

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

**for
STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS
under the
ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT
As amended in 2001**

**For reporting on
School Year 2011-12**

NORTH CAROLINA



**PART I DUE THURSDAY, DECEMBER 20, 2012
PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 2013**

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

INTRODUCTION

Sections 9302 and 9303 of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)*, as amended in 2001 provide to States the option of applying for and reporting on multiple *ESEA* programs through a single consolidated application and report. Although a central, practical purpose of the Consolidated State Application and Report is to reduce "red tape" and burden on States, the Consolidated State Application and Report are also intended to have the important purpose of encouraging the integration of State, local, and *ESEA* programs in comprehensive planning and service delivery and enhancing the likelihood that the State will coordinate planning and service delivery across multiple State and local programs. The combined goal of all educational agencies—State, local, and Federal—is a more coherent, well-integrated educational plan that will result in improved teaching and learning. The Consolidated State Application and Report includes the following *ESEA* programs:

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

The *ESEA* Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2011-12 consists of two Parts, Part I and Part II.

PART I

Part I of the CSPR 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 the *ESEA*. The five *ESEA* Goals established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application are:

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

Beginning with the CSPR SY 2005-06 collection, the Education of Homeless Children and Youths was added. The Migrant Child count was added for the SY 2006-07 collection.

PART II

Part II of the CSPR consists of information related to State activities and outcomes of specific *ESEA* programs. While the information requested varies from program to program, 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 pending full implementation of required ED Facts submission.
3. The information will provide valid evidence of program outcomes or results.

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 2011-12 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Thursday, December 20, 2012**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 15, 2013**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2011-12, unless otherwise noted.

The format states will use to submit the Consolidated State Performance Report has changed to an online submission starting with SY 2004-05. 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 "SY 2011-12 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 SY 2011-12 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

		OMB Number: 1810-0614
		Expiration Date: 11/30/2013
<p>Consolidated State Performance Report For State Formula Grant Programs under the Elementary And Secondary Education Act as amended in 2001</p>		
Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting:		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2011-12		<input type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2011-12
Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report: NC Department of Public Instruction		
Address: 6301 Mail Service Center Raleigh, NC 27699-6301		
Person to contact about this report:		
Name: Karl R. Pond		
Telephone: 919-807-3241		
Fax: 919-807-4300		
e-mail: kpond@dpi.state.nc.us		
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): June St. Clair Atkinson		
		Friday, March 8, 2013, 10:50:36 AM
Signature		Date

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART I**

For reporting on
School Year 2011-12



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 20, 2012
5PM EST**

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

STANDARDS OF ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

This section requests descriptions of the State's implementation of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as amended (ESEA)* academic content standards, academic achievement standards and assessments to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(1) of *ESEA*.

1.1.1 Academic Content Standards

Indicate below whether your state has made or is planning to make revisions to or change the State's academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science since the State's content standards were most recently approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. If yes, indicate specifically in what school year your State implemented or will implement the revisions or changes.

	No revisions or changes to academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science made or planned.		
	State has revised or changed its academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science or is planning to make revisions to or change its academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Indicate below the year these changes were or will be implemented or GÇ£Not ApplicableGÇ¥ to indicate that changes were not made or will not be made in the subject area.		
<u>State has revised or changed</u>			
Acceptable responses are a school year (e.g., 2011-12) or Not Applicable.			
	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Academic Content Standards	2012-13	2012-13	2012-13

If the responses above do not fully describe revisions or changes to your State's academic achievement standards, describe the revisions or changes below.

The response is limited to 1,000 characters

Common Core State Standards in Mathematics and English Language Arts and the Essential Standards in Science were adopted by the State Board of Education in 2010; however, implementation with new assessments is effective in 2012-13.

1.1.1.1 Academic Achievement Standards in Mathematics, Reading/Language Arts and Science

Indicate below whether your state has changed or is planning to change the State's academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science since the State's academic achievement standards were most recently approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. If yes, indicate specifically in what school year your State implemented or will implement the changes.

As applicable, include changes to academic achievement standards based on any assessments (e.g., alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards, alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards, native language assessments, or others) implemented to meet the assessment requirements under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA.

<p><u>State has revised or changed</u></p>	<p>No revisions or changes to academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science made or planned.</p>		
	<p>State has changed its academic achievement standards or is planning to change its academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Indicate below either the school year in which these changes were or will be implemented or GÇ£Not ApplicableGÇ¥ to indicate that changes were not made or will not be made in the subject area.</p>		

Acceptable responses are a school year (e.g., 2011-12) or Not Applicable.

Academic Achievement Standards for	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Regular Assessments in Grades 3-8	2012-13	2012-13	2012-13
Regular Assessments in High School	2012-13	2012-13	2012-13
Alternate Assessments Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards (if applicable)			
Alternate Assessments Based on Modified Achievement Standards (if applicable)	2012-13	2012-13	2012-13
Alternate Assessments Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	2012-13	2012-13	2012-13

If the responses above do not fully describe revisions or changes to your State's academic achievement standards, describe the revisions or changes below.

The response is limited to 1,000 characters

In 2012-13, the state is implementing new achievement standards for all assessments: general, modified, and alternate based on extended content standards

1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts and Science

Indicate below whether your state has changed or is planning to change the State's academic assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts or science since the State's academic assessments were most recently approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. If yes, indicate specifically in what school year your State implemented or will implement the changes.

As applicable, include any assessments (e.g., alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards, alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards, native language assessments, or others) implemented to meet the assessment requirements under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*.

	No changes to assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts or science made or planned.
<u>State has revised or changed</u>	State has changed or is planning to change its assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Indicate below the year these changes were implemented or GÇ£Not ApplicableGÇ¥ to indicate that changes were not made or will not be made in the subject area.

Acceptable responses are a school year (e.g., 2011-12) or Not Applicable.

Academic Assessments	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Regular Assessments in Grades 3-8	2012-13	2012-13	2012-13
Regular Assessments in High School	2012-13	2012-13	2012-13
Alternate Assessments Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards (if applicable)			
Alternate Assessments Based on Modified Achievement Standards (if applicable)	2012-13	2012-13	2012-13
Alternate Assessments Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	2012-13	2012-13	2012-13

If the responses above do not fully describe revisions or changes to your State's academic achievement standards, describe the revisions or changes below.

The response is limited to 1,000 characters

New assessments for general, modified, and extended content standards are being implemented in 2012-13.

1.1.3 Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities

1.1.3.1 Percentages of Funds Used for Standards and Assessment Development and Other Purposes

For funds your State had available under *ESEA* section 6111 (Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities) during SY 2011-12, estimate what percentage of the funds your State used for the following (round to the nearest ten percent).

Purpose	Percentage (rounded to the nearest ten percent)
To pay the costs of the development of the State assessments and standards required by section 1111(b)	80.00
To administer assessments required by section 1111(b) or to carry out other activities described in section 6111 and other activities related to ensuring that the State's schools and local educational agencies are held accountable for the results	20.00
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.1.3.2 Uses of Funds for Purposes Other than Standards and Assessment Development

For funds your State had available under *ESEA* section 6111 (Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities) during SY 2011-12 that were used for purposes other than the costs of the development of the State assessments and standards required by section 1111(b), for what purposes did your State use the funds? (Enter "yes" for all that apply and "no" for all that do not apply).

Purpose	Used for Purpose (yes/no)
Administering assessments required by section 1111(b)	<u>Yes</u>
Developing challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards and aligned assessments in academic subjects for which standards and assessments are not required by section 1111(b)	<u>No</u>
Developing or improving assessments of English language proficiency necessary to comply with section 1111(b)(7)	<u>Yes</u>
Ensuring the continued validity and reliability of State assessments, and/or refining State assessments to ensure their continued alignment with the State's academic content standards and to improve the alignment of curricula and instructional materials	<u>Yes</u>
Developing multiple measures to increase the reliability and validity of State assessment systems	<u>No</u>
Strengthening the capacity of local educational agencies and schools to provide all students the opportunity to increase educational achievement, including carrying out professional development activities aligned with State student academic achievement standards and assessments	<u>Yes</u>
Expanding the range of accommodations available to students with limited English proficiency and students with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) to improve the rates of inclusion of such students, including professional development activities aligned with State academic achievement standards and assessments	<u>Yes</u>
Improving the dissemination of information on student achievement and school performance to parents and the community, including the development of information and reporting systems designed to identify best educational practices based on scientifically based research or to assist in linking records of student achievement, length of enrollment, and graduation over time	<u>Yes</u>
Other	<u>No</u>
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

This section collects data on the participation of students in the State assessments.

Note: States are not required to report these data by the seven (7) racial/ethnic groups; instead, they are required to report these data by the major racial and ethnic groups that are identified in their Accountability Workbooks. The charts below display racial/ethnic data that has been mapped back from the major racial and ethnic groups identified in their workbooks, to the 7 racial/ethnic groups to allow for the examination of data across states.

1.2.1 Participation of all Students in Mathematics Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of students enrolled during the State's testing window for mathematics assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA (regardless of whether the students were present for a full academic year) and the number of students who participated in the mathematics assessment in accordance with ESEA. The percentage of students who were tested for mathematics will be calculated automatically.

The student group "children with disabilities (IDEA)" includes children who participated in the regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments. Do not include former students with disabilities (IDEA). Do not include students only covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

The student group "limited English proficient (LEP) students" includes recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months. Do not include former LEP students.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	798,377	794,113	99.47
American Indian or Alaska Native	11,432	11,276	98.64
Asian	19,776	19,660	99.41
Black or African American	211,024	209,455	99.26
Hispanic or Latino	104,509	103,961	99.48
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	674	667	98.96
White	421,642	419,913	99.59
Two or more races	29,320	29,181	99.53
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	103,704	103,704	100.00
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	48,640	48,296	99.29
Economically disadvantaged students	436,051	433,441	99.40
Migratory students	993	986	99.30
Male	408,093	405,551	99.38
Female	390,284	388,562	99.56
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The scores for first year LEP students who score below 4.0 on the state English language reading test are not included in proficiency. These students are included for participation only. At the high school, students who transfer in with Algebra I credit are not required to be assessed on the Algebra I EOC. The students count for participation only.			

1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Mathematics Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of children with disabilities (*IDEA*) participating during the State's testing window in mathematics assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* (regardless of whether the children were present for a full academic year) by the type of assessment. The percentage of children with disabilities (*IDEA*) who participated in the mathematics assessment for each assessment option will be calculated automatically. The total number of children with disabilities (*IDEA*) participating will also be calculated automatically.

The data provided below should include mathematics participation data from all students with disabilities as defined under the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act(IDEA)*. Do not include former students with disabilities (*IDEA*). Do not include students only covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	19,372	18.68
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	55,455	53.47
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.00
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	21,865	21.08
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	7,012	6.76
Total	103,704	

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The scores for first year LEP students who score below 4.0 on the state English language reading test are not included in proficiency. These students are included for participation only. At the high school, students who transfer in with Algebra I credit are not required to be assessed on the Algebra I EOC. The students count for participation only.

