

**Student Accountability Standards
In Grades Three, Five, and Eight**

2001-2002

**State Board of Education
November 2002**

**NORTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION
ACCOUNTABILITY SERVICES DIVISION
REPORTING SECTION**

Table of Contents

	<u>Page Numbers</u>
Executive Summary	i
Background	1
What are the Standards?	1
Standards Development	2
Implementation of Standards	3
Statewide Performance	5
Grade Level Results	5
Table 1. Gateway Standards Used by LEA and Charter Schools for Each Test Administration	4
Table 2. Percent of Students Passing and/or Failing Reading and Mathematics After All Retests	5
Table 3. Student Accountability Status	6
Table 4. Reasons for Student Promotion, Standard Not Met	7
Table 5. Reasons Students were Retained, Standards Met	8
Table 6. Student Accountability Standards by Ethnicity	9
Table 7. Promotion Reasons for Absent Students, LEP Students, Students Participating in Alternate Assessments, NCCATS, and Transfer Students	11
Table 8. Retention Reasons for Absent Students, LEP Students, Students Participating in Alternate Assessments, NCCATS, and Transfer Students	12
Table 9. Standard Not Met, Student Promoted, by Ethnicity	13
Table 10. Standard Met, Student Retained, by Ethnicity	14
Table 11. Promotion Status of Students, by Gender	15

Table 12. Standard not met, Student Promoted, by Gender	16
Table 13. Standard Met, Student Retained, by Gender	17
Table 14. Promotion Status for Students With Disabilities, Students Without Disabilities	18
Table 15. 2001-2002 Number and Percent of Students in Grades 3, 5, and 8, Promoted or Retained	20
Summary	18
Appendix	21
Table 1. Promotion Status for All Students, by Ethnicity	22
Table 2. Number and Percent Passing Reading and Mathematics, by Ethnicity, Grade 3	23
Table 3. Number and Percent Passing Reading and Mathematics, by Ethnicity, Grade 5	24
Table 4. Number and Percent Passing Reading and Mathematics, by Ethnicity, Grade 8	25
Table 5. Promotion Status of Migrant Students	26
Table 6. Promotion Status for Students with Disabilities and Students without Disabilities, by Ethnicity, Grade 3	27
Table 7. Promotion Status for Students with Disabilities and Students without Disabilities, by Ethnicity, Grade 5	28
Table 8. Promotion Status for Students with Disabilities and Students without Disabilities, by Ethnicity, Grade 8	29
Technical Notes	30

Executive Summary
Student Accountability Standards in Grades Three, Five, and Eight

2001 – 2002

Background

The 1997 General Assembly directed the State Board of Education (SBE) to “develop ... grade-level student proficiency benchmarks, ... and to establish a Committee on Standards and Accountability (GS 115C-12).”

The Committee on Standards and Accountability, after meeting with various constituencies and reviewing extant research, advised the SBE in December of 1998 to establish four gateways through which students must pass to move to the next grade level. It also recommended the inclusion of appropriate intervention for students to eliminate barriers that could prevent them from reaching proficiency levels. The ultimate goal of the recommendations was for all students to reach proficiency and not be retained.

The SBE used the Committee’s report in developing the policy on student accountability standards. The SBE adopted the final policy on April 1, 1999 after 7 months of deliberation, discussion, and public input.

Statewide Performance

The overall performance of North Carolina students in grades 3, 5, and 8 in End-of-Grade (EOG) reading and mathematics after all retests is shown below.

**2001-2002 Number and Percent of Students in Grades 3, 5, and 8
Promoted or Retained**

	Total N	Promoted	% Promoted	Retained	% Retained	Blank	% Blank
Grade 3	104,760	98,870	94.4	5,483	5.2	407	0.4
Grade 5	106,277	103,207	97.1	2,510	2.4	558	0.5
Grade 8	100,349	97,082	96.7	2,838	2.8	427	0.4
Total	311,386	299,159	96.1	10,831	3.5	1,392	0.4

The table above reflects students in any of the categories listed below

- End of Grade Reading and Mathematics Test
- North Carolina Alternate Assessment Portfolio
- North Carolina Academic Alternate Assessment Indicator
- North Carolina Computer Adaptive Testing Systems
- Absent
- Limited English Proficiency (Year 1 or Year 2)
- Transfer

“Blank” indicates that a promotion or retention indicator was not given for those students.

Highlights 2001-2002

- The percent of tested students who met Gateways 1, 2, and 3 and were promoted ranged from 88% for grade three to 92% for grade eight. Generally, student promotion increased as grade level increased for most ethnic groups with some differences noted in the Hispanic and Multi-Racial groups.
- Among students who did not meet the standard, 64.4% were promoted. The predominant reason a student was promoted without meeting the accountability gateway was “Principal’s Decision.” This may well reflect the principals’ statutory responsibility to consider multiple factors when making decisions about student promotion.
- The percent of students who did not meet the standard and were retained ranged from 5 percent at grade three to 2 percent at grades five and eight.
- Few students were retained, even though they met the promotion standard. The percent of students who met the standard and were retained was generally less than one percent for all grades. The most cited rationale for retention was “Local Promotion Standards based on Academic Reasons.” The least cited was “Local Standards based on Attendance.”
- Promotion and retention percentages were not very different between males and females, but females did demonstrate higher rates of promotion performance at all grade levels. There were also grade level differences between the males and females being retained but there is no additional evidence to suggest that this is unusual. “Principal’s Decision” played an important role in the promotion and retention decisions for these groups and differential impact is noted.
- Students that were absent, Limited English Proficient (LEP), participated in alternate assessments, participated in North Carolina Computerized Adaptive Testing System (NCCATS), and transfer students also were subject to the student accountability standards.
- Overall, a lower percentage of students with disabilities were promoted if they met the standard. On the other hand, a higher percentage of students with disabilities were promoted without meeting the gateway standard when compared to students without disabilities.
- The 2001-2002 school year should be considered a baseline year in order to track the effect of the SBE policy for the next several years.

Student Accountability Standards in Grades Three, Five, and Eight

2001 – 2002

Background

The 1997 General Assembly directed the State Board of Education (SBE) to:

“develop a plan to implement high school exit exams, grade-level student proficiency benchmarks, student proficiency benchmarks for academic courses required for admission to constituent institutions of The University of North Carolina, student proficiency benchmarks for the knowledge and skills necessary to enter the workforce, and to establish a Committee on Standards and Accountability (GS 115C-12).”

The Committee on Standards and Accountability, after meeting with various constituencies and reviewing extant research, advised the SBE on student performance standards and presented a report to the SBE in December of 1998.

The Committee recommended four gateways through which students must pass to move to the next grade level. It also recommended the inclusion of appropriate intervention for students to eliminate barriers that may prevent them from reaching proficiency levels. Intervention strategies for retained students should be innovative and matched to individual student needs. The ultimate goal of the recommendations was for all students to reach proficiency and not be retained.

The SBE used the Committee’s report in developing the policy on student accountability standards. The SBE adopted the final policy on April 1, 1999 after 7 months of deliberation, discussion, and public input.

What are the Standards?

The Student Accountability Standards represent the next level of accountability in the state’s ABCs program. The ABCs moved accountability from the district level to the school level. The Student Accountability Standards moved accountability from the school level to the student level and are designed to eliminate social promotion. Social promotion is the practice of promoting students from grade to grade regardless of whether they have mastered the appropriate material and are academically prepared to do the work at the next level.

Under the Student Accountability Standards policy, promotion decisions are to be made according to local policy and discretion but they must include statewide accountability standards at grades 3, 5, 8, and high school. At a minimum, each local board of education must adopt procedures to ensure that all students are treated fairly. The local policies must also recognize the statutory authority of the principal to make promotion and retention decisions. The policies shall also include provisions for the notification and involvement of parents in retention and promotion decisions.

