

Table of Contents

	Page
List of Tables	iii
Executive Summary	
Background	v
Results	v
Statewide	vi
Race/Ethnicity	vi
Gender	vii
Students with/without Disabilities	vii
Migrant/Not Migrant Students	vii
2002-03 Student Accountability Standards, Grades Three, Five, and Eight	
Background	1
What are the Standards?	2
Implementation of Standards	2
EOG Performance - Statewide	4
Promotion and Retention - Statewide	4
Reasons for Promotions When Standards Were Not Met	5
Reasons for Retention When Standards Were Met	6
Students Promoted or Retained Who Met/Did Not Meet the Standards, by Race/Ethnicity	7
Reasons for Promotion of Absent Students, Students Participating in Alternate Assessments, and Transfer Students	8
Reasons for Retention of Absent Students, Students Participating in Alternate Assessments, and Transfer Students	10
Reasons for Promotion When Standards Were Not Met, by Race/Ethnicity	11
Reasons for Retention When Standards Were Met, by Race/Ethnicity	13
Promotion and Retention When Standards Were Met/Not Met, by Gender	15

	Page
Reasons for Promotion When Standards Were Not Met, by Gender	16
Reasons for Retention When Standards Were Met, by Gender	17
Promotion and Retention of Students with/without Disabilities Who Met/ Did Not Meet the Standards, by Race/Ethnicity	17
Promotion and Retention of Migrant/Not Migrant Students When Standards Were Met/Not Met	18
Appendices	20
Tables A-1 to A7	21
Technical Notes	28
Standards Development	28
Documentation	28
Table Descriptions (Report)	28
Table Descriptions (Appendix)	29
Checklist of Table Requirements	30
Explanation of Codes	31

List of Tables

Table		Page
1	Number and Percent of LEAs and Charter Schools Implementing Gateway Standards for Each Test Administration, 2001-03	3
2	Number and Percent of Students in Grades Three, Five, and Eight Promoted and Retained When Standards Met and Standards Not Met, 2001-03	5
3	Number and Percent of Students in Grades Three Five, and Eight Promoted and Reasons for Promotion When Standards Not Met, 2001-03	6
4	Number and Percent of Students in Grades Three, Five, and Eight Retained When Standards Met and Reasons for Retention, 2001-03	7
5	Number and Percent of Students in Grades Three, Five, and Eight Promoted and Retained When Standards Met/Not Met, by Race/Ethnicity, 2002-03	8
6	Number and Percent of Absent Students, Students Participating Alternate Assessments, and Transfer Students Promoted and Reasons for Promotion, 2002-03	9
7	Number and Percent of Absent, NCAAAI, NCAAP, and Transfer Students Retained and Reasons for Retention, 2002-03	10
8	Number and Percent of Students in Grades Three, Five, and Eight Promoted When Standards Not Met and Reasons for Promotion, by Race/Ethnicity, 2002-03	12
9	Number and Percent of Students in Grades Three, Five, and Eight Retained When Standards Met and Reasons for Retention, by Race/Ethnicity, 2002-03	14
10	Number and Percent of Students in Grades Three, Five, and Eight Promoted and Retained When Standards Met/Not Met by Gender, 2002-03	15
11	Number and Percent of Students in Grades Three, Five, and Eight Promoted When Standards Not Met and Reasons for Promotion, by Gender, 2002-03	16

Table	Page	
12	Number and Percent of Students in Grades Three, Five, and Eight Retained When Standards Met and Reasons for Retention, by Gender, 2002-03	17
13	Number and Percent of Students in Grades Three, Five, and Eight with Disabilities and without Disabilities Promoted and Retained When Standards Met/Not Met, 2002-03	18
14	Number and Percent of Migrant Students in Grades Three, Five, and Eight Promoted and Retained When Standards Met/Not Met, 2002-03	19
Appendices		20
A-1	Number and Percent of Students Passing and/or Failing Reading and Mathematics After All Retests, 2001-03	21
A-2	Number and Percent of Students in Grade Three Passing End-of-Grade Tests and Retests, by Race/Ethnicity, 2002-03	22
A-3	Number and Percent of Students in Grade Five Passing End-of-Grade Tests and Retests, by Race/Ethnicity, 2002-03	23
A-4	Number and Percent of Students in Grade Eight Passing End-of-Grade Tests and Retests, by Race/Ethnicity, 2002-03	24
A-5	Number and Percent of Students in Grade Three with Disabilities and without Disabilities Promoted/Retained Who Met/Did Not Meet the Standards, by Race/Ethnicity, 2002-03	25
A-6	Number and Percent of Students in Grade Five with Disabilities and without Disabilities Promoted/Retained Who Met/Did Not Meet the Standards, by Race/Ethnicity, 2002-03	26
A-7	Number and Percent of Students in Grade Eight with Disabilities and without Disabilities Promoted/Retained Who Met/Did Not Meet the Standards, by Race/Ethnicity, 2002-03	27

Executive Summary

2002-03 Student Accountability Standards in Grades Three, Five, and Eight

Background

In 1997, pursuant to growing concerns regarding the issue of social promotions, the North Carolina General Assembly ratified GS 115C-12. Among other things, the statute directed the State Board of Education (SBE) to develop “grade-level student proficiency benchmarks” and to “establish a Committee on Standards and Accountability.” The Committee on Standards and Accountability recommended that the SBE adopt four gateways through which students must pass to be promoted to the next grade level. This report addresses North Carolina’s student performance on the three gateways that are in effect at this time.

Results

The overall performance of North Carolina’s students in grades three, five, and eight in End-of-Grade (EOG) reading and mathematics after all retests for 2002-03 and 2001-02 is shown in the following table. More students were promoted and fewer students retained at each of the gateways in 2002-03 than in the previous year. The greatest differences were noted in grade five.

Number and Percent¹ of Students in Grades 3, 5, and 8 Promoted or Retained, 2001-03²

	Grade 3		Grade 5		Grade 8	
	2001-02	2002-03	2001-02	2002-03	2001-02	2002-03
Total N	104,760	104,987	106,277	106,519	100,349	104,413
Promoted	98,870	101,695	103,207	105,520	97,082	102,164
% Promoted	94.4	96.9	97.1	99.1	96.7	97.8
Retained	5,483	3,264	2,510	954	2,838	2,207
% Retained	5.2	3.1	2.4	0.9	2.8	2.1
Blank³	407	28	558	45	427	42
% Blank	0.4	0.0	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.0

¹Percentages do not add to 100% due to rounding.

²The table above reflects students in any of the following categories: End of Grade (EOG) Reading and Mathematics Test; North Carolina Alternate Assessment Portfolio (NCAAP); North Carolina Alternate Assessment Academic Inventory (NCAAAI); Absent; and Transfer.

³“Blank” indicates that a promotion or retention indicator was not given for those students.

Highlights of North Carolina’s student performance on the accountability standards in 2002-03 are provided below. The 2002-03 school year is the second year of full implementation of the student accountability standards at grades three, five, and eight.

Statewide

The majority of North Carolina's public school students (91 percent at grade three, 96 percent at grade five, and 93 percent at grade eight) passed both reading and mathematics after all retests in 2002-03 (see Table A-1 in the Appendix). The 2002-03 test performance (improvement at each of the benchmark grades from the previous year) suggests that implementation of the gateway standards are having a positive influence on student promotions statewide.

Among all students not meeting the standards in 2002-03, 74.6 percent (13,549 students) were promoted, compared with 64.4 percent (16,804 students) in 2001-02.

When students were promoted without meeting the gateways, "Principal's Decision" was the main reason for promotion (see Table 3). This reason accounted for the promotion of 41.3 percent and 41.7 percent of students at grades three and eight, respectively, who did not meet the standards. "Waiver" was the primary reason for the promotion of grade five students who did not meet the standards.

