

**Revision to the Report on LEA Status for Title III Improvement
December 17, 2009**

Introduction

Title III, Part A of No Child Left Behind (NCLB) is concerned with English language acquisition and academic achievement of students who are limited English proficient, including immigrant children and youth. Title III of NCLB requires subgrantees, composed of local education agencies (LEAs) and charter schools, to meet three annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) for their LEP students.

In November 2009, information was presented to the State Board of Education (SBE) regarding each of the AMAOs. It has since been determined that AMAO 2, dealing with Proficiency, needs to be adjusted to reflect LEAs who failed to meet AMAO 2 for two consecutive years. These LEAs have been identified for Title III district improvement status and will be notified.

The revised list of Title III subgrantees in district improvement for 2009-10 is attached.

Title III Improvement for 2009-10 School Year (Based on 2008-09 Data)

Title III of NCLB requires subgrantees, composed of LEAs and charter schools, to meet three annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) for their LEP students:

- **AMAO 1 (Progress):** To show progress, students identified as LEP must increase one full proficiency level in at least one language domain tested with state identified English language proficiency assessment (currently, the ACCESS for ELLs[®]). For a Title III subgrantee to meet this AMAO, at least 65% of the LEP students in that subgrantee must show progress.
- **AMAO 2 (Proficiency):** To attain English language proficiency, students identified as LEP must obtain a composite score at a proficiency level of 4.8 on the ACCESS for ELLs[®], with minimum proficiency levels of 4.0 on both the Reading and Writing domains. For a Title III subgrantee to meet AMAO 2, at least 14.7% of the LEP students in that subgrantee must attain English language proficiency as determined by the above criteria.
- **AMAO 3 (AYP for the LEP subgroup):** The LEP subgroup must meet AYP sub-targets (rates of both participation and proficiency) in Reading Grades 3-8, Reading at the high school, Mathematics Grades 3-8, and Mathematics at the high school. The AYP calculations are identical to those performed for Title I calculations.

Tables one through four show the LEAs/Charter Schools that are in Title III Improvement because they have not met an Annual Measurable Achievement Objective (AMAO 1, AMAO 2, or at least one AMAO 3 sub-target) for two or more consecutive years.

Table 1. LEAs Missing at Least One AMAO for Two Consecutive Years

Subgrantee	Target(s) missed for two consecutive years
Burke	AYP Reading HS (Proficiency)
Cabarrus	AYP Math HS
Chatham	AYP Math HS; AMAO 2 (Proficiency)
Duplin	AMAO 2 (Proficiency)
Edgecombe	AMAO 2 (Proficiency)
Elkin	AMAO 2 (Proficiency)
Franklin	AMAO 2 (Proficiency)
Granville	AMAO 2 (Proficiency)
Green	AMAO 2 (Proficiency)
Henderson	AMAO 2 (Proficiency)

Table 1. LEAs Missing at Least One AMAO for <u>Two</u> Consecutive Years (continued)	
Subgrantee	Target(s) missed for two consecutive years
Hickory	AMAO 2 (Proficiency)
Hoke	AMAO 2 (Proficiency)
Jackson	AMAO 2 (Proficiency)
Johnston	AMAO 2 (Proficiency)
Lenoir	AMAO 2 (Proficiency)
Lexington	AMAO 2 (Proficiency)
New Hanover	AYP Math HS
Orange	AMAO 2 (Proficiency)
Pender	AMAO 2 (Proficiency)
Pitt	AMAO 2 (Proficiency)
Randolph	AMAO 2 (Proficiency)
Richmond	AMAO 2 (Proficiency)
Rockingham	AMAO 2 (Proficiency)
Rowan-Salisbury	AMAO 2 (Proficiency)
Sampson	AMAO 2 (Proficiency)
Surry	AMAO 2 (Proficiency)
Thomasville	AMAO 2 (Proficiency)
Vance	AMAO 2 (Proficiency)
Wilkes	AMAO 2 (Proficiency)

Table 2. LEAs Missing at Least One AMAO for Three Consecutive Years

Subgrantee	Target(s) missed for three consecutive years
Alamance – Burlington	AMAO 2 (Proficiency); AYP Reading HS
Guilford	AYP Math HS
Cumberland	AYP Math HS; AYP Reading HS
Harnett	AYP Math HS; [AMAO 2 (Proficiency) (2 years)]
Kannapolis	AMAO 2 (Proficiency)
Notes: Information in brackets ([]) indicates additional reasons for requiring subgrantee improvement persisting for less than 3 years.	

Table 3. LEAs Missing at Least One AMAO for Four Consecutive Years

Subgrantee	Target(s) missed for four consecutive years
Buncombe	AYP Reading HS; [<i>AYP Math HS (3 years)</i>]
Gaston	AYP Math HS; AYP Reading HS
Lee	AYP Reading HS; [<i>AYP Math HS (2 years); AMAO 2 (Proficiency) (2 years)</i>]
Yancey	AMAO 2 (Proficiency)
<u>Notes:</u> Information in brackets ([]) indicates additional reasons for requiring subgrantee improvement persisting for less than 4 years.	

Table 4. LEAs Missing at Least One AMAO for Five Consecutive Years

Subgrantee	Target(s) missed for five consecutive years
Charlotte/ Mecklenburg	AYP Reading HS; [<i>AYP Math HS (4 years)</i>]
Durham	AYP Math HS; AYP Reading HS; [<i>AMAO 2 (Proficiency) (2 years)</i>]
Wake	AYP Reading HS
Winston-Salem/Forsyth	AYP Math HS; AYP Reading HS; [<i>AMAO 2 (Proficiency) (2 years)</i>]
<u>Notes:</u> Information in brackets ([]) indicates additional reasons for requiring subgrantee improvement persisting for less than 5 years.	