The SBE Student Accountability Standards policy also requires local boards of education to annually report their progress to the SBE in increasing the number of students who meet the standards. These standards, also called gateways, are:

<p style="text-align: center;">Gateway 1: Grade 3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Meet local promotion requirements. ● Demonstrate grade-level proficiency by scoring at Level III or above on state end-of-grade tests in reading and mathematics. 	<p style="text-align: center;">Gateway 2: Grade 5</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Meet local promotion requirements. ● Score at Level III or above on state end-of-grade tests in reading and mathematics. ● Score at or above proficiency level 2.5 on the grade 4 writing assessment. (Students who do not have this score will be given additional instruction and assistance.)
<p style="text-align: center;">Gateway 3: Grade 8</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Meet local promotion requirements. ● Score at Level III or above on state end-of-grade tests in reading and mathematics. ● Score at or above proficiency level 2.5 on the grade 7 writing assessment. (Students who do not have this score will be given additional instruction and assistance.) 	<p style="text-align: center;">Gateway 4: High School</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Meet existing local and state graduation requirements. ● A passing score on an exit exam of essential skills. Timeline for implementation is being reconsidered due to budget. ● A passing score on the computer skills tests (effective with class of 2001).

For more complete information about the Student Accountability policy, visit:

http://www.ncpublicschools.org/student_promotion/draft_standards.html.

The General Assembly and the SBE have been concerned about how the implementation of the standards/gateways would impact student promotion and retention across the state. This report begins to address their concerns by summarizing the results of promotion/retention data for all third, fifth, and eighth grade students enrolled in public and charter schools in North Carolina during the 2001-2002 school year.

Standards Development

Prior to 2000-2001, no mechanism existed for collecting pertinent data on the Student Accountability Standards. To address this deficit, a series of meetings were held between LEAs and members of the Department of Public Instruction (DPI). As a consequence of these meetings, data acquisition tools were selected and procedures were developed for their use. Discussions at these meetings also focused on identifying and codifying the reasons for student promotion or retention. As a result, two distinct categories of rationale were identified.

Those reasons are:

1. Reasons for promoting a student who did not make Level III:
 - a. Waiver – (e.g., because the student is at grade level or making adequate progress)
 - b. LEP (Limited English Proficiency)
 - c. Local Policy /Other
 - d. Principal’s Decision.

2. Reasons for retaining a student who made Level III:
 - a. Local promotion standards /academic
 - b. Local promotion standards /attendance
 - c. Other criteria
 - d. Principal’s Decision.

This report shows that the school principal plays a major role in the decision to promote or retain a student. The latitude given to principals to make grade and classification decisions concerning students derives from general statute G.S.115C-288. For retention or promotion decisions the statute states:

“In determining the appropriate grade for a pupil who is already attending a public school, the principal shall consider the pupil’s classroom work and grades, the pupils scores on standardized tests, and the best educational interest of the pupil. **The principal shall not make the decision solely on the basis of standardized test scores.**” (emphasis added)

Clarifying the role of standardized test scores in promotion and retention decisions is new to the statute this year and gives the principal considerable latitude to use his/her professional judgment.

Implementation of Standards

Students who did not meet the gateway during the first administration of their grade level End-of-Grade (EOG) tests or North Carolina Computerized Adaptive Testing System (NCCATS) were given a second and/or third opportunity to pass the appropriate gateway after intervention was provided by the LEA.

LEAs had their choice of implementing the gateway standard which is Achievement Level III + 1 Standard Error of Measurement (SEM) [i.e. reaches Achievement Level III using 1 SEM applied to the student’s score] or using a higher standard (e.g., Achievement Level III without using 1 SEM applied to the student’s score). For the 2001-2002 school year LEAs predominately used the Achievement level III + 1 SEM as their gateway standard. This was consistent across all three grade levels.

Table 1

Gateway Standards Used by LEA and Charter Schools for Each Test Administration

Standard	Grade 3		Grade 5		Grade 8	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
End of Grade Test						
Achievement Level III	18	10.3	17	9.7	18	11.0
Achievement Level III + 1 SEM	157	89.7	158	90.3	145	89.0
Retest 1						
Achievement Level III	17	9.9	15	9.1	16	10.7
Achievement Level III + 1 SEM	154	90.1	150	90.9	133	89.3
Retest 2						
Achievement Level III	15	10.6	14	10.1	15	12.2
Achievement Level III + 1 SEM	127	89.4	124	89.9	108	87.8

Because of the differences in the implementation modes of the North Carolina Alternate Assessment Academic Inventory (NCAAAI) and the North Carolina Alternate Assessment Portfolio (NCAAP), students who took these instruments and did not obtain Achievement Level III were given appropriate opportunities to achieve and/or demonstrate grade level performance.

For example, the NCAAAI is an alternate assessment instrument in which teachers utilize a checklist to evaluate student performance on curriculum benchmarks in the areas of reading, mathematics, and writing. Teachers evaluate students at three points during the year:

- (1) first month of student participation,
- (2) during the first month of the second semester of the school year, and
- (3) during the final month of school.

Due to the nature of this assessment and that of the NCAAP, there is no retest opportunity if a student does not demonstrate grade level performance. Student scores (achievement levels) from the NCAAAI or the NCAAP must be used as one criterion for making student promotion/retention decisions. Other criteria appropriate to either assessment may include:

- (1) student work samples;
- (2) other test data;
- (3) information supplied by the parents;
- (4) for students with disabilities, information that is included in the students' IEPs;
and
- (5) other information that verifies that a student is at grade level.

Students with disabilities must be at grade level or making progress to meet grade level requirements.

In July 2002, the SBE declared the North Carolina Computerized Adaptive Testing System (NCCATS) to be a pilot program for 2001-02. Therefore, for students who took NCCATS in 2001-02, LEAs based their promotion decisions on other information.

Statewide Performance

The overall performance of North Carolina students in grades 3, 5, and 8 in reading and mathematics on the EOG, after all testing was completed, is in Table 2. The table documents the number of students who passed and/or failed reading and mathematics after all retests. The passing rates for both reading and mathematics were in the ninety percent range after all retests. Students in grades 5 and 8 passed mathematics at a higher percentage than reading.

Table 2

Percent of Students Passing and/or Failing Reading and Mathematics After All Retests

		Mathematics		
		Pass	Fail	Total**
R e a d i n g	Grade Three			
	Total N	89,946	9,370	99,316
	Pass	91,687	87.0	4.5
	Fail	7,629	2.8	4.8
	Total**	99,316	89.7	9.3
	Grade Five			
	Total N	96,908	2,805	99,713
	Pass	93,266	91.5	0.9
	Fail	6,447	4.6	1.8
	Total**	99,713	96.0	2.8
	Grade Eight			
	Total N	90,786	4,262	95,048
Pass	90,235	92.3	2.1	
Fail	4,813	2.7	2.4	
Total**	95,048	94.9	4.5	

**Percentages do not add to 100% due to some information not coded for some students.

Grade Level Results

Student results for grades 3, 5, and 8 are reported statewide and, in various tables, are disaggregated by grade, ethnicity, gender, disability status, and migrant status. **In all tables, an asterisk indicates no data.** Table cells with small student counts were left in the report to demonstrate that some student categories are very small. In those cases, any corresponding percentages shown are to be interpreted with caution. Because these are state level data, individual students are not identifiable from the results. Readers should also note that percentages in some tables do not add up to 100 percent due to rounding.

Table 3 provides statewide promotion/retention results for the student accountability standards by grade. The percent of tested students who met Gateways 1, 2, and 3 and were promoted ranged

from 88% for grade three to 92% for grade eight. The percent of students who did not meet the appropriate standard but were promoted ranged from 7 percent for grade three to almost 5 percent for grade eight. Promotion of students who did not meet the standard generally decreased as grade level increased.