"Principal's Decision" was cited less in the promotion of students who did not meet the standards in 2002-03 than in the previous year, while an increase in other reasons (Waiver, LEP, and Local Policy/Other) was observed (see Table 3).

In 2002-03, only 2.8 percent of tested students did not meet the standards and were retained at grade three, 0.6 percent at grade five, and 1.2 percent at grade eight, compared with 5.2 percent at grade three, 2.2 percent at grade five, and 2.1 percent at grade eight in 2001-02 (see Table 2).

Race/Ethnicity

Among racial/ethnic groups higher percentages of students met the standards and were promoted in 2002-03 than in 2001-02 (see Table 5). Ninety-five percent or more of Asian and White students at the benchmark grades met the standards and were promoted. Multi-Racial students had 92.3 percent at grade three, 97.0 percent at grade five, and 94.0 percent at grade eight.

For American Indians, 86.3 percent, 93.7 percent, and 89.5 percent of students met the standards and were promoted, followed by Black students with 84.4 percent, 93.4 percent, and 86.9. Among Hispanics, 84.6 percent of students at grade three, 92.0 percent at grade five, and 83.9 percent at grade eight met the standards and were promoted.

The percentage of students promoted who met the standards was higher at grades five and eight than at grade three for all racial/ethnic groups, except Hispanic students had a higher percentage at grade three than at grade eight. All racial/ethnic groups had more students meeting the standards and promoted at grade five than at grades three and eight (Table 5).

Gender

More females than males passed the gateways when the standards were met (Table 10). At grade eight, more males (0.9 percent) were retained when they met the standards than females (0.5

percent). A similar trend was observed for males (6.3 percent) and females (3.8 percent) when they did not meet the standards.

When the standards were not met, males were promoted at a higher rate than females (Table 10). Males were promoted at rates of 6.8 percent in grade three, 3.4 percent in grade five, and 6.3 percent in grade eight, while females were promoted at 4.4 percent in grade three, 1.9 percent in grade five, and 3.8 percent in grade eight.

Principal's decision played an equal role in promoting male and female students when they did not meet the standards in grades three and eight (Table 11), while "Waiver" was the major factor in grade five.

Students with/without Disabilities

In grades three, five, and eight, 67.6 percent, 79.4 percent, and 66.8 percent of students, respectively, "with" disabilities met the standard and were promoted. In contrast, 94.1 percent of students in grade three, 98.4 percent in grade five, and 96.2 percent in grade eight "without" disabilities were promoted in the benchmark grades (Table 13).

Among students "with" disabilities who did not meet the standards, 21.7 percent, 13.7 percent, and 26.0 percent at the benchmark grades were promoted. In contrast, only 3.2 percent of students "without" disabilities at grade three, 1.0 percent at grade five, and 2.1 percent at grade eight were promoted.

Migrant/Not Migrant Students

More "Not Migrant" than "Migrant" students met the standards and were promoted (see Table 14). For "Not Migrant" students, 90.7 percent at grade three, 95.9 percent at grade five, and 92.6 percent at grade eight were promoted, compared with 83.1 percent of "Migrant" students at grade three, 90.3 percent at grade five, and 78.4 percent at grade eight.

Among students who did not meet the standards, the percentage of "Migrant" students promoted was twice that of "Not Migrant" students (see Table 14).

2002-03 Student Accountability Standards in Grades Three, Five, and Eight

Background

In 1997, the North Carolina 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 the following four gateways through which students must pass to move to the next grade level:

<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).

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 G. S. 115C-288 on April 1, 1999 after 7 months of deliberation, discussion, and public input. The policy does not include Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) and Department of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (DJJDP)

schools. Consequently, they are not included in this report, but the data for these schools are included in the LEA results spreadsheets, which are available on the NCDPI web site.

What are the Standards?

The Student Accountability Standards were designed to eliminate social promotion, 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 three, five, eight, 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 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.

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

<http://disag.ncpublicschools.org/studentaccountabilitystandardsReport>.

This report addresses the impact of the full implementation of the student accountability standards 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 2002-2003.

This report shows that the school principal plays a major role in the decision to promote or retain a student. Principals are authorized to make grade and classification decisions concerning students based on 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 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 were given a second and/or third opportunity to pass the appropriate gateway, after intervention was provided by the LEA.

LEAs had the option of implementing one of two gateway standards: (1) 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 (2) using a higher standard (e.g., Achievement Level III without using 1 SEM applied to the student's score). For 2002-03 and 2001-02, LEAs predominately used Achievement level III + 1 SEM as the gateway standard (about 90 percent across all grade levels) as shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Number and Percent of LEAs and Charter Schools Implementing Gateway Standards for Each Test Administration, 2001-03¹

Standards	Grade 3		Grade 5		Grade 8							
	2001-02	2002-03	2001-02	2002-03	2001-02	2002-03						
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%				
End-of-Grade												
Achievement Level III	18	10.3	16	8.9	17	9.7	15	8.4	18	11.0	18	10.8
Achievement Level III + 1 SEM	157	89.7	164	91.1	158	90.3	164	91.6	145	89.0	148	89.2
Retest 1												
Achievement Level III	17	9.9	14	8.2	15	9.1	16	9.8	16	10.7	16	10.5
Achievement Level III + 1 SEM	154	90.1	156	91.8	150	90.9	148	90.2	133	89.3	137	89.5
Retest 2												
Achievement Level III	15	10.6	14	10.4	14	10.1	13	10.8	15	12.2	14	12.1
Achievement Level III + 1 SEM	127	89.4	121	89.6	124	89.9	107	89.2	108	87.8	102	87.9

¹Percentages do not add up to 100% due to rounding.

Due to the nature of the North Carolina Alternate Assessment Academic Inventory (NCAAAI) and the North Carolina Alternate Assessment Portfolio (NCAAP) assessments, there is no retest opportunity if a student does not demonstrate grade level performance. Students who took these instruments and did not score at Achievement Level III were given other 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 curricular 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) the first month of the second semester of the school year, and
- (3) the final month of school.

Student achievement levels from the NCAAAI or the NCAAP should 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) information that is included in the students' IEPs (for students with disabilities); and
- (5) other information that verifies that a student is at grade level.

Students with disabilities who are at grade level or making progress to meet grade level requirements can to be promoted by reason of “waiver”.

In some tables, student results for grades three, five, and eight are reported statewide and are disaggregated by grade, ethnicity, gender, disability status, and migrant status. Where feasible, data for 2002-03 and 2001-02 (the baseline year) are included in the tables.

In all tables, an asterisk indicates no data. Table cells with small student counts (five or less) were included in the report to show that some student categories are very small. Individual students are not identifiable in state level data. Any corresponding percentages associated with small cells should be interpreted with caution. As indicated in the footnotes of some tables, percentages do not add up to 100 percent due to rounding, or to information not being coded for some students.

In this report, the gateway grades three, five, and eight in ascending order will be referred to collectively as the “benchmark grades.”

EOG Performance - Statewide

The overall performance of North Carolina's students in grades three, five, and eight in reading and mathematics on the EOG, after all testing was completed, is shown in Table A-1 in the appendix. 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 at grades three, five, and eight were above ninety percent after all retests. Passing rates for grades three, five, and eight increased about four percent, five percent, and one percent, respectively, from the previous year. More students in grades five and eight passed reading and mathematics than did students in grade three.

Promotion and Retention - Statewide

Table 2 shows statewide promotion and retention results for the student accountability standards by grade. The percent of tested students who met the standards and were promoted statewide was 91.3 percent at grade three, 96.5 percent at grade five, and 93.0 percent at grade eight. Of the tested students, 5.6 percent, 2.7 percent, and 5.1 percent at grades three, five, and eight, respectively, did not meet the standards and were promoted. Fewer students at grades three (1.4 percent) and five (2.5 percent) did not meet the standards and were promoted in 2002-03 than in 2001-02.