1.2.3 Participation of All Students in the Reading/Language Arts Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.1 and collects data on the State's reading/language arts assessment.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	798,957	796,102	99.64
American Indian or Alaska Native	11,426	11,360	99.42
Asian	19,826	19,730	99.52
Black or African American	210,931	209,900	99.51
Hispanic or Latino	104,498	104,089	99.61
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	675	671	99.41
White	422,275	421,125	99.73
Two or more races	29,326	29,227	99.66
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	104,715	104,102	99.41
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	48,606	48,326	99.42
Economically disadvantaged students	435,857	434,128	99.60
Migratory students	992	986	99.40
Male	408,329	406,672	99.59
Female	390,628	389,430	99.69

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The scores for first year LEP students who score below 4.0 on the state English language reading test are not included in proficiency. These students are included for participation only. At the high school, students who transfer in with Algebra I credit are not required to be assessed on the Algebra I EOC. The students count for participation only.

1.2.3.1 Recently Arrived LEP Students Taking ELP Assessments in Lieu of Reading/Language Arts Assessments

In the table below, provide the number of recently arrived LEP students (as defined in 34 C.F.R. Part 200.6(b)(4)) included in the participation counts in 1.2.3 and 1.3.2.1 who took an assessment of English language proficiency in lieu of the State's reading/language arts assessment, as permitted under 34 C.F.R. Part 200.20.

Recently arrived LEP students who took an assessment of English language proficiency in lieu of the State's reading/language arts assessment	2,080
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------

1.2.4 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Reading/Language Arts Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.2 and collects data on the State's reading/language arts assessment.

The data provided should include reading/language arts participation data from all students with disabilities as defined under the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)*. Do not include former students with disabilities (*IDEA*). Do not include students only covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

Note: For this question only, report on students with disabilities (*IDEA*) who are also LEP students in the U.S. less than 12 months who took the ELP in lieu of the statewide reading/language arts assessment.

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	22,560	21.66
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	49,647	47.67
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.00
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	25,650	24.63
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	6,245	6.00
LEP < 12 months, took ELP	37	0.04
Total	104,139	

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The scores for first year LEP students who score below 4.0 on the state English language reading test are not included in proficiency. These students are included for participation only. At the high school, students who transfer in with Algebra I credit are not required to be assessed on the Algebra I EOC. The students count for participation only.

1.2.5 Participation of All Students in the Science Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.1 and collects data on the State's science assessment.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	335,350	321,733	95.94
American Indian or Alaska Native	4,695	4,495	95.74
Asian	8,359	7,958	95.20
Black or African American	89,665	85,061	94.87
Hispanic or Latino	39,811	38,225	96.02
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	296	272	91.89
White	180,877	174,474	96.46
Two or more races	11,647	11,248	96.57
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	42,281	39,766	94.05
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	15,234	14,414	94.62
Economically disadvantaged students	172,868	165,106	95.51
Migratory students	323	308	95.36
Male	171,057	163,590	95.63
Female	164,293	158,143	96.26
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The scores for first year LEP students who score below 4.0 on the state English language reading test are not included in proficiency. These students are included for participation only. At the high school, students who transfer in with Algebra I credit are not required to be assessed on the Algebra I EOC. The students count for participation only.			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

1.2.6 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Science Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.2 and collects data on the State's science assessment.

The data provided should include science participation results from all students with disabilities as defined under the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)*. Do not include former students with disabilities (*IDEA*). Do not include students only covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	12,603	31.69
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	15,356	38.62
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.00
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	8,023	20.18
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	3,784	9.52
Total	39,766	
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The scores for first year LEP students who score below 4.0 on the state English language reading test are not included in proficiency. These students are included for participation only. At the high school, students who transfer in with Algebra I credit are not required to be assessed on the Algebra I EOC. The students count for participation only.		

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

This section collects data on student academic achievement on the State assessments.

Note: States are not required to report these data by the seven (7) racial/ethnic groups; instead, they are required to report these data by the major racial and ethnic groups that are identified in their Accountability Workbooks. The charts below display racial/ethnic data that has been mapped back from the major racial and ethnic groups identified in their workbooks, to the 7 racial/ethnic groups to allow for the examination of data across states.

1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics

In the format of the table below, provide the number of students who received a valid score on the State assessment(s) in mathematics implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* (regardless of whether the students were present for a full academic year) and for whom a proficiency level was assigned, and the number of these students who scored at or above proficient, in grades 3 through 8 and high school. The percentage of students who scored at or above proficient is calculated automatically.

The student group "children with disabilities (*IDEA*)" includes children who participated, and for whom a proficiency level was assigned in the regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments. Do not include former students with disabilities (*IDEA*). The student group "limited English proficient (LEP) students" does include recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months. Do not include former LEP students.

1.3.1.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	116,637	96,419	82.67
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,610	1,211	75.22
Asian	3,071	2,792	90.92
Black or African American	29,300	20,187	68.90
Hispanic or Latino	17,614	13,888	78.85
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	85	72	84.71
White	60,292	54,339	90.13
Two or more races	4,665	3,930	84.24
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	15,692	9,166	58.41
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	12,390	9,150	73.85
Economically disadvantaged students	66,855	50,050	74.86
Migratory students	190	137	72.11
Male	59,756	49,290	82.49
Female	56,881	47,129	82.86
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.3.2.1 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	116,644	80,122	68.69
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,610	942	58.51
Asian	3,070	2,431	79.19
Black or African American	29,306	15,453	52.73
Hispanic or Latino	17,615	9,382	53.26
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	84	60	71.43
White	60,294	48,505	80.45
Two or more races	4,665	3,349	71.79
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	15,698	6,078	38.72
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	12,385	5,227	42.20
Economically disadvantaged students	66,862	37,485	56.06
Migratory students	189	77	40.74
Male	59,762	39,539	66.16
Female	56,882	40,583	71.35
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The scores for first year LEP students who score below 4.0 on the state English language reading tests are not included in proficiency. These students are included in participation only.			

1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. There is not a science assessment for grade 3.			

1.3.1.2 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	115,933	98,541	85.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,517	1,190	78.44
Asian	2,951	2,754	93.32
Black or African American	29,872	21,939	73.44
Hispanic or Latino	17,086	13,967	81.75
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	100	85	85.00
White	59,992	54,807	91.36
Two or more races	4,415	3,799	86.05
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	16,448	9,760	59.34
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	9,545	6,888	72.16
Economically disadvantaged students	66,334	51,862	78.18
Migratory students	187	136	72.73
Male	59,370	49,876	84.01
Female	56,563	48,665	86.04
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.3.2.2 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	115,932	82,919	71.52
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,516	913	60.22
Asian	2,951	2,378	80.58
Black or African American	29,874	16,654	55.75
Hispanic or Latino	17,082	9,917	58.06
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	100	71	71.00
White	59,994	49,684	82.81
Two or more races	4,415	3,302	74.79
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	16,447	6,733	40.94
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	9,540	3,644	38.20
Economically disadvantaged students	66,333	39,616	59.72
Migratory students	186	77	41.40
Male	59,371	40,724	68.59
Female	56,561	42,195	74.60
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The scores for first year LEP students who score below 4.0 on the state English language reading tests are not included in proficiency. These students are included in participation only.			

1.3.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. There is not a science assessment at grade 4.			

1.3.1.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	118,295	96,968	81.97
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,606	1,135	70.67
Asian	2,919	2,687	92.05
Black or African American	31,078	21,414	68.90
Hispanic or Latino	16,449	12,977	78.89
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	92	76	82.61
White	61,780	55,078	89.15
Two or more races	4,371	3,601	82.38
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	16,689	9,404	56.35
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	7,123	4,478	62.87
Economically disadvantaged students	66,805	49,530	74.14
Migratory students	163	117	71.78
Male	60,523	49,202	81.29
Female	57,772	47,766	82.68
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.3.2.3 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	118,292	85,361	72.16
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,607	959	59.68
Asian	2,916	2,352	80.66
Black or African American	31,077	17,909	57.63
Hispanic or Latino	16,443	9,872	60.04
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	92	58	63.04
White	61,784	50,980	82.51
Two or more races	4,373	3,231	73.89
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	16,691	7,023	42.08
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	7,115	2,293	32.23
Economically disadvantaged students	66,801	40,478	60.59
Migratory students	163	85	52.15
Male	60,524	42,020	69.43
Female	57,768	43,341	75.03
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The scores for first year LEP students who score below 4.0 on the state English language reading tests are not included in proficiency. These students are included in participation only.			

1.3.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	118,539	89,858	75.80
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,606	1,157	72.04
Asian	3,013	2,526	83.84
Black or African American	31,079	18,293	58.86
Hispanic or Latino	16,559	10,858	65.57
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	96	72	75.00
White	61,813	53,547	86.63
Two or more races	4,373	3,405	77.86
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	16,699	8,742	52.35
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	7,371	3,236	43.90
Economically disadvantaged students	66,965	43,790	65.39
Migratory students	165	106	64.24
Male	60,644	47,241	77.90
Female	57,895	42,617	73.61
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.3.1.4 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	116,599	93,623	80.29
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,741	1,279	73.46
Asian	2,850	2,614	91.72
Black or African American	31,111	20,438	65.69
Hispanic or Latino	15,213	11,506	75.63
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	99	70	70.71
White	61,419	54,316	88.44
Two or more races	4,166	3,400	81.61
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	15,390	8,353	54.28
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,782	3,184	55.07
Economically disadvantaged students	64,781	46,195	71.31
Migratory students	145	96	66.21
Male	59,601	46,894	78.68
Female	56,998	46,729	81.98
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.3.2.4 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	116,596	87,505	75.05
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,741	1,121	64.39
Asian	2,843	2,398	84.35
Black or African American	31,114	18,686	60.06
Hispanic or Latino	15,211	9,831	64.63
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	99	67	67.68
White	61,421	52,154	84.91
Two or more races	4,167	3,248	77.95
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	15,393	6,651	43.21
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,763	1,858	32.24
Economically disadvantaged students	64,777	41,538	64.12
Migratory students	145	75	51.72
Male	59,601	43,124	72.35
Female	56,995	44,381	77.87
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The scores for first year LEP students who score below 4.0 on the state English language reading tests are not included in proficiency. These students are included in participation only.			

1.3.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. There is not a science assessment at grade 6.			

1.3.1.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	114,213	92,419	80.92
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,641	1,232	75.08
Asian	2,710	2,466	91.00
Black or African American	30,902	21,036	68.07
Hispanic or Latino	13,994	10,866	77.65
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	110	89	80.91
White	60,846	53,424	87.80
Two or more races	4,010	3,306	82.44
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	14,816	7,901	53.33
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,706	3,458	60.60
Economically disadvantaged students	62,126	45,053	72.52
Migratory students	133	92	69.17
Male	58,250	45,854	78.72
Female	55,963	46,565	83.21
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.3.2.5 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	114,223	77,680	68.01
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,641	889	54.17
Asian	2,701	2,058	76.19
Black or African American	30,908	15,642	50.61
Hispanic or Latino	13,995	7,951	56.81
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	110	78	70.91
White	60,859	48,243	79.27
Two or more races	4,009	2,819	70.32
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	14,817	5,598	37.78
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,695	1,505	26.43
Economically disadvantaged students	62,133	34,086	54.86
Migratory students	133	59	44.36
Male	58,263	38,269	65.68
Female	55,960	39,411	70.43
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The scores for first year LEP students who score below 4.0 on the state English language reading tests are not included in proficiency. These students are included in participation only.			