Table 3
Student Accountability Status

Student Accountability Status	Number of Students	Percent of Tested Students	Percent of All Students
Standard Met, Promoted			
Grade 3	86,976	87.7	83.0
Grade 5	92,159	92.4	86.7
Grade 8	87,648	92.3	87.3
Standard Not Met, Promoted			
Grade 3	6,908	7.0	6.6
Grade 5	5,205	5.2	4.9
Grade 8	4,691	4.9	4.7
Standard Not Met, Retained			
Grade 3	5,123	5.2	4.9
Grade 5	2,166	2.2	2.0
Grade 8	1,982	2.1	2.0
Standard Met, Retained			
Grade 3	163	0.2	0.2
Grade 5	158	0.2	0.1
Grade 8	601	0.6	0.6
Total			
Grade 3	99,170	100.1	94.7**
Grade 5	99,688	100.0	93.7**
Grade 8	94,922	99.9	94.6**

**“Percent of All Students” do not add to 100% across categories for each grade due to some information not coded for some students.

The percent of students who did not meet the standard and were retained ranged from 5 percent at grade three to 2 percent at grades five and eight. The percent of students who met the standard and were retained was less than one percent for all grades.

Among students who did not meet the standard, 64.4% were promoted. This may well reflect the principals’ statutory responsibility to consider multiple factors when making decisions about student promotion.

Table 4 documents, by grade and criteria, the rationale cited for promotion when a student did not meet a Gateway. The frequency of cited rationale was generally consistent across grade levels within rationale category with small variations noted. Promotion rationale in order of most to least cited reasons were “Principal’s Decision,” “Waiver,” “Local Policy,” and “LEP.” The importance of “Waiver” as a reason for promotion when a student did not meet the standard increased as grade level increased. This is in contrast to “Principal’s Decision” as reason for promotion, which decreased slightly in importance as grade level increased.

Table 4
Reasons for Student Promotion, Standard Not Met

Reasons Promoted, Standard Not Met	Students Promoted	
	Number	Percent
Waiver		
Grade 3	2,091	30.3
Grade 5	1,729	33.2
Grade 8	1,721	36.7
LEP (Limited English Proficient)		
Grade 3	142	2.1
Grade 5	128	2.5
Grade 8	132	2.8
Local Policy/Other		
Grade 3	1,500	21.7
Grade 5	1,104	21.2
Grade 8	862	18.4
Principal's Decision		
Grade 3	3,175	46.0
Grade 5	2,244	43.1
Grade 8	1,976	42.1
Total		
Grade 3	6,908	
Grade 5	5,205	
Grade 8	4,691	

Some students were retained, although not many, even though they met the promotion standard. Table 5 lists the primary rationale cited for student retention after they had met promotion standards. The most cited rationale for retention was “Local Promotion Standards based on Academic Reasons.” The least cited was “Local Promotion Standards based on Attendance.” The small number of students in several of the cells makes interpretation of any apparent trend problematic.

Table 5
Reasons Students were Retained, Standards Met

Reasons Retained, Standard Met	Students Retained	
	Number	Percent
Local Promotion Standards/Academic		
Grade 3	117	71.8
Grade 5	120	75.9
Grade 8	476	79.2
Local Promotion Standards/Attendance		
Grade 3	5	3.1
Grade 5	5	3.2
Grade 8	25	4.2
Other		
Grade 3	14	8.6
Grade 5	5	3.2
Grade 8	18	3.0
Principal's Decision		
Grade 3	27	16.9
Grade 5	28	17.7
Grade 8	82	13.6
Total		
Grade 3	163	
Grade 5	158	
Grade 8	601	

Table 6 shows the promotion and retention of students by ethnicity and grade level. Generally, if the standard was met, student promotion increased as grade level increased for most ethnic groups with some differences noted in the Hispanic and Multi-racial groups.

If a student did not meet the standard for his/her grade, there is not a consistent pattern across grades.

Table 6

Student Accountability Standards by Ethnicity**

Ethnicity	Total N	Standard Met				Standard Not Met			
		Promoted		Retained		Promoted		Retained	
		n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
American Indian									
Grade 3	1,501	1,227	81.8	*	*	119	7.9	118	7.9
Grade 5	1,483	1,220	82.3	1	0.1	146	9.8	67	4.5
Grade 8	1,310	1,151	87.9	8	0.6	82	6.3	61	4.7
Asian									
Grade 3	1,842	1,724	93.6	1	0.1	76	4.1	29	1.6
Grade 5	1,765	1,669	94.6	1	0.1	70	4.0	13	0.7
Grade 8	1,732	1,653	95.4	3	0.2	50	2.9	19	1.1
Black									
Grade 3	30,801	23,740	77.1	57	0.2	3,658	11.9	2,906	9.4
Grade 5	30,380	25,793	84.9	66	0.2	2,781	9.2	1,247	4.1
Grade 8	27,811	23,767	85.5	185	0.7	2,570	9.2	1,021	3.7
Hispanic									
Grade 3	5,173	4,172	80.6	3	0.1	557	10.8	357	6.9
Grade 5	4,521	3,837	84.9	6	0.1	441	9.8	162	3.6
Grade 8	3,393	2,789	82.2	21	0.6	392	11.6	160	4.7
Multi-Racial									
Grade 3	2,170	1,924	88.7	11	0.5	114	5.3	102	4.7
Grade 5	1,764	1,668	94.6	5	0.3	45	2.6	22	1.2
Grade 8	1,166	1,078	92.5	13	1.1	49	4.2	16	1.4
White									
Grade 3	58,730	54,180	92.3	91	0.2	2,384	4.1	1,611	2.7
Grade 5	60,987	57,962	95.0	79	0.1	1,722	2.8	654	1.1
Grade 8	60,195	57,194	95.0	371	0.6	1,545	2.6	699	1.2

	Total	Standard Met				Standard Not Met			
		Promoted		Retained		Promoted		Retained	
Ethnicity	N	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Other									
Grade 3	9	8	88.9	*	*	*	*	*	*
Grade 5	11	10	90.9	*	*	*	*	1	9.1
Grade 8	22	14	63.6	*	*	2	9.1	6	27.3
Total									
Grade 3	100,225	86,975	86.8	163	0.2	6,908	6.9	5,123	5.1
Grade 5	100,911	92,159	91.3	158	0.2	5,205	5.2	2,166	2.1
Grade 8	95,629	87,646	91.7	601	0.6	4,690	4.9	1,982	2.1

**Percentages do not add to 100% due to some information not coded for some students.

Students that were absent, LEP, students who participated in NCCATS, participated in alternate assessments, and transfer students also were subject to the student accountability standards. For most students, the data demonstrates that principals played major roles in promotion or retention decisions (Tables 7 and 8). LEP students were promoted based on being identified as LEP.

Table 7**Promotion Reasons for Absent Students, LEP Students, Students Participating in Alternate Assessments, NCCATS, and Transfer Students**

Status/Test	Number Promoted	% Waiver	% LEP (Limited English Proficient)	% Local Policy /Other	% Principal's Decision
Absent					
Grade 3	54	11.1	1.9	13.0	74.1
Grade 5	56	19.6	1.8	12.5	66.1
Grade 8	165	15.2	1.2	13.9	69.7
LEP					
Grade 3	1,221	*	99.8	0.1	0.1
Grade 5	1,119	*	99.8	*	0.2
Grade 8	1,007	0.1	99.8	*	0.1
NCAAAI					
Grade 3	1,414	22.1	0.6	39.1	38.1
Grade 5	1,030	26.5	0.3	38.6	34.6
Grade 8	391	38.4	*	32.0	29.7
NCAAP					
Grade 3	337	17.2	0.3	41.2	41.2
Grade 5	460	15.4	*	37.8	46.7
Grade 8	403	24.6	*	38.7	36.7
NCCATS					
Grade 3	878	22.3	0.8	35.5	41.3
Grade 5	1,894	28.6	0.3	31.6	39.6
Grade 8	2,087	32.8	0.2	27.2	39.8
Transfer					
Grade 3	28	10.7	*	39.3	50.0
Grade 5	14	7.1	*	71.4	21.4
Grade 8	22	13.6	*	54.5	31.8

