

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: Parts I and II

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

For reporting on
School Year 2005-2006



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 1, 2006
PART II DUE FEBRUARY 1, 2007**

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

INTRODUCTION

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

The Consolidated State Application and Report includes the following ESEA programs:

- Title I, Part A – *Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies.*
- Title I, Part B, Subpart 3 – *William F. Goodling Even Start Family Literacy Programs.*
- Title I, Part C – *Education of Migratory Children.*
- Title I, Part D – *Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk.*
- Title I, Part F – *Comprehensive School Reform.*
- Title II, Part A – *Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund).*
- Title II, Part D – *Enhancing Education through Technology.*
- 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 IV, Part B – *21st Century Community Learning Centers.*
- 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.*

In addition to the programs cited above, the Title X, Part C - *Education for Homeless Children and Youths* program data will be incorporated in the CSPR for 2005-2006.

The NCLB Consolidated State Performance Report for the 2005-2006 school year consists of two information collections. Part I of this report is due to the Department by December 1, 2006 . Part II is due to the Department by February 1, 2007.

PART I

Part I of the Consolidated State Report, which States must submit to the Department by **December 1, 2006**, 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 ESEA. The five ESEA Goals established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application are as follows:

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

PART II

Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report consists of information related to State activities and outcomes of specific ESEA programs for the 2005-2006 school year. Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report is due to the Department by **February 1, 2007**. The information requested in Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report for the 2005-2006 school year necessarily varies from program to program. However, for all programs, 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.
3. The information will provide valid evidence of program outcomes or results.
4. The Consolidated State Performance Report is the best vehicle for collection of the data.

The Department is continuing to work with the Performance-Based Data Management Initiative (PBDMI) to streamline data collections for the 2005-2006 school year and beyond.

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the 2005-2006 school year must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **December 1, 2007**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **February 1, 2007**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the 2005-2006 school year, unless otherwise noted.

The format states will use to submit the Consolidated State Performance Report has changed to an online submission. 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 "2005-06 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 2005-2006 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1810-0614. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 111 hours per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimates(s) contact School Support and Technology Programs, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW, Washington DC 20202-6140. Questions about the new electronic CSPR submission process, should be directed to the EDEN Partner Support Center at 1-877-HLP-EDEN (1-877-457-3336).

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART I

For reporting on
School Year 2005-2006



PART I DUE DECEMBER 1, 2006

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

Section 1111(b)(1) of ESEA requires States to adopt challenging academic content and achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science and to develop assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(3) in the required grade levels. In the following sections, States are asked to provide a detailed description of their progress in meeting the NCLB standards and assessments requirements.

1.1.1 Please provide a detailed description of the State's progress in adopting challenging academic content standards in science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(1).

State Response

The North Carolina State Board of Education adopted a revised science component of the Standard Course of Study in December, 2003. More information about this curriculum is printed below.

Intent

The science component of the North Carolina Standard Course of Study (SCS) was created to establish competency goals and objectives for teaching and learning science in all grades. It contains the concepts and theories, strands, skills, and processes on which all science instruction should be based. In addition, the curriculum defines and illustrates the connections between the National Science Education Standards, the Benchmarks for Scientific Literacy, and the state standards. The SCS is a guide to stronger, more relevant science education for every student.

Revisions

The SCS was last revised in 1999. The 2004 revision has been written to reflect the development of National Science Education Standards better. The 2004 revision further reflects the recommendations of the Third International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS) and the 1996 National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) science framework and assessment. The SCS has been written to expand the intent of previous documents and represents an evolutionary process of curriculum refinement. These standards can be accessed through the Department's website address: <http://www.ncpublicschools.org/curriculum/science/scos/2004/>

PHILOSOPHY

The science component is designed to assist educators in planning, implementing, and assessing a science program that allows "students to develop an understanding of what science is, what science is not, what science can and cannot do, and how science contributes to culture." (National Science Education Standards, 1996, p.21) It is based on the belief that:

• Science is a human activity that can be characterized by participants' processes.

• All students can learn and succeed in science.

• Learning science is something students do, not something that is done to them.

• Everyone can describe, explain, and predict natural phenomena.

• Science, technology and society are interrelated.

• Attitudes toward science established in childhood shape adult scientific literacy.

The goal of the North Carolina Standard Course of Study is to achieve scientific literacy. The National Science Education Standards define scientific literacy as "the knowledge and understanding of scientific concepts and processes required for scientific decision making, participation in civic and cultural affairs, and economic productivity." (p. 22)

The tenets of scientific literacy include the ability to:

• Find or determine answers to questions derived from everyday experiences.

• Describe, explain, and predict natural phenomena.

• Understand articles about science.

â€¢ Engage in non-technical conversation about the validity of conclusions.

â€¢ Identify scientific issues underlying national and local decisions.

â€¢ Pose explanations based on evidence derived from one's own work.

This philosophy is based on research, state and federal documents, and ideas of professional societies. Though research shows that all students can learn and succeed in science, all students will not become scientists nor achieve the same level of understanding. Rather, the goal is to create a scientifically literate society crucial to our increasingly complex and technological world. The decisions of future policy makers will, in large measure, be based on attitudes developed in today's classrooms. Research in cognitive science and science education supports the need for concept development through science and technology instruction. All students, in all grades, deserve continuing and meaningful science instruction.

1.1.2 Please provide a detailed description of the State's progress in developing and implementing, in consultation with LEAs, assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(3) in the required grade levels. Please provide in your response a description of the State's progress in developing alternate assessments for students with disabilities, including alternate assessments aligned to alternate achievement standards and those aligned to grade-level achievement standards.

State Response

Statewide assessments for the areas of reading and mathematics in grades three through eight and high school are already established and in place. Assessments in the area of science grades 5 & 8 are being developed according to the timeline below.

Science Assessments Timeline

2004-05

Item development, item reviews, and item tryouts

2005-06

Item data analyzed, item revisions/ development and item/form production and field testing

2006-07

Field test data analyzed. Test assembly, test production, tests administered as an operational pilot, academic achievement standards set, agency approves revised tests

2007-08

Operational tests administered. Results reported, technical documentation reported

Alternate assessments currently are available for the reading and mathematics assessments and are being developed for science in grades 5 & 8.

For information on alternate assessments starting with the 2005-06 school year see:

http://www.ncpublicschools.org/docs/accountability/alternate_assessment_changes_2005_06_080305.pdf.

1.1.3 Please provide a detailed description of the State's progress in setting, in consultation with LEAs, academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(1). If applicable, please provide in your response a description of the State's progress in developing alternate achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.

State Response

The academic achievement standards (performance standards) have been established in the areas of reading and mathematics for grades three through eight as well as high school. North Carolina has four achievement levels, which are Achievement Level I (the lowest level of achievement), up to Achievement Level IV (the highest level of achievement). Descriptors of these achievement levels were submitted during the Title I Peer Review Process for Assessments and they were expanded based on that review. The North Carolina State Board of Education approved the expanded achievement level descriptors at its meeting on March 2, 2006. The achievement standards in the area of science will be determined during the 2006-07 school year for implementation in the 2007-08 school year.