Among all students not meeting the standards in 2002-03, 74.6 percent (13,549 students) were promoted, compared with 64.4 percent (16,804 students) in 2001-02. (This percent was determined by dividing the number of students promoted who did not meet the standards in grades three, five, and eight by the total number of students who did not meet the standards in grades three, five, and eight.)

Table 2. Number and Percent¹ of Students in Grades Three, Five, and Eight Promoted and Retained When Standards Met and Standards Not Met, 2001-03

Student Accountability Status	Number of Students		Percent of Tested Students		Percent of All Students	
	2001-02	2002-03	2001-02	2002-03	2001-02	2002-03
Standards Met, Promoted						
Grade 3	86,976	92,122	87.7	91.3	83.0	87.7
Grade 5	92,159	98,901	92.4	96.5	86.7	92.8
Grade 8	87,648	93,897	92.3	93.0	87.3	89.9
Standard Not Met, Promoted						
Grade 3	6,908	5,700	7.0	5.6	6.6	5.4
Grade 5	5,205	2,727	5.2	2.7	4.9	2.6
Grade 8	4,691	5,122	4.9	5.1	4.7	4.9
Standard Met, Retained						
Grade 3	163	287	0.2	0.3	0.2	0.3
Grade 5	158	225	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.2
Grade 8	601	725	0.6	0.7	0.6	0.7
Standard Not Met, Retained						
Grade 3	5,123	2,835	5.2	2.8	4.9	2.7
Grade 5	2,166	582	2.2	0.6	2.0	0.5
Grade 8	1,982	1,178	2.1	1.2	2.0	1.1
Total						
Grade 3	99,170	100,944	100.1	100.0	94.7	96.1
Grade 5	99,688	102,435	100.0	100.0	93.7	96.2
Grade 8	94,922	100,922	99.9	100.0	94.6	96.7

¹Percentages may not add up to 100 percent due to rounding, or due to information not being coded for some students.

Reasons for Promotions When Standards Were Not Met

Table 3 documents, by grade and criteria, the reasons cited for promotion when students did not meet the standards. The major reason for promoting students who did not meet the standards in grades three and eight was “Principal’s Decision.” At grade five, “Waiver” was the most frequently cited. “Waiver” was also the secondary reason for promoting students who did not meet the standards at grades three and eight.

Table 3. Number and Percent¹ of Students in Grades Three, Five, and Eight Promoted and Reasons for Promotion When Standards Not Met, 2001-03

	Student Promotion			
	2001-02		2002-03	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Principal's Decision				
Grade 3	3,175	46.0	2,355	41.3
Grade 5	2,244	43.1	901	33.0
Grade 8	1,976	42.1	2,138	41.7
Waiver				
Grade 3	2,091	30.3	1,779	31.2
Grade 5	1,729	33.2	1,066	39.1
Grade 8	1,721	36.7	1,886	36.8
Local Policy/Other				
Grade 3	1,500	21.7	1,360	23.8
Grade 5	1,104	21.2	663	24.3
Grade 8	862	18.4	920	18.0
LEP (Limited English Proficient)				
Grade 3	142	2.1	206	3.6
Grade 5	128	2.5	97	3.6
Grade 8	132	2.8	178	3.5
Total				
Grade 3	6,908	n/a	5,700	n/a
Grade 5	5,205	n/a	2,727	n/a
Grade 8	4,691	n/a	5,122	n/a

¹Percentages may not add up to 100 percent due to rounding, or due to information not being coded for some students.
n/a = not applicable

Reasons for Retention When Standards Were Met

Table 4 lists the number and percent of students retained when they met the standards and the reasons for retention. The most frequently cited reason for retaining students when they met the standards was “Local Promotion Standards/Academic,” which was given for 57.5 percent, 60.4 percent, and 72.4 percent of the retained students in grades three, five, and eight, respectively.

A secondary reason for student retention when the standards were met was “Principal’s Decision,” which accounted for the retention of 34.1 percent of students at grade three, 23.6 percent at grade five, and 18.2 percent at grade eight.

Table 4. Number and Percent¹ of Students in Grades Three, Five, and Eight Retained When Standards Met and Reasons for Retention, 2001-03

Reasons Retained, Standards Met	Student Retained			
	2001-02		2002-03	
	n	%	n	%
Local Promotion Standards, Academic				
Grade 3	117	71.8	165	57.5
Grade 5	120	75.9	136	60.4
Grade 8	476	79.2	525	72.4
Principal's Decision				
Grade 3	27	16.9	98	34.1
Grade 5	28	17.7	53	23.6
Grade 8	82	13.6	132	18.2
Local Promotion Standards, Attendance				
Grade 3	5	3.1	8	2.8
Grade 5	5	3.2	22	9.8
Grade 8	25	4.2	41	5.6
Other				
Grade 3	14	8.6	16	5.6
Grade 5	5	3.2	14	6.2
Grade 8	18	3.0	27	3.7
Total				
Grade 3	163	n/a	287	n/a
Grade 5	158	n/a	225	n/a
Grade 8	601	n/a	725	n/a

¹Percentages may not add to 100% due to rounding.
n/a = not applicable.

Students Promoted or Retained Who Met/Did Not Meet the Standards, by Race/Ethnicity

Table 5 shows promotion and retention data by race/ethnicity for students who met the standards and students who did not meet the standards. Of the five racial/ethnic groups, more Asian and White students met the standards than other groups, with 95 percent or more students at the benchmark grades meeting the standards.

The Multi-Racial group had 92.3 percent of students at grade three, 97 percent at grade five, and 94 percent at grade eight who met the standards and were promoted. The American Indian group had 86.3 percent of students in grade three who met the standards and were promoted, 94 percent in grade five and 90 percent in grade eight. The Black group had 84.4 percent of students who met the standards at grade three, 94 percent at grade five, and 88 percent at grade eight, while Hispanics had 85 percent at grades three and eight and 92 percent at grade five who met the standards.

Table 5. Number and Percent¹ of Students in Grades Three, Five, and Eight Promoted and Retained When Standards Met/Not Met, by Race/Ethnicity, 2002-03

Ethnicity	Total N	Standards Met				Standards Not Met			
		Promoted		Retained		Promoted		Retained	
		n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
American Indian									
Grade 3	1,550	1,337	86.3	1	0.1	121	7.8	70	4.5
Grade 5	1,578	1,478	93.7	*	0.3	66	4.2	16	1.0
Grade 8	1,395	1,249	89.5	10	0.7	107	7.7	16	1.1
Asian									
Grade 3	1,981	1,877	94.8	3	0.2	68	3.4	23	1.2
Grade 5	1,970	1,919	97.4	5	0.3	26	1.3	2	0.1
Grade 8	1,930	1,845	95.6	4	0.2	57	3.0	11	0.6
Black									
Grade 3	30,712	25,931	84.4	121	0.4	2,857	9.3	1532	5.0
Grade 5	31,364	29,294	93.4	94	0.3	1,364	4.3	311	1.0
Grade 8	30,134	26,198	86.9	263	0.9	2,763	9.2	644	2.1
Hispanic									
Grade 3	6,433	5,441	84.6	17	0.3	633	9.8	238	3.7
Grade 5	5,581	5,133	92.0	3	0.1	290	5.2	63	1.1
Grade 8	4,457	3,733	83.8	45	1.0	483	10.8	130	2.9
Multi-Racial									
Grade 3	2,479	2,289	92.3	4	0.2	115	4.6	61	2.5
Grade 5	2,029	1,968	97.0	3	0.2	39	1.9	9	0.4
Grade 8	1,477	1,389	94.0	8	0.5	58	3.9	16	1.1
White									
Grade 3	58,445	55,247	94.5	141	0.2	1,905	3.3	911	1.6
Grade 5	60,612	59,109	97.5	109	0.2	942	1.6	181	0.3
Grade 8	62,082	59,483	95.8	395	0.6	1,654	2.7	361	0.6
Total									
Grade 3	101,600	92,122	90.7	287	0.3	5,699	5.6	2,835	2.8
Grade 5	103,134	98,901	95.9	225	0.2	2,727	2.6	582	0.6
Grade 8	101,475	93,897	92.5	725	0.7	5,122	5.0	1,178	1.2

¹Percentages do not add to 100% due to some information not coded for some students.