Status/Test	Number Promoted	% Waiver	% LEP (Limited English Proficient)	%Local Policy /Other	%Principal's Decision
Other					
Grade 3	795	28.6	1.0	33.6	36.9
Grade 5	1,132	29.6	1.1	30.7	38.6
Grade 8	406	38.2	1.5	27.6	32.8

Table 8

Retention Reasons of Absent Students, LEP Students, Students Participating in Alternate Assessments, NCCATS, and Transfer Students

Status/Test	Number Retained	% Academic	% Attendance	% Other	% Principal's Decision
Absent					
Grade 3	32	6.3	18.8	21.9	53.2
Grade 5	16	25.0	18.8	6.3	50.0
Grade 8	132	28.8	22.0	15.2	34.1
LEP					
Grade 3	28	35.7	*	17.9	46.4
Grade 5	19	42.1	*	10.5	47.4
Grade 8	4	75.0	*	25.0	*
NCAA I					
Grade 3	36	44.1	5.6	11.1	38.9
Grade 5	32	21.9	*	46.9	31.3
Grade 8	11	54.5	*	36.4	9.1
NCAAP					
Grade 3	3	33.3	*	*	66.7
Grade 5	35	8.6	2.9	71.4	17.1
Grade 8	26	26.9	*	42.3	30.8
NCCATS					
Grade 3	43	53.5	*	18.6	27.9
Grade 5	43	48.8	*	18.6	32.6
Grade 8	40	45.0	10.0	7.5	37.5
Transfer					
Grade 3	*	*	*	*	*
Grade 5	1	*	*	100.0	*
Grade 8	*	*	*	*	*

Status/Test	Number Retained	% Academic	% Attendance	% Other	% Principal's Decision
Other					
Grade 3	30	66.7	3.3	10.0	20.0
Grade 5	24	37.5	8.3	12.5	41.7
Grade 8	8	75.0	*	25.0	*

Table 8 is presented for informational purposes only as the number of retained students in each category and grade level is very small.

The predominant reason a student was promoted (Table 9) without meeting the accountability gateway was “Principal’s Decision.” This was generally consistent across all ethnic groups.

Table 9
Standard Not Met, Student Promoted, by Ethnicity

Ethnicity	Total	Waiver		LEP (Limited English Proficient)		Local Policy/Other		Principal's Decision		
	N	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	
American Indian										
Grade 3	119	36	30.3	*	*	24	20.2	59	49.6	
Grade 5	146	52	35.6	*	*	21	14.4	73	50.0	
Grade 8	82	28	34.1	*	*	13	15.9	41	50.0	
Asian										
Grade 3	76	12	15.8	16	21.1	15	19.7	33	43.4	
Grade 5	70	14	20.0	17	24.3	5	7.1	34	48.6	
Grade 8	50	13	26.0	10	20.0	9	18.0	18	36.0	
Black										
Grade 3	3,658	1,086	29.7	5	0.1	813	22.2	1,754	47.9	
Grade 5	2,781	880	31.6	1	0.0	627	22.5	1,273	45.8	
Grade 8	2,570	978	38.1	6	0.2	501	19.5	1,085	42.2	
Hispanic										
Grade 3	557	113	20.3	116	20.8	110	19.7	218	39.1	
Grade 5	441	108	24.5	108	24.5	68	15.4	157	35.6	
Grade 8	392	91	23.2	108	27.6	59	15.1	134	34.2	

Ethnicity	Total	Waiver		LEP (Limited English Proficient)		Local Policy/Other		Principal's Decision	
	N	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Multi-Racial									
Grade 3	114	39	34.2	2	1.8	22	19.3	51	44.7
Grade 5	45	11	24.4	*	*	14	31.1	20	44.4
Grade 8	49	16	32.7	1	2.0	9	18.4	23	46.9
White									
Grade 3	2,384	805	33.9	3	0.1	516	21.6	1,060	44.5
Grade 5	1,722	664	38.6	2	0.1	369	21.4	687	39.9
Grade 8	1,545	593	38.5	7	0.5	270	17.5	675	43.7
Other									
Grade 3	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Grade 5	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Grade 8	2	2	100	*	*	*	*	*	*
Total									
Grade 3	6,908	2,091	30.3	142	2.1	1,500	21.7	3,175	46.0
Grade 5	5,205	1,729	33.2	128	2.5	1,104	21.2	2,244	43.1
Grade 8	4,690	1,721	36.7	132	2.8	861	18.4	1,976	42.1

Table 10 details the reasons students were retained even though they met the gateway standard. This table clearly shows that the number of students statewide that met the promotion standard but were retained was very small.

Table 10
Standard Met, Student Retained, by Ethnicity

Local Promotion Standards

Ethnicity	Total	Academic		Attendance		Other		Principal's Decision	
	N	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
American Indian									
Grade 3	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Grade 5	1	1	100.0	*	*	*	*	*	*
Grade 8	8	7	87.5	*	*	*	*	1	12.5

Local Promotion Standards

Ethnicity	Total		Academic		Attendance		Other		Principal's Decision	
	N	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	
Asian										
Grade 3	1	1	100.0	*	*	*	*	*	*	
Grade 5	1	*	*	*	*	*	*	1	100.0	
Grade 8	3	3	100.0	*	*	*	*	*	*	
Black										
Grade 3	57	46	80.7	1	1.8	3	5.3	7	12.3	
Grade 5	66	60	90.9	*	*	2	3.0	4	6.1	
Grade 8	185	136	73.5	4	2.2	2	1.1	43	23.2	
Hispanic										
Grade 3	3	3	100.0	*	*	*	*	*	*	
Grade 5	6	5	83.3	*	*	*	*	1	16.7	
Grade 8	21	15	71.4	*	*	1	4.8	5	23.8	
Multi-Racial										
Grade 3	11	11	100.0	*	*	*	*	*	*	
Grade 5	5	3	60.0	*	*	*	*	2	40.0	
Grade 8	13	12	92.3	*	*	*	*	1	7.7	
White										
Grade 3	91	56	61.5	4	4.4	11	12.1	20	22.0	
Grade 5	79	51	64.6	5	6.3	3	3.8	20	25.3	
Grade 8	371	303	81.7	21	5.7	15	4.0	32	8.6	
Total										
Grade 3	163	117	71.8	5	3.1	14	8.6	27	16.6	
Grade 5	158	120	75.9	5	3.2	5	3.2	28	17.7	
Grade 8	601	476	79.2	25	4.2	18	3.0	82	13.6	

Promotion status data were also disaggregated by gender (Table 11). Promotion and retention percentages are not very different between males and females, but females do demonstrate higher rates of promotion performance at all grade levels. For students who met the standard, the (increasing) pattern of promotion as grade level increases obtains for both genders. Conversely, the pattern in being promoted and retained if the standard is not met shows a decrease in promotion and retention rates as grade level increases.

Table 11

Promotion Status of Students, by Gender**

		Standard Met				Standard Not Met			
		Promoted		Retained		Promoted		Retained	
Gender	N	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Female									
Grade 3	49,378	43,648	88.4	84	0.2	3,002	6.1	2,331	4.7
Grade 5	49,861	46,533	93.3	61	0.1	2,073	4.2	841	1.7
Grade 8	47,769	44,668	93.5	210	0.4	1,892	4.0	735	1.5
Male									
Grade 3	50,847	43,327	85.2	79	0.2	3,906	7.7	2,792	5.5
Grade 5	51,049	45,625	89.4	97	0.2	3,132	6.1	1,325	2.6
Grade 8	47,861	42,979	89.8	391	0.8	2,798	5.8	1,247	2.6
Total									
Grade 3	100,225	86,975	86.8	163	0.2	6,908	6.9	5,123	5.1
Grade 5	100,910	92,158	91.3	158	0.2	5,205	5.2	2,166	2.1
Grade 8	95,630	87,647	91.7	601	0.6	4,690	4.9	1,982	2.1

**Percentages do not add to 100% due to some information not coded for some students.

The predominant reason given for promoting students who did not meet the gateway by gender (Table 12) was “Principal’s Decision,” followed by “Waiver.”

