to identify common needs across each region, and to coordinate technical assistance provided for the districts and schools identified as having the greatest need for support. Regional Roundtables are facilitated by NCDPI Regional Leads, one assigned to each of the eight regions across North Carolina. These Regional Leads attend the Agency Roundtable to ensure that communication regarding the needs of districts and schools, as well as initiatives addressing those needs, are continually reassessed and adjusted as appropriate. A Title I consultant serves on each Regional Roundtable in order to ensure that statutory requirements are understood by all parties and appropriate services and support are brokered for Title I schools.

1.4.9 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

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

1.4.9.1 Public School Choice

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

1.4.9.1.2 Public School Choice – Students

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

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

The number of students who applied to transfer should include:

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

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

Public School Choice	# Students
Eligible for public school choice	
Applied to transfer	
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Through its ESEA Flexibility Request, North Carolina has an approved waiver to the requirements in ESEA section 1111 for an SEA to identify for improvement or corrective action, as appropriate, a school that, for two consecutive years or more, fails to make AYP, and for a school so identified to take certain improvement actions. The waiver was initially approved on May 29, 2012 and extended for four years on March 31, 2015. Therefore no schools were identified for improvement action and no schools offered Public School Choice or Supplemental Educational Services in 2014-15.	

1.4.9.1.3 Funds Spent on Public School Choice

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

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

1.4.9.1.4 Availability of Public School Choice Options

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

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

Unable to Provide Public School Choice	# LEAs
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	0

FAQs about public school choice:

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

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

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

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

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. N/A

1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

1.4.9.2.2 Supplemental Educational Services – Students

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

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

Supplemental Educational Services	# Students
Eligible for supplemental educational services	
Applied for supplemental educational services	
Received supplemental educational services	
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Through its ESEA Flexibility Request, North Carolina has an approved waiver to the requirements in ESEA section 1111 for an SEA to identify for improvement or corrective action, as appropriate, a school that, for two consecutive years or more, fails to make AYP, and for a school so identified to take certain improvement actions. The waiver was approved on May 29, 2012. Therefore no schools were identified for improvement action and no schools offered Public School Choice or Supplemental Educational Services in 2014-15.	

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*.

Spending on Supplemental Educational Services	Dollars Spent
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	$
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Through its ESEA Flexibility Request, North Carolina has an approved waiver to the requirements in ESEA section 1111 for an SEA to identify for improvement or corrective action, as appropriate, a school that, for two consecutive years or more, fails to make AYP, and for a school so identified to take certain improvement actions. The waiver was initially approved on May 29, 2012 and extended for four years on March 31, 2015. Therefore no schools were identified for improvement action and no schools offered Public School Choice or Supplemental Educational Services in 2014-15.	

1.5 TEACHER QUALITY

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

1.5.1 Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified

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

Classes	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified
All classes	80,584	77,655	96.37	2,929	3.63
All elementary classes	45,319	44,303	97.76	1,016	2.24
All secondary classes	35,265	33,352	94.58	1,913	5.42

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

Data table includes classes taught by special education teachers who provide direct instruction in core academic subjects.	Yes

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.

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.

1.5.2.1 Elementary School Classes

Elementary School Classes	Percentage
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	31.16
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	2.89
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	28.92
Other (please explain in comment box below)	37.03
Total	100.00

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other: expired, no payroll or license on file

1.5.2.2 Secondary School Classes

Secondary School Classes	Percentage
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)	32.34
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	19.14
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	32.56
Other (please explain in comment box below)	15.96
Total	100.00

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other: expired, 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.

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

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

School Type	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified
Elementary Schools			
High Poverty Elementary Schools	10,651	10,347	97.15
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	13,338	12,960	97.17
Secondary Schools			
High Poverty secondary Schools	4,217	3,752	88.97
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	10,497	9,999	95.26

1.5.3.1 Poverty Quartile Breaks

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

	High-Poverty Schools (more than what %)	**Low-Poverty Schools** (less than what %)
Elementary schools	83.60	48.90
Poverty metric used	Per guidance Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines high-poverty schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State. Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines low-poverty schools as schools in the bottom quartile of poverty in the State. 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. 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.	
Secondary schools	62.10	38.80
Poverty metric used	Per guidance Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines high-poverty schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State. Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines low-poverty schools as schools in the bottom quartile of poverty in the State. 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. 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.	