1.3.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. There is not a science assessment for grade 7.			

1.3.1.6 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	112,318	95,499	85.03
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,715	1,352	78.83
Asian	2,699	2,521	93.40
Black or African American	30,016	22,164	73.84
Hispanic or Latino	13,068	10,771	82.42
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	111	87	78.38
White	60,706	55,150	90.85
Two or more races	4,003	3,454	86.29
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	13,985	8,279	59.20
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,156	3,516	68.19
Economically disadvantaged students	59,165	45,998	77.75
Migratory students	100	83	83.00
Male	57,456	47,657	82.95
Female	54,862	47,842	87.20
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.3.2.6 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	112,292	79,689	70.97
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,714	991	57.82
Asian	2,695	2,108	78.22
Black or African American	30,004	16,110	53.69
Hispanic or Latino	13,053	7,569	57.99
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	111	73	65.77
White	60,711	49,878	82.16
Two or more races	4,004	2,960	73.93
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	13,984	5,439	38.89
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,138	1,276	24.83
Economically disadvantaged students	59,138	34,277	57.96
Migratory students	100	45	45.00
Male	57,448	39,510	68.78
Female	54,844	40,179	73.26
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The scores for first year LEP students who score below 4.0 on the state English language reading tests are not included in proficiency. These students are included in participation only.			

1.3.3.6 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	112,530	86,790	77.13
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,715	1,132	66.01
Asian	2,768	2,349	84.86
Black or African American	30,012	17,911	59.68
Hispanic or Latino	13,192	8,946	67.81
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	111	80	72.07
White	60,729	53,191	87.59
Two or more races	4,003	3,181	79.47
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	13,984	7,315	52.31
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,406	2,259	41.79
Economically disadvantaged students	59,290	39,118	65.98
Migratory students	108	64	59.26
Male	57,556	44,847	77.92
Female	54,974	41,943	76.30
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.3.1.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - High School

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	100,118	83,183	83.08
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,446	1,140	78.84
Asian	2,460	2,233	90.77
Black or African American	27,176	19,182	70.58
Hispanic or Latino	10,537	8,445	80.15
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	70	63	90.00
White	54,878	49,110	89.49
Two or more races	3,551	3,010	84.76
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	10,684	4,804	44.96
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,594	1,264	48.73
Economically disadvantaged students	47,375	35,301	74.51
Migratory students	68	50	73.53
Male	50,595	40,998	81.03
Female	49,523	42,185	85.18

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Students who transfer in with Algebra I credit are not required to be assessed on Algebra I EOC. The students count for participation only.

1.3.2.7 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - High School

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	102,123	87,998	86.17
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,531	1,140	74.46
Asian	2,554	2,197	86.02
Black or African American	27,617	21,081	76.33
Hispanic or Latino	10,690	8,477	79.30
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	75	68	90.67
White	56,062	51,810	92.42
Two or more races	3,594	3,225	89.73
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	11,072	5,095	46.02
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,690	882	32.79
Economically disadvantaged students	48,084	37,378	77.73
Migratory students	70	46	65.71
Male	51,703	42,921	83.01
Female	50,420	45,077	89.40

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The scores for first year LEP students who score below 4.0 on the state English language reading tests are not included in proficiency. These students are included in participation only.

1.3.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Science - High School

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	90,705	76,273	84.09
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,174	894	76.15
Asian	2,179	1,958	89.86
Black or African American	23,988	17,125	71.39
Hispanic or Latino	8,481	6,673	78.68
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	65	59	90.77
White	51,944	47,114	90.70
Two or more races	2,874	2,450	85.25
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	9,119	4,674	51.26
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,637	640	39.10
Economically disadvantaged students	38,878	29,017	74.64
Migratory students	35	25	71.43
Male	45,409	38,025	83.74
Female	45,296	38,248	84.44
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY

This section collects data on the Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) status of schools and districts.

1.4.1 All Schools and Districts Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public elementary and secondary schools and districts in the State, including charters, and the total number of those schools and districts that made AYP based on data for SY 2011-12. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2011-12	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2011-12
Schools	2,598		
Districts	245		
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Due to the ESEA waiver, NC is not required to provide AYP data for the 2011-12 school year.			

1.4.2 Title I School Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public Title I schools by type and the total number of those schools that made AYP based on data for SY 2011-12. Include only public Title I schools. Do not include Title I programs operated by local educational agencies in private schools. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2011-12	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2011-12
All Title I schools	1,268		
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	1,175		
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	91		
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Due to the ESEA waiver, NC is not required to provide AYP data for the 2011-12 school year.			

1.4.3 Accountability of Districts That Received Title I Funds

In the table below, provide the total number of districts that received Title I funds and the total number of those districts that made AYP based on data for SY 2011-12. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds in SY 2011-12	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2011-12	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2011-12
115		
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Due to the ESEA waiver, NC is not required to provide AYP data for the 2011-12 school year.		

1.4.4.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for schools in corrective action, provide the number of schools for which the listed corrective actions under *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2011-12 (based on SY 2010-11 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2011-12
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	56
Extension of the school year or school day	20
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	7
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	10
Replacement of the principal	29
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	19
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	29
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2

In the table below, for schools in restructuring – year 2 (implementation year), provide the number of schools for which the listed restructuring actions under *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2011-12 (based on SY 2010-11 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Restructuring Action	# of Title I Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	40
Reopening the school as a public charter school	
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	
Takeover the school by the State	
Other major restructuring of the school governance	78
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

In the space below, list specifically the "other major restructuring of the school governance" action(s) that were implemented.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Creation of learning development centers for all classroom teachers.
 The principal provides leadership as she and other school leaders, including the assistant principal, School Improvement Team members, continue full implementation for the ACCEL period, a daily period of remediation and enrichment. The district K-5 Education Coordinator, EC Director and Curriculum Specialist, and Federal Programs Director are available to assist with implementation.
 Principal worked closely with district office due to being in second year at school.
 School Improvement Planning Process developed and implemented by central office personnel. Oversight in monitoring of process monthly. Approval required for site administrative changes and/or decisions.
 Partnered with outside consultant to revise school processes and provide appropriate professional development.
 District assumes a more directive role with teaching and learning strategies through increased central services of C&I Director, EC Director, HR Director.
 Diminished school-based management and decision making by increasing control, monitoring, and oversight of the schools operations and educational programs by the district.
 School followed the transformation SIG model with an extended school day and the addition of a dedicated PreK at the school site.
 Participation in the School Transformation by Actively Recruiting, Rewarding, and Retaining initiative (STAR 3).
 NCDPI collaborative partnership authorized by a court consent agenda.
 Mentor for principals, curriculum coach, intense staff development for administration and staff.

Operate from a more detailed and strategic school improvement plan that raises emphasis on accountability, community partnerships, and quality teaching. Our focus on professional development, data driven instruction and curriculum alignment with Common Core Essential Standards have driven both teaching and learning.

Carry out restructuring of school's governance that made fundamental reforms: Increase professional development and data analysis; Increase monitoring visits.

Developed a restructuring team to focus on data for student achievement.

POC, Common Core, and Thinking Maps.

State provided technical assistance by providing a transformation coach for the principal and an instructional coach for the faculty and staff. Followed the directives of their coaches and implemented the recommendations from the state's written needs assessment.

All schools where given either lead teachers or coaches to help improve the instruction in all classrooms.

1.4.5.2 Actions Taken for Districts That Received Title I Funds and Were Identified for Improvement

In the space below, briefly describe the measures being taken to address the achievement problems of districts identified for improvement or corrective action. Include a discussion of the technical assistance provided by the State (e.g., the number of districts served, the nature and duration of assistance provided, etc.).

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

In 2010, NC adopted the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) and developed Essential Standards (ES) for all other core academic content areas. Districts in Corrective Action participated in Summer Institutes designed to support the implementation of CCSS and ES beginning with the 2012-13 school year. As a follow up to the institutes, DPI staff provided districts in Corrective Action with additional opportunities for professional development to support their local development of pacing guides, curriculum maps, and lesson plans aligned to CCSS and ES.

1.4.5.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for districts in corrective action, provide the number of districts in corrective action in which the listed corrective actions under ESEA were implemented in SY 2011-12 (based on SY 2010-11 assessments under Section 1111 of ESEA).

Corrective Action	# of Districts receiving Title I funds in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2011-12
Implemented a new curriculum based on State standards	29
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	0
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	0
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	0
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	0
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	0
Restructured the district	0
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2010-11 and beginning of SY 2011-12 as a corrective action)	0
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.4.7 Appeal of AYP and Identification Determinations

In the table below, provide the number of districts and schools that appealed their AYP designations based on SY 2011-12 data and the results of those appeals.

	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts	0	0
Schools	0	0
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2011-12 data was complete	
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

1.4.8 Sections 1003(a) and (g) School Improvement Funds

In the section below, "schools in improvement" means Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of *ESEA* for SY 2011-12.

1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2011 (SY 2011-12) Title I, Part A allocation that the SEA reserved in accordance with Section 1003(a) of *ESEA* and §200.100(a) of ED's regulations governing the reservation of funds for school improvement under Section 1003(a) of *ESEA*: 4.00 %

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

1.4.8.5.2 Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Allocations to LEAs and Schools

For SY 2011-12 there is no need to upload a spreadsheet to answer this question in the CSPR.

1.4.8.5.2 will be answered automatically using data submitted to ED Facts in Data Group 694, School improvement funds allocation table, from File Specification N/X132. You may review data submitted to ED Facts using the report named "Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Allocations to LEAs and Schools - CSPR 1.4.8.5.2 (EDEN012)" from the ED Facts Reporting System.

1.4.8.5.3 Use of Section 1003(g)(8) Funds for Evaluation and Technical Assistance

Section 1003(g)(8) of *ESEA* allows States to reserve up to five percent of Section 1003(g) funds for administration and to meet the evaluation and technical assistance requirements for this program. In the space below, identify and describe the specific Section 1003(g) evaluation and technical assistance activities that your State conducted during SY 2011-12.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The North Carolina Department of Public Instruction (NCDPI) reserved five (5) percent of the School Improvement Grant for administration, evaluation, and monitoring of its SIG funded implementation. Funds were used as follows:

1. The provision of technical assistance to LEAs to assist with plan development including two statewide meetings with current and potential Priority/SIG schools. The statewide meetings included presentations from SEA specialists on topics such as English Language Learners, Exceptional Children, and Parent Engagement.
2. An increase in resources to support the application review process and monitoring requirements including contracts with outside experts. North Carolina contracted with a retired state Title I Director (and former United States Department of Education monitor), and a retired North Carolina Associate State Superintendent with significant experience regarding the statewide system of support.
3. The enhancement of existing DPI data systems to include required SIG data reporting elements. NCDPI is currently working with the Center on Innovation and Improvement to implement the Indistar School Improvement Grants Online Planning Tool (NC Indistar) for all SIG/Priority schools.
4. Completion of the evaluation process for each LEA receiving SIG funds. In addition to quarterly monitoring visits conducted for SIG schools in year one of implementation, LEAs/Schools submitted revisions to their initial grant in June 2012. Revisions were reviewed and approved in the fall of 2012.
5. An increase in direct services to LEAs determined to have low capacity for implementing interventions in coordination with the Statewide System of Support and the Race to the Top initiative. School Transformation Coaches from NCDPI work with identified schools and a contract for support was also established with the Executive Director of the North Carolina Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

1.4.8.6 Actions Taken for Title I Schools Identified for Improvement Supported by Funds Other than Those of Section 1003(a) and 1003(g).

