

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT:
Parts I and II**

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

For reporting on
School Year 2004-2005



**PART I DUE MARCH 6, 2006
PART II DUE APRIL 14, 2006**

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

INTRODUCTION

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

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

- o Title I, Part A - *Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies*
- o Title I, Part B, Subpart 3 - *William F. Goodling Even Start Family Literacy Programs*
- o Title I, Part C - *Education of Migratory Children*
- o Title I, Part D - *Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk*
- o Title I, Part F - *Comprehensive School Reform*
- o Title II, Part A - *Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund)*
- o Title II, Part D - *Enhancing Education through Technology*
- o Title III, Part A - *English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement Act*
- o Title IV, Part A, Subpart 1 - *Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities State Grants*
- o Title IV, Part A, Subpart 2 - *Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Activities (Community Service Grant Program)*
- o Title IV, Part B - *21st Century Community Learning Centers*
- o Title V, Part A - *Innovative Programs*
- o Title VI, Section 6111 - *Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities*
- o Title VI, Part B - *Rural Education Achievement Program*

The NCLB Consolidated State Performance Report for the 2004-2005 school year consists of two information collections. Part I of this report is due to the Department by March 6, 2006 . Part II is due to the Department by April 14, 2006.

PART I

Part I of the Consolidated State Report, which States must submit to the Department by **March 6, 2006** , requests information related to the five ESEA Goals, established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application, and information required for the Annual State Report to the Secretary, as described in section 1111(h)(4) of ESEA. The five ESEA Goals established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application are as follows:

- o **Performance goal 1:** By 2013-2014, all students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.

- o **Performance goal 2** : All limited English proficient students will become proficient in English and reach high academic standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.
- o **Performance goal 3** : By 2004-2005, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.
- o **Performance goal 4** : All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free, and conducive to learning.
- o **Performance Goal 5** : All students will graduate from high school.

PART II

Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report consists of information related to State activities and outcomes of specific ESEA programs for the 2004-2005 school year. Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report is due to the Department by **April 14, 2006**. The information requested in Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report for the 2004-2005 school year necessarily varies from program to program. However, for all programs, the specific information requested for this report meets the following criteria.

1. The information is needed for Department program performance plans or for other program needs.
2. The information is not available from another source, including program evaluations.
3. The information will provide valid evidence of program outcomes or results.
4. The Consolidated State Performance Report is the best vehicle for collection of the data.

The Department is continuing to work with the Performance-Based Data Management Initiative (PBDMI) to streamline data collections for the 2004-2005 school year and beyond.

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the 2004-2005 school year must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **March 6, 2006**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **April 14, 2006**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the 2004-2005 school year, unless otherwise noted.

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

TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

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

Initially, a state user will log onto EDEN and be provided with an option that takes him or her to the "2004-2005 CSPR". The main CSPR screen will allow the user to select the section of the CSPR that he or she needs to either view or enter data. After selecting a section of the CSPR, the user will be presented with a screen or set of screens where the user can input the data for that section of the CSPR. A user can only select one section of the CSPR at a time. After a state has included all available data in the designated sections of a particular CSPR Part, a lead state user will certify that Part and transmit it to the Department. Once a Part has been transmitted, ED will have access to the data. States may still make changes or additions to the transmitted data, by creating an updated version of the CSPR. Detailed instructions for transmitting the 2004-2005 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN website (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1965, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1810-0614. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 111 hours per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimates(s) contact School Support and Technology Programs, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW Washington DC 20202-6140. Questions about the new electronic CSPR submission process, should be directed to the EDEN Partner Support Center at 1-877-HLP-EDEN (1-877-457-3336).

OMB Number: 1810-0614

Expiration Date: 07/31/2006

Consolidated State Performance Report
For
State Formula Grant Programs
under the
Elementary And Secondary Education Act
as amended by the
No Child Left Behind Act of 2001

Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting:

Part I, 2004-2005

Part II, 2004-2005

Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report:

Address:

Person to contact about this report:

Name:

Telephone:

Fax:

e-mail:

Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type):

Signature

Date

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART I

For reporting on
School Year 2004-2005



PART I DUE MARCH 6, 2006

1.1. STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

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

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

STATE RESPONSE

STATE RESPONSE

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

Intent

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

Revisions

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

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

STATE RESPONSE

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

Science Assessments Timeline

2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08
Item development, item reviews, and item tryouts	Item data analyzed, item revisions/development and item/form production and field testing	Field test data analyzed. Test assembly, test production, tests administered as an operational pilot, academic achievement standards set, agency approves revised tests	Operational tests administered. Results reported, technical documentation reported

Alternate assessments currently are available for the reading and mathematics assessments and are being developed for science. The alternate assessments used in North Carolina during the 2004-05 school year were:

North Carolina Alternate Assessment Portfolio (NCAAP)