The alternate achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities are in place for reading and mathematics and are being developed for science. The alternate assessments described in B above are used to measure these students against the alternate achievement standards.

Alternate assessments currently are available for the reading and mathematics assessments and are being developed for science in grades 5 & 8. For information on alternate assessments starting with the 2005-06 school year see: http://www.ncpublicschools.org/docs/accountability/alternate_assessment_changes_2005?06_080305.pdf.

North Carolina's assessment system, including science standards have been approved through ED's peer review process as of the end of SY 2005-06 (defined as June 30, 2006 for this process).

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS**Participation of All Students in 2005-2006 State Assessments**

In the following tables, please provide the total number and percentage for each of the listed subgroups of students who participated in the State's 2005-2006 school year academic assessments.

The data provided below for students with disabilities should include participation results from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act and do not include results from students covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

1.2.1 Student Participation in 2005-2006 School Year Test Administration**1.2.1.1 2005-2006 School Year Mathematics Assessment**

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Tested
All Students	746456	99.20
American Indian or Alaska Native	10697	98.90
Asian or Pacific Islander	15988	99.40
Black, non-Hispanic	215997	98.90
Hispanic	60921	99.00
White, non-Hispanic	422391	99.40
Students with Disabilities	98472	98.20
Limited English Proficient	34416	99.10
Economically Disadvantaged	337523	99.10
Migrant	1693	99.00
Male	380870	99.10
Female	365579	99.40

Comments: These data were moved over from the EDEN upload.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.2.1.2 2005-2006 School Year Reading/Language Arts Assessment

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Tested
All Students	744506	99.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	10677	98.70
Asian or Pacific Islander	15909	98.90
Black, non-Hispanic	215395	98.60
Hispanic	60467	98.20
White, non-Hispanic	421650	0.00
Students with Disabilities	98195	99.30
Limited English Proficient	40801	98.40
Economically Disadvantaged	336652	98.80
Migrant	1667	0.00
Male	379929	0.00
Female	364581	0.00

Comments: No EDEN participation rates were apparent at the time of this certification, so the rates shown here were computed from data provided by Accountability Services, Reporting Section. Due to timing, there may be slight discrepancies between the EDEN total numbers of students tested and CSPR total number of students tested. Total numbers for migrants, males and females were moved over from the EDEN data. There were no rates available for these categories.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in State Assessment System

Students with disabilities (as defined under IDEA) participate in the State's assessment system either by taking the regular State assessment, with or without accommodations, by taking an alternate assessment aligned to grade-level standards, or by taking an alternate assessment aligned to alternate achievement standards. In the following table, please provide the total number and percentage of students with disabilities who participated in these various assessments.

The data provided below should include participation results from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act and do not include results from students covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

1.2.2

1.2.2.1 Participation of Students with Disabilities the in 2005-2006 School Year Test Administration -- Math Assessment

	Total Number of Students with Disabilities Tested	Percent of Students with Disabilities Tested
Regular Assessment, with or without accommodations	81285	82.60
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards	13177	13.40
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	4011	4.10

Comments:

1.2.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities the in 2005-2006 School Year Test Administration -- Reading/Language Arts Assessment

	Total Number of Students with Disabilities Tested	Percent of Students with Disabilities Tested
Regular Assessment, with or without accommodations	79023	80.50
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards	15164	15.40
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	4008	4.10

Comments:

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

In the following charts, please provide student achievement data from the 2005-2006 school year test administration. Charts have been provided for each of grades 3 through 8 and high school to accommodate the varied State assessment systems in mathematics and reading/language arts during the 2005-2006 school year. States should provide data on the total number of students tested as well as the percentage of students scoring at the proficient or advanced levels for those grades in which the State administered mathematics and reading/language arts assessments during the 2005-2006 school year.

The data for students with disabilities should include participation results from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, including results from alternate assessments, and do not include results from students covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

1.3.1 Grade 3 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	105286	65.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	1552	54.60
Asian or Pacific Islander	2301	82.40
Black, non-Hispanic	29108	44.50
Hispanic	9836	55.20
White, non-Hispanic	59052	76.40
Students with Disabilities	14973	40.10
Limited English Proficient	6227	43.70
Economically Disadvantaged	52161	54.50
Migrant	345	44.30
Male	53831	64.90
Female	51455	65.20

Comments: These are the percentages as reported in our statewide disaggregated data reports. Our statewide standards changed in 2005-06, thus the discrepancy with previous year's data.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.2 Grade 3 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	105216	83.40
American Indian or Alaska Native	1553	75.50
Asian or Pacific Islander	2297	90.60
Black, non-Hispanic	29111	72.80
Hispanic	9765	73.30
White, non-Hispanic	59055	90.10
Students with Disabilities	14967	54.60
Limited English Proficient	6186	61.80
Economically Disadvantaged	52104	74.10
Migrant	342	59.10
Male	53786	80.20
Female	51430	86.70

Comments: Data were derived from statewide disaggregated data report.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.3 Grade 4 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	105286	65.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	1552	54.60
Asian or Pacific Islander	2372	81.10
Black, non-Hispanic	29123	44.50
Hispanic	10176	54.20
White, non-Hispanic	59080	76.40
Students with Disabilities	14977	40.20
Limited English Proficient	6665	42.60
Economically Disadvantaged	50315	50.90
Migrant	220	49.50
Male	53831	64.90
Female	51455	65.20

Comments: New standards were in place in 2005-06.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.4 Grade 4 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	105216	83.40
American Indian or Alaska Native	1553	75.50
Asian or Pacific Islander	2297	90.60
Black, non-Hispanic	29111	72.80
Hispanic	9765	73.30
White, non-Hispanic	59055	90.10
Students with Disabilities	14967	54.60
Limited English Proficient	6186	61.80
Economically Disadvantaged	50260	74.50
Migrant	342	59.10
Male	53786	80.20
Female	51430	86.70

Comments: Data were derived from the disaggregated data report (statewide).