Among racial/ethnic groups who did not meet the standards and were promoted, Whites and Asians were promoted the least, followed by Multi-Racials, American Indians, Blacks and Hispanics. For the various racial/ethnic groups, the promotion pattern when standards were not met was the opposite of when the standards were met.

Reasons for Promotion of Absent Students, Students Participating in Alternate Assessments, and Transfer Students

“Absent” students, students who participated in alternate assessments, and transfer students were included in the student accountability standards. For “Absent” students, “Principal’s Decision”

was the major reason cited for promotion, accounting for 63.6 percent, 67.2 percent, and 70.7 percent of promotions in grades three, five, and eight, respectively (Table 6).

Among students who took the NCAAAI, 43.0 percent, 43.6 percent, and 42.4 percent for the benchmark grades, respectively, were promoted due to “Waiver.”

The majority of “NCAAP” students were also promoted due to “Waiver,” which included 52.6 percent, 51.3 percent, and 45.6 percent of students at grades three, five, and eight, respectively.

“Transfer” students were promoted largely due to “Local Policy/Other” factors (53.3 percent, 57.1 percent, and 85.7 percent, respectively, at the benchmark grades).

Table 6. Number and Percent¹ of Absent Students, Students Participating in Alternate Assessments, and Transfer Students Promoted and Reasons for Promotion, 2002-03

Status/Test	# Promoted	% Waiver	% LEP (Limited English Proficient)	% Local Policy /Other	%Principal’s Decision
Absent					
Grade 3	66	18.2	3.0	15.1	63.6
Grade 5	67	16.4	1.5	14.9	67.2
Grade 8	225	14.7	2.7	12.4	70.7
NCAAAI					
Grade 3	2,995	43.0	14.8	10.4	31.8
Grade 5	2,949	43.6	13.7	11.4	31.2
Grade 8	1,961	42.4	16.0	11.1	30.5
NCAAP					
Grade 3	397	52.6	0.2	24.2	22.9
Grade 5	503	51.3	0.4	20.7	27.6
Grade 8	377	45.6	*	22.3	32.1
Transfer					
Grade 3	30	26.7	3.3	53.3	16.7
Grade 5	14	28.6	*	57.1	14.3
Grade 8	28	10.7	*	85.7	3.6

¹Percentages may not add to 100% due to rounding.

*Data not available.

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

Table 7 shows retention data for Absent, NCAAAI, NCAAP, and Transfer students and reasons for retention. “Principal’s Decision” was the chief reason Absent students were retained, cited for 50.0 percent and 53.3 percent of students in the benchmark grades, respectively. At grade eight, “Principal’s Decision” (37.4 percent) and “Other” (37.5 percent) were important.

“Principal’s Decision” was responsible also for “NCAAAI” students retained at grades three and five (48.8 percent and 48.4 percent, respectively). “Academic” factors (42.9 percent) played the greatest role in the retention of “Absent” students in grade eight.

The reasons “NCAAP” students were retained primarily involved “Academic” (50 percent) factors at grade three and “Other” factors at grades five and eight (56.4 percent and 48.9 percent, respectively).

Table 7. Number and Percent¹ of Absent, NCAAAI, NCAAP, and Transfer Students Retained and Reasons for Retention, 2002-03

Status/Test	# Retained	% Academic	% Attendance	% Other	% Principal’s Decision
Absent					
Grade 3	8	12.5	*	37.5	50.0
Grade 5	15	20.0	13.3	13.3	53.3
Grade 8	155	28.4	21.3	12.9	37.4
NCAAAI					
Grade 3	86	39.5	4.6	7.0	48.8
Grade 5	62	30.6	9.7	11.3	48.4
Grade 8	49	42.9	6.1	26.5	24.5
NCAAP					
Grade 3	6	50.0	*	16.7	33.3
Grade 5	39	12.8	*	56.4	30.8
Grade 8	45	35.6	2.2	48.9	13.3
Transfer					
Grade 3	2	*	*	100.0	*
Grade 5	5	*	*	100.0	*
Grade 8	3	*	*	100.0	*

¹Percentages may not add to 100% due to rounding.

*Data not available.

Although “Other” factors were the only reasons cited for the retention of “Transfer” students, the data should be interpreted with caution due to the small number of students in the cell categories. The same caution should be exercised for other cell categories with small numbers of students.

Reasons for Promotion When Standards Were Not Met, by Race/Ethnicity

Table 8 shows student promotions data and reasons for promotions when standards were not met by race/ethnicity. More American Indian students were promoted when the standards were not met due to “Local Policy/Other reasons” (43.8 percent at grade three, 56.1 percent at grade five, and 37.4 percent at grade eight).

“Principal’s Decision” was cited most often in the promotion of Asian students at grades five and eight, while “Local Policy/Other” was cited at grade three.

Black, Hispanic, Multi-Racial and White students were promoted most frequently due to “Principal’s Decision” at grades three and eight. At grade five, “Waiver” was cited for Black, Multi-Racial, and White students and LEP for Hispanic students.

Table 8. Number and Percent¹ of Students in Grades Three, Five, and Eight Promoted When Standard Not Met and Reasons for Promotion, by Race/Ethnicity, 2002-03

Ethnicity	Total N	Waiver ²		LEP (Limited English Proficient)		Local Policy/Other		Principal's Decision	
		n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
American									
Grade 3	121	40	33.1	*	*	53	43.8	28	23.1
Grade 5	66	20	30.3	*	*	37	56.1	9	13.6
Grade 8	107	30	28.0	2	1.9	40	37.4	35	32.7
Asian									
Grade 3	68	6	8.8	17	25.0	27	39.7	18	26.5
Grade 5	26	6	23.1	4	15.4	5	19.2	11	42.3
Grade 8	57	9	15.8	19	33.3	9	15.8	20	35.1
Black									
Grade 3	2,857	847	29.6	3	0.1	730	25.5	1,277	44.7
Grade 5	1,364	556	40.8	4	0.3	341	25.0	463	33.9
Grade 8	2,763	1058	38.3	5	0.2	541	19.6	1,159	41.9
Hispanic									
Grade 3	633	116	18.3	183	28.9	143	22.6	191	30.2
Grade 5	290	64	22.1	82	28.3	69	23.8	75	25.9
Grade 8	483	88	18.2	145	30.0	83	17.2	167	34.6
Multi-Racial									
Grade 3	115	30	26.1	*	*	34	29.6	51	44.3
Grade 5	39	17	43.6	*	*	13	33.3	9	23.1
Grade 8	58	21	36.2	1	1.7	11	19.0	25	43.1
White									
Grade 3	1,905	740	38.8	3	0.2	372	19.5	790	41.5
Grade 5	942	403	42.8	7	0.7	198	21.0	334	35.5
Grade 8	1,654	680	41.1	6	4.0	236	14.3	732	44.3
Total									
Grade 3	5699	1779	31.2	206	3.6	1359	23.8	2355	41.3
Grade 5	2727	1066	39.1	97	3.6	663	24.3	901	33.0
Grade 8	5122	1886	36.8	178	3.5	920	18.0	2138	41.7

¹Waiver – Applied to promote students functioning at grade level and making adequate progress.