The NCAAP is a yearlong assessment process that involves a representative and deliberate collection of student work/information that will allow the user(s) to make judgments about what a student knows and is able to do, and the progress that has been made in relation to the goals specified in the student's current IEP. It is designed specifically for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities. The purpose of the NCAAP is to measure student performance and progress on goals specified in the current IEP from the extensions of the North Carolina *Standard Course of Study*. The IEP Team determines if the disability is severe enough to require that the student not participate in the standard test administration (with or without accommodations) or NCEXTEND2. The IEP Team also determines if the severity of the disability is such that the student must participate in the alternate assessment portfolio. Documentation for the basis of the decision, including current and longitudinal data and performance of skills across settings, must exist in the current IEP. Placement in the NCAAP must not be the result of social, cultural, or economic differences, or excessive absences. Students assessed with the NCAAP are measured against alternate achievement standards.

North Carolina Alternate Assessment Academic Inventory (NCAAAI)

The NCAAI is yearlong formative and summative assessment process in which teachers utilize a checklist to evaluate student performance on curriculum benchmarks in the areas of reading, mathematics, and/or writing. The NCAAAI has been devised for students with disabilities for whom the IEP Team or Section 504 Committee determines that due to the nature of the disability, the standard administration of statewide tests, use of accommodations for statewide tests, or participation in the NCAAP is inappropriate. The NCAAAI measures competencies located in the North Carolina *Standard Course of Study*. Students may be assessed on the NCAAAI against alternate achievement standards or against grade level achievement standards depending on the decision of the IEP team.

For information on alternate assessments starting with the 2005-06 school year see:
http://www.ncpublicschools.org/docs/accountability/alternate_assessment_changes_2005_06_080305.pdf.

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

STATE RESPONSE

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

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

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

Participation of All Students in 2004-2005 State Assessments

In the following tables, please provide the total number and percentage for each of the listed subgroups of students who participated in the State's 2004-2005 school year academic assessments.

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

1.2.1 Student Participation in 2004-2005 School Year Test Administration**1.2.1.1 2004-2005 School Year Mathematics Assessment**

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Tested
All Students	737708	99.4
American Indian/Alaska Native	10679	99.1
Asian/Pacific Islander	15001	99.4
Black, non-Hispanic	217270	99.2
Hispanic	53829	99.2
White, non-Hispanic	423123	99.6
Students with Disabilities	99387	99.0
Limited English Proficient	30029	99.0
Economically Disadvantaged	332687	99.3
Migrant	2449	99.3
Male	376916	99.3
Female	360793	99.5

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

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

1.2.1.2 2004-2005 School Year Reading/Language Arts Assessment

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Tested
All Students	736743	99.3
American Indian/Alaska Native	10681	99.1
Asian/ Pacific Islander	14959	99.1
Black, non-Hispanic	216796	99.0
Hispanic	53690	98.9
White, non-Hispanic	422829	99.5
Students with Disabilities	99226	98.8
Limited English Proficient	29909	98.6
Economically Disadvantaged	332331	99.2
Migrant	2442	99.0
Male	376464	99.2
Female	360277	99.4

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

1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in State Assessment System

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

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

1.2.2.1 Participation of Students with Disabilities the in 2004-2005 School Year Test Administration - Math Assessment

	Total Number of Students with Disabilities Tested	Percent of Students with Disabilities Tested
Regular Assessment, with or without accommodations	86603	86.0
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards	492	0.5
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	10355	10.3

1.2.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities the in 2004-2005 School Year Test Administration - Reading/Language Arts Assessment

	Total Number of Students with Disabilities Tested	Percent of Students with Disabilities Tested
Regular Assessment, with or without accommodations	84623	84.0
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards	674	0.7
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	11608	11.5

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

In the following charts, please provide student achievement data from the 2004-2005 school year test administration. Charts have been provided for each of grades 3 through 8 and high school to accommodate the varied State assessment systems in mathematics and reading/language arts during the 2004-2005 school year. States should provide data on the total number of students tested as well as the percentage of students scoring at the proficient or advanced levels for those grades in which the State administered mathematics and reading/language arts assessments during the 2004-2005 school year.