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.5 Grade 5 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	106120	63.10
American Indian or Alaska Native	1532	44.50
Asian or Pacific Islander	2213	81.90
Black, non-Hispanic	30137	43.20
Hispanic	9273	54.00
White, non-Hispanic	59714	74.30
Students with Disabilities	14821	35.50
Limited English Proficient	5711	40.40
Economically Disadvantaged	50044	48.00
Migrant	298	39.90
Male	54649	62.80
Female	51471	63.40

Comments: There were new mathematics standards set in 2005-06.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.6 Grade 5 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	106070	88.40
American Indian or Alaska Native	1532	78.40
Asian or Pacific Islander	2209	93.20
Black, non-Hispanic	30132	80.80
Hispanic	9233	79.00
White, non-Hispanic	59713	93.60
Students with Disabilities	14810	61.90
Limited English Proficient	5696	68.40
Economically Disadvantaged	50012	81.30
Migrant	297	62.60
Male	54623	86.20
Female	51447	90.70

Comments: Data were derived using our statewide disaggregated database.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.7 Grade 6 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	109046	61.90
American Indian or Alaska Native	1604	46.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	2228	82.40
Black, non-Hispanic	32584	40.20
Hispanic	8689	51.30
White, non-Hispanic	60942	74.50
Students with Disabilities	14249	32.40
Limited English Proficient	4556	35.30
Economically Disadvantaged	51777	45.80
Migrant	230	35.20
Male	56023	60.80
Female	53023	63.00

Comments: Data were derived using our statewide disaggregated data report.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.8 Grade 6 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	109042	81.50
American Indian or Alaska Native	1607	72.10
Asian or Pacific Islander	2218	88.30
Black, non-Hispanic	32616	69.00
Hispanic	8645	70.10
White, non-Hispanic	60959	89.50
Students with Disabilities	14260	49.50
Limited English Proficient	4527	52.20
Economically Disadvantaged	51786	71.00
Migrant	182	58.20
Male	56024	77.70
Female	53018	85.50

Comments: Data were derived statewide disaggregated data report.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.9 Grade 7 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	108670	61.80
American Indian or Alaska Native	1576	47.40
Asian or Pacific Islander	2172	81.40
Black, non-Hispanic	32867	40.20
Hispanic	7955	50.60
White, non-Hispanic	61443	74.40
Students with Disabilities	13821	31.70
Limited English Proficient	4073	34.10
Economically Disadvantaged	49691	45.50
Migrant	291	42.60
Male	55596	60.70
Female	53074	62.90

Comments: New math standards were in place in 2005-06.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.10 Grade 7 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	108704	86.40
American Indian or Alaska Native	1578	79.50
Asian or Pacific Islander	2165	91.00
Black, non-Hispanic	32928	77.70
Hispanic	7907	75.30
White, non-Hispanic	61469	92.30
Students with Disabilities	13870	56.40
Limited English Proficient	4054	58.40
Economically Disadvantaged	49730	78.00
Migrant	294	55.40
Male	55704	83.00
Female	53129	89.80

Comments: Data were derived from the disaggregated data report for 2005-06.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.11 Grade 8 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	109919	60.70
American Indian or Alaska Native	1609	45.40
Asian or Pacific Islander	2193	81.20
Black, non-Hispanic	33325	40.00
Hispanic	7539	50.30
White, non-Hispanic	62799	72.60
Students with Disabilities	14260	30.90
Limited English Proficient	3849	36.80
Economically Disadvantaged	48487	44.10
Migrant	250	41.60
Male	55938	58.80
Female	53981	62.70

Comments: Data were derived using our disaggregated data report for 2005-06.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.12 Grade 8 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	109897	86.90
American Indian or Alaska Native	1611	79.80
Asian or Pacific Islander	2188	91.70
Black, non-Hispanic	33333	77.90
Hispanic	7492	76.00
White, non-Hispanic	62820	92.90
Students with Disabilities	14291	58.10
Limited English Proficient	3864	58.40
Economically Disadvantaged	48559	78.40
Migrant	79	60.80
Male	55925	84.30
Female	53972	89.60

Comments: Data were derived from the disaggregated data report for 2005-06.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.13 High School - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	97630	75.70
American Indian or Alaska Native	1260	69.40
Asian or Pacific Islander	2139	80.80
Black, non-Hispanic	28249	61.90
Hispanic	5309	63.80
White, non-Hispanic	58889	83.40
Students with Disabilities	10544	42.80
Limited English Proficient	2923	53.20
Economically Disadvantaged	33115	64.50
Migrant	102	62.70
Male	48885	73.50
Female	48745	77.90

Comments: These data were not derived from the disaggregated data report for 2005-06. They were provided by the Reporting section, Accountability Services.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.14 High School - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	95801	51.60
American Indian or Alaska Native	1232	32.40
Asian or Pacific Islander	2096	57.70
Black, non-Hispanic	27542	35.70
Hispanic	5096	33.20
White, non-Hispanic	58094	60.90
Students with Disabilities	10246	15.80
Limited English Proficient	2771	13.90
Economically Disadvantaged	32289	33.80
Migrant	105	9.50
Male	47997	44.10
Female	47804	59.20

Comments: These data were not derived from the disaggregated data report for 2005-06. They were provided by the Reporting section, Accountability Services.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY

1.4.1 For all public elementary and secondary schools and districts in the State (Title I and non-Title I), please provide the total number and percentage of all schools and districts that made adequate yearly progress (AYP), based on data from the 2005-2006 school year.

School Accountability	Total number of public elementary and secondary schools (Title I and non-Title I) in State	Total number of public elementary and secondary schools (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP	Percentage of public elementary and secondary schools (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP
Based on 2005-2006 School Year Data	2353	1043	44.30

Comments:

District Accountability	Total number of public elementary and secondary districts (Title I and non-Title I) in State	Total number of public elementary and secondary districts (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP	Percentage of public elementary and secondary districts (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP
Based on 2005-2006 School Year Data	115	3	2.60

Comments: In 2004-05 there were 8 LEAs that made AYP.

1.4.2 For all Title I schools and districts in the State, please provide the total number and percentage of all Title I schools and districts that made AYP, based on data from the 2005-2006 school year.

Title I School Accountability	Total number of Title I schools in State	Total number of Title I schools in State that made AYP	Percentage of Title I schools in State that made AYP
Based on 2005-2006 School Year Data	1165	538	46.20

Comments: Our numbers of schools in improvement rose dramatically in 2005-06. This is a comment to confirm the 56% increase

Title I District Accountability	Total number of Title I districts in State	Total number of Title I districts in State that made AYP	Percentage of Title I districts in State that made AYP
Based on 2005-2006 School Year Data	115	3	2.60

Comments: In 2004-05 there were 8 LEAs that made AYP. In 2005-06, that number shrank to only 3 LEAs making AYP.

1.4.3 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

1.4.3.1 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement, Corrective Action, and Restructuring (in 2006-2007 based on the data from 2005-2006)

1.4.3.2 Briefly describe the measures being taken to address the achievement problems of **schools** identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring.

State assistance is provided in several ways. First, the Title I teams offer regional technical assistance through regional-based consultants. Secondly, state assistance teams composed of retired educators, teachers-on-loan, and State agency staff provide assistance in selected schools that are in the corrective action and that may also be identified through the State's accountability program. Thirdly, the State Agency is seeking to build capacity at the District level, particularly in districts that are in Corrective Action and who have schools in Title I Corrective Action. District teams are invited to a data orientation and training session at the State Agency where they will meet with LEA Assistance Program teams to examine data and define strategies to address deficiencies. The Associate Superintendent of Curriculum and School Reform has developed an extensive plan for a three tiered approach to assistance in Title I schools and Districts moving into improvement.