In the space below, describe actions (if any) taken by your State in SY 2011-12 that were supported by **funds other than Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) funds** to address the achievement problems of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of *ESEA*.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

LEAs and schools with the greatest need will be identified for direct support through the District and School Transformation (DST) division in collaboration with the Program Monitoring and Support division including schools and districts in Title I improvement status. LEAs identified for DST undergo a supported CNA process and then collaboratively develop a Service Plan. The plan reflects strengths and areas for improvement identified in the needs assessment, as well as identifying transforming initiatives for district and individual schools. Service Plans are developed to provide a rationale for choices with a clear implementation plan.

DST is designed to provide on-site support, guidance and services to districts for a three-year commitment. The level and nature of services are determined by district performance and capacity, including results of test data as reported in the ABCs of Public Education and No Child Left behind (NCLB). The primary aims are to improve student academic performance and to build internal capacity in the central office and school's leadership for positive change and continuous growth. Services and assistance provided to districts by NCDPI will be extended and reinforced by (a) utilizing school, district, and regional coaches to develop school and district leadership by sharing best practices and providing knowledge of exemplary programs and strategies; and (b) brokering NCDPI staff and external partners as needed to provide professional development and technical assistance. The number of districts served and the extent of services depend on the availability of resources and will be provided to districts with the lowest performance and least capacity. These districts will be approved and designated by the State Board of Education.

In addition to DST support, Title I staff conduct Program Quality Reviews to review district and school Title program requirements and provide technical assistance for moving programs from compliance to high quality.

Technical assistance for all LEAs and charter schools is coordinated through the roundtables. Service delivery is provided internally through NCDPI agency and regional staff to include initiatives such as Response to Intervention (RTI) training by NCDPI Exceptional Children staff. Services are also brokered with various partnerships for support to include, NC RESAs, the New Schools Project, The Collaborative Project, the UNC Center for School Leadership and Development, and the Appalachian Regional Comprehensive Center (ARCC).

1.4.9 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on public school choice and supplemental educational services.

1.4.9.1 Public School Choice

This section collects data on public school choice. FAQs related to the public school choice provisions are at the end of this section.

1.4.9.1.2 Public School Choice – Students

In the table below, provide the number of students who were eligible for public school choice, the number of eligible students who applied to transfer, and the number who transferred under the provisions for public school choice under Section 1116 of *ESEA*. The number of students who were eligible for public school choice should include:

1. All students currently enrolled in a school Title I identified for improvement, corrective action or restructuring.
2. All students who transferred in the current school year under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116, and
3. All students who previously transferred under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116 and are continuing to transfer for the current school year under Section 1116.

The number of students who applied to transfer should include:

1. All students who applied to transfer in the current school year but did not or were unable to transfer.
2. All students who transferred in the current school year under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116; and
3. All students who previously transferred under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116 and are continuing to transfer for the current school year under Section 1116.

For any of the respective student counts, States should indicate in the Comment section if the count does not include any of the categories of students discussed above.

	# Students
Eligible for public school choice	199,525
Applied to transfer	5,705
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	5,478
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.4.9.1.3 Funds Spent on Public School Choice

In the table below, provide the total dollar amount spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice under Section 1116 of *ESEA*.

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$ 6,937,457

1.4.9.1.4 Availability of Public School Choice Options

In the table below provide the number of LEAs in your State that are unable to provide public school choice to eligible students due to any of the following reasons:

1. All schools at a grade level in the LEA are in school improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.
2. LEA only has a single school at the grade level of the school at which students are eligible for public school choice.
3. LEA's schools are so remote from one another that choice is impracticable.

	# LEAs
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	23

FAQs about public school choice:

- a. How should States report data on Title I public school choice for those LEAs that have open enrollment and other choice programs? For those LEAs that implement open enrollment or other school choice programs in addition to public school choice under Section 1116 of *ESEA*, the State may consider a student as having applied to transfer if the student meets the following:
- Has a "home" or "neighborhood" school (to which the student would have been assigned, in the absence of a school choice program) that receives Title I funds and has been identified, under the statute, as in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring; and
 - Has elected to enroll, at some point since July 1, 2002 (the effective date of the Title I choice provisions), and after the home school has been identified as in need of improvement, in a school that has not been so identified and is attending that school; and
 - Is using district transportation services to attend such a school.

In addition, the State may consider costs for transporting a student meeting the above conditions towards the funds spent by an LEA on transportation for public school choice if the student is using district transportation services to attend the non-identified school.

- b. How should States report on public school choice for those LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice? In the count of LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice (for any of the reasons specified in 1.4.9.1.4), States should include those LEAs that are unable to offer public school choice at one or more grade levels. For instance, if an LEA is able to provide public school choice to eligible students at the elementary level but not at the secondary level, the State should include the LEA in the count. States should also include LEAs that are not able to provide public school choice at all (i.e., at any grade level). States should provide the reason(s) why public school choice was not possible in these LEAs at the grade level(s) in the Comment section. In addition, States may also include in the Comment section a separate count just of LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice at any grade level.

For LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice at one or more grade levels, States should count as eligible for public school choice (in 1.4.9.1.2) all students who attend identified Title I schools regardless of whether the LEA is able to offer the students public school choice.

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

³ Adapted from OESE/OII policy letter of August 2004. The policy letter may be found on the Department's Web page at <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/stateletters/choice/choice081804.html>.

1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

1.4.9.2.2 Supplemental Educational Services – Students

In the table below, provide the number of students who were eligible for, who applied for, and who received supplemental educational services under Section 1116 of *ESEA*.

	# Students
Eligible for supplemental educational services	147,732
Applied for supplemental educational services	29,142
Received supplemental educational services	27,061
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services

In the table below, provide the total dollar amount spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services under Section 1116 of *ESEA*.

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$ 28,399,482
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.5 TEACHER QUALITY

This section collects data on "highly qualified" teachers as the term is defined in Section 9101(23) of ESEA.

1.5.1 Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified

In the table below, provide the number of core academic classes for the grade levels listed, the number of those core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified, and the number taught by teachers who are not highly qualified. The percentage of core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified and the percentage taught by teachers who are not highly qualified will be calculated automatically. Below the table are FAQs about these data.

	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified
All classes	82,168	81,124	98.73	1,044	1.27
All elementary classes	44,715	44,469	99.45	246	0.55
All secondary classes	37,453	36,655	97.87	798	2.13

Do the data in Table 1.5.1 above include classes taught by special education teachers who provide direct instruction core academic subjects?

Data table includes classes taught by special education teachers who provide direct instruction core academic subjects.	<u>Yes</u>
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------

If the answer above is no, please explain below. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

Does the State count elementary classes so that a full-day self-contained classroom equals one class, or does the State use a departmentalized approach where a classroom is counted multiple times, once for each subject taught?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Full day, self-contained classroom equals one class

FAQs about highly qualified teachers and core academic subjects:

- a. *What are the core academic subjects?* English, reading/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.
- b. *How is a teacher defined?* An individual who provides instruction in the core academic areas to kindergarten, grades 1 through 12, or ungraded 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]
- c. *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% of the time [from NCES Non-fiscal Data Handbook for Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education, 2003].
- d. *Should 6th-, 7th-, and 8th-grade classes be reported in the elementary or the 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. Report classes in grade 6 through 8 consistent with how teachers have been classified to determine their highly qualified status, regardless of whether their schools are configured as elementary or middle schools.
- e. *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.
- f. *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 the same teacher teaches English, calculus, history, and science in a self-contained classroom, count these as four classes in the denominator. If the teacher is Highly Qualified to teach English and history, he/she would be counted as Highly Qualified in two of the four subjects in the numerator.
- g. *What is the reporting period?* The reporting period is the school year. The count of classes must include all semesters, quarters, or terms of the school year. For example, if core academic classes are held in summer sessions, those classes should be included in the count of core academic classes. A state determines into which school year classes fall.

1.5.2 Reasons Core Academic Classes Are Taught by Teachers Who Are Not Highly Qualified

In the tables below, estimate the percentages for each of the reasons why teachers who are not highly qualified teach core academic classes. For example, if 900 elementary classes were taught by teachers who are not highly qualified, what percentage of those 900 classes falls into each of the categories listed below? If the three reasons provided at each grade level are not sufficient to explain why core academic classes at a particular grade level are taught by teachers who are not highly qualified, use the row labeled "other" and explain the additional reasons. The total of the reasons is calculated automatically for each grade level and must equal 100% at the elementary level and 100% at the secondary level.

Note: Use the numbers of core academic classes taught by teachers who are not highly qualified from 1.5.1 for both elementary school classes (1.5.2.1) and for secondary school classes (1.5.2.2) as your starting point.

	Percentage
Elementary School Classes	
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	36.00
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	6.20
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	23.40
Other (please explain in comment box below)	34.40
Total	100.00

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other = Expired license, No payroll or license on file

	Percentage
Secondary School Classes	
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)	22.50
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	28.40
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	34.20
Other (please explain in comment box below)	14.90
Total	100.00

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Expired license, No payroll or license on file

1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

In the table below, provide the number of core academic classes for each of the school types listed and the number of those core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified. The percentage of core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified will be calculated automatically. The percentages used for high- and low-poverty schools and the poverty metric used to determine those percentages are reported in the second table. Below the tables are FAQs about these data.

NOTE: No source of classroom-level poverty data exists, so States may look at school-level data when figuring poverty quartiles. Because not all schools have traditional grade configurations, and because a school may not be counted as both an elementary and as a secondary school, States may include as elementary schools all schools that serve children in grades K through 5 (including K through 8 or K through 12 schools).

This means that for the purpose of establishing poverty quartiles, some classes in schools where both elementary and secondary classes are taught would be counted as classes in an elementary school rather than as classes in a secondary school in 1.5.3. This also means that such a 12th grade class would be in a different category in 1.5.3 than it would be in 1.5.1.