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

1.3.1 Grade 3 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05
All Students	104105	85.1
American Indian/Alaska Native	1572	80.5
Asian/Pacific Islander	2234	93.2
Black, non-Hispanic	29298	72.8
Hispanic	9166	80.3
White, non-Hispanic	58554	91.8
Students with Disabilities	15136	64.2
Limited English Proficient	5622	71.8
Economically Disadvantaged	50804	77.0
Migrant	433	76.6
Male	53427	84.4
Female	50678	85.8

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

1.3.2 Grade 3 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05
All Students	104098	82.3
American Indian/Alaska Native	1572	77.2
Asian/Pacific Islander	2230	88.3
Black, non-Hispanic	29301	71.5
Hispanic	9159	71.0
White, non-Hispanic	58555	89.3
Students with Disabilities	15134	54.2
Limited English Proficient	5612	56.7
Economically Disadvantaged	50799	72.8
Migrant	433	63.9
Male	53425	79.4
Female	50673	85.3

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

1.3.3 Grade 4 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05
All Students	104209	91.8
American Indian/Alaska Native	1559	88.1
Asian/Pacific Islander	2106	95.0
Black, non-Hispanic	29761	85.2
Hispanic	8594	88.1
White, non-Hispanic	59144	95.0
Students with Disabilities	15232	74.0
Limited English Proficient	5107	81.4
Economically Disadvantaged	50028	86.9
Migrant	371	79.9
Male	50403	92.8
Female	53806	90.8

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

1.3.4 Grade 4 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05
All Students	104211	82.4
American Indian/Alaska Native	1560	73.6
Asian/Pacific Islander	2106	88.0
Black, non-Hispanic	29761	71.6
Hispanic	8589	71.6
White, non-Hispanic	59149	89.3
Students with Disabilities	15235	53.1
Limited English Proficient	5101	55.9
Economically Disadvantaged	50027	72.8
Migrant	372	64.7
Male	53804	79.5
Female	50407	85.4

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

1.3.5 Grade 5 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05
All Students	106831	89.9
American Indian/Alaska Native	1607	83.8
Asian/Pacific Islander	2137	95.0
Black, non-Hispanic	31797	82.1
Hispanic	8035	85.8
White, non-Hispanic	60386	94.4
Students with Disabilities	15090	68.6
Limited English Proficient	4184	76.8
Economically Disadvantaged	51868	83.9
Migrant	376	82.1
Male	54834	89.0
Female	51997	90.9

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

1.3.6 Grade 5 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05
All Students	106823	88.9
American Indian/Alaska Native	1606	82.7
Asian/Pacific Islander	2136	92.6
Black, non-Hispanic	31797	81.5
Hispanic	8026	79.9
White, non-Hispanic	60389	93.8
Students with Disabilities	15088	63.3
Limited English Proficient	4174	65.0
Economically Disadvantaged	51864	82.1
Migrant	376	72.1
Male	54829	86.7
Female	51994	91.1

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

1.3.7 Grade 6 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05
All Students	107205	89.2
American Indian/Alaska Native	1573	86.0
Asian/Pacific Islander	2083	95.0
Black, non-Hispanic	32655	81.0
Hispanic	7345	83.3
White, non-Hispanic	60982	94.0
Students with Disabilities	14216	63.4
Limited English Proficient	3469	70.5
Economically Disadvantaged	50545	82.4
Migrant	376	74.9
Male	55105	87.4
Female	52100	91.0

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

1.3.8 Grade 6 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05
All Students	107231	81.1
American Indian/Alaska Native	1574	73.0
Asian/Pacific Islander	2083	87.1
Black, non-Hispanic	32669	68.5
Hispanic	7340	68.7
White, non-Hispanic	60998	89.2
Students with Disabilities	14232	48.1
Limited English Proficient	3462	45.2
Economically Disadvantaged	50560	70.1
Migrant	377	53.5
Male	55118	77.5
Female	52113	85.0

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

1.3.9 Grade 7 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05
All Students	109999	84.3
American Indian/Alaska Native	1665	80.1
Asian/Pacific Islander	2078	92.3
Black, non-Hispanic	33830	72.9
Hispanic	7100	76.0
White, non-Hispanic	62976	91.1
Students with Disabilities	14889	54.6
Limited English Proficient	3283	60.7
Economically Disadvantaged	50391	74.9
Migrant	405	71.3
Male	56371	82.3
Female	53628	86.4

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

1.3.10 Grade 7 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05
All Students	110036	85.1
American Indian/Alaska Native	1669	78.8
Asian/Pacific Islander	2078	89.6
Black, non-Hispanic	33845	75.1
Hispanic	7096	73.9
White, non-Hispanic	62999	91.6
Students with Disabilities	14905	53.9
Limited English Proficient	3277	53.0
Economically Disadvantaged	50411	75.8
Migrant	405	64.2
Male	56399	81.8
Female	53637	88.5

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

1.3.11 Grade 8 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05
All Students	108729	89.0
American Indian/Alaska Native	1550	80.3
Asian/Pacific Islander	2024	92.5
Black, non-Hispanic	33009	71.4
Hispanic	6495	76.1
White, non-Hispanic	63464	91.0
Students with Disabilities	14720	53.6
Limited English Proficient	3106	62.0
Economically Disadvantaged	47913	73.8
Migrant	311	70.0
Male	55661	81.7
Female	53068	86.3