1.4.4 Title I Districts Identified For Improvement.

1.4.4.1 Title I Districts Identified for Improvement and Corrective Action (in 2006-2007 based on the data from 2005-2006)

1.4.4.2 Briefly describe the measures being taken to address the achievement problems of districts identified for improvement and corrective action.

The LEA Assistance Program (LEAAP) is designed to provide varying degrees of support, guidance and services to districts. The level of services is determined by district performance in the ABCs of Public Education and/or No Child Left Behind (NCLB). The primary aims are to improve student academic performance and to build internal capacity in the central office and school's leadership for positive change and continual growth. Services and assistance provided to districts by NCDPI will be extended and reinforced by (a) encouraging and promoting the partnering of districts to share best practices, programs and strategies (b) clustering districts located in close proximity that have similar needs and demographics and (c) calling upon partners such as the Center for School Leadership Development. The number of districts served will depend on the availability of resources and will be provided to the ten districts in Tier I or Guided Assistance with the greatest need. These districts will be approved and designated by the State Board of Education. The remaining districts will fall into the voluntary assistance categories and will be offered services in the order that requests are received. The number received will depend upon the available resources. The State is required by federal guidance to provide assistance upon a district's request.

1.4.5 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

1.4.5.1 Public School Choice	
	Number
1. Please provide the number of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring from which students transferred under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	128
2. Please provide the number of public schools to which students transferred under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	629
How many of these schools were charter schools?	0
3. Please provide the number of students who transferred to another public school under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	4053
4. Please provide the number of students who were eligible to transfer to another public school under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	86345
Optional Information:	
5. If the State has the following data, the Department would be interested in knowing the following:	
6. The number of students who applied to transfer to another public school under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	0
7. The number of students, among those who applied to transfer to another public school under the Title I public school choice provisions, who were actually offered the opportunity to transfer by their LEAs, during the 2005-2006 school year.	0
Comments: Question #2, part b: Charter Schools has zero. Are considered as a school & LEA as one (1) and unless they have an agreement with another district, they cannot offer choice. #5,6,7, data will be in collected in 2006-2007.	

1.4.5.2 Supplemental Educational Services	
	Number
1. Please provide the number of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring whose students received supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	97
2. Please provide the number of students who received supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	6546
3. Please provide the number of students who were eligible to receive supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	33153
Optional Information:	
If the State has the following data, the Department would be interested in knowing the following:	
4. The number of students who applied to receive supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	0
Comments: The optional information is reported as zero and was not intended for completion. Zero was entered as the only option.	

1.5 TEACHER AND PARAPROFESSIONAL QUALITY

1.5.1 In the following table, please provide data from the 2005-2006 school year for classes in the core academic subjects being taught by "highly qualified" teachers (as the term is defined in Section 9101(23) of the ESEA), in the aggregate for all schools and in "high-poverty" and "low-poverty" elementary schools (as the terms are defined in Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) of the ESEA). Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "high-poverty" schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State and "low-poverty" schools as schools in the bottom quartile of poverty in the State. Additionally, please provide information on classes being taught by highly qualified teachers by the elementary and secondary school level.

School Type	Total Number of Core Academic Classes	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers
All Schools in State	73572	68894	93.60
Elementary Level			
High-Poverty Schools	8290	7885	95.10
Low-Poverty Schools	10958	10626	97.00
All Elementary Schools	39396	37903	96.20
Secondary Level			
High-Poverty Schools	6509	5678	87.20
Low-Poverty Schools	9844	9126	92.70
All Secondary Schools	34176	30991	90.70
Comments:			

Definitions and Instructions

What are the core academic subjects?

English, reading or 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.

How is a teacher defined?

An individual who provides instruction in the core academic areas to kindergarten, grades 1 through 12, or un-graded 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]

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 percent of the time [from NCES Non-fiscal Data Handbook for Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education, 2003].

Should 6th, 7th, and 8th grade classes be reported in the elementary or 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. See Question A-14 in the August 3, 2006, Non-Regulatory Guidance for additional information. Report classes in grade 6 through 8 consistent with how teachers have been classified to determine their highly qualified status, regardless if their schools are configured as elementary or middle schools.

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.

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 English, calculus, history, and science are taught in a self-contained classroom by the same teacher, count these as four classes in the denominator. If the teacher is Highly Qualified in English and history, he/she would be counted as Highly Qualified in two of the four subjects in the numerator.

1.5.2 For those classes in core academic subjects being taught by teachers who are **not highly qualified** as reported in Question 1.5.1, estimate the percentages of those classes in the following categories (Note: Percentages should add to 100 percent of classes taught by not highly qualified teachers for each level).

Reason For Being Classified as Not Highly Qualified	Percentage
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL CLASSES	
a) 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	15.00
b) 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	14.00
c) Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	71.00
d) Other (please explain)	0.00
SECONDARY SCHOOL CLASSES	
a) 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)	11.00
b) Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	32.00
c) Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	57.00
d) Other (please explain)	0.00
Comments:	

1.5.3 Please report the State poverty quartile breaks for high- and low-poverty elementary and secondary schools used in the table in Question 1.5.1.

	High-Poverty Schools (more than what %)	Low-Poverty Schools (less than what %)
Elementary Schools	76.70	40.00
Poverty Metric Used	% free and reduced lunch	
Secondary Schools	62.50	30.20
Poverty Metric Used	% free and reduced lunch	

Comments:

Definitions and Instructions

How are the poverty quartiles determined?

Separately rank order elementary and secondary schools from highest to lowest on your percent poverty measure. Divide the list into 4 equal groups. Schools in the first (highest group) are high-poverty schools. Schools in the last group (lowest group) are the low-poverty schools. Generally, states use the percentage of students who qualify for the free or reduced price lunch program for this calculation.

Since the poverty data are collected at the school and not classroom level, how do we classify schools as either elementary or secondary for this purpose?

States may include as elementary schools all schools that serve children in grades K-5 (including K-8 or K-12 schools) and would therefore include as secondary schools those that exclusively serve children in grades 6 and higher.

1.5.4 Paraprofessional Quality. NCLB defines a qualified paraprofessional as an employee who provides instructional support in a program supported by Title I, Part A funds who has (1) completed two years of study at an institution of higher education; (2) obtained an associate's (or higher) degree; or (3) met a rigorous standard of quality and be able to demonstrate, through a formal State or local academic assessment, knowledge of and the ability to assist in instructing reading, writing, and mathematics (or, as appropriate, reading readiness, writing readiness, and mathematics readiness) (Section 1119(c) and (d).) For more information on qualified paraprofessionals, please refer to the Title I paraprofessionals Guidance, available at:

<http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/paraguidance.doc>

In the following chart, please provide data from the 2005-2006 school year for the percentage of Title I paraprofessionals (excluding those with sole duties as translators and parental involvement assistants) who are qualified.

School Year	Percentage of Qualified Title I Paraprofessionals
2005-2006 School Year	91.40

Comments:

1.6 ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY

1.6.1.1 English Language Proficiency (ELP) Standards

Has the State developed ELP standards (k-12) as required under Section 3113(b)(2) and are these ELP standards fully approved, adopted, or sanctioned by the State governing body?