Table 12
Standard Not Met, Student Promoted, by Gender

Gender	Total		Waiver		LEP (Limited English Proficient)		Local Policy/ Other		Principal's Decision	
	N	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	
Female										
Grade 3	3,002	938	31.2	67	2.2	615	20.5	1,382	46.0	
Grade 5	2,073	667	32.2	63	3.0	450	21.7	893	43.1	
Grade 8	1,892	720	38.1	61	3.2	333	17.6	778	41.1	
Male										
Grade 3	3,906	1,153	29.5	75	1.9	885	22.7	1,793	45.9	
Grade 5	3,132	1,062	33.9	65	2.1	654	20.9	1,351	43.1	
Grade 8	2,798	1,001	35.9	71	2.5	528	18.9	1,198	42.8	

The number of students statewide who were retained after they met the standard is modest. There were grade level differences between the males and females being retained but there is no additional evidence to suggest that this is unusual. The primary rationale used in retention decisions was Academic. “Principal’s Decision” also played an important role in the retention decision and it was somewhat more important for females than for males. Compared to males, females are less frequently retained for Academic reasons, and considerably more likely to be retained for Attendance or by the Principal’s Decision.

Table 13
Standard Met, Student Retained, by Gender

Gender	Local Promotion								
	Total	Academic		Attendance		Other		Principal's Decision	
	N	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Female									
Grade 3	84	55	65.5	4	4.8	7	8.3	18	21.4
Grade 5	61	44	72.1	3	4.9	2	3.3	12	19.7
Grade 8	210	155	73.8	14	6.7	8	3.8	33	15.7
Male									
Grade 3	79	62	78.5	1	1.3	7	8.9	9	11.4
Grade 5	97	76	78.4	2	2.1	3	3.1	16	16.5
Grade 8	391	321	82.1	11	2.8	10	2.6	49	12.5

Table 14 catalogues the promotion status of tested students who were classified “Students with Disabilities” and “Students without Disabilities.” There are 14 categories of disability. They include: behaviorally/emotionally disabled, hearing impaired, educable mentally disabled, specific learning disabled, speech language impaired, visually impaired, other health impaired, orthopedically impaired, traumatic brain injury, autistic, severe profound mentally disabled, multi handicapped, deaf blind, and trainable mentally disabled. For this report, students classified as not disabled were: not identified in the data as an exceptional student or were identified in the data as academically and intellectually gifted (AIG).

Table 14
Promotion Status for Students With Disabilities, Students Without Disabilities**

Group	Total	Standard Met				Standard Not Met			
		Promoted		Retained		Promoted		Retained	
		n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Students with Disabilities									
Grade 3	12,244	7,580	61.9	24	0.2	2,625	21.4	1,200	9.8
Grade 5	12,133	8,083	66.6	33	0.3	2,250	18.5	667	5.5
Grade 8	10,565	6,952	65.8	48	0.5	2,416	22.9	707	6.7
Students without Disabilities									
Grade 3	87,982	79,396	90.2	139	0.2	4,283	4.9	3,923	4.5
Grade 5	88,778	84,076	94.7	125	0.1	2,955	3.3	1,499	1.7
Grade 8	85,069	80,696	94.9	553	0.7	2,275	2.7	1,275	1.5

**Percentages do not add to 100% due to some information not coded for some students.

Overall, a higher percentage of students without disabilities were promoted if they met the standard. A higher percentage of students with disabilities were promoted without meeting the gateway standard when compared to students without disabilities. If the standard was not met, students with disabilities are being retained at a higher percentage than students without disabilities. If the standard was met, there is little difference in retention percentages between Students with Disabilities and Students without Disabilities.

The Appendix presents student data presented in the body of the report but in greater detail.

Summary

The majority of students passed both reading and mathematics after all retests (Table 2). The data presented in this report suggest that implementation of the gateway standards in grades 3, 5 and 8 is having some effect statewide. A majority, in excess of 90% (except for grade three, at 88%) of the

students who participated in end-of-grade tests for reading and mathematics met the gateway (Table 3). Ethnic differences were noted in the passing rates for all grades (Table 6).

When students were promoted without meeting the gateway, the data suggest that the principal's decision played a prominent role (Table 9). This reason accounted for over 40% of all students, across all grades, promoted without meeting the gateway.

Some small gender differences were noted with more females passing the gateway than males (Table 11). Males were retained at a slightly higher rate than females, most notably in grades 3 and 8 (Table 11). If the standard was not met, males were promoted at slightly higher rates than females (Table 11). Principal's decision played the main role in promoting male and female students if they had not met the standard (Table 12).

Overall, a lower percentage of students with disabilities were promoted if they met the standard. On the other hand, a higher percentage of students with disabilities were promoted without meeting the gateway standard when compared to students without disabilities (Table 14).

Due to the incremental implementation of the student accountability standards only a modest initial trend for the fifth grade can be documented. In 1999-2000, before Student Accountability Standards, 1.4% fifth graders were retained. In 2000-2001 (1st year Student Accountability Standards), 2.3% were retained. For the 2001-2002 school year 2.3% fifth grade students were retained, little changed from the previous year.

Due to improved data collection procedures and analysis methodology, school systems provided increasingly accurate student accountability data for grades 3, 5, and 8. As a consequence, the 2001-2002 school year should be considered a baseline year in order to track the effect of the SBE policy for the next several years.

Table 15

**2001-2002 Number and Percent of Students in Grades 3, 5, and 8
Promoted or Retained**

	Total N	Promoted	% Promoted	Retained	% Retained	Blank	% Blank
Grade 3	104,760	98,870	94.4	5,483	5.2	407	0.4
Grade 5	106,277	103,207	97.1	2,510	2.4	558	0.5
Grade 8	100,349	97,082	96.7	2,838	2.8	427	0.4
Total	311,386	299,159	96.1	10,831	3.5	1,392	0.4

The table above reflects students in any of the categories listed below

- End of Grade Reading and Mathematics Test
- North Carolina Alternate Assessment Portfolio
- North Carolina Academic Alternate Assessment Indicator
- North Carolina Computer Adaptive Testing Systems
- Absent
- Limited English Proficiency (Year 1 or Year 2)
- Transfer

“Blank” indicates that a promotion or retention indicator was not given for those students.

Appendix

Table 1
Promotion Status for All Students, by Ethnicity**

Ethnicity	N	Standard Met				Standard Not Met			
		Promoted		Retained		Promoted		Retained	
		n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
American Indian									
Grade 3	1,587	1,227	77.3	*	*	119	7.5	118	7.4
Grade 5	1,598	1,220	76.3	1	0.1	146	9.1	67	4.2
Grade 8	1,408	1,151	81.7	8	0.6	82	5.8	61	4.3
Asian									
Grade 3	2,003	1,724	86.1	1	0.0	76	3.8	29	1.4
Grade 5	1,915	1,669	87.2	1	0.1	70	3.7	13	0.7
Grade 8	1,883	1,653	87.8	3	0.2	50	2.7	19	1.0
Black									
Grade 3	32,499	23,740	73.0	57	0.2	3,658	11.3	2,906	8.9
Grade 5	32,592	25,793	79.1	66	0.2	2,781	8.5	1,247	3.8
Grade 8	29,761	23,767	79.9	185	0.6	2,570	8.6	1,021	3.4
Hispanic									
Grade 3	6,349	4,172	65.7	3	0.0	557	8.8	357	5.6
Grade 5	5,620	3,837	68.3	6	0.1	441	7.8	162	2.9
Grade 8	4,315	2,789	64.6	21	0.5	392	9.1	160	3.7
Multi-Racial									
Grade 3	2,234	1,924	86.1	11	0.5	114	5.1	102	4.6
Grade 5	1,832	1,668	91.0	5	0.3	45	2.5	22	1.2
Grade 8	1,205	1,078	89.5	13	1.1	49	4.1	16	1.3
White									
Grade 3	60,073	54,180	90.2	91	0.2	2,384	4.0	1,611	2.7
Grade 5	62,706	57,962	92.4	79	0.1	1,722	2.7	654	1.0
Grade 8	61,745	57,194	92.6	371	0.6	1,545	2.5	699	1.1