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

1.3.12 Grade 8 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05
All Students	108753	87.9
American Indian/Alaska Native	1551	83.7
Asian/Pacific Islander	2024	90.4
Black, non-Hispanic	33020	79.3
Hispanic	6486	74.9
White, non-Hispanic	63484	93.6
Students with Disabilities	14733	58.6
Limited English Proficient	3100	52.5
Economically Disadvantaged	47435	79.3
Migrant	311	58.6
Male	55677	85.5
Female	53076	90.4

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

1.3.13 High School - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05
All Students	94117	79.8
American Indian/Alaska Native	1158	72.7
Asian/Pacific Islander	2039	88.4
Black, non-Hispanic	27051	64.4
Hispanic	4594	69.6
White, non-Hispanic	57759	87.6
Students with Disabilities	10295	43.6
Limited English Proficient	2179	58.0
Economically Disadvantaged	29447	67.0
Migrant	177	53.7
Male	47662	78.5
Female	46455	82.9

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

1.3.14 High School - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05
All Students	93045	47.3
American Indian/Alaska Native	1153	28.1
Asian/Pacific Islander	1997	51.7
Black, non-Hispanic	26532	30.0
Hispanic	4471	26.8
White, non-Hispanic	57395	57.0
Students with Disabilities	10078	14.0
Limited English Proficient	2078	10.9
Economically Disadvantaged	29014	28.4
Migrant	168	9.9
Male	45939	39.3
Female	47106	56.2

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

1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY

1.4.1 For all public elementary and secondary schools and districts in the State (Title I and non-Title I), please provide the total number and percentage of all schools and districts that made adequate yearly progress (AYP), based on data from the 2004-2005 school year.

School Accountability	Total number of public elementary and secondary schools (Title I and non-Title I) in State	Total number of public elementary and secondary schools (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP	Percentage of public elementary and secondary schools (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP
Based on 2004-2005 School Year Data	2300	1307	56.8

District Accountability	Total number of public elementary and secondary districts (Title I and non-Title I) in State	Total number of public elementary and secondary districts (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP	Percentage of public elementary and secondary districts (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP
Based on 2004-2005 School Year Data	115	8	7.0

1.4.2 For all Title I schools and districts in the State, please provide the total number and percentage of all Title I schools and districts that made AYP, based on data from the 2004-2005 school year.

Title I School Accountability	Total number of Title I schools in State	Total number of Title I schools in State that made AYP	Percentage of Title I schools in State that made AYP
Based on 2004-2005 School Year Data	1153	734	63.7

Title I District Accountability	Total number of Title I districts in State	Total number of Title I districts in State that made AYP	Percentage of Title I districts in State that made AYP
Based on 2004-2005 School Year Data	115	8	7.0

1.4.3 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

1.4.3.1 In the following chart, please provide a list of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under section 1116 for the 2005-2006 school year, based upon data from the 2004-2005 school year. For each school listed, please provide the name of the school's district, the areas in which the school missed AYP (e.g., missing reading proficiency target, reading participation rate, other academic indicator), and the school improvement status for the 2005 - 2006 school year (e.g., school in need of improvement year 1, school in need of improvement year 2, corrective action, restructuring - planning, restructuring - implementation). Additionally, for any Title I school identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring for the 2005 - 2006 school year, that made AYP based upon data from the 2004-2005 school year, please add "Made AYP 2004-2005."

Title I Schools Identified for Improvement, Corrective Action, and Restructuring (in 2005 - 2006 based on the data from 2004-2005)

See attached file

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

Title I schools in School Improvement that are in corrective action have first priority for support in addressing student achievement problems. Title I schools in corrective action that missed the most targets receive State Assistance Teams for an entire school year with services provided on a daily basis. The Team assists in completing a global assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the instructional program. This needs assessment provides the focus for the year. For Title I schools in school improvement (not in corrective action), technical assistance is on-going through the assigned Title I consultant who works directly with the Title I director to provide requested technical assistance. Communication is by phone and e-mail contact as well as school site visitation, if requested. The SEA employs a full-time SES Consultant to work with schools and districts on the provision and evaluation of supplemental education services to eligible students. Title I schools in improvement each receive an allotment of funds from the 4% Title I set-aside. To access these funds, an LEA must submit a plan outlining how funds will be used for school improvement activities, public choice, or SES. All schools in improvement provide a copy of their revised school improvement plan to their designated Title I Consultant for review. Additionally, they receive a copy of the SEA publication "Assisting Schools and Districts: Implementing the ABC's of Public Education and No Child Left Behind" when they meet with the Associate Superintendent of Curriculum and School Reform Services to discuss their school improvement status.