²Percentages do not add to 100% due to rounding.

*Data not available.

Reasons for Retention When Standards Were Met, by Race/Ethnicity

The reasons students were retained when they met the standards are shown by race/ethnicity in Table 9. American Indian students were retained when they met the standards due to “Academic” reasons. The number of American Indian students retained was small, with ten in grade eight and 1 in grade three.

Asians also comprised a small number of retained students (five or less in each of the three grades). Among these students, the majority of them were retained due to “Principal’s Decision” and the others for “Academic” reasons.

The majority of Black students were retained due to “Academic” reasons. Hispanic students at grades three and eight were retained primarily due to “Academic” reasons and at grade five due to “Principal’s Decision.”

Multi-Racial students also represented a small number of the total students retained (eight or less at each of the benchmark grades). The majority of the students in grades five and eight were retained due to “Academic” reasons and at grade three due to “Principal’s Decision.”

Most of the White students in the benchmark grades were retained for “Academic” reasons.

Table 9. Number and Percent¹ of Students in Grades Three, Five, and Eight Retained When Standards Met and Reasons for Retention, by Race/Ethnicity, 2002-03

Ethnicity	Local Promotion Standards								
	Total	Academic		Attendance		Other		Principal's Decision	
	N	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
American Indian									
Grade 3	1	1	100.0	*	*	*	*	*	*
Grade 5	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Grade 8	10	9	90.0	*	*	*	*	*	*
Asian									
Grade 3	3	1	33.3	*	*	*	*	2	66.7
Grade 5	5	*	*	*	*	*	*	5	100.0
Grade 8	4	2	50.0	*	*	*	*	2	50.0
Black									
Grade 3	121	78	64.5	1	0.8	2	1.7	40	33.1
Grade 5	94	66	70.2	9	9.6	6	6.4	13	13.8
Grade 8	263	181	68.8	11	4.2	12	4.6	59	22.4
Hispanic									
Grade 3	17	10	58.8	*	*	*	*	7	41.2
Grade 5	14	5	35.7	1	7.1	*	*	8	57.1
Grade 8	45	34	75.6	1	2.2	*	*	10	22.2
Multi-Racial									
Grade 3	4	1	25.0	*	*	*	*	3	75.0
Grade 5	3	2	66.7	1	33.3	*	*	*	*
Grade 8	8	8	100.0	*	*	*	*	*	*
White									
Grade 3	141	74	52.5	7	5.0	14	9.9	46	32.6
Grade 5	109	63	57.8	11	10.1	8	7.3	27	24.8
Grade 8	395	291	73.7	29	7.3	15	3.8	60	15.2
Total									
Grade 3	287	165	57.5	8	2.8	16	5.6	98	34.1
Grade 5	225	136	60.4	22	9.8	14	6.2	53	23.6
Grade 8	725	525	72.4	41	5.7	27	3.7	132	18.2

¹Percentages may not add to 100% due to rounding.

* = Data not available.

Promotion and Retention When Standards Were Met/Not Met, by Gender

Promotion and retention data for males and females when standards were met or not met are shown in Table 10. More female students (92.8 percent, 97.2 percent, and 94.5 percent at the benchmark grades, respectively) than male students (88.7 percent, 94.7 percent, and 90.6 percent at the benchmark grades, respectively) were promoted when they met the standards.

Conversely, more male than female students were promoted when they did not meet the standards. For males, 10.1 percent of students at grade three, 4.1 percent at grade five, and 7.8 percent at grade eight did not meet the standards. In contrast, for females, 6.6 percent of students at grade three, 2.3 percent at grade five, and 4.6 percent at grade eight did not meet the standards.

Table 10. Number and Percent¹ of Students in Grades Three, Five, and Eight Promoted and Retained When Standards Met/Not Met by Gender, 2002-03

		Standard Met				Standard Not Met			
		Promoted		Retained		Promoted		Retained	
Gender	N	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Female									
Grade 3	49,685	46,085	92.8	134	0.3	2,173	4.4	1,122	2.3
Grade 5	50,803	49,363	97.2	79	0.2	944	1.9	205	0.4
Grade 8	50,468	47,689	94.5	254	0.5	1,902	3.8	421	0.8
Male									
Grade 3	51,915	46,037	88.7	153	0.3	3,526	6.8	1,713	3.3
Grade 5	52,331	49,538	94.7	146	0.3	1,783	3.4	377	0.7
Grade 8	51,007	46,208	90.6	471	1.0	3,220	6.3	757	1.5
Total									
Grade 3	101,600	92,122	90.7	287	0.3	5,699	5.6	2,835	2.8
Grade 5	103,134	98,901	95.9	225	0.2	2,727	2.6	582	0.6
Grade 8	101,475	93,897	92.5	725	0.8	5,122	5.0	1,178	1.2

¹Percentages do not add to 100% due to some information not coded for some students.

Reasons for Promotion When Standards Were Not Met, by Gender

The reasons given for promoting students who did not meet the gateway are shown by gender in Table 11. The main reason male and female students were promoted when they did not meet the standards in grades three and eight was “Principal’s Decision.” In grade five, “Waiver” was the chief reason. The actual percent of students promoted was about the same for males and females.

Table 11. Number and Percent¹ of Students in Grades Three, Five, and Eight Promoted When Standard Not Met and Reasons for Promotion, by Gender, 2002-03

Ethnicity	Total	Waiver ²		LEP (Limited English Proficient)		Local Policy/Other		Principal's Decision	
	N	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Female									
Grade 3	2,173	645	29.7	96	4.4	539	24.8	893	41.0
Grade 5	944	351	37.2	43	4.6	244	25.8	306	32.4
Grade 8	1,902	663	34.9	84	4.4	380	20.0	775	40.7
Male									
Grade 3	3,526	1134	32.2	110	3.1	820	23.2	1462	41.5
Grade 5	1,783	715	40.1	54	3.0	419	23.5	595	33.4
Grade 8	3,220	1223	38.0	94	2.9	540	16.8	1363	42.3

¹Percentages may not add to 100% due to rounding.

Reasons for Retention When Standards Were Met, by Gender

The number of students statewide who were retained when they met the standards is relatively small (see Table 12). 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,” for male and female students in the gateway grades. “Principal’s Decision” also played an important role in the retention of male and female students.

Table 12. Number and Percent of Students in Grades Three, Five, and Eight Retained When Standards Met and Reasons for Retention, by Gender, 2002-03

Ethnicity	Total		Academic		Attendance		Other		Principal's Decision	
	N	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	
Female										
Grade 3	134	79	59.0	2	1.5	5	3.7	48	35.8	
Grade 5	79	50	63.3	11	13.9	3	3.8	15	19.0	
Grade 8	254	194	76.4	20	7.9	10	3.9	30	11.8	
Male										
Grade 3	153	86	56.2	6	3.9	11	7.2	50	32.7	
Grade 5	146	86	58.9	11	7.5	11	7.5	38	26.0	
Grade 8	471	331	70.3	21	4.5	17	3.6	102	21.7	

¹Percentages may not add to 100% due to rounding.

Promotion and Retention of Students with and without Disabilities Who Met/Did Not Meet the Standards, by Race/Ethnicity

Table 13 shows the promotion and retention status of students “with” disabilities and students “without” disabilities when they met the standards and when they did not meet the standards. Not surprisingly, more students “without” disabilities (94.1 percent at grade three, 98.4 percent at grade five, and 96.2 percent at grade eight) met the standards and were promoted than students “with” disabilities (67.6 percent at grade three, 79.4 percent at grade five, and 66.8 percent at grade eight).

Among students “with” disabilities, 21.7 percent at grade three, 13.7 percent at grade five, and 26.0 percent at grade eight did not meet the standards and were promoted. Similarly, more students “with” disabilities did not meet the standards and were retained, more than twice the percentage for students “without” disabilities.