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

a. *What is a "high-poverty school"?* Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "high-poverty" schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State.

b. *What is a "low-poverty school"?* Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "low-poverty" schools as schools in the bottom quartile of poverty in the State.

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

d. *Since the poverty data are collected at the school and not classroom level, how do we classify schools as either elementary or secondary for this purpose?* States may include as elementary schools all schools that serve children in grades K through 5 (including K through 8 or K through 12 schools) and would therefore include as secondary schools those that exclusively serve children in grades 6 and higher.

1.6 Title III and Language Instructional Programs

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

1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Push in- Small groups based upon student data
Transitional
ESL Block Classes
Newcomer Program
ExC-ELL
Summer Enrichment in writing

1.6.2 Student Demographic Data

1.6.2.1 Number of ALL LEP Students in the State

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

- 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	96,986
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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

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

LEP Students Receiving Services	#
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	95,308
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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	82,146
Arabic	1,958
Chinese	1,337
Vietnamese	1,144
Hmong	935

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.6.3 Student Performance Data

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

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

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

All LEP Testing	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	98,980
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	474
Total	99,454
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

All LEP Results	#
Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	18,021
Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	18.46
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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

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

Title III LEP Testing	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	97,089
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	467
Total	97,556
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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

Title III First Time Tested	#
Number of Title III students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time whose progress cannot be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO 1.	22,110

1.6.3.2.2 Title III LEP English Language Proficiency Results

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

Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:

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

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

Title III Results	Results #	Results %	Targets #	Targets %
Making progress	47,742	63.67	44,316	59.10
Attained proficiency	17,736	18.27	14,173	14.60
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.				

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

1.6.3.5.2 Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given

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

Language(s)
English
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

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

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

1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students

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

1.6.3.6.1 Title III Served MFLEP Students by Year Monitored

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

Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) students include:

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

Table 1.6.3.6.1 Definitions:

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

# Year One	# Year Two	Total
14,330	14,708	29,038
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

1.6.3.6.2 MFLEP Students Results for Mathematics

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

Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
22,018	8,455	38.40	13,563
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.6.3.6.3 MFLEP Students Results for Reading/Language Arts

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

Table 1.6.3.6.3 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
22,064	5,784	26.21	16,280
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.6.3.6.4 MFLEP Students Results for Science

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

Table 1.6.3.6.4 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
10,005	4,036	40.34	5,969
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.6.4 Title III Subgrantees

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

1.6.4.1 Title III Subgrantee Performance

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

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

Title III Subgrantees	#
Total number of subgrantees for the year	90
////////////

1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students

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

Note: All immigrant students are not LEP students.

1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students

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

Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:

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

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants
13,871	771	27

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development

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

1.6.6.1 Teacher Information

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

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

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

Title III Teachers	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	1,744
Estimate number of **additional** certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	811

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

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

Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:

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

Professional Development (PD) Topics	# Subgrantees
Instructional strategies for LEP students	85
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	82
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	79
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	67
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	71
Other (Explain in comment box)	0

PD Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	79	17,310
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	66	1,620
PD provided to principals	64	1,582
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	62	1,227
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	18	553
PD provided to community based organization personnel	50	2,228
Total	//////////////////////////////////////	24,520

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities

This section collects data on State grant activities.

1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process

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

Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:

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

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

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/$$ Distribution
7/1/14	8/25/14	46
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Title III application process was initiated earlier to better streamline the review process and to increase efficiency.It also integrated components so that applications were reviewed for completion prior to the final submission to ensure all appropriate information was included as to not delay approval. Electronic tracking was utilized to maintain the status of applications.