1.4.4 Title I Districts Identified for Improvement.

1.4.4.1 In the following chart, please provide a list of Title I districts identified for improvement or corrective action under section 1116 for the 2005 - 2006 school year, based upon data from the 2004-2005 school year. For each district listed, please provide the areas in which the district missed AYP (e.g., missing reading proficiency target, reading participation rate, other academic indicator), and the district improvement status for the 2005 - 2006 school year (e.g., district in need of improvement year 1, district in need of improvement year 2, corrective action). Additionally for any Title I district identified for improvement or corrective action for the 2005 - 2006 school year that made AYP based on data from the 2004-2005 school year, please add "Made AYP for 2004-2005."

Title I Districts Identified for Improvement and Corrective Action (in 2005 - 2006 based on the data from 2004-2005)

See attached file

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

Districts in improvement are required to revise their LEA Plans and technical assistance is provided by Title I Consultants as plans are revised and until they are approved. Districts with the greatest number of schools in corrective action for which an LEA has not carried out its statutory and regulatory responsibilities regarding corrective action have first priority for district-level assistance through LEAAP (LEA Assistance Program). LEAAP provides varying levels of assistance to districts. The aim is to build capacity in central offices and school leadership for positive change and continued growth. LEAAP encourages LEAs to partner to share best practices, clusters LEAs in close proximity with similar needs and demographics, and calls for partners such as the Center for School Leadership. Districts with the greatest number of schools identified as in school improvement are second priority for service. Title I LEAs that need additional support are the third level of priority. Also, the state provides assistance to districts upon request.

1.4.5 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

1.4.5.1 Public School Choice

1. Please provide the number of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring from which students transferred under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2004-2005 school year. 122
2. Please provide the number of public schools to which students transferred under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2004-2005 school year. 227 How many of these schools were charter schools? 0
3. Please provide the number of students who transferred to another public school under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2004-2005 school year. 2826
4. Please provide the number of students who were eligible to transfer to another public school under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2004-2005 school year. 76089

Optional Information :

5. If the State has the following data, the Department would be interested in knowing the following:

6. The number of students who applied to transfer to another public school under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2004-2005 school year. 0

7. The number of students, among those who applied to transfer to another public school under the Title I public school choice provisions, who were actually offered the opportunity to transfer by their LEAs, during the 2004-2005 school year. 0

The optional information does not apply; zeros were entered because there was no option for entering NA.

1.4.5.2 Supplemental Educational Services

1. Please provide the number of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring whose students received supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2004-2005 school year. 19

2. Please provide the number of students who received supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2004-2005 school year. 666

3. Please provide the number of students who were eligible to receive supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2004-2005 school year. 5539

Optional Information :

If the State has the following data, the Department would be interested in knowing the following:

4. The number of students who applied to receive supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2004-2005 school year. 0

Again, the optional information was not intended for completion. Zero was entered as the only option.

1.5 TEACHER AND PARAPROFESIONAL QUALITY

1.5.1 In the following table, please provide data from the 2004-2005 school year for classes in the core academic subjects being taught by "highly qualified" teachers (as the term is defined in Section 9101(23) of the ESEA), in the aggregate for all schools and in "high-poverty" and "low-poverty" elementary schools (as the terms are defined in Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) of the ESEA). Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "high-poverty" schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State and "low-poverty" schools as schools in the bottom quartile of poverty in the State. Additionally, please provide information on classes being taught by highly qualified teachers by the elementary and secondary school level.

School Type	Total Number of Core Academic Classes	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers
All Schools in State	64357	56824	88.0
Elementary Level			
High-Poverty Schools	6687	5912	88.0
Low-Poverty Schools	9039	8384	93.0
All Elementary Schools	32030	29438	92.0
Secondary Level			
High-Poverty Schools	5292	4158	79.0
Low-Poverty Schools	10261	9066	88.0
All Secondary Schools	32327	27386	85.0

Definitions and Instructions***What are the core academic subjects?***

English, reading or language arts, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, and geography [*Title IX*, Section 9101(11)]. While the statute includes the arts in the core academic subjects, it does not specify which of the arts are core academic subjects; therefore, States must make this determination.

How is a teacher defined?

An individual who provides instruction in the core academic areas to kindergarten, grades 1 through 12, or un-graded classes; or individuals who teach in an environment other than a classroom setting (and who maintain daily student attendance records) [from NCES, CCD, 2001-02]

How is a class defined?

A class is a setting in which organized instruction of core academic course content is provided to one or more students (including cross-age groupings) for a given period of time. (A course may be offered to more than one class). Instruction, provided by one or more teachers or other staff members, may be delivered in person or via a different medium. Classes that share space should be considered as separate classes if they function as separate units for more than 50 percent of the time [from NCES Non-fiscal Data Handbook for Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education, 2003.

Should 6th, 7th, and 8th grade classes be reported in the elementary or secondary category?

States are responsible for determining whether the content taught at the middle school level meets the competency requirements for elementary or secondary instruction. See Question A-14 in the August 3, 2005, Non-Regulatory Guidance for additional information. Report classes in grade 6 through 8 consistent with how teachers have been classified to determine their highly qualified status, regardless if their schools are configured as elementary or middle schools.