Developed	<u>No Response</u>
Approved, adopted, sanctioned	<u>No Response</u>
Operationalized (e.g., Are standards being used by district and school teachers?)	<u>No Response</u>

Please provide a detailed description of the State's progress in establishing, implementing, and operationalizing English Language Proficiency (ELP) standards for raising the level of ELP, that are derived from the four domains of speaking, listening, reading, and writing, and that are aligned with achievement of the challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards described in section 1111(b)(1).

STATE RESPONSE

North Carolina's English Language Proficiency Standard Course of Study (ELD SCS) was developed by a committee of thirty ESL educators in 2003 and was approved by our State Board of Education on December 3, 2003. Implementation of the ELD SCS was mandated beginning with the 2004-2005 school year.

The ELD SCS is organized by grade level for K-8 and by grade cluster for 9-12. Objectives were written to address the four language domains of Listening, Speaking, Reading, and Writing at specific grade levels and for each of our six proficiency levels: Novice Low, Novice High, Intermediate Low, Intermediate High, Advanced, and Superior. The objectives at the Superior level are linked to our English Language Arts Standard Course of Study; students working at this level are considered to be proficient in English and able to handle grade-level tasks and assignments.

This standard course of study was designed to set standards for growth leading to the attainment of full English language proficiency in accordance with the cognitive development of children and adolescents, as well as the language needs of academic content, which becomes increasingly demanding as students move up the K-12 continuum.

The ELD SCS is to be used by ESL teachers, as well as content teachers and all other instructional personnel who teach English language learners in our schools. It serves as a framework that should be expanded by local districts to reflect the needs of their own student populations. Procedures for the first revision will begin in 2007, and State Board approval will be sought in the fall of 2008.

1.6.1.2 Alignment of Standards

Please provide a detailed description of the State's progress for linking/aligning the State English Proficiency Standards to the State academic content and student academic achievement standards in English language arts/reading and mathematics.

STATE RESPONSE

The ELD SCS is clearly linked to ELA/reading standards. The Superior level includes objectives from the North Carolina English Language Arts Standard Course of Study. All ELD SCS objectives focus on the acquisition of English skills across the four domains of Listening, Speaking, Reading, and Writing.

The ELD SCS is linked to mathematics through the objectives that specify the comprehension and production of academic content vocabulary and subject matter language. In addition, many objectives refer to demonstrating comprehension of grade-level texts. For example, at grades 9-12, objective A 2.06 states, "Prepare and deliver presentations and reports across content areas." Also, at fifth grade, objective S 3.05 states, "Draw conclusions, make generalizations, and gather support by referencing grade-level text."

In 2006 and 2007, we will begin examining the language functions and patterns in the North Carolina Mathematics Standard Course of Study and Science Standard Course of Study.

When we begin the process of revising the ELD SCS in 2007-2008, careful attention will be given to expanding the document in order to focus more narrowly on the academic vocabulary and language conventions of mathematics and science.

1.6.2 English Language Proficiency (ELP) Assessments

1. The expectation for the full administration of the new or enhanced ELP assessment(s) that are aligned with the State's English language proficiency (ELP) standards as required under Section 3113 (b)(2) is spring 2007. Please indicate if the State has conducted any of the following:

- An independent alignment study No
- Other evidence of alignment No

2. Provide an updated description of the State's progress in developing and implementing the new or enhanced ELP assessments. Specifically describe how the State ensures:

1. The annual assessment of all LEP students in the State in grades k-12;
2. The ELP assessment(s) which address the five domains of listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension;
3. ELP assessments are based on ELP standards;
4. Technical quality (validity, reliability, etc.)

STATE RESPONSE

During the 2004-05 school year, North Carolina began working with Ballard and Tighe Publishers who were in the process of developing a new version of the IDEA (Individualized Developmental English Activities) English Language Proficiency Tests (IPT II) to comply with the Title III requirements of NCLB.

1. The new IPT consists of four subtests - Listening, Speaking, Reading, and Writing for grades spans K, 1-2, 3-5, 6-8, and 9-12. Starting in 2005-06, the new IPT will be administered to all students identified as LEP annually during the Feb. 1 - April 30 testing window.

2. The new IPT provides scores for Listening, Speaking, Reading, Writing, and Comprehension (combined score of Listening and Reading).

3. The new IPT consists of four subtests - Listening, Speaking, Reading, and Writing for grades spans K, 1-2, 3-5, 6-8, and 9-12. Starting in 2005-06, the new IPT will be administered to all students identified as LEP annually during the Feb. 1 - April 30 testing window.

4. The new IPT provides scores for Listening, Speaking, Reading, Writing, and Comprehension (combined score of Listening and Reading).

5. The new IPT consists of four subtests - Listening, Speaking, Reading, and Writing for grades spans K, 1-2, 3-5, 6-8, and 9-12. Starting in 2005-06, the new IPT will be administered to all students identified as LEP annually during the Feb. 1 - April 30 testing window.

6. The new IPT provides scores for Listening, Speaking, Reading, Writing, and Comprehension (combined score of Listening and Reading).

7. North Carolina's English Language Arts standards and English Language Development Standard Course of Study were included in the analyses that formed the basis for the design of the new IPT. When North Carolina students participated in the piloting of the new IPT, teachers were asked to review the test items. The teachers' feedback indicated that they thought there was a clear relationship between the IPT and the ELD Standard Course of Study, especially in terms of increased emphasis on Academic English. During standard-setting, groups of experienced North Carolina ESL teachers reviewed the IPT items directly in relation to the ELP Standards and established preliminary cut scores for reporting the IPT test results on North Carolina's proficiency levels. In their post-workshop questionnaires, the standard-setting participants indicated that the process of evaluating the test had taught them a great deal more about the ELP Standards, and again confirmed the close relationship between the standards and the IPT. In 2006-07, NCDPI will be conducting an independent alignment study.

8. The items that are included in the IPT tests underwent two nationally representative field trials: a field test to establish item statistics and a unified measurement scale, and a pilot test to analyze the performance of a subset of the items as a complete test. During the analysis of the field test data, student performance and test items were

scaled using Rasch methodology.

Test form reliability was established two different ways. First, classical reliability coefficients (alphas) were computed using the pilot test data to ensure that final test forms had adequately high reliability estimates. Also, inter-rater reliability estimates were obtained using intraclass correlation coefficients for items that were scored by rating on a rubric. Second, standard errors of measurement were obtained for every score point on the reporting scale for each IPT test.

The validity of the test scores was established three ways. First, a content review by three categories of content experts was used to establish the content validity of the instruments. Second, the criterion-related validity of the instruments was assessed using an analysis involving an external criterion measure. Third, the construct analysis of the tests was established through analyses of additional, external measures of the same construct that the tests were designed to measure, including teacher evaluations of student proficiency and test results from other tests.