School Type	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified
Elementary Schools			
High Poverty Elementary Schools	10,725	10,643	99.24
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	12,920	12,822	99.24
Secondary Schools			
High Poverty secondary Schools	4,457	4,245	95.24
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	11,629	11,447	98.43

1.5.3.1 Poverty Quartile Breaks

In the table below, provide the poverty quartiles breaks used in determining high- and low-poverty schools and the poverty metric used to determine the poverty quartiles. Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

	High-Poverty Schools (more than what %)	Low-Poverty Schools (less than what %)
Elementary schools	81.00	44.20
Poverty metric used	Per guidance Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "high-poverty" schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State. Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "low-poverty" schools as schools in the bottom quartile of poverty in the State. Separately rank order elementary and secondary schools from highest to lowest on your percentage poverty measure. Divide the list into four 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. States may include as elementary schools all schools that serve children in grades K through 5 (including K through 8 or K through 12 schools) and would therefore include as secondary schools those that exclusively serve children in grades 6 and higher. Any discrepancies can be explained based on how the poverty matrices were calculated for x103. North Carolina has reviewed the data for 1.5.3 and are verifying the veracity of the data provided.	
Secondary schools	76.40	48.60
Poverty metric used	Per guidance Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "high-poverty" schools as schools in the top	

quartile of poverty in the State.

Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "low-poverty" schools as schools in the bottom quartile of poverty in the State.

Separately rank order elementary and secondary schools from highest to lowest on your percentage poverty measure. Divide the list into four 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.

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

Any discrepancies can be explained based on how the poverty metrics were calculated for x103.

North Carolina has reviewed the data for 1.5.3 and are verifying the veracity of the data provided.

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

- a. *What is a "high-poverty school"?* Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "high-poverty" schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State.
- b. *What is a "low-poverty school"?* Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "low-poverty" schools as schools in the bottom quartile of poverty in the State.
- c. *How are the poverty quartiles determined?* Separately rank order elementary and secondary schools from highest to lowest on your percentage poverty measure. Divide the list into four 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.
- d. *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 through 5 (including K through 8 or K through 12 schools) and would therefore include as secondary schools those that exclusively serve children in grades 6 and higher.

1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

This section collects annual performance and accountability data on the implementation of Title III programs.

1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs

In the table below, place a check next to each type of language instruction educational programs implemented in the State, as defined in Section 3301(8), as required by Sections 3121(a)(1), 3123(b)(1), and 3123(b)(2).

Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

1. **Types of Programs** = Types of programs described in the subgrantee's local plan (as submitted to the State or as implemented) that is closest to the descriptions in http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/files/rcd/BE021775/Glossary_of_Terms.pdf.
2. **Other Language** = Name of the language of instruction, other than English, used in the programs.

Check Types of Programs	Type of Program	Other Language
<u>Yes</u>	Dual language	Spanish, Chinese (Mandarin), Japanese, German, French
<u>No</u>	Two-way immersion	
<u>Yes</u>	Transitional bilingual programs	Spanish, Chinese (Mandarin), French
<u>Yes</u>	Developmental bilingual	Spanish, Chinese (Mandarin)
<u>Yes</u>	Heritage language	Spanish, Cherokee
<u>Yes</u>	Sheltered English instruction	
<u>No</u>	Structured English immersion	
<u>No</u>	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)	
<u>Yes</u>	Content-based ESL	
<u>Yes</u>	Pull-out ESL	
<u>Yes</u>	Other (explain in comment box below)	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other - ESL Co-teaching

1.6.2 Student Demographic Data

1.6.2.1 Number of ALL LEP Students in the State

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of ALL LEP students in the State who meet the LEP definition under Section 9101(25).

- Include newly enrolled (recent arrivals to the U.S.) and continually enrolled LEP students, whether or not they receive services in a Title III language instruction educational program.
- Do not include Former LEP students (as defined in Section 200.20(f)(2) of the Title I regulation) and monitored Former LEP students (as defined under Section 3121(a)(4) of Title III) in the ALL LEP student count in this table.

Number of ALL LEP students in the State	105,056
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.6.2.2 Number of LEP Students Who Received Title III Language Instruction Educational Program Services

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of LEP students who received services in Title III language instructional education programs.

	#
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	103,508
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.6.2.3 Most Commonly Spoken Languages in the State

In the table below, provide the five most commonly spoken languages, other than English, in the State (for all LEP students, not just LEP students who received Title III Services). The top five languages should be determined by the highest number of students speaking each of the languages listed.

Language	# LEP Students
Spanish; Castilian	87,879
Arabic	1,838
Vietnamese	1,514
Chinese	1,407
Hmong	1,403

Report additional languages with significant numbers of LEP students in the comment box below.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

1.6.3 Student Performance Data

This section collects data on LEP students' English language proficiency, as required by Sections 1111(h)(4)(D) and 3121(a)(2).

1.6.3.1.1 All LEP Students Tested on the State Annual English Language Proficiency Assessment

In the table below, please provide the number of ALL LEP students tested and not tested on annual State English language proficiency (ELP) assessment (as defined in 1.6.2.1).

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	99,582
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	296
Total	99,878
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The number of students tested on the State annual ELP assessment reflects all students who are enrolled during the testing window.	

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

	#
Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	17,651
Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	17.89
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.6.3.2.1 Title III LEP Students Tested on the State Annual English Language Proficiency Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of Title III LEP students tested on annual State English language proficiency assessment.

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	98,096
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	294
Total	98,390
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The number of students tested on the State annual ELP assessment reflects all students who are enrolled during the testing window.	
In the table below, provide the number of Title III students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time and whose progress cannot be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO 1. Report this number ONLY if the State did not include these students in establishing AMAO 1/ making progress target and did not include them in the calculations for AMAO 1/ making progress (# and % making progress).	
	#
Number of Title III students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time whose progress cannot be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO 1.	20,026

1.6.3.2.2 Title III LEP English Language Proficiency Results

This section collects information on Title III LEP students' development of English and attainment of English proficiency.

Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:

1. **Annual Measureable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs)** = State targets for the number and percent of students making progress and attaining proficiency.
2. **Making Progress** = Number and percent of Title III LEP students that met the definition of "Making Progress" as defined by the State and submitted to ED in the Consolidated State Application (CSA), or as amended.
3. **Attained Proficiency** = Number and percent of Title III LEP students that met the State definition of "Attainment" of English language proficiency submitted to ED in the Consolidated State Application (CSA), or as amended.
4. **Results** = Number and percent of Title III LEP students that met the State definition of "Making Progress" and the number and percent that met the State definition of "Attainment" of English language proficiency.

In the table below, provide the State targets for the number and percent of students making progress and attaining English proficiency for this reporting period. Additionally, provide the results from the annual State English language proficiency assessment for Title III-served LEP students who participated in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12. If your State uses cohorts, provide us with the range of targets, (i.e., indicate the lowest target among the cohorts, e.g., 10% and the highest target among a cohort, e.g., 70%).

	Results		Targets	
	#	%	#	%
Making progress	46,394	59.43	43,793	56.10
Attained proficiency	17,254	17.59	12,654	12.90
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.				

1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments

This section collects data on LEP students assessed in their native language (Section 1111(b)(6)) to be used for AYP determinations.

1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language

In the table below, check "Yes" if the specified assessment is used for AYP purposes.

State offers the State reading/language arts content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
State offers the State mathematics content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
State offers the State science content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.6.3.5.2 Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given

In the table below, report the language(s) in which native language assessments are given for *ESEA* accountability determinations for mathematics.

Language(s)
English Only
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

1.6.3.5.3 Native Language of Reading/Language Arts Tests Given

In the table below, report the language(s) in which native language assessments are given for *ESEA* accountability determinations for reading/language arts.

Language(s)
English Only
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

1.6.3.5.4 Native Language of Science Tests Given

In the table below, report the language(s) in which native language assessments are given for *ESEA* accountability determinations for science.

Language(s)
English Only
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students

This section collects data on the performance of former LEP students as required by Sections 3121(a)(4) and 3123(b)(8).

1.6.3.6.1 Title III Served MFLEP Students by Year Monitored

In the table below, report the unduplicated count of monitored former LEP students during the two consecutive years of monitoring, which includes both MFLEP students in AYP grades and in non-AYP grades.

Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) students include:

- Students who have transitioned out of a language instruction educational program.
- Students who are no longer receiving LEP services and who are being monitored for academic content achievement for 2 years after the transition.

Table 1.6.3.6.1 Definitions:

1. **# Year One** = Number of former LEP students in their first year of being monitored.
2. **# Year Two** = Number of former LEP students in their second year of being monitored.
3. **Total** = Number of monitored former LEP students in year one and year two. This is automatically calculated.

# Year One	# Year Two	Total
15,729	13,235	28,964
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

1.6.3.6.2 MFLEP Students Results for Mathematics

In the table below, report the number of MFLEP students who took the annual mathematics assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned out of language instruction educational programs and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:

1. **# Tested** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in mathematics in all AYP grades.
2. **# At or Above Proficient** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual mathematics assessment.
3. **% Results** = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the number tested.
4. **# Below proficient** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual mathematics assessment. This will be automatically calculated.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
22,013	20,013	90.91	2,000
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.6.3.6.3 MFLEP Students Results for Reading/Language Arts

In the table below, report results for MFLEP students who took the annual reading/language arts assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned out of language instruction educational programs and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

Table 1.6.3.6.3 Definitions:

1. **# Tested** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in reading/language arts in all AYP grades.
2. **# At or Above Proficient** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment.
3. **% Results** = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the total number tested. This will be automatically calculated.
4. **# Below proficient** = State-aggregated number MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
22,049	16,984	77.03	5,065

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

1.6.3.6.4 MFLEP Students Results for Science

In the table below, report results for MFLEP students who took the annual science assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned out of language instruction educational programs and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are MFLEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

Table 1.6.3.6.4 Definitions:

1. **# Tested** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in science.
2. **# At or Above Proficient** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual science assessment.
3. **% Results** = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the total number tested. This will be automatically calculated.
4. **# Below proficient** = State-aggregated number MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual science assessment.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
10,989	8,783	79.93	2,206

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

1.6.4 Title III Subgrantees

This section collects data on the performance of Title III subgrantees.

1.6.4.1 Title III Subgrantee Performance

In the table below, report the number of Title III subgrantees meeting the criteria described in the table. Do not leave items blank. If there are zero subgrantees who met the condition described, put a zero in the number (#) column. Do not double count subgrantees by category.

Note: Do not include number of subgrants made under Section 3114(d)(1) from funds reserved for education programs and activities for immigrant children and youth. (Report Section 3114(d)(1) subgrants in 1.6.5.1 ONLY.)

	#
# - Total number of subgrantees for the year	90
# - Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	59
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	74
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	84
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	73
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	0
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2010-11 and 2011-12)	10
# - Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2011-12 for not meeting Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years	10
# - Number of subgrantees that have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2008-09, 2009-10, 2010-11, and 2011-12)	14

Provide information on how the State counted consortia members in the total number of subgrantees and in each of the numbers in table 1.6.4.1.

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Each consortium is reported as 1 subgrantee.

1.6.4.2 State Accountability

In the table below, indicate whether the State met all three Title III AMAOs.

Note: Meeting all three Title III AMAOs means meeting each State-set target for each objective: Making Progress, Attaining Proficiency, and Making AYP for the LEP subgroup. This section collects data that will be used to determine State AYP, as required under Section 6161.