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

1.9 Education for Homeless Children and Youths Program

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

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

LEAs	#	# LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	216	66
LEAs with subgrants	48	49
Total	264	115
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. There are 48 McKinney Vento Sub-grant awards with one award being a consortium of 2 districts with totals the 49.		

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

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

1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youth

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

Age/Grade	# of Homeless Children/Youth Enrolled in Public School in LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youth Enrolled in Public School in LEAs With Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	55	366
K	386	2,267
1	403	2,175
2	365	2,010
3	349	1,947
4	333	1,786
5	319	1,688
6	330	1,688
7	327	1,672
8	298	1,661
9	320	1,897
10	249	1,381
11	224	1,200
12	305	1,465
Ungraded		2
Total	4,263	23,205
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. For the 14-15SY, Specification C118 requires counts for Grade 13; that headcount is not included in this table, which accounts for the discrepancy with table 1.9.1.2, which does count students in Grade 13.		

1.9.1.2 Primary Nighttime Residence of Homeless Children and Youth

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

Primary Nighttime Residence	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs With Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	345	2,592
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	3,425	17,001
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	92	804
Hotels/Motels	410	2,822
Total	4,272	23,219
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. For the 14-15SY, Specification 118 requires counts for Grade 13; that headcount is included in this table, which accounts for the discrepancy with table 1.9.1.1, which does not reflect students in Grade 13.		

1.9.1.3 Subgroups of Homeless Students Enrolled

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

Special Population	# Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs With Subgrants
Unaccompanied homeless youth	484	2,172
Migratory children/youth	27	72
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	663	3,951
Limited English Proficient (LEP) students	198	1,394
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

1.9.2.1 Homeless Children and Youth Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

Age/Grade	# Homeless Children/Youth Served by Subgrants
Age Birth Through 2	45
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	198
K	1,545
1	1,451
2	1,375
3	1,331
4	1,194
5	1,146
6	1,158
7	1,121
8	1,106
9	1,197
10	814
11	752
12	941
Ungraded	0
Total	15,374
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. For the 14-15SY, Specification 118 requires counts for Grade 13; that headcount is included in this table, which accounts for the discrepancy with table 1.9.1.1, which does not reflect students in Grade 13.	

1.9.2.2 Subgroups of Homeless Students Served

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

Subgroup	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied homeless youth	1,420
Migratory children/youth	52
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	2,870
Limited English Proficient (LEP) students	1,073
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.9.3 Academic Achievement of Homeless Students

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

1.9.3.1 Reading Assessment

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

Grade	LEAs Without Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	LEAs Without Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs Without Subgrants - % of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs With Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	LEAs With Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs With Subgrants - % of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient
3	276	68	24.64	1,659	344	20.74
4	270	74	27.41	1,551	347	22.37
5	261	47	18.01	1,459	242	16.59
6	257	65	25.29	1,434	306	21.34
7	260	74	28.46	1,416	273	19.28
8	236	52	22.03	1,417	229	16.16
High School	171	54	31.58	1,031	276	26.77
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.						

1.9.3.2 Mathematics Assessment

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

Grade	LEAs Without Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	LEAs Without Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs Without Subgrants - % of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs With Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	LEAs With Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs With Subgrants - % of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient
3	276	69	25.00	1,660	370	22.29
4	271	76	28.04	1,549	352	22.72
5	261	61	23.37	1,460	317	21.71
6	257	46	17.90	1,436	204	14.21
7	260	42	16.15	1,418	186	13.12
8	237	34	14.35	1,414	146	10.33
High School	170	35	20.59	989	188	19.01
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.						

1.9.3.3 Science Assessment

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

Grade	LEAs Without Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	LEAs Without Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs Without Subgrants - % of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs With Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	LEAs With Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs With Subgrants - % of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient
3						
4						
5	261	66	25.29	1,459	389	26.66
6						
7						
8	235	99	42.13	1,410	491	34.82
High School	156	40	25.64	833	206	24.73
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Science Assessments are not given in NC for grades 3, 4, 6 or 7.						