9. In July 2004, North Carolina Department of Instruction staff and the agency's LEP Testing Advisory Committee met with Ballard and Tighe, the test publishers of the IPT, to review the revised assessment. In Fall 2004, local education agencies (LEAs) participated in pilot testing for the new assessment. In June 2005, the North Carolina State Board of Education (NCSBE) approved the interim proficiency cut scores for the IPT tests used in grades 2-12 for the 2005-2006 school year. Interim proficiency cut scores for the grades K-1 test were approved in November test were approved in November 2005. These proficiency cut scores were used for the 2005-06 school year. In May 2006, the interim proficiency cut scores were reevaluated and revised based on data gathered from ESL teachers using the bookmarking standard setting method and data from the first operational administrations of the IPT in North Carolina were held in spring 2006. In August 2006, proficiency cut scores for the test in grades K-12 were approved by the NCSBE. The cut scores became effective starting with the 2006-07 school year.

1.6.3.2 Data Reflecting the Most Common Languages Spoken in the State		
2005-2006 Data of the Most Common Languages Spoken by LEPs		
Language	Number of ALL LEP Students in the State	Percentage of ALL LEP Students in the State
1. Spanish	74766	83.00
2. Hmong	2651	2.90
3. Vietnamese	1332	1.50
4. Arabic	1129	1.30
5. Chinese	1041	1.20
6. Korean	855	1.00
7. French	854	1.00
8. Russian	580	0.60
9. Hindi	467	0.50
10. Japanese	383	0.40
Comments:		

- In the above chart, list the ten most commonly spoken languages in your State. Indicate the number and percentage of LEP students that speak each of the languages listed in table 1.6.3.2.

1.6.4 Immigrant Children and Youth Data

Programs and activities for immigrant children and youth

Definitions:

- **# immigrants enrolled in the State** = number of students, who meet the definition of immigrant children and youth in Section 3301(6), enrolled in the elementary or secondary schools in the State
- **# immigrants served by Title III** = 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
- **# of immigrant subgrants** = number of subgrants made in the State under Section 3114(d)(1), with the funds reserved for immigrant education programs/activities

**Table 1.6.4 Education Programs for Immigrant Students
2005-2006**

# Immigrants enrolled in the State	# Immigrants served by Title III	# Immigrant subgrants
29430	14483	37

Comments:

STATE RESPONSE: (Provide information on what has changed, e.g., sudden influx of large number of immigrant children and youth, increase/change of minority language groups, sudden population change in school districts that are less experienced with education services for immigrant students in the State during the 2 previous years.)

There were 34 subgrantees who received this funding in the 2004-2005 school year, and only 26 who received it for the 2005-2006 school year. North Carolina's immigrant population only grew by 164 children from spring of 2005 to spring of 2006. There are fewer children being born outside of the United States.

1.6.5 Definition of Proficient

If the State has made changes since the last Consolidated State Performance Report submission (for school year 2004-2005), please provide the State's definition of "proficient" in English as defined by the State's English language proficiency standards and assessments under Section 3122(a)(3). Please include the following in your response:

1. The test score range or cut scores for each of the State's ELP assessments;
2. A description of how the five domains of listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension are incorporated or weighted in the State's definition of "proficient" in English;
3. Other criteria used to determine attaining proficiency in English.

STATE RESPONSE

1. Cut score ranges used in 2004-05 were the same as the ones used in 2003-04. The cut score ranges for the 2005-06 can be found at -

<http://sbepolicy.dpi.state.nc.us/policies/HSP-A-011.asp?pri=01&cat=A&pol=011&acr=HSP>

2. "Proficient" in English is defined as scoring Superior on all four subtests (i.e. Listening, Speaking, Reading, and Writing) of the state-identified English language proficiency tests. The comprehension score is a combination of the Listening and Reading score.

3. No other criteria are used to determine attainment of proficiency in English.

1.6.6 Definition of Making Progress

If the State has made changes since the last Consolidated State Performance Report submission (for school year 2004-2005), please provide the State's definition of "making progress" in learning English as defined by the State's English language proficiency standards and assessment(s) in Section 3122(a)(3).

Please include the following in your response:

1. A description of the English language proficiency levels and any sub-levels as defined by the State's English language proficiency standards and assessments;
2. A description of the criteria students must meet to progress from one proficiency level to the next (e.g., narrative descriptions, cut scores, formula, data from multiple sources).

STATE RESPONSE

"Making progress" is defined as improving at least one proficiency level in one of the subtests (reading, writing, speaking, and listening) on the required state identified English language proficiency test.

1. The English language proficiency level descriptors can be found at:
2. To progress from one proficiency level to the next, students must attain the appropriate cut scores. Cut score ranges by subtest and grade can be found at:

http://sbepolicy.dpi.state.nc.us/policies/HSP-A_011.asp?pri=01&cat=A&pol=011&acr=HSP

1.6.7 Definition of Cohort

If the State has made changes since the last Consolidated State Performance Report submission (for school year 2004-2005), please provide the State's definition of "cohort." Include a description of the specific characteristics of the cohort(s) in the State, e.g., grade/grade span or other characteristics.

STATE RESPONSE

North Carolina's cohort remains unchanged: K-12 LEP students.

1.6.8 Information on the Acquisition of English Language Proficiency for ALL Limited English Proficient Students in the State.

Please provide information on the progress made by **ALL LEP students in your State** in learning English and attaining English language proficiency.

Did your State apply the Title III English language proficiency annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) to **ALL LEP** students in the State? Yes

If yes, you may use the format provided below to report the requested information.

English Language Proficiency	Percent and Number of ALL LEP Students in the State Who Made Progress in Learning English				Percent and Number of ALL LEP Students in the State Who Attained English Proficiency			
	Projected AMAO Target		Actual		Projected AMAO Target		Actual	
2005-2006 School Year	% 50.00	# 20815	% 69.10	# 28766	% 30.00	# 6717	% 10.20	# 2518

If no, please describe the different evaluation mechanism used by the State to measure both the progress of ALL LEP students in learning English and in attaining English language proficiency and provide the data from that evaluation.

1.6.9 Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs) for English Language Proficiency for Title III Participants

Critical synthesis of data reported by Title III subgrantees

[SEC. 3121(a) p. 1701, 3123(b)(1, 3) p.1704]

Provide the results of Title III LEP students in meeting the State English language proficiency (ELP) annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) for making progress and attainment of English language proficiency as required in Table 1.6.9.

TABLE 1.6.9 INSTRUCTIONS:

Report **ONLY** the results from State English language proficiency assessment(s) for LEP students who participate in Title III English language instruction educational programs in grades K-12.

Blackened cells in this form indicate information which, each SEA should collect and maintain, but which is not being collected at this time.