State met <u>all</u> three Title III AMAOs	<u>No</u>
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.6.4.3 Termination of Title III Language Instruction Educational Programs

This section collects data on the termination of Title III programs or activities as required by Section 3123(b)(7).

Were any Title III language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> activities terminated for failure to reach program goals?	<u>No</u>
If yes, provide the number of language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> activities for immigrant children and youth terminated.	
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students

This section collects data on education programs and activities for immigrant students.

Note: All immigrant students are not LEP students.

1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students

In the table below, report the unduplicated number of immigrant students enrolled in schools in the State and who participated in qualifying educational programs under Section 3114(d)(1).

Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:

1. **Immigrant Students Enrolled** = Number of students who meet the definition of immigrant children and youth under Section 3301(6) and enrolled in the elementary or secondary schools in the State.
2. **Students in 3114(d)(1) Program** = Number of immigrant students who participated in programs for immigrant children and youth funded under Section 3114(d)(1), using the funds reserved for immigrant education programs/activities. This number should not include immigrant students who only receive services in Title III language instructional educational programs under Sections 3114(a) and 3115(a).
3. **3114(d)(1) Subgrants** = Number of subgrants made in the State under Section 3114(d)(1), with the funds reserved for immigrant education programs/activities. Do not include Title III Language Instruction Educational Program (LIEP) subgrants made under Sections 3114(a) and 3115(a) that serve immigrant students enrolled in them.

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants
12,544	995	15

If state reports zero (0) students in programs or zero (0) subgrants, explain in comment box below.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development

This section collects data on teachers in Title III language instruction educational programs as required under Section 3123 (b)(5).

1.6.6.1 Teacher Information

This section collects information about teachers as required under Section 3123 (b)(5).

In the table below, report the number of teachers who are working in the Title III language instruction educational programs as defined under Section 3301(8) and reported in 1.6.1 (Types of language instruction educational programs) even if they are not paid with Title III funds.

Note: Section 3301(8) v The term 'Language instruction educational program' means an instruction course v (A) in which a limited English proficient child is placed for the purpose of developing and attaining English proficiency, while meeting challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards, as required by Section 1111(b)(1); and (B) that may make instructional use of both English and a child's native language to enable the child to develop and attain English proficiency and may include the participation of English proficient children if such course is designed to enable all participating children to become proficient in English as a second language.

	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	1,686
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	418

Explain in the comment box below if there is a zero for any item in the table above.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

By survey, LEAs reported the following for 2011-2012:
 ESL Certified Teachers = 1690
 Dual Language, Transitional, and Developmental Bilingual Teachers = 175
 Heritage Language Teachers = 60

EDEN data collection does not identify all teachers working in Title III Language Instruction Educational Programs.

* This number should be the total additional teachers needed for the next 5 years, not the number needed for each year. Do not include the number of teachers currently working in Title III English language instruction educational programs.

1.6.6.2 Professional Development Activities of Subgrantees Related to the Teaching and Learning of LEP Students

In the tables below, provide information about the subgrantee professional development activities that meet the requirements of Section 3115(c)(2).

Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:

1. **Professional Development Topics** = Subgrantee professional development topics required under Title III.
2. **#Subgrantees** = Number of subgrantees who conducted each type of professional development activity. A subgrantee may conduct more than one professional development activity. (Use the same method of counting subgrantees, including consortia, as in 1.6.1 and 1.6.4.)
3. **Total Number of Participants** = Number of teachers, administrators and other personnel who participated in each type of the professional development activities reported.
4. **Total** = Number of all participants in professional development (PD) activities.

Type of Professional Development Activity	# Subgrantees	
Instructional strategies for LEP students	90	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	86	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	88	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	74	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	82	
Other (Explain in comment box)	0	
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	80	16,392
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	60	1,834
PD provided to principals	63	1,463
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	53	875
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	19	356
PD provided to community based organization personnel	40	3,065
Total	315	23,985

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities

This section collects data on State grant activities.

1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process

In the table below, report the time between when the State receives the Title III allocation from ED, normally on July 1 of each year for the upcoming school year, and the time when the State distributes these funds to subgrantees for the intended school year. Dates must be submitted using the MM/DD/YY format.

Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:

1. **Date State Received Allocation** = Annual date the State receives the Title III allocation from US Department of Education (ED).
2. **Date Funds Available to Subgrantees** = Annual date that Title III funds are available to approved subgrantees.
3. **# of Days/\$\$ Distribution** = Average number of days for States receiving Title III funds to make subgrants to subgrantees beginning from July 1 of each year, except under conditions where funds are being withheld.

Example: State received SY 2011-12 funds July 1, 2011, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2011, for SY 2011-12 programs. Then the "# of days/\$\$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
07/08/11	9/28/11	82
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Funds were dispursed to NC immediately prior to a holiday weekend; they were marked "received" as soon as feasible the following week.		

1.6.7.2 Steps To Shorten the Distribution of Title III Funds to Subgrantees

In the comment box below, describe how your State can shorten the process of distributing Title III funds to subgrantees.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Title III application process is consistently being refined to better streamline the review process and accomodate utilization of technological processes to increase efficiency.

1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS

In the table below, provide the number of schools identified as persistently dangerous, as determined by the State, by the start of the school year. For further guidance on persistently dangerous schools, refer to Section B "Identifying Persistently Dangerous Schools" in the Unsafe School Choice Option Non-Regulatory Guidance, available at: <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/unsafeschoolchoice.pdf>.

	#
Persistently Dangerous Schools	0
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS PROGRAM

This section collects data on homeless children and youths and the McKinney-Vento grant program.

In the table below, provide the following information about the number of LEAs in the State who reported data on homeless children and youths and the McKinney-Vento program. The totals will be will be automatically calculated.

	#	# LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	173	173
LEAs with subgrants	42	42
Total	215	215
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

1.9.1 All LEAs (with and without McKinney-Vento subgrants)

The following questions collect data on homeless children and youths in the State.

1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youths

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youths by grade level enrolled in public school at any time during the regular school year. The totals will be automatically calculated:

Age/Grade	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	47	219
K	525	2,156
1	499	1,986
2	461	1,839
3	445	1,955
4	434	1,902
5	469	1,878
6	453	1,660
7	390	1,545
8	394	1,545
9	393	1,708
10	308	1,256
11	290	1,090
12	426	1,379
Ungraded		
Total	5,534	22,118

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. There were no children classified as "ungraded" in our 2011-12 collection.

1.9.1.2 Primary Nighttime Residence of Homeless Children and Youths

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youths by primary nighttime residence enrolled in public school at any time during the regular school year. The primary nighttime residence should be the student's nighttime residence when he/she was identified as homeless. The totals will be automatically calculated.

	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	708	2,182
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	4,008	17,304
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	285	712
Hotels/Motels	533	1,920
Total	5,534	22,118

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Data may be updated when CSPP I reopens in February 2013. These are preliminary numbers due to organizational reorg and resulting personnel changes, and this is the first cut. Further review may result in changes.

1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants

The following sections collect data on LEAs with McKinney-Vento subgrants.

1.9.2.1 Homeless Children and Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youths by grade level who were served by McKinney-Vento subgrants during the regular school year. The total will be automatically calculated.

Age/Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by Subgrants
Age Birth Through 2	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	139
K	1,673
1	1,583
2	1,479
3	1,584
4	1,519
5	1,497
6	1,275
7	1,211
8	1,186
9	1,307
10	965
11	834
12	1,096
Ungraded	
Total	17,348

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

1.9.2.2 Subgroups of Homeless Students Served

In the table below, please provide the following information about the homeless students served during the regular school year.

	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied homeless youth	1,423
Migratory children/youth	58
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	3,067
Limited English Proficient (LEP) students	1,471

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

1.9.3 Academic Achievement of Homeless Students

The following questions collect data on the academic achievement of enrolled homeless children and youths.

1.9.3.1 Reading Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of enrolled homeless children and youths who were tested on the State *ESEA* reading/language arts assessment and the number of those tested who scored at or above proficient. Provide data for grades 9 through 12 only for those grades tested for *ESEA*.

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient
3	2,063	922
4	2,040	1,008
5	2,038	1,035
6	1,827	1,001
7	1,654	766
8	1,621	792
High School	1,058	772

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

1.9.3.2 Mathematics Assessment

This section is similar to 1.9.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State mathematics assessment.

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient
3	2,059	1,321
4	2,039	1,410
5	2,040	1,285
6	1,827	1,090
7	1,654	1,052
8	1,623	1,091
High School	1,036	668

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

1.9.3.3 Science Assessment

This section is similar to 1.9.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State science assessment.

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient
3		
4		
5	2,038	1,082
6		
7		
8	1,630	895
High School	876	603

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

1.10 MIGRANT CHILD COUNTS

This section collects the Title I, Part C, Migrant Education Program (MEP) child counts which States are required to provide and may be used to determine the annual State allocations under Title I, Part C. The child counts should reflect the reporting period of September 1, 2011 through August 31, 2012. This section also collects a report on the procedures used by States to produce true, accurate, and valid child counts.

To provide the child counts, each SEA should have sufficient procedures in place to ensure that it is counting only those children who are eligible for the MEP. Such procedures are important to protecting the integrity of the State's MEP because they permit the early discovery and correction of eligibility problems and thus help to ensure that only eligible migrant children are counted for funding purposes and are served. If an SEA has reservations about the accuracy of its child counts, it must inform the Department of its concerns and explain how and when it will resolve them under Section 1.10.3.4 *Quality Control Processes*.

Note: In submitting this information, the Authorizing State Official must certify that, to the best of his/her knowledge, the child counts and information contained in the report are true, reliable, and valid and that any false Statement provided is subject to fine or imprisonment pursuant to 18 U.S.C. 1001.

FAQs on Child Count:

a. How is "out-of-school" defined? Out-of-school means youth up through age 21 who are entitled to a free public education in the State but are not currently enrolled in a K-12 institution. This could include students who have dropped out of school, youth who are working on a GED outside of a K-12 institution, and youth who are "here-to-work" only. It does not include preschoolers, who are counted by age grouping.

b. How is "ungraded" defined? Ungraded means the children are served in an educational unit that has no separate grades. For example, some schools have primary grade groupings that are not traditionally graded, or ungraded groupings for children with learning disabilities. In some cases, ungraded students may also include special education children, transitional bilingual students, students working on a GED through a K-12 institution, or those in a correctional setting. (Students working on a GED outside of a K-12 institution are counted as out-of-school youth.)

1.10.1 Category 1 Child Count

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number by age/grade of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, resided in your State for one or more days during the reporting period of September 1, 2011 through August 31, 2012. This figure includes all eligible migrant children who may or may not have participated in MEP services. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

- Children age birth through 2 years
- Children served by the MEP (under the continuation of services authority) after their period of eligibility has expired when other services are not available to meet their needs
- Previously eligible secondary-school children who are receiving credit accrual services (under the continuation of services authority).