Table 13. Number and Percent¹ of Students in Grades Three, Five, and Eight with Disabilities and without Disabilities Promoted and Retained When Standards Met/Not Met, 2002-03

Group	Total N	Standard Met				Standard Not Met			
		Promoted		Retained		Promoted		Retained	
		n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Students with Disability									
Grade 3	13223	8942	67.6	44	0.3	2863	21.7	824	6.2
Grade 5	13518	10735	79.4	41	0.3	1850	13.7	275	2.0
Grade 8	12612	8419	66.8	73	0.6	3279	26.0	469	3.7
Students without Disability									
Grade 3	88378	83180	94.1	243	0.3	2837	3.2	2011	2.3
Grade 5	89616	88166	98.4	184	0.2	877	1.0	307	0.3
Grade 8	88863	85478	96.2	652	0.7	1843	2.1	709	0.8

¹Percentages do not add to 100% due to some information not coded for some students.

Notes:

- Students classified as not disabled were not identified in the data as exceptional students or were identified as academically and intellectually gifted (AIG). There were 14 categories of disability. These categories included: 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.

Promotion and Retention of Migrant/Not Migrant Students When Standards Were Met/Not Met

The number and percent of migrant students promoted or retained when they met or did not meet the standards are shown in Table 14. More “Not Migrant” students than “Migrant” students met the standards and were promoted. For “Not Migrant” students, 90.7 percent at grade three, 95.9 percent at grade five, and 92.6 percent at grade eight were promoted, compared with 83.1 percent of “Migrant” students at grade three, 90.3 percent at grade five, and 78.4 percent at grade eight.

The percentage of “Migrant” students (11.8 percent at grade three, 7.3 percent at grade five, and 11.4 percent at grade eight) who did not meet the standards and were promoted was twice that of “Not Migrant” students (5.6 percent at grade three, 2.6 percent at grade five, and 5.0 percent at grade eight).

Fewer “Migrant” and “Not Migrant” students did not meet the standards and were promoted in 2002-03 than in 2001-02, with the exception that at grade eight the percent promoted was about the same for both years.

Table 14. Number and Percent¹ of Migrant Students in Grades Three, Five, and Eight Promoted and Retained When Standards Met/Not Met, 2002-03

Group	N	Standard Met				Standard Not Met			
		Promoted		Retained		Promoted		Retained	
		n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Migrant									
Grade 3	706	587	83.1	2	0.3	83	11.8	27	3.8
Grade 5	826	746	90.3	2	0.2	60	7.3	9	1.1
Grade 8	473	371	78.4	13	2.7	54	11.4	31	6.6
Not Migrant									
Grade 3	100,895	91,535	90.7	285	0.3	5,617	5.6	2,808	2.8
Grade 5	102,308	98,155	95.9	223	0.2	2,667	2.6	573	0.6
Grade 8	101,002	93,526	92.6	712	0.7	5,068	5.0	1,147	1.1
Total									
Grade 3	101,601	92,122	90.7	287	0.3	5,700	5.6	2,835	2.8
Grade 5	103,134	98,901	95.9	225	0.2	2,727	2.6	582	0.6
Grade 8	101,475	93,897	92.5	725	0.7	5,122	5.0	1,178	1.2

¹Percentages may not add to 100% due to rounding.

Appendices

Table A-1. Number and Percent¹ of Students Passing and/or Failing Reading and Mathematics After All Retests, 2001-03

Group		Mathematics							
		Total N		Pass		Fail		Total ¹	
		2001-02	2002-03	2001-02	2002-03	2001-02	2002-03	2001-02	2002-03
Reading	Grade Three	Total N		89,946	97,066	9,370	3,952	99,316	101,018
	Pass	91,687	93,657	87.0	90.9	4.5	1.2	91.5	92.1
	Fail	7,629	7,361	2.8	4.6	4.8	2.7	7.6	7.3
	Total	99,316	101,018	89.7	95.5	9.3	3.9	99	99.4
	Grade Five	Total N		96,908	101,163	2,805	1,361	99,713	102,524
	Pass	93,266	99,730	91.5	96.1	0.9	0.6	92.4	96.7
	Fair	6,447	2,794	4.6	2.0	1.8	0.7	6.4	2.7
	Total	99,713	102,524	96.0	98.1	2.8	1.3	98.8	99.4
	Grade Eight	Total N		90,786	97,345	4,262	3,775	95,048	101,120
	Pass	90,235	96,436	92.3	93.2	2.1	1.8	94.4	95.0
	Fail	4,813	4,684	2.7	2.7	2.4	1.9	5.0	4.6
	Total	95,048	101,120	94.9	95.9	4.5	3.7	99.4	99.6

¹Percentages may not add up to 100 percent due to rounding, or due to information not being coded for some students.

Table A-2. Number and Percent¹ of Students in Grade Three Passing End-of-Grade Tests and Retests, by Race/Ethnicity, 2002-03

Test Administration	Subject		Ethnicity						
			All	American Indian	Asian	Black	Hispanic	Multi-Racial	White
End of Grade Test	Reading	Number	88,207	1,257	1,804	24,112	5,040	2,176	53,818
		Percent	86.8	81.1	91.1	78.5	78.3	87.8	92.1
	Math	Number	94,040	1,384	1,938	26,346	5,870	2,306	56,196
		Percent	92.6	89.3	97.8	85.8	91.2	93.0	96.2
	Both	Number	85,809	12,14	1,789	22,710	4,931	2,128	53,037
		Percent	84.5	78.3	90.3	73.9	76.7	85.8	90.7
Retest 1	Reading	Number	4,181	73	69	2,034	363	112	1,530
		Percent	4.1	4.7	3.5	6.6	5.6	4.5	2.6
	Math	Number	2,622	57	16	1,437	201	65	846
		Percent	2.6	3.7	0.8	4.7	3.1	2.6	1.4
	Both	Number	420	15	1	229	36	9	130
		Percent	0.4	1.0	0.1	0.7	0.6	0.4	0.2
Cumulative After Retest 1	Reading	Number	92,237	1329	1,871	26,055	5,392	2,283	55,307
		Percent	90.8	85.7	94.4	84.8	83.8	92.1	94.6
	Math	Number	96,511	1440	1,954	27,683	6,055	2,365	57,014
		Percent	95.0	92.9	98.6	90.1	94.1	95.4	97.6
	Both	Number	86,219	1,229	1,790	22,933	4,966	2,137	53,164
		Percent	84.9	79.3	90.4	74.7	77.2	86.2	91.0
Retest 2	Reading	Number	1,525	32.0	19	832	132	42	468
		Percent	1.5	2.1	1.0	2.7	2.1	1.7	0.8
	Math	Number	997	29.0	3	623	53	24	265
		Percent	1.0	1.9	0.2	2.0	0.8	1.0	0.5
	Both	Number	118	1	*	79	2	2	34
		Percent	0.1	0.1	*	0.3	0.0	0.1	0.1
Cumulative After Retest 2	Reading	Number	93,700	1361.0	1,889	26,849	5,517	2,234	55,760
		Percent	92.2	87.8	95.4	87.4	85.8	93.7	95.4
	Math	Number	97,436	1469.0	1,957	28,266	6,105	2,388	57,251
		Percent	95.9	94.8	98.8	92.0	94.9	96.3	98.0
	Both	Number	86,328	1230.0	1,790	23,006	4,968	2,139	53,195
		Percent	85.0	79.4	90.4	74.9	77.2	86.3	91.0

¹Percentages do not add to 100% due to some information not coded for some students; the percentages in this table are based on the total number of students in each racial/ethnic group, which are not explicitly shown in this table.

*Data not available.