Definitions:

1. **MAKING PROGRESS** = as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
2. **DID NOT MAKE PROGRESS** = The number and percentage of Title III LEP students who did not meet the State definition of "Making Progress."
3. **ATTAINED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY** = as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
4. **TOTAL** = the total number of students from **making progress**, **not making progress**, and **attainment**, for each year in the table. The figure reported in this cell should be an unduplicated count of LEP students who participate in Title III English language instruction educational programs in grades K-12.
5. **AMAO TARGET** = the AMAO target for the year as established by State and submitted to OELA in the CSA (September 2003 submission), or as amended and approved, for each objective for "Making progress" and "Attainment" of English language proficiency.
6. **ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS** = The number and percentage of Title III LEP students who met/did not meet the State definitions of "Making Progress" and the number and percentage of Title III LEP students who met the definition for "Attainment" of English language proficiency.

1.6.9 Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs) for English Language Proficiency for Title III Participants			
2005-2006			
	AMAO TARGET	ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS	
	%	#	%
MAKING PROGRESS	50.00	33392	67.40
DID NOT MAKE PROGRESS		16164	
ATTAINED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY	30.00	2476	10.20
TOTAL		1897392	

Explanation of data for Table

Check the answer to the following question.

Are monitored* LEP students reflected in the Table "Attainment" "Achievement Results"? No

* Monitored LEP students are those who

- have achieved "proficient" on the State ELP assessment
- have transitioned into classrooms that are not designed for LEP students
- are no longer receiving Title III services, and who are being monitored for academic content achievement for 2 years after transition

1.6.10 Title III program effectiveness in assisting LEP students to meet State English language proficiency and student academic achievement standards

[SEC. 3122(b)(2) p. 1703, 3123(b)(1, 4) p.1704-5, 3121(b)(2) p. 1701,]

Provide the count for each year.

It is not necessary to respond to the items in this form, which reference other collections. The information provided by each SEA to those other collections will be collected by OELA and utilized to produce the Biennial Report.

Title III Subgrantee Information	
	2005-2006
Total number of Title III subgrantees for each year	82
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for making progress	79
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for attaining English proficiency	3
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for AYP	19
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs*	1
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met 2 AMAOs	18
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met 1 AMAO	57
Total number of Title III subgrantees that did not meet any AMAO	3
Total number of Title III subgrantees that did not meet AMAOs for two consecutive years	8
Total number of Title III subgrantees with an improvement plan for not meeting Title III AMAOs	8
Total number of Title III subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (beginning in 2007-08)	0
Did the State meet all three Title III AMAOs? *	<u>No</u>

Comments: # of Title III subgrantees reported as zero above. Will not know until December 2007.

* Meeting all three Title III AMAOs means meeting each State set target for each objective: Making Progress, Attaining Proficiency and making AYP.

1.6.11 On the following tables for 2005-2006, please provide data regarding the academic achievement of monitored LEP students who transitioned into classrooms not designated for LEP students and who are no longer receiving services under Title III. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned in 2005-2006 school year.

1.6.11.1 Number and percent of former Title III served, monitored LEP students scoring at the proficient and advanced levels on the State reading language arts assessments		
Grade/Grade Span	Students Proficient & Advanced	
	#	%
3	568	97.80
4	1151	96.30
5	588	99.00
6	464	91.70
7	689	94.80
8	275	97.90
H.S.	101	46.30

Comments:

1.6.11.2 Number and percent of former Title III served, monitored LEP students scoring at the proficient and advanced levels on the State mathematics assessments

Grade/Grade Span	Students Proficient & Advanced	
	#	%
3	529	91.20
4	953	81.20
5	493	84.70
6	366	72.80
7	520	72.30
8	220	79.70
H.S.	195	91.10

Comments:

1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS

1.7.1 In the following chart, please provide data for the number of schools identified as persistently dangerous as determined by the State by the start of the 2006-2007 school year. For further guidance on persistently dangerous schools, please refer to the Unsafe School Choice Option Non-Regulatory Guidance, available at:

Number of Persistently Dangerous Schools	
2006-2007 School Year	0

Comments: There were NO schools identified for 2006-07. Schools for 2006-07 will not be identified until June 2007.

1.8 GRADUATION AND DROPOUT RATES

1.8.1 Graduation Rates

Section 200.19 of the Title I regulations issued under the No Child Left Behind Act on December 2, 2002, defines graduation rate to mean:

- The percentage of students, measured from the beginning of high school, who graduate from public high school with a regular diploma (not including a GED or any other diploma not fully aligned with the State's academic standards) in the standard number of years; or,
- Another more accurate definition developed by the State and approved by the Secretary in the State plan that more accurately measures the rate of students who graduate from high school with a regular diploma; and
- Avoids counting a dropout as a transfer.

1. The Secretary approved each State's definition of the graduation rate, consistent with section 200.19 of the Title I regulations, as part of each State's accountability plan. Using the definition of the graduation rate that was approved as part of your State's accountability plan, in the following chart please provide graduation rate data for the 2004-2005 school year.

2. For those States that are reporting transitional graduation rate data and are working to put into place data collection systems that will allow the State to calculate the graduation rate in accordance with Section 200.19 for all the required subgroups, please provide a detailed progress report on the status of those efforts.

1.8.1 Graduation Rates	
High School Graduates	Graduation Rate
Student Group	2004-2005 School Year
All Students	95.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	95.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	95.00
Black, non-Hispanic	93.10
Hispanic	91.80
White, non-Hispanic	95.00
Students with Disabilities	91.60
Limited English Proficient	86.70
Economically Disadvantaged	94.00
Migrant	0.00
Male	0.00
Female	0.00

Comments: This is a transition year in computation of graduation rates. The State's baseline for the new cohort graduation rate will be set based on the 2005-06 graduation rates. The data provided here were those reported for 2004-05 on the State's Report Card, which reported only the AYP Graduation rates for the State's subgroups. Migrant, male, and female rates were not reported. These rates represent the percent of graduates who graduated in four years or less.

Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.8.2 Dropout Rate

For purposes of calculating and reporting a dropout rate for this performance indicator, States should use the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistics' (NCES) Common Core of Data

Consistent with this requirement, States must use NCES' definition of "high school dropout," An individual who: 1) was enrolled in school at some time during the previous school year; and 2) was not enrolled at the beginning of the current school year; and 3) has not graduated from high school or completed a state- or district-approved educational program; and 4) does not meet any of the following exclusionary conditions: a) transfer to another public school district, private school, or state- or district approved educational program (including correctional or health facility programs); b) temporary absence due to suspension or school-excused illness; or c) death.

In the following chart, please provide data for the 2004-2005 school year for the percentage of students who drop out of high school, disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged.

1.8.2 Dropout Rate	
Dropouts	Dropout Rate
Student Group	2004-2005 School Year
All Students	5.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	9.50
Asian or Pacific Islander	2.50
Black, non-Hispanic	5.60
Hispanic	8.50
White, non-Hispanic	4.40
Students with Disabilities	8.70
Limited English Proficient	30.30
Economically Disadvantaged	7.30
Migrant	13.90
Male	6.20
Female	4.40
Comments: Dropout rates were computed using 2004-05 dropout events.	
Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.	