Ethnicity	N	Standard Met				Standard Not Met			
		Promoted		Retained		Promoted		Retained	
		n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Other									
Grade 3	11	8	72.7	*	*	*	*	*	*
Grade 5	11	10	90.9	*	*	*	*	1	9.1
Grade 8	22	14	63.6	*	*	2	9.1	6	27.3
Total									
Grade 3	104,756	86,975	83.0	163	0.2	6,908	6.6	5,123	4.9
Grade 5	106,274	92,159	86.7	158	0.1	5,205	4.9	2,166	2.0
Grade 8	100,339	87,646	87.3	601	0.6	4,690	4.7	1,982	2.0

**Percentages do not add to 100% due to some information not coded for some students. Therefore some students included in the total N-count are not shown explicitly in the table. They account for 5.3%(Grade 3), 6.3%(Grade 5), and 5.4%(Grade 8) of the students.

Table 2

Number and Percent Passing Reading and Mathematics, by Ethnicity

Grade 3

			Ethnicity							
Test Administration			All	Asian	Black	Hispanic	American Indian	Multi-Racial	Other	White
End of Grade Test	Subject									
	Reading	Number	85,596	1,655	23,532	3,951	1,191	1,911	7	53,346
		Percent	85.4	89.8	76.4	76.4	79.5	88.1	77.8	90.8
	Math	Number	83,710	1,672	21,513	4,072	1,174	1,880	7	53,391
		Percent	83.5	90.8	69.8	78.7	78.3	86.6	77.8	90.9
	Both	Number	78,412	1,577	19,459	3,583	1,065	1,769	7	50,951
Percent		78.2	85.6	63.2	69.3	71.0	81.5	77.8	86.8	
Retest 1	Reading	Number	4,825	81	2,397	344	74	94	1	1,834
		Percent	4.8	4.4	7.8	6.6	4.9	4.3	11.1	3.1
	Math	Number	4,891	72	2,528	314	98	89	2	1,788
		Percent	4.9	3.9	8.2	6.1	6.5	4.1	22.2	3.0
	Both	Number	873	18	462	50	11	16	1	315
		Percent	0.9	1.0	1.5	1.0	0.7	0.7	11.1	0.5
Cumulative After Retest 1	Reading	Number	90,224	1,733	25,800	4,287	1,266	1,999	8	55,130
		Percent	90.0	94.1	83.8	82.9	84.4	92.1	88.9	93.9
	Math	Number	88,366	1,743	23,898	4,373	1,271	1,966	9	55,105
		Percent	88.2	94.6	77.6	84.5	84.7	90.6	100.0	93.8
	Both	Number	84,589	1,684	22,413	4,000	1,180	1,892	8	53,411
		Percent	84.4	91.4	72.8	77.3	78.7	87.2	88.9	90.9
Retest 2	Reading	Number	1,617	25	894	121	28	23	*	526
		Percent	1.6	1.4	2.9	2.3	1.9	1.1	*	0.9
	Math	Number	2,190	29	1,269	143	43	36	*	670
		Percent	2.2	1.6	4.1	2.8	2.9	1.7	*	1.1
	Both	Number	234	4	148	18	3	2	*	59
		Percent	0.2	0.2	0.5	0.3	0.2	0.1	*	0.1
Cumulative After Retest 2	Reading	Number	91,752	1,757	26,631	4,404	1,291	2,020	8	55,641
		Percent	91.5	95.4	86.5	85.1	86.1	93.1	88.9	94.7
	Math	Number	90,464	1,771	25,106	4,511	1,314	2,000	9	55,753
		Percent	90.3	96.1	81.5	87.2	87.6	92.2	100.0	94.9
	Both	Number	87,152	1,725	23,806	4,176	1,227	1,935	8	54,274
		Percent	87.0	93.6	77.3	80.7	81.8	89.2	88.9	92.4

Table 3
Number and Percent Passing Reading and Mathematics, by Ethnicity
Grade 5

Test Administration		Ethnicity								
		All	Asian	Black	Hispanic	American Indian	Multi-Racial	Other	White	
End of Grade Test	Subject									
	Reading	Number	88,107	1,592	23,692	3,610	1,114	1,617	10.0	56,472
		Percent	87.3	90.2	78.0	79.8	75.1	91.7	90.9	92.6
	Math	Number	93,924	1,716	26,422	4,062	1,292	1,661	10.0	58,761
		Percent	93.1	97.2	87.0	89.8	87.1	94.2	90.9	96.3
	Both	Number	85,739	1,580	22,409	3,504	1,072	1,566	9.0	55,599
Percent		85.0	89.5	73.8	77.5	72.3	88.8	81.8	91.2	
Retest 1	Reading	Number	3,980	64	2,023	187	94	57	*	1,555
		Percent	3.9	3.6	6.7	4.1	6.3	3.2	*	2.5
	Math	Number	2,950	18	1,652	174	69	48	1.0	988
		Percent	2.9	1.0	5.4	3.8	4.7	2.7	9.1	1.6
	Both	Number	410	1	237	19	12	6	*	135
		Percent	0.4	0.1	0.8	0.4	0.8	0.3	*	0.2
Cumulative After Retest 1	Reading	Number	90,541	1,650	24,823	3,740	1,173	1,649	10.0	57,496
		Percent	89.7	93.5	81.7	82.7	79.1	93.5	90.9	94.3
	Math	Number	96,708	1,734	27,943	4,232	1,361	1,706	11.0	59,721
		Percent	95.8	98.2	92.0	93.6	91.8	96.7	100.0	97.9
	Both	Number	86,140	1,581	22,638	3,523	1,084	1,572	9.0	55,733
		Percent	85.4	89.6	74.5	77.9	73.1	89.1	81.8	91.4
Retest 2	Reading	Number	1,421	19	818	85	45	18	*	436
		Percent	1.4	1.1	2.7	1.9	3.0	1.0	*	0.7
	Math	Number	1,084	4	685	78	38	14	*	265
		Percent	1.1	0.2	2.3	1.7	2.6	0.8	*	0.4
	Both	Number	145	*	96	9	3	4	*	33
		Percent	0.1	*	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.2	*	0.1
Cumulative After Retest 2	Reading	Number	93,376	1,674	26,451	3,875	1,249	1,692	10.0	58,425
		Percent	92.5	94.8	87.1	85.7	84.2	95.9	90.9	95.8
	Math	Number	97,738	1,738	28,590	4,309	1,398	1,718	11.0	59,974
		Percent	96.9	98.5	94.1	95.3	94.3	97.4	100.0	98.3
	Both	Number	92,314	1,670	25,856	3,843	1,221	1,673	10.0	58,041
		Percent	91.5	94.6	85.1	85.0	82.3	94.8	90.9	95.2