Table A-3. Number and Percent¹ of Students in Grade Five Passing End-of-Grade Tests and Retests, by Race/Ethnicity, 2002-03

Test Administration	Subject		Ethnicity						
			All	American Indian	Asian	Black	Hispanic	Multi-Racial	White
End of Grade Test	Reading	Number	96,620	1,402	1,886	28,045	4,903	1,940	58,444
		Percent	93.7	88.8	95.7	89.4	87.9	95.6	96.4
	Math	Number	99,254	1,478	1,947	29,149	5,273	1,972	59,435
		Percent	96.2	93.7	98.8	92.9	94.5	97.2	98.1
	Both	Number	94,710	1,349	1,875	26,951	4,808	1,903	57,824
		Percent	91.8	85.5	95.2	85.9	86.1	93.8	95.4
Retest 1	Reading	Number	2,679	72	39	1,441	222	35	870
		Percent	2.6	4.6	2.0	4.6	4.0	1.7	1.4
	Math	Number	2,062	74	14	1,190	166	39	579
		Percent	2.0	4.7	0.7	3.8	3.0	1.9	1.0
	Both	Number	307	13	4	189	23	4	74
		Percent	0.3	0.8	0.2	0.6	0.4	0.2	0.1
Cumulative After Retest 1	Reading	Number	99,101	1,471	1,921	29,345	5,114	1,973	59,277
		Percent	96.1	93.2	97.5	93.6	91.6	97.2	97.8
	Math	Number	101,158	1,546	1,961	30,229	5,424	2,005	59,993
		Percent	98.1	98.0	99.5	96.4	97.2	98.8	99.0
	Both	Number	94,991	1,362	1,879	27,119	4,830	1,906	57,895
		Percent	92.1	86.3	95.4	86.5	86.5	93.9	95.5
Retest 2	Reading	Number	751	23	7	439	70	10	202
		Percent	0.7	1.5	0.4	1.4	1.3	0.5	0.3
	Math	Number	513	8	1	326	30	6	142
		Percent	0.5	0.5	0.1	1.0	0.5	0.3	0.2
	Both	Number	60	1	1	39	2	*	17
		Percent	0.1	0.1	0.1	*	0.0	*	0.0
Cumulative After Retest 2	Reading	Number	99,798	1,493	1,927	29,750	5,175	1,983	59,470
		Percent	96.8	94.6	97.8	94.9	92.7	97.7	98.1
	Math	Number	101,624	1,552	1,962	30,525	5,454	2,010	60,121
		Percent	98.5	98.4	99.6	97.3	97.7	99.1	99.2
	Both	Number	95,045	1,363	1,880	27,153	4,832	1,906	57,911
		Percent	92.2	86.4	95.4	86.6	86.6	93.9	95.5

¹Percentages do not add to 100% due to some information not coded for some students; the percentages in this table are based on the total number of students in each racial/ethnic group, which are not explicitly shown in this table.

*Data not available.

Table A-4. Number and Percent¹ of Students in Grade Eight Passing End-of-Grade Tests and Retests, by Race/Ethnicity, 2002-03

			Ethnicity						
			All	American Indian	Asian	Black	Hispanic	Multi-Racial	White
Test Administration	Subject								
End of Grade Test	Reading	Number	92,824	1,232	1,807	25,588	3,555	1,387	59,255
		Percent	91.5	88.3	93.6	84.9	79.8	93.9	95.4
	Math	Number	92,714	1,252	1,865	25,102	3,831	1,370	59,294
		Percent	91.4	89.7	96.6	83.3	86.0	92.8	95.5
	Both	Number	88,344	1,165	1,775	23,048	3,332	1,326	57,698
		Percent	87.1	83.5	92.0	76.5	74.8	89.8	92.9
Retest 1	Reading	Number	3,118	49	38	1,641	262	31	1,087
		Percent	3.1	3.5	2	5.4	5.9	2.1	1.8
	Math	Number	4,238	68	45	2,352	294	54	1,425
		Percent	4.2	4.9	2.3	7.8	6.6	3.7	2.3
	Both	Number	572	12	4	320	43	11	182
		Percent	0.6	0.9	0.2	1.1	1	0.7	0.3
Cumulative After Retest 1	Reading	Number	95,744	1,278	1,845	27,109	3,800	1,414	60,298
		Percent	94.4	91.6	95.6	90.0	85.3	95.7	97.1
	Math	Number	96,571	1,319	1,903	27,239	4,104	1,416	60,590
		Percent	95.2	94.6	98.6	90.4	92.1	95.9	97.6
	Both	Number	88,881	1,176	1,779	23,347	3,373	1,336	57,870
		Percent	87.6	84.3	92.2	77.5	75.7	90.5	93.2
Retest 2	Reading	Number	850	13	15	510	68	9	235
		Percent	0.8	0.9	0.8	1.7	1.5	0.6	0.4
	Math	Number	1,088	20	5	701	68	15	279
		Percent	1.1	1.4	0.3	2.3	1.5	1.0	0.4
	Both	Number	118	1	*	68	10	1	38
		Percent	0.1	0.1	*	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.1
Cumulative After Retest 2	Reading	Number	96,503	1,290	1,859	27,566	3,862	1,422	60,504
		Percent	95.1	92.5	96.3	91.5	86.7	96.3	97.5
	Math	Number	97,488	1,337	1,907	27,826	4,165	1,426	60,827
		Percent	96.1	95.8	98.8	92.3	93.4	96.5	98.0
	Both	Number	88,989	1,177	1,779	23,408	3,383	1,337	57,905
		Percent	87.7	84.4	92.2	77.7	75.9	90.5	93.3

¹Percentages do not add to 100% due to some information not coded for some students; the percentages in this table are based on the total number of students in each racial/ethnic group, which are not explicitly shown in this table.

*Data not available.

Table A-5. Number and Percent¹ of Students in Grade Three with Disabilities and without Disabilities Promoted/Retained Who Met/Did Not Meet the Standards, by Race/Ethnicity, 2002-03

Ethnicity	Group	Total N	Standard Met, Promoted		Standard Met, Retained		Standard Not Met, Promoted		Standard Not Met, Retained	
			n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
American Indian	Not SWD	1331	1,216	91.4	1	0.1	59	4.4	55	4.1
	SWD	219	121	55.3	*	*	62	28.3	15	6.8
Asian	Not SWD	1,862	1,791	96.2	3	0.2	49	2.6	14	0.8
	SWD	119	86	72.3	*	*	19	16.0	9	7.6
Black	Not SWD	26,485	23,617	89.2	106	0.4	1,560	5.9	1160	4.4
	SWD	4,227	2,314	54.7	15	0.4	1,297	30.7	372	8.8
Hispanic	Not SWD	5,823	5,126	88.0	17	0.3	434	7.5	200	3.4
	SWD	610	315	51.6	*	*	199	32.6	38	6.2
Multi-Racial	Not SWD	2,172	2,066	95.1	4	0.2	59	2.7	43	2.0
	SWD	307	223	72.6	*	*	56	18.2	18	5.9
White	Not SWD	50,704	49,364	97.4	112	0.2	675	1.3	539	1.1
	SWD	7,741	5,883	76.0	29	0.4	1230	15.9	372	4.8
Total		101,600	92,122	90.7	287	0.3	5,699	5.6	2,835	2.8

¹Percentages may not add to 100% due to rounding.

*Data not available.