How should States count teachers (including specialists or resource teachers) in elementary classes?

States that count self-contained classrooms as one class should, to avoid over-representation, also count subject-area specialists (e.g., mathematics or music teachers) or resource teachers as teaching one class.

On the other hand, States using a departmentalized approach to instruction where a self-contained classroom is counted multiple times (once for each subject taught) should also count subject-area specialists or resource teachers as teaching multiple classes.

How should States count teachers in self-contained multiple subject secondary classes?

Each core academic subject taught for which students are receiving credit toward graduation should be counted in the numerator and the denominator. For example, if English, calculus, history, and science are being taught in a self-contained classroom by the same teacher, count these as four classes in the denominator. If the teacher is Highly Qualified in English and history, he/she would be counted as Highly Qualified in two of the four subjects in the numerator.

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

Reason For Being Classified as Not Highly Qualified	Percentage
a) Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	27.0
b) Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	0
c) Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	11.0
d) Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	33.0
e) Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	0
f) Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	29.0
g) Other (please explain)	0

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

	High-Poverty Schools	Low-Poverty Schools
Elementary Schools	More than <u>70.0%</u>	Less than <u>38.0%</u>
Poverty Metric Used	% free and reduced lunch	
Secondary Schools	More than <u>61.0%</u>	Less than <u>29.0%</u>
Poverty Metric Used	% free and reduced lunch	

Definitions and Instructions

How are the poverty quartiles determined?

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

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

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

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

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

In the following chart, please provide data from the 2004-2005 school year for the percentage of Title I paraprofessionals (excluding those with sole duties as translators and parental involvement assistants) who are qualified.

School Year	Percentage of Qualified Title I Paraprofessionals
2004-2005 School Year	80.0

1.6 English Language Proficiency

1.6.1.1 English Language Proficiency (ELP) Standards

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

Developed Yes No

Approved, adopted, sanctioned Yes No

Operationalized Yes No (e.g., Are standards being used by district and school teachers?)

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

STATE RESPONSE

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

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

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

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

1.6.1.2 Alignment of Standards

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

STATE RESPONSE

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

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

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

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

1.6.2 English Language Proficiency (ELP) Assessments

1. **The expectation for the full administration of the new or enhanced ELP assessment(s) that are aligned with the State's English language proficiency (ELP) standards as required under Section 3113(b)(2) is spring 2006 . Please indicate if the State has conducted any of the following:**
 - An independent alignment study No
 - Other evidence of alignment No

2. **Provide an updated description of the State's progress in developing and implementing the new or enhanced ELP assessments. Specifically describe how the State ensures:**
 - The annual assessment of all LEP students in the State in grades k-12;
 - The ELP assessment(s) which address the five domains of listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension;
 - ELP assessments are based on ELP standards;
 - Technical quality (validity, reliability, etc.)

STATE RESPONSE

	<p>During the 2004-05 school year, North Carolina began working with Ballard and Tighe Publishers who were in the process of developing a new version of the IDEA (Individualized Developmental English Activities) English Language Proficiency Tests (IPT II) to comply with the Title III requirements of NCLB.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The new IPT consists of four subtests – Listening, Speaking, Reading, and Writing for grades spans K, 1-2, 3-5, 6-8, and 9-12. Starting in 2005-06, the new IPT will be administered to all students identified as LEP annually during the Feb. 1 – April 30 testing window. 2. The new IPT provides scores for Listening, Speaking, Reading, Writing, and Comprehension (combined score of Listening and Reading). 3. The new IPT consists of four subtests – Listening, Speaking, Reading, and Writing for grades spans K, 1-2, 3-5, 6-8, and 9-12. Starting in 2005-06, the new IPT will be administered to all students identified as LEP annually during the Feb. 1 – April 30 testing window. 4. The new IPT provides scores for Listening, Speaking, Reading, Writing, and Comprehension (combined score of Listening and Reading). 5. The new IPT consists of four subtests – Listening, Speaking, Reading, and Writing for grades spans K, 1-2, 3-5, 6-8, and 9-12. Starting in 2005-06, the new IPT will be administered to all students identified as LEP annually during the Feb. 1 – April 30 testing window. 6. The new IPT provides scores for Listening, Speaking, Reading, Writing, and Comprehension (combined score of Listening and Reading). 7. North Carolina's English Language Arts standards and English Language Development Standard Course of Study were included in the analyses that formed the basis for the design of the new IPT. When North Carolina students participated in the piloting of the new IPT, teachers were asked to review the test items. The teachers' feedback indicated that they thought there was a clear relationship between the IPT and the ELD Standard Course of Study, especially in terms of increased emphasis on Academic English. During standard-setting, groups of experienced North Carolina ESL teachers reviewed the IPT items directly in relation to the ELP Standards and established preliminary cut scores for reporting the IPT test results on North Carolina's proficiency levels. In their post-workshop questionnaires, the standard-setting participants indicated that the process of evaluating the test had taught them a great deal more about the ELP Standards, and again confirmed the close relationship between the standards and the IPT. In 2006-07, NCDPI will be conducting an independent alignment study. 8. The items that are included in the IPT tests underwent two nationally representative field trials: a field test to establish item statistics and a unified measurement scale, and a pilot test to analyze the performance of a subset of the items as a complete

test. During the analysis of the field test data, student performance and test items were scaled using Rasch methodology.