Table 4
Number and Percent Passing Reading and Mathematics, by Ethnicity
Grade 8

Test Administration			Ethnicity								
			All	Asian	Black	Hispanic	American Indian	Multi-Racial	Other	White	
End of Grade Test	Subject	Number	86,119	1,610	22,769	2,650	1,102	1,077	13.0	56,896	
		Percent	90.0	93.0	81.9	78.1	84.1	92.4	59.1	94.5	
	Reading	Number	85,451	1,653	22,304	2,755	1,161	1,042	16.0	56,519	
		Percent	89.4	95.4	80.2	81.2	88.6	89.4	72.7	93.9	
	Math	Number	81,081	1,574	20,163	2,427	1,034	1,003	12.0	54,866	
		Percent	84.8	90.9	72.5	71.5	78.9	86.0	54.5	91.1	
Retest 1	Reading	Number	3,696	53	1,987	224	83	36	3.0	1,310	
		Percent	3.9	3.1	7.1	6.6	6.3	3.1	13.6	2.2	
	Math	Number	5,011	47	2,653	261	75	69	3.0	1,903	
		Percent	5.2	2.7	9.5	7.7	5.7	5.9	13.6	3.2	
	Both	Number	738	5	433	34	12	11	1.0	242	
		Percent	0.8	0.3	1.6	1.0	0.9	0.9	4.5	0.4	
Cumulative After Retest 1	Reading	Number	89,219	1,653	24,384	2,851	1,181	1,112	14.0	58,022	
		Percent	93.3	95.4	87.7	84.0	90.2	95.4	63.6	96.4	
	Math	Number	89,651	1,691	24,498	2,974	1,225	1,100	18.0	58,143	
		Percent	93.7	97.6	88.1	87.7	93.5	94.3	81.8	96.6	
	Both	Number	86,325	1,634	22,813	2,712	1,136	1,067	14.0	56,947	
		Percent	90.3	94.3	82.0	79.9	86.7	91.5	63.6	94.6	
Retest 2	Reading	Number		1,323	18	814	69	32	16	1.0	373
		Percent		1.4	1.0	2.9	2.0	2.4	1.4	4.5	0.6
	Math	Number		1,739	14	1,030	99	43	22	*	531
		Percent		1.8	0.8	3.7	2.9	3.3	1.9	*	0.9
	Both	Number		218	2	128	14	8	6	*	60
		Percent		0.2	0.1	0.5	0.4	0.6	0.5	*	0.1
Cumulative After Retest 2	Reading	Number	90,332	1,670	25,050	2,914	1,198	1,124	15.0	58,359	
		Percent	94.5	96.4	90.1	85.9	91.5	96.4	68.2	96.9	
	Math	Number	91,075	1,703	25,328	3,056	1,237	1,119	18.0	58,612	
		Percent	95.2	98.3	91.1	90.1	94.4	96.0	81.8	97.4	
	Both	Number	88,251	1,655	23,954	2,811	1,159	1,091	14.0	57,565	
		Percent	92.3	95.6	86.1	82.8	88.5	93.6	63.6	95.6	

Table 5

Promotion Status of Migrant Students**

Group	Total N	Standard Met				Standard Not Met			
		Promoted		Retained		Promoted		Retained	
		n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Migrant									
Grade 3	797	623	78.2	4	0.5	98	12.3	60	7.5
Grade 5	473	380	80.3	1	0.2	61	12.9	21	4.4
Grade 8	242	186	76.9	2	0.8	37	15.3	14	5.8
Not Migrant									
Grade 3	99,429	86,353	86.8	159	0.2	6,810	6.8	5,063	5.1
Grade 5	100,438	91,779	91.4	157	0.2	5,144	5.1	2,145	2.1
Grade 8	95,392	87,462	91.7	599	0.6	4,654	4.9	1,968	2.1
Total									
Grade 3	100,226	86,976	86.8	163	0.2	6,908	6.9	5,123	5.1
Grade 5	100,911	92,159	91.3	158	0.2	5,205	5.2	2,166	2.1
Grade 8	95,635	87,648	91.6	601	0.6	4,691	4.9	1,982	2.1

**Percentages do not add to 100% due to some information not coded for some students.

Table 6

**Promotion Status for Students with Disabilities (SWD) and Students without Disabilities,
by Ethnicity****

Grade 3

Ethnicity		Total N	Standard Met, Promoted		Standard Met, Retained		Standard Not Met, Promoted		Standard Not Met, Retained	
			n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
American Indian	Not SWD	1,303	1,124	86.3	*	*	85	6.5	93	7.1
	SWD	197	103	52.3	*	*	34	17.3	25	12.7
Asian	Not SWD	1,741	1,655	95.1	1	0.1	55	3.2	23	1.3
	SWD	101	69	68.3	*	*	21	20.8	6	5.9
Black	Not SWD	26,975	21,981	81.5	49	0.2	2,504	9.3	2,329	8.6
	SWD	3,826	1,759	46.0	8	0.2	1,154	30.2	577	15.1
Hispanic	Not SWD	4,722	3,956	83.8	3	0.1	428	9.1	298	6.3
	SWD	451	216	47.9	*	*	129	28.6	59	13.1
Multi-Racial	Not SWD	1,916	1,755	91.6	11	0.6	73	3.8	74	3.9
	SWD	254	169	66.5	*	*	41	16.1	28	11
White	Not SWD	51,317	48,917	95.3	75	0.1	1,138	2.2	1,106	2.2
	SWD	7,413	5,263	71.0	16	0.2	1,246	16.8	505	6.8
Other	Not SWD	7	7	100.0	*	*	*	*	*	*
	SWD	2	1	50.0	*	*	*	*	*	*
Total		100,225	86,975	86.8	163	0.2	6,908	6.9	5,123	5.1

**Percentages do not add to 100% due to some information not coded for some students.

Table 7

Promotion Status for Students with Disabilities (SWD) and Student without Disabilities, by Ethnicity**

Grade 5

Ethnicity		Total N	Standard Met, Promoted		Standard Met, Retained		Standard Not Met, Promoted		Standard Not Met, Retained	
			n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
American Indian	Not SWD	1,309	1,142	87.2	1	0.1	104	7.9	59	4.4
	SWD	174	78	44.8	*	*	42	24.1	9	5.2
Asian	Not SWD	1,690	1,622	96.0	*	*	53	3.1	12	0.7
	SWD	75	47	62.7	1	1.3	17	22.7	1	1.3
Black	Not SWD	26,413	23,711	89.8	54	0.2	1,708	6.5	894	3.4
	SWD	3,967	2,082	52.5	12	0.3	1,073	27.0	353	8.7
Hispanic	Not SWD	4,114	3,629	88.2	6	0.1	335	8.1	133	3.2
	SWD	407	208	51.1	*	*	106	26.0	29	7.1
Multi-Racial	Not SWD	1,576	1,524	96.7	4	0.3	26	1.6	16	1.0
	SWD	188	144	76.6	1	0.5	19	10.1	6	3.2
White	Not SWD	53,667	52,440	97.7	60	0.1	729	1.4	385	0.7
	SWD	7,320	5,522	75.4	19	0.3	993	13.8	269	3.7
Other	Not SWD	9	8	88.9	*	*	*	*	1	11.1
	SWD	2	2	100.0	*	*	*	*	*	*
Total		100,911	92,159	91.3	158	0.2	5,205	5.2	2,166	2.1

**Percentages do not add to 100% due to some information not coded for some students.

Table 8
Promotion Status for Students with Disabilities (SWD) and Students without Disabilities,
by Ethnicity**

Grade 8

Ethnicity	Total	Standard Met, Promoted		Standard Met, Retained		Standard Not Met, Promoted		Standard Not Met, Retained		
		n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	
American Indian	Not SWD	1,169	1,065	91.1	8	0.7	54	4.6	41	3.5
	SWD	141	86	61.0	*	*	28	19.9	20	14.2
Asian	Not SWD	1,661	1,606	96.7	3	0.2	32	1.9	17	1.0
	SWD	71	47	66.2	*	*	18	25.4	2	2.8
Black	Not SWD	24,245	22,053	91.0	175	0.7	1,280	5.3	647	2.7
	SWD	3,566	1,714	48.1	10	0.3	1,290	36.2	374	10.5
Hispanic	Not SWD	3,153	2,649	84.0	19	0.6	333	10.6	133	4.2
	SWD	240	140	58.3	2	0.8	59	24.6	27	11.3
Multi-Racial	Not SWD	1,048	997	95.1	12	1.1	25	2.4	10	1.0
	SWD	118	81	68.6	1	0.8	24	20.3	6	5.1
White	Not SWD	53,772	52,312	97.3	336	0.6	550	1.0	442	0.8
	SWD	6,423	4,882	76.0	35	0.5	995	15.5	277	4.3
Other	Not SWD	17	12	70.6	*	*	*	*	5	29
	SWD	5	2	40.0	*	*	2	40.0	1	20.0
Total	95,629	87,646	91.7	601	0.6	4,690	4.9	1,982	2.1	

**Percentages do not add to 100% due to some information not coded for some students.

Technical Notes

Student Accountability Report

Documentation

The North Carolina Statewide Student Accountability Standards Requirements are documented at the following web address:

http://www.ncpublicschools.org/student_promotion/draft_standards.html. This document contains information on the Student Accountability Standards that are reflected in the Student Accountability Standards Report.