Table A-6. Number and Percent¹ of Students in Grade Five with Disabilities and without Disabilities Promoted/Retained Who Met/Did Not Meet the Standards, by Race/Ethnicity, 2002-03

Ethnicity	Group	Total N	Standard Met, Promoted		Standard Met, Retained		Standard Not Met, Promoted		Standard Not Met, Retained	
			n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
American Indian	Not SWD	1,343	1,312	97.7	*	*	24	1.8	7	0.5
	SWD	235	166	70.6	*	*	42	17.9	9	3.8
Asian	Not SWD	1,874	1,835	97.9	5	0.3	18	1.0	2	0.1
	SWD	96	84	87.5	*	*	8	8.3	*	*
Black	Not SWD	26,552	25,845	97.3	85	0.3	425	1.6	173	0.7
	SWD	4,812	3,449	71.7	9	0.2	939	19.5	138	2.9
Hispanic	Not SWD	5,026	4,761	94.7	13	0.3	188	3.7	43	0.9
	SWD	555	372	67.0	1	0.2	102	18.4	20	3.6
Multi-Racial	Not SWD	1,781	1,766	99.2	2	0.1	11	0.6	2	0.1
	SWD	248	202	81.5	1	0.4	28	11.3	7	2.8
White	Not SWD	53,040	52,647	99.3	79	0.1	211	0.4	80	0.2
	SWD	7,572	6,462	85.3	30	0.4	731	9.7	101	1.3
Total		103,134	98,901	95.9	225	0.2	2,727	2.6	582	0.6

¹Percentages may not add to 100% due to rounding.

*Data not available.

Table A-7. Number and Percent¹ of Students in Grade Eight with Disabilities and without Disabilities Promoted/Retained Who Met/Did Not Meet the Standards, by Race/Ethnicity, 2002-03

Ethnicity	Group	Total N	Standard Met, Promoted		Standard Met, Retained		Standard Not Met, Promoted		Standard Not Met, Retained	
			n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
American Indian	Not SWD	1,223	1,158	94.7	10	0.8	45	3.7	10	0.8
	SWD	172	91	52.9	*	*	62	36.0	6	3.5
Asian	Not SWD	1,853	1,792	96.7	3	0.2	38	2.1	10	0.5
	SWD	77	53	68.8	1	1.3	19	24.7	1	1.3
Black	Not SWD	25,305	23,705	93.7	240	0.9	911	3.6	375	1.5
	SWD	4,829	2,493	51.6	23	0.5	1,852	38.4	269	5.6
Hispanic	Not SWD	4,102	3,507	85.5	42	1.0	396	9.7	114	2.8
	SWD	355	226	63.7	3	0.8	87	24.5	16	4.5
Multi-Racial	Not SWD	1,299	1,267	97.5	8	0.6	14	1.1	8	0.6
	SWD	178	122	68.5	*	*	44	24.7	8	4.5
White	Not SWD	55,081	54,049	98.1	349	0.6	439	0.8	192	0.3
	SWD	7,001	5,434	77.6	46	0.7	1,215	17.4	169	2.4
Total		101,475	93,897	92.5	725	0.7	5,122	5.0	1,178	1.2

¹Percentages may not add to 100% due to rounding.

*Data not available.

Technical Notes

Standards Development

Prior to 2000-01, methods for collecting pertinent data on the Student Accountability Standards had not been developed. To address this issue, a meeting was held at DPI on April 6, 2001 to gather input from 26 LEAs. Discussions at the meeting focused on the rationale for promotion or retention of a student. As a result of these discussions, two distinct categories arose:

1. Reasons for promoting a student who did not make Level III:
 - a. **Waiver** – because a student is performing at grade level or making adequate progress to meet the requirements of the next grade level. (See SBE policies 16NCAC6D.501; 16NCAC6D0504; and 16NCAC6D.0505. These policies can be found at <http://sbepolicy.dpi.state.nc.us/policies/>
A committee shall be appointed to review student waiver requests. This committee, composed of teachers and a principal from another school, shall make recommendations to the student’s principal about whether the student should be promoted to the next grade. (See Student Accountability Standards Requirements at: http://www.ncpublicschools.org/student_promotion/draft_standards.html)
 - b. **Local Policy /Principal’s Decision/Other**
Teachers or parents may request a promotion for students after the second or third test administration. Teachers shall provide documentation of the students’ performance during a review process.)Students who are not promoted after the second or third administration of the test shall be given focused intervention of a time period that is instructionally sound.
2. Reasons for retaining a student who made Level III:
 - a. Local promotion standards based on academic criteria
 - b. Local promotion standards based on attendance criteria
 - c. Principal’s decision or other criteria.See Local Policies Student Accountability Standards at http://www.ncpublicschools.org/student_promotion/standardslocal.html.

Documentation

The North Carolina Statewide Student Accountability Standards Requirements may be found at: http://www.ncpublicschools.org/student_promotion/draft_standards.html.

Tables in the Student Accountability Standards Report were created with data collected from the LEAs, including Charter Schools, but excluding the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) and the Department of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (DJJDP) schools. Descriptions of the student groups used to create each table, a checklist of table requirements, and a description of data codes are provided here.

Table Descriptions (Report)

- Table 1 shows Gateway Standards used by LEAs (including Charter Schools) in 2001-02 and 2002-03. Variations in the number of LEAs across the three grades reflect the absence or presence of all three grades at a Charter School and/or differences in Gateway Standards chosen by an LEA for End-of-Grade tests and retests.

- Tables 2 – 4 are based on student level data using Assessment status and Promotion/Retention status [excluding Absent, NCAAP, NCAAAI, Transfer, or blank (not coded) students].
- Table 5 is based on student level data using ethnicity, assessment status, and Promotion/Retention status [excluding Absent, NCAAP, NCAAAI, Transfer, or blank (not coded) students].
- Tables 6 – 7 are based on student level data using Regular, Retest 1, Retest 2 Reading and Mathematics Status, and Promotion/Retention status for Absent, NCAAP, NCAAAI, or Transfer students. Students taking NCCATS, NCAAAI, who were absent, or LEP and took the regular EOG test are counted in the “Other” category.
- Tables 8 – 9 are based on student level data using ethnicity, Assessment status, and Promotion/Retention status [excluding Absent, NCAAP, NCAAAI, Transfer, or blank (not coded) students].
- Tables 10 – 12 are based on student level data using gender, Assessment status, and Promotion/Retention status [excluding Absent, NCAAP, NCAAAI, Transfer, or blank (not coded) students].
- Table 13 is based on student level data using exceptionality codes, assessment status, and Promotion/Retention status [excluding Absent, NCAAP, NCAAAI, Transfer, or blank (not coded) students].
- Table 14 is based on student level data using Migrant code, Assessment status, and Promotion/Retention status [excluding Absent, NCAAP, NCAAAI, Transfer, or blank (not coded) students].

Table Descriptions (Appendix)

- Table A-1 is based on student level data using the Regular, Retest 1, Retest 2 Reading and Mathematics Status [excluding Absent, NCAAP, NCAAAI, Transfer, or blank (not coded) students].
- Tables A-2 to A4 are based on student level data using ethnicity code and Regular, Retest 1, Retest 2 Reading and Mathematics Status [excluding Absent, NCAAP, NCAAAI, Transfer, or blank (not coded) students].
- Tables A-5 to A-7 are based on student level data using ethnicity code, exceptionality code, Assessment status, and Promotion/Retention status [excluding Absent, NCAAP, NCAAAI, Transfer, or blank (not coded) students].

Checklist of Table Requirements

Table #	Assessment Status	Promotion/Retention Status	Gateway Standards	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	✓	✓						✓
Appendix								
A-1				✓				
A-2				✓	✓			
A-3				✓	✓			
A-4				✓	✓			
A-5	✓	✓			✓		✓	
A-6	✓	✓			✓		✓	
A-7	✓	✓			✓		✓	

Explanation of Codes

Gateway Standards:

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.

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 – Multi-handicapped
- 15 – Deaf-Blind
- 16 – Trainable Mentally Disabled

Migrant:

- 1 – Non-Title I School and student not served by Migrant Program.
- 2 – Non-Title I School, student served by Migrant Program.
- 3 – School-Wide Title I Program but student no served by Migrant Program
- 4 – School-Wide Title I 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.