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

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

1.6.3 English Language Proficiency Data

In the following tables, please provide English language proficiency (ELP) data from the **2004-2005** school year test administration. The ELP data should be aggregated at the State level.

States may use the sample format below or another format to report the requested information. The information following the chart is meant to explain what is being requested under each column.

1.6.3.1 English Language Proficiency (ELP) Assessment Data

2004-2005 Data for ALL LEP Students in the State											
Name of ELP Assessment(s) (1)	Total number of ALL Students assessed for ELP (2)	Total number and percentage of ALL students identified as LEP		Total number and percentage of ALL students identified as LEP at each level of English language proficiency							
		Number and Percentage at Basic or Level 1 (4)	Number and Percentage at Level 2 (5)	Number and Percentage at Level 3 (6)	Number and Percentage at Level 4 (7)						
IPT	70288	70288	100.0	16005	22.8	26166	37.2	15952	22.7	12165	17.3
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

- (1) In column one, provide the name(s) of the English Language Proficiency Assessment(s) used by the State.
- (2) In column two, provide the total number of all students assessed for limited English proficiency ("assessed" refers to the number of students evaluated using State-selected ELP assessment(s)).
- (3) In column three, provide the total number and percentage of all students identified as LEP by each State-selected ELP assessment(s) ("identified" refers to the number of students determined to be LEP on State-selected ELP assessments).
- (4-7) In columns four-seven, provide the total number and percentage of all students identified as LEP at each level of English language proficiency as defined by State-selected ELP assessment(s). The number (#) and percentage (%) of columns 4-7 should equate to the number (#) and percentage (%) of all students identified as limited English proficient in column 3.

1.6.3.2 Data Reflecting the Most Common Languages Spoken in the State

2004-2005 Data of the Most Common Languages Spoken by LEPs		
Language	Number and Percentage of ALL LEP Students in the State	
1. Spanish	59172	83.0
2. Hmong	2663	3.8
3. Vietnamese	846	1.2
4. Arabic	843	1.2
5. Chinese	801	1.1
6. Korean	669	0.9
7. French	528	0.7
8. Russian	366	0.5
9. Japanese	363	0.5
10. Hindi	357	0.5

- In the above chart, list the ten most commonly spoken languages in your State. Indicate the number and percentage of LEP students that speak each of the languages listed in table 1.6.4.1.

1.6.3.3 English Language Proficiency (ELP) Assessment Data

2004-2005 Data for LEP Students in the State Served under Title III													
Name of ELP Assessment(s) (1)	Total number and percentage of students identified as LEP who participated in Title III programs (2)		Total number and percentage of Title III students identified at each level of English language proficiency								Total number and percentage of Title III LEP students transitioned for 2 year monitoring (7)		
			Number and Percentage at Basic or Level 1 (3)		Number and Percentage at Intermediate or Level 2 (4)		Number and Percentage at Advanced or Level 3 (5)		Number and Percentage at Proficient or Level 4 (6)				
IPT	69620	99.0	15858	22.8	25903	37.2	15811	22.7	12048	17.3	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

0

- (1) In column one, provide the name of the English Language Proficiency Assessment used by the State.
- (2) In column two, provide the total number and percentage of LEP students who participated in a Title III language instruction educational program during the 2004-2005 school year.
- (3-6) In columns three-six, provide the total number and percentage of LEP students at each level of English language proficiency who received Title III services during the 2004-2005 school year. The number (#) and percentage (%) of columns 3-6 should equate to the number (#) and percentage (%) of all students identified as limited English proficient in column 2.
- (7) In column seven, provide the total number and percentage of LEP students who participated in a Title III language instruction educational program during the 2004-2005 school year and who were transitioned into a classroom not tailored for LEP children and are no longer receiving services under Title III.