Tables in the Student Accountability Standards Report were created with data collected from the LEAs and Charter Schools. Below are descriptions of which students were used to create each table, a chart showing the needed codes, and a description of the codes.

Report

- Table 1 uses Gateway Standard codes chosen by LEAs and Charter Schools. Fluctuations between grade levels are due to Charter Schools not having all three grade levels and LEAs choosing higher and lower standards for retests.
- Table 2 is based on student level data using the Regular, Retest 1, Retest 2 Reading and Mathematics Status (excluding Absent, LEP (Year 1 or 2), NCCATS, NCAAP, NCAAAI, Transfer, or blank (not coded) students).
- Tables 3 – 5 are based on student level data using Assessment status and Promotion/Retention status (excluding Absent, LEP (Year 1 or 2), NCCATS, NCAAP, NCAAAI, Transfer, or blank (not coded) students).
- Table 6 is based on student level data using ethnicity, Assessment status, and Promotion/Retention status (excluding Absent, LEP (Year 1 or 2), NCCATS, NCAAP, NCAAAI, Transfer, or blank (not coded) students).
- Tables 7 – 8 are based on student level data using Regular, Retest 1, Retest 2 Reading and Mathematics Status, and Promotion/Retention status for Absent, LEP (Year 1 or 2), NCCATS, NCAAP, NCAAAI, or Transfer students. Students taking NCCATS, NCAAAI, were absent, or LEP and took the regular EOG test are counted in the “Other” category.
- Tables 9 – 10 are based on student level data using ethnicity, Assessment status, and Promotion/Retention status (excluding Absent, LEP (Year 1 or 2), NCCATS, NCAAP, NCAAAI, Transfer, or blank (not coded) students).
- Tables 11 – 13 are based on student level data using gender, Assessment status, and Promotion/Retention status (excluding Absent, LEP (Year 1 or 2), NCCATS, NCAAP, NCAAAI, Transfer, or blank (not coded) students).
- Table 14 is based on student level data using exceptionality code, Assessment status, and Promotion/Retention status (excluding Absent, LEP (Year 1 or 2), NCCATS, NCAAP, NCAAAI, Transfer, or blank (not coded) students).
- Table 15 is based on student level data using promotion/retention status.

Appendix:

- Table 1 is based on student level data using ethnicity code, Assessment status, Promotion/Retention status, and overall N-count counting all students in the files. Students coded as Absent, LEP (Year 1 or 2), NCCATS, NCAAP, NCAAAI, Transfer, or blank (not coded) are not explicitly shown in the table but are included in the overall count of students.
- Tables 2-4 are based on student level data using ethnicity code and Regular, Retest 1, Retest 2 Reading and Mathematics Status (excluding Absent, LEP (Year 1 or 2), NCCATS, NCAAP, NCAAAI, Transfer, or blank (not coded) students).
- Table 5 is based on student level data using Migrant code, Assessment status, and Promotion/Retention status (excluding Absent, LEP (Year 1 or 2), NCCATS, NCAAP, NCAAAI, Transfer, or blank (not coded) students).
- Tables 6-8 are based on student level data using ethnicity code, exceptionality code, Assessment status, and Promotion/Retention status (excluding Absent, LEP (Year 1 or 2), NCCATS, NCAAP, NCAAAI, Transfer, or blank (not coded) students).

Table #	Assessment Status	Promotion /Retention Status	Gateway Standard	Regular, Retest 1, Retest 2 Reading and Mathematics Status	Ethnicity	Gender	Exceptionality	Migrant
1			✓					
2				✓				
3	✓	✓						
4	✓	✓						
5	✓	✓						
6	✓	✓			✓			
7		✓		✓				
8		✓		✓				
9	✓	✓			✓			
10	✓	✓			✓			
11	✓	✓				✓		
12	✓	✓				✓		
13	✓	✓				✓		
14	✓	✓					✓	
15		✓						

Appendix

**Student Accountability Report
Data needed to complete each table**

1	✓	✓			✓			
2				✓	✓			
3				✓	✓			
4				✓	✓			
5	✓	✓						✓
6	✓	✓			✓		✓	
7	✓	✓			✓		✓	
8	✓	✓			✓		✓	

Explanation of Codes

Gateway Standard:

Blank – Not Coded

1 – Lowest Scale Score for Level III

2 – Lowest Score for Level III plus 1 Standard Error (SEM)
(SEM applied to the student scale score)

3 – Other Local standard.

Assessment Status:

Blank – Not tested with reading and mathematics test.

0 – Passed both reading and mathematics during regular administration.

1 – Passed reading and mathematics by retest 1.

2 – Passed reading and mathematics by retest 2.

3 – Student did not meet standard after all given administrations.

Promotion/Retention Status:

1 – Promoted: Scored at Level III or Level III + 1 SEM.

2 – Promoted: Waiver – e.g. at grade level or making adequate progress.

3 – Promoted: LEP (Limited English Proficiency).

4 – Promoted: Local Policy/Other.

5 – Promoted: Principal's decision.

Blank – Not coded.

A – Retained: Did not score at Level III or Level III + 1 SEM.

B – Retained: Local promotion standards/Academic.

C – Retained: Local promotion standards/Attendance.

D – Retained: Other.

E – Retained: Principal's decision.

Regular, Retest 1, Retest 2, Reading and Mathematics Status:

1 – “Yes”, passed subject at Level III.

2 – “Yes”, passed subject at Level III + 1 SEM.

3 – “No”, scored within 1 SEM but Standard used was Level III.

4 – “No”, scored within 2 SEM of Level III.

5 – “No”, did not meet standard.

A – Absent from test.

B – LEP Year 1.

C – LEP Year 2.

D – NCCATS.

E – NCAAP.

F – NCAAAI.

J – Transfer.

Ethnicity:

American Indian, Asian, Black, Hispanic, Multi-Racial, White, Other.

Gender:

Male, Female.

Exceptionality:

1 – Not identified as an Exceptional Student

- 2 – Academically/Intellectually Gifted (AIG)
- 3 – Behaviorally-Emotionally Handicapped
- 4 – Hearing Impaired
- 5 – Educable Mentally Handicapped
- 6 – Specific Learning Disabled
- 7 – Speech-Language Impaired
- 8 – Visually Impaired
- 9 – Other Health Impaired
- 10 – Orthopedically Impaired
- 11 – Traumatic Brain Injured
- 12 – Autistic
- 13 – Severe/Profound Mentally Disabled
- 14 – Multihandicapped
- 15 – Deaf-Blind
- 16 – Trainable Mentally Disabled

Migrant:

- 1 – Non-Title 1 School and student not served by Migrant Program.
- 2 – Non-Title 1 School, student served by Migrant Program.
- 3 – School-Wide Title 1 Program but student no served by Migrant Program
- 4 – School-Wide Title 1 Program and student served by Migrant Program
- 5 – Student not served by Targeted Assistance or Migrant Program.
- 6 – Not served by Targeted Assistance Program but served by Migrant Program.
- 7 – Served by Targeted Assistance Program but not served by Migrant Program.
- 8 – Served by Targeted Assistance Program and served by Migrant Program.

**This report reflects data received as of October 1, 2002.