Provide the following information for homeless children and youth in your State for the 2005-2006 school year (as defined by your State). To complete this form, compile data for LEAs with and without subgrants.

1.9.1 DATA FROM ALL LEAs WITH AND WITHOUT MCKINNEY-VENTO SUBGRANTS

1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTH PROGRAM

1.9.1.1 How does your State define the period that constitutes a school year? (e.g., "The school year shall begin on the first day of July and end on the thirtieth day of June" or "A total of 175 instructional days").

STATE RESPONSE

The school year shall begin on the first day of July and end of the thirtieth day of June.

1.9.1.2 What are the totals in your State as follows:

	Total Number in State	Total Number LEAs Reporting
LEAs without Subgrants	93	93
LEAs with Subgrants	22	22

Comments:

1.9.1.3 Number of Homeless Children And Youth In The State

Provide the number of homeless children and youth in your State enrolled in public school (compulsory grades--excluding pre-school) during the 2005-2006 school year according to grade level groups below:

Grade Level	Number of homeless children/youth enrolled in public school in LEAs without subgrants	Number of homeless children/youth enrolled in public school in LEAs with subgrants
K	731	554
1	633	583
2	576	486
3	551	448
4	575	404
5	503	360
6	376	484
7	368	413
8	384	411
9	363	388
10	249	201
11	238	151
12	217	139

Comments:

1.9.1.4 Primary Nighttime Residence Of Homeless Children And Youth

Of the total number of homeless children and youth (excluding preschoolers), provide the numbers who had the following as their primary nighttime residence at the time of initial identification by LEAs.

Primary nighttime residence	* Number of homeless children/ youth-- excluding preschoolers LEAs without subgrants	* Number of homeless children/ youth-- excluding preschoolers LEAs with subgrants
Shelters	362	718
Doubled-up	2994	1960
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, etc.)	73	100
Hotels/Motels	262	290
Unknown	2427	1600

Comments:

* The primary nighttime residence is the basis for identifying homeless children and youth. The totals should match the totals in item #3 above.

1.9.2 DATA FROM LEAs WITH MCKINNEY-VENTO SUBGRANTS**1.9.2.1 Number Of Homeless Children And Youths Served By McKinney-Vento Subgrants**

Provide the number of homeless children and youth that were served by McKinney-Vento subgrants in your State during the 2005-2006 academic school year disaggregated by grade level groups

Grade levels of homeless children and youth served by subgrants in 2005-2006	Number of homeless children and youth <i>served</i> by subgrants enrolled in school by grade level
K	269
1	266
2	223
3	251
4	216
5	192
6	250
7	210
8	195
9	199
10	97
11	77
12	75

Comments:

1.9.2.2 Number of homeless preschool-age children

Provide the number of homeless preschool-age children in your State in districts with subgrants attending public preschool programs during the 2005-2006 school year (i.e., from birth through pre-K).

Number of homeless preschool-age children enrolled in public preschool in LEAs with subgrants in 2005-2006

55

Comments:

1.9.2.3 Unaccompanied Youths

Provide the number of unaccompanied youths served by subgrants during the 2005-2006 school year.

Number of homeless unaccompanied youths enrolled in public schools in LEAs with subgrants in 2005-2006

30

Comments:

1.9.2.4 Migrant Children/Youth Served

Provide the number of homeless migrant children/youth served by subgrants during the 2005-2006 school year.

Number of homeless migrant children/youth enrolled in public schools (Total for LEAs with subgrants)

<n

Comments:

1.9.2.5 Number of Children Receiving Educational and School Support Services

Provide the number of homeless children and youth served by subgrants and enrolled in school during the 2005-2006 school year that received the following educational and school support services from the LEA

Educational and school related activities and services	Number of homeless students in subgrantee programs that received educational and support services
Special Education (IDEA)	470
English Language Learners (ELL)	127
Gifted and Talented	21
Vocational Education	0

Comments: Nothing reported for this calendar year.

1.9.2.6 Educational Support Services

Provide the number of subgrantee programs that provided the following educational support services with McKinney-Vento funds.

Services and Activities Provided by the McKinney-Vento subgrant program	Number of your State's subgrantees that offer these services
Tutoring or other instructional support	12
Expedited evaluations	6
Staff professional development and awareness	9
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	11
Transportation	15
Early childhood programs	5
Assistance with participation in school programs	10
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	6
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	5
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	9
Coordination between schools and agencies	10
Counseling	5
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	6
Clothing to meet a school requirement	11
School supplies	14
Referral to other programs and services	14
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	6
Other (optional)	11

Comments:

1.9.2.7 Barriers To The Education Of Homeless Children And Youth

Provide the number of subgrantees that reported the following barriers to the enrollment and success of homeless children and youth during the 2005-2006 school year.

Barriers	List number of subgrantees reporting each barrier
Eligibility for homeless services	2
School selection	26
Transportation	353
School records	130
Immunizations or other medical records	15
Other enrollment issues	180

Comments:

1.9.2.8 Additional Barriers (Optional)

Note any other barriers not listed above that were frequently reported:

List other barriers	List number of subgrantees reporting each barrier
Housing	28

Comments:

1.9.2.9 Academic Progress of Homeless Students

In order to ensure that homeless children and youth have access to education and other services needed to meet the State's challenging academic standards:

a) Check the grade levels in which your State administered a statewide assessment in reading or mathematics; b) note the number of homeless children and youth served by subgrants in 2005-2006 that were included in statewide assessments in reading or mathematics; and c) note the number of homeless children and youth that met or exceeded the State's proficiency level or standard on the reading or mathematics assessment.

Reading Assessment:

School Grade Levels *	a) Reading assessment by grade level (check boxes where appropriate; indicate "DNA" if assessment is required and data is not available for reporting; indicate "N/A" for grade not assessed by State)	b) Number of homeless children/youth taking reading assessment test.	c) Number of homeless children/youth that met or exceeded state proficiency.
Grade 3	Yes	406	271
Grade 4	Yes	386	268
Grade 5	Yes	350	258
Grade 6	Yes	379	246
Grade 7	Yes	352	254
Grade 8	Yes	355	253
Grade 9	No		
Grade 10	DNA		
Grade 11	No		
Grade 12			

Comments:**Mathematics Assessment:**

School Grade Levels *	a) Mathematics assessment by grade level (check boxes where appropriate; indicate "DNA" if assessment is required and data is not available for reporting; indicate "N/A" for grade not assessed by State)	b) Number of homeless children/youth taking mathematics assessment test.	c) Number of homeless children/youth that met or exceeded state proficiency.
Grade 3	Yes	407	169
Grade 4	Yes	384	159
Grade 5	Yes	349	131
Grade 6	Yes	378	135
Grade 7	Yes	350	115
Grade 8	Yes	353	118
Grade 9	No		
Grade 10	DNA		
Grade 11	No		
Grade 12	No		

Comments: No amended data were provided by the homeless contact person for our agency.

* Note: State assessments in grades 3-8 and one year of high school are NCLB requirements. However, States may assess students in other grades as well.