1.6.4 Immigrant Children and Youth Data

Please provide the following information required under Section 3111©:

1.6.4.1	Number of immigrant children and youth reported in 2004-2005	<u>29266</u>
1.6.4.2	Number of immigrant children and youth served in 2004-2005	<u>13320</u>
1.6.4.3	Number of subgrants awarded to LEAs for immigrant children and youth programs for 2004-2005	<u>36</u>

1.6.5 Definition of Proficient

If the State has made changes since the last Consolidated State Performance Report submission (for school year 2003-2004), please provide the State's definition of "proficient" in English as defined by the State's English language proficiency standards and assessments under Section 3122(a)(3). Please include the following in your response:

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

STATE RESPONSE

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

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

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

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

1.6.6 Definition of Making Progress

If the State has made changes since the last Consolidated State Performance Report submission (for school year 2003-2004), please provide the State's definition of "making progress" in learning English as defined by the State's English language proficiency standards and assessment(s) in Section 3122(a)(3). Please include the following in your response:

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

STATE RESPONSE

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

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

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

1.6.7 Definition of Cohort

If the State has made changes since the last Consolidated State Performance Report submission (for school year 2003-2004), please provide the State's definition of "cohort." Include a description of the specific characteristics of the cohort(s) in the State, e.g., grade/grade span or other characteristics.

STATE RESPONSE

*No changes have been made, so our cohort is still all K-12 LEP students.

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

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

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

Yes No

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

English Language Proficiency	Percent and Number of ALL LEP Students in the State Who Made Progress in Learning English				Percent and Number of ALL LEP Students in the State Who Attained English Proficiency			
	Projected AMAO Target		Actual		Projected AMAO Target		Actual	
2004-2005 School Year	95.0	17614	81.0	31955	25.0	5625	53.3	12113

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

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

Please provide the State's progress in meeting performance targets/annual measurable achievement objectives in LEAs served by Title III.

States may use the sample format below or another format to report the requested information.

English Language Proficiency	Percent and Number of Title III LEP Students in the State Who Made Progress in Learning English				Percent and Number of Title III LEP Students in the State Who Attained English Proficiency			
	Projected AMAO Target		Actual		Projected AMAO Target		Actual	
2004-2005 School Year	45.0	17614	81.0	31710	25.0	5625	53.3	11997

1.6.10 Please provide the following data on Title III Programs for the 2004-2005 School Year

	Number:
Number of Title III subgrantees	81
Number of Title III subgrantees that met all three components of Title III annual measurable achievement objectives (making progress, attainment, and AYP)	34
Number of Title III subgrantees that did not meet all three components of Title III annual measurable achievement objectives	47

1.6.11 On the following tables for 2004-2005, please provide data regarding the academic achievement of monitored LEP students who transitioned into classrooms not designated for LEP students and who are no longer receiving services under Title III. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned in 2004-2005 school year.

1.6.11.1 Number and percent of former Title III served, monitored LEP students scoring at the proficient and advanced levels on the State reading language arts assessments

Grade/Grade Span	Students Proficient & Advanced	
	#	%
3	1280	92.4
4	786	91.9
5	1110	95.0
6	669	86.7
7	335	87.7
8	351	92.6
H.S.	85	35.9

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

Grade/Grade Span	Students Proficient & Advanced	
	#	%
3	1312	94.7
4	830	97.1
5	1133	96.9
6	740	95.9
7	348	90.9
8	344	90.8
H.S.	195	86.7

1.7 Persistently Dangerous Schools

In the following chart, please provide data for the number of schools identified as persistently dangerous as determined by the State by the start of the 2005 - 2006 school year. For further guidance on persistently dangerous schools, please refer to the Unsafe School Choice Option Non-Regulatory Guidance, available at:

	Number of Persistently Dangerous Schools
2005-2006 School Year	0

1.8 Graduation and Dropout Rates

1.8.1 Graduation Rates

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

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

1. The Secretary approved each State's definition of the graduation rate, consistent with section 200.19 of the Title I regulations, as part of each State's accountability plan. Using the definition of the graduation rate that was approved as part of your State's accountability plan, in the following chart please provide graduation rate data for the 2003-2004 school year.

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

High School Graduates	Graduation Rate
Student Group	03-04 School Year
All Students	95.7
American Indian/Alaska Native	93.8
Asian/Pacific Islander	95.9
Black, non-Hispanic	92.2
Hispanic	90.7
White, non-Hispanic	97.3
Students with Disabilities	88.7
Limited English Proficient	88.9
Economically Disadvantaged	92.7
Migrant	84.6
Male	94.1
Female	97.1

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

1.8.2 Dropout Rate

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

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

In the following chart, please provide data for the 2003-2004 school year for the percentage of students who drop out of high school, disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged.

Dropouts	Dropout Rate
Student Group	03-04 School Year
All Students	4.9
American Indian/Alaska Native	9.8
Asian/Pacific Islander	2.6
Black, non-Hispanic	5.9
Hispanic	8.7
White, non-Hispanic	4.5
Students with Disabilities	8.5
Limited English Proficient	11.8
Economically Disadvantaged	4.6
Migrant	21.8
Male	6.2
Female	4.3

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