Age/Grade	12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	830
K	406
1	376
2	358
3	331
4	287
5	289
6	244
7	244
8	195
9	239
10	169
11	112
12	97
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	1,578
Total	5,755

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. North Carolina has requested be allowed to resubmit its data for Category 1 and Category 2 Child Count, reported in Part 1 of the Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for the Title I, Part C (Education of Migratory Children) program. In an effort to comprehensively increase the quality of all state data, NC is now fully implementing a state longitudinal data system, CEDARS, from which EDEN files are now reported. Due to delays in this first year of implementing new work flow processes, data corrections are needed at this time.

1.10.1.1 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases

In the space below, explain any increases or decreases from last year in the number of students reported for Category 1 greater than 10 percent.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

N/A

1.10.2 Category 2 Child Count

In the table below, enter by age/grade the unduplicated statewide number of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, were served for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods that occurred within the reporting period of September 1, 2011 through August 31, 2012. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. Count a child who moved to different schools within the State and who was served in both traditional summer and year-round school intersession programs only once. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

- Children age birth through 2 years
- Children served by the MEP (under the continuation of services authority) after their period of eligibility has expired when other services are not available to meet their needs
- Previously eligible secondary-school children who are receiving credit accrual services (under the continuation of services authority).

Age/Grade	Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	365
K	177
1	215
2	211
3	201
4	161
5	162
6	128
7	124
8	115
9	133
10	90
11	54
12	42
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	483
Total	2,661
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.10.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases

In the space below, explain any increases or decreases from last year in the number of students reported for Category 2 greater than 10 percent.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Category 2 (Summer Served) Child Count has shown an increase for several reasons: Last spring's Service Delivery update meetings (held in October and May) and webinars stressed the need for developing summer instruction for migratory children, especially in those counties seeing an increase in tomato and blueberry workers during the summer months. In fact, it was the expectation of the SEA that all programs would provide summer instruction, either through a home visit program (in counties with smaller numbers of students) or a formal summer program.

In addition, the number of Out of School Youth (OSY) receiving instructional services increased. In 2010-2012, 266 OSY received instructional services, and in 2011-2012, 309 received instructional services, even though the total number of OSY decreased. This has come, in part, as a result of our participation in the Out of School Youth Consortium Incentive Grants. The grants have enabled us to hold OSY-specific professional development across the state.

Thirdly, we stressed accurate completion of monthly Service Records by local program staff. We held 4 webinars on the procedures for and importance of timely submission of records, and greatly improved accountability in service provision. The improvement in recordkeeping allowed for a more accurate count of actual services performed. We also closely monitor service provision through both Consolidated Monitoring and Program Quality Reviews. The Program Quality Reviews give us an opportunity to troubleshoot problems in all aspects of the MEP and to provide immediate technical assistance.

1.10.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures

The following question requests information on the State's MEP child count calculation and validation procedures.

1.10.3.1 Student Information System

In the space below, respond to the following questions: What system(s) did your State use to compile and generate the Category 1 and Category 2 child count for this reporting period (e.g., NGS, MIS 2000, COEStar, manual system)? Were child counts for the last reporting period generated using the same system(s)? If the State's Category 2 count was generated using a different system from the Category 1 count, please identify each system.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

NC uses the MIS2000 system to compile and generate the Category 1 and Category 2 child counts. Data files are sent to the Common Educational Data and Reporting System (CEDARS), NC longitudinal system, and from there EDEN files are generated and loaded into EdFacts.

This is the same system used for the last reporting period.

1.10.3.2 Data Collection and Management Procedures

In the space below, respond to the following questions: How was the child count data collected? What data were collected? What activities were conducted to collect the data? When were the data collected for use in the student information system? If the data for the State's Category 2 count were collected and maintained differently from the Category 1 count, please describe each set of procedures.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

How was the child count data collected?

The child count data is collected in MIS2000 through its main two windows, COE data and Student data. The COE data is collected from the paper COE completed during the eligibility interview. Beginning with the second year of eligibility, the student data is collected from schools, migrant families, and migrant OSY through the enrollment verification process and through the on-going monthly process of reporting services provided to migrant children.

What data were collected?

The Certificate of Eligibility (COE) data collected is standardized for the entire state. The sections of the COE contain the following data: Section I: Family Data; Section II: Child/Youth Data; Section III: Qualifying move & work; Section IV: Comments; Section V: Paren/Guardian/Spouse/Worker Signature; Section VI: Eligibility Data Certification; Data collection is done year round. All information collected in the handwritten COE is loaded into MIS2000.

Section II: Child/Youth data is used to enroll the child/youth in the migrant program. The information in this section includes: child/youth full name (Paternal, Maternal, First, Middle), Suffix, Mother's maiden name, "Race", "Sex", Date of Birth, Age, DOB Verification, Birth Place (City, State, Country), Current School, Enrollment Date, Grade, and Residency Date.

Section III: Qualifying move & work data is used specifically to determine eligibility. The information in this section includes: The child listed moved From (District, City, State, Country) and To (District, City, State); Qualifying Arrival Date; The child moved With, To Join, or On his/her own; Qualifying worker moved in order to obtain Qualifying work, Any work, or Qualifying work but didn't find it. Qualifying work is/was: Temporary, Seasonal, Agricultural Related, Fishing Related; Qualifying Activity; Worker's Name, and Relationship to the child(ren). The School History panel collects school/migrant program enrollment information. This panel contains the following enrollment data: School Name, Enroll Date, Withdraw Date, Residency Only Verification Date, Type, Grade, Termination Type, Termination Date, and Immunization flag. This information is collected through the handwritten COE the first year of eligibility. For the second and third year of eligibility, this information is collected from schools, families, and out-of-school youth during the enrollment verification process conducted in the beginning of the school year and in the beginning of the summer period.

Services provided to migrant children are also loaded into MIS2000. This information is provided by the local migrant program to each Data Specialist and it is entered in the Supplemental Program Panel. This panel collects Service Code, Service Name, Start Date, End Date, Funding, Schedule, and Provider.

What activities were conducted to collect the data?

In North Carolina, the COE is the legal document used to enroll migrant children into the Migrant Education Program (MEP). A North Carolina MEP Recruiter or any other assigned person must be trained and authorized by the State Educational Agency (SEA) or by the Local Educational Agency (LEA) to conduct eligibility interviews and to complete a COE.

The State ID&R plan targets the recruitment and services of: Out-of-School pre-kindergarten children; Students attending schools; Out-of-school youth. The State ID&R plan focuses its intervention in three major areas: local school systems; community agencies and business; county employment opportunities.

Recruiters know seasonal timelines for specific crops and migrant activities in their counties or regions and recruit accordingly. Migrant recruitment and identification is done year round. In addition, some counties have health fairs that provide services and also serve as a forum for identification and recruitment of new families.

A North Carolina MEP Data Specialist or any other assigned person must be trained and authorized by the SEA to enter data into MIS2000. The Data Specialist is responsible for entering each COE, MEP/school enrollment information, and services provided into MIS2000.

The MEP/School enrollment information is verified every year, twice a year (regular school term and summer term), by the Data Specialist and Recruiter with schools, migrant families, and/or Out-of-School youths through the "Enrollment Verification" process. This process verifies eligibility/services and residency of every migrant child in the state. Every year, the child is re-enrolled in the migrant program if the child is still eligible or is receiving services after the end of eligibility and if he/she is still residing in the LEA.

On an on-going basis recruiters and service providers report into MIS2000 all services provided to migrant children paid in part or whole with migrant funds. The information is provided at least monthly by the recruiters, tutors, or service coordinators to the Data Specialist, who keeps this data updated into MIS2000.

When were the data collected for use in the student information system?

The COE is reviewed by the MEP COE Reviewer to verify that based on the recorded data, the child/youth is eligible for MEP services. Once the COE is signed by the COE Reviewer, the Data Specialist enters the data to the state database in the MIS2000 software.

The Enrollment Verification process is done twice a year. First, in the beginning of the regular school year and then, in the beginning of summer. After each child's eligibility/services and residency in the LEA is verified, the child's re-enrollment information is entered by the Data Specialist into MIS2000.

Services provided to migrant children are uploaded into MIS2000 on an on-going basis.

The data collected from each LEA (or LOA) MEP is then uploaded to the state migrant server. This server maintains the statewide migrant database, which is then used to generate the Migrant Child Count and Consolidated State Performance Reports.

Participant migrant counties have access to search and download students from the state server. Through communication with the three Data Specialists, each county or sub-grantee is responsible for maintaining and updating COEs and their databases with school history information, health, supplemental programs, student profile and family data. Data collected from COEs is loaded to the migrant server in its entire form. The upload process to the state server is maintained all year long.

Data Specialists are required to enter COEs and school enrollment information into MIS2000 within 2 weeks after the day the families are interviewed. Data Specialists are instructed to upload any data changes in local databases to the state server the same day changes are made. School enrollments for students identified in any previous terms coincide with regular school enrollments. In North Carolina, schools typically start late August and end in mid June. Summer enrollment begins in mid June and depends on the length of summer school. Withdrawals are done on or before August 31. The data manager runs a preliminary report in the middle of September to confirm the activities done by each LEA or Regional Recruiter. The report is given to each data specialist comparison of data between the state server and local databases. Data specialists then check with each of their counties. Data specialists, LEAs, and Regional Recruiters have two (2) weeks to verify the preliminary report and to modify or update their data. A copy of the state database is created by the data manager at end of September and used to generate the final Child Count, Consolidated State Performance Reports, and data files that are uploaded into CEDARS.

In the space below, describe how the child count data are inputted, updated, and then organized by the student information system for child count purposes at the State level.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Each Regional Data Specialist enters eligible migrant children data into the MIS2000 database. The Data Specialist keys COEs into the MIS2000 software from a handwritten COE (hard copy), which has been uploaded to the MIS2000 secure server after being reviewed by the local COE Reviewer. (In cases of very small programs, the Data Specialist is also the COE Reviewer.). The local reviewer is typically a Director or Program Coordinator. The original COE hard copies are maintained by the local programs; in case of Regional Recruiters, the hard copies are maintained by the State ID and R Coordinator.

A unique identification number is created for each migrant student in MIS2000. Before entering any new student, the software assists users to do a student search. This feature prevents users from duplicating students. Any duplicates that are created by mistake can be identified by running local reports that check for potential duplicated records. Records can be matched by checking same DOB, close DOB, Matching DOB + Last Name or First Name, Matching DOB Last Name + First Name, or Matching DOB or Last + First Name.

Data Specialists ran all the reports that find potential duplicates three times during the 11-12 year. Duplicate records were merged into one. The criteria used to match duplicates are: find the same student's last name, student's first name, middle initial, DOB, mother's last name and mother's first name. The merge job was done by one of the regional data specialists in a machine dedicated to resolve duplicates. Each regional data specialist rotated every 4 months. The merged or split records were then made available on the MSEdD online tool for use by local programs.

Uploads are done frequently to the state database to synchronize regional Data Specialists' databases with the state migrant server. COE data is loaded to MIS2000 within 2 weeks of identifying students. Data entry personnel upload data to the state server as soon as changes are made to the LEA MEP database in order to keep the rest of the state with the latest student information available.

Once data is entered into MIS2000 it is available to be used, edited and deleted by the LEA MEP through the online MSedd database (nc.msedd.com). After uploading changes to the server, data is available at state level for the same purposes. Every time that new information needs to be added or current information need to be modified, the Data Specialists access the COE or Student record in MIS2000 and update the data as needed. Records can be accessed by student Id, COE Id, student name, parents' name, district, school, birthday, or birth city. When the record is uploaded to the server, the updated data is available at the state level.

LEAs and Regional Recruiters are required to conduct an enrollment verification process every year, twice a year (it is part of the ID&R plan components). LEAs and Regional Recruiters develop and implement their own procedure. The most common practice is to conduct enrollment verification during the first months of the new school year for K-12 migrant students. Enrollment verification for OS migrant students, pre-k or youth, takes place throughout the year, usually during the peak season. A second verification is done during summer.

The Data Specialist runs the enrollment verification report from MIS2000 and gets all students that resided in his/her LEA during the past period. For K-12 students, the Data Specialist contacts schools or checks the school computer system (NCWISE) to get enrollment information on students that are still in school. If the student is enrolled in the school and is still eligible or receiving MEP services, a new school history line is added to the student's record in MIS2000 and the student information is updated if needed. If the student is not enrolled in school or he/she is an OS pre-k or youth, the Recruiter contacts the family to verify they are still in the county. The Recruiter reports the findings to the Data Specialist, who will make the needed changes in the student's record in MIS2000, for example, enroll date, withdrawal date, type of enrollment, grade, address, family information, etc.

A Certification is signed by the local MEP Director and Data Specialist from each LEA and submitted to NCMEP. The Certification confirms that all children's records were reviewed and that eligible children were re-enrolled in the program.

If the data for the State's Category 2 count were collected and maintained differently from the Category 1 count, please describe each set of procedures.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

N/A

1.10.3.3 Methods Used To Count Children

In the space below, respond to the following question: How was each child count calculated? Please describe the compilation process and edit functions that are built into your student information system(s) specifically to produce an accurate child count. In particular, describe how your system includes and counts only:

- Children who were between age 3 through 21
- Children who met the program eligibility criteria (e.g., were within 3 years of a last qualifying move, had a qualifying activity)
- Children who were resident in your State for at least 1 day during the eligibility period (September 1 through August 31)
- Children who—in the case of Category 2—received a MEP-funded service during the summer or intersession term
- Children once per age/grade level for each child count category.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

<p>Children who were between age 3 through 21 The student's age must be between 3 and 21 years during the reporting year. MIS2000 computes the fields "Student ThirdBDay" is less than the end date of the report period and the "Student Twenty.SecondBDay" is greater than the start date of the reporting period.</p> <p>A child will be counted if they turn 3 or 22 during the reporting period.</p> <p>Children who met the program eligibility criteria (e.g., were within 3 years of a last qualifying move, had a qualifying activity) The End of Eligibility date must be greater than the beginning of the reporting period.</p> <p>The Qualifying Arrival Date must be equal to or greater than 09/01/08 and be within 36 months of the Residency date.</p> <p>The End of Eligibility date must be greater than the date qualifying the student (i.e. Enroll Date). The exceptions are Withdraw and Supplemental Program End dates. (Withdraw is defined as ending an enrollment period in a school history line). In MIS2000 the supplemental program section has a field named "End Date". This date can be the same as the Withdraw date from a history line, but it can stand on its own if the Local Educational Agency wants to end a supplemental program before they are withdrawn from a school history enrollment line. End of Eligibility is not the same as Program End Date. End of Eligibility means the student has ended the 36 months of eligibility, has graduated, or has died.</p> <p>A child will be counted in the A1 count if the qualifying arrival date plus 36 months is equal or greater than the beginning of the reporting period and if any of the following dates falls between the reporting range period: enroll date, withdraw date, supplemental program start date, or supplemental program end date. Also, the interview date has to be before or equal to the last date of the reporting period.</p> <p>A child will be counted in the A2 count if in addition to the criteria for the A1 count the child's end of eligibility is equal to or after the beginning of the summer program and if the child's summer services were paid in whole or part with MEP funds.</p> <p>For this purpose, the reporting period for the A1 count and for Intersession in the A2 count goes from 09/01/11 to 08/31/12. The reporting period for summer in the A2 count goes from 06/16/12 to 08/31/12.</p> <p>Children who were resident in your State for at least 1 day during the eligibility period (September 1 through August 31) For a child to be counted, one of the following dates must be between 09/01 and 08/31 of the reporting year: Enroll, Withdraw, Supplemental Program Start or End dates. Enrollment means the student has a school history line in MIS2000 showing enrollment in a school or in the migrant program (for out-of-school children). Supplemental Programs are defined in North Carolina as services above and beyond the basic educational programs provided by the local school district. Students who were resident in North Carolina for at least one day during the reporting period and who have activity in MIS2000 in any of the fields listed above will be counted in category 1 count.</p> <p>Children who—in the case of Category 2—received a MEP-funded service during the summer or intersession term For a child to be counted in category 2 count the enrollment type must be summer. Summer participants are defined as children receiving supplemental programs either as supportive services or basic educational programs provided by the local school district during 06/16 - 08/31. At least one service must be paid in whole or in part with migrant funds.</p> <p>For a child with a summer enrollment type to be counted, one of the following dates must fall within the specified summer time frame (default is 06/16 to 08/31): Enroll or Withdraw and Supplemental Program Start or End date.</p> <p>Students who were residents in North Carolina for at least one day and have eligibility during the summer/intersession</p>

reporting period, and have received supplemental services for at least one day during the summer/intersession reporting period, and MIS2000 confirms activity in any of the fields named above will be counted in category 2.

Children counted once per age/grade level for each child count category.

Each student is counted only one time for the state regardless of the number of school history lines on the student's record for the state. Migrant children are assigned a unique ID. Throughout the year duplicate records are merged in to one to make sure there are no duplicates in the state and local database. Student's duplicate records are merged if the student's last name, student's first name, student's middle initial, student's DOB, mother's last name and mother's first name match more than one record.

If the student has been in more than one LEA during the same reporting period, the student is counted in the last LEA he/she resided during that time

If your State's Category 2 count was generated using a different system from the Category 1 count, please describe each system separately.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

N/A

1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes

In the space below, respond to the following question: What steps are taken to ensure your State properly determines and verifies the eligibility of each child included in the child counts for the reporting period of September 1 through August 31 before that child's data are included in the student information system(s)?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The N.C. MEP ID&R Quality Assurance system includes the following components that address child eligibility before the data is entered into MIS2000:

1. Using a Standardized Certificate of Eligibility (COE)

N.C. MEP uses a standardized COE. The COE has been revised as needed to reflect changes in eligibility law interpretation.

A guide including instructions on how to complete the COE is also available for training and reference purposes.

N.C. MEP requires a handwritten COE for all enrollments. The Recruiter's signature indicates that he or she gathered the data directly from the parent, guardian, or youth in a face-to-face interview. An MIS2000 electronic COE is also kept for all N.C. MEP students.

2. Training

A N.C. MEP Recruiter or any other assigned person must be trained and authorized by the SEA or by the LEA to conduct eligibility interviews and to complete a COE. The LEA must inform the SEA of any new Recruiter or any other assigned person trained to recruit in the LEA.

The SEA MEP staff provides training at four different levels:

One-on-one - Upon the LEA request to the SEA, the statewide recruitment coordinator, state data manager, or both provided one-on-one basic training to new Recruiters and Data Specialists.

Service Area Meetings - Service Area Meetings were conducted in October, 2011 and March, 2012. The agendas of those meetings included training and updates on ID&R and data collection.

Webinars - Trainings through Webinars were conducted year-round on various topics that included ID&R and Data Collection.

"Help Desk" type assistance is offered to all Recruiters and Data Specialists by telephone or e-mail from the ID&R Coordinator and the MEP Consultant.

3. Determining Accuracy of Written Eligibility Documentation

The LEA must assign an authorized and qualified MEP staff member to review and sign each COE. The COE Reviewer must be a person other than the Recruiter/interviewer who originally made the eligibility determination. Regional Recruiters are assigned the State ID&R Coordinator to review and sign each COE.

The COE Reviewer must sign each COE after completing the COE Review Form. His or her signature certifies that the COE was reviewed and that he/she verified, based on the recorded data, that the child or youth is eligible for MEP services. The COE Review Form is attached to the original COE and kept on file for a period of 11 years.

A COE should be included in the MIS2000 software only when the COE includes all the information necessary to verify the child or youth's eligibility.

4. Resolving Eligibility Questions

The State ID&R Plan established a process for resolving eligibility questions, which establishes the order in which MEP staff should be contacted when questions arise. It includes three components: reviewing written documentation and guidance on eligibility, discussing any questions with local MEP staff (the local COE Reviewer or the Director) and consulting the ID&R coordinator or data manager. SEA staff is available as needed by phone, e-mail, list serve, or by visiting the site.

Questions about Quality Control Process:

Training is mandatory when a new recruiter is hired in an LEA, participation is recorded when the new recruiter receives a certificate of participation. Training is also mandatory when there are new regulations and guidelines, attendance is recorded when trainees register for the webinar or sign in at the meeting. All training opportunities are available on demand when required. Training is also mandatory when there are new regulations and guidelines, attendance is recorded when trainees register for a webinar or sign in at meetings. We hold two to three large regional or statewide meetings each year to discuss all aspects of the Migrant Education Program. In addition, webinars are given every month or two on topics that come up during monitoring visits and Program Quality Reviews. We also send out a monthly MEP Update newsletter with pertinent information for all local MEP staff. All training opportunities are available on demand when required, and site visits include time for ongoing professional development. All attendees are recorded either through sign-in sheets, electronic rosters, or site visit reports.

In the space below, describe specifically the procedures used and the results of any re-interview processes used by the SEA during the reporting period to test the accuracy of the State's MEP eligibility determinations. In this description, please include the number of eligibility determinations sampled, the number for which a test was completed, and the number found eligible.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

North Carolina's Identification and Recruitment Coordinator used a stratified methodology for random sampling in order to generate information that represented all subgroups and narrowed the number of interviews in each location. The ID&R Coordinator selected the interviews according to monitoring visits already planned in chosen LEAs, the days families/students were available, and regions. The re-interviewers used the NC Migrant Education Prospective Re-Interview Form for each family/student interviewed. There were 50 re-interviews conducted which affected 116 students. There were 5 COEs that needed corrections which affected 12 students. None were withdrawn so all 116 students are still eligible. The ID&R Coordinator contacted the Data Specialists when COE corrections were needed and discussed the results with MEP staff during the state's service area meetings.

Questions about re-interviews:

Re-interviews were conducted both face-to-face and over the phone (when a family was not in NC). The re-interviews were conducted by the Program Specialist and the ID&R Coordinator who both were independent of the original eligibility. Both interviewers were trained by OME at their webinar and updated at the National Conference.

In the space below, respond to the following question: Throughout the year, what steps are taken by staff to check that child count data are inputted and updated accurately (and—for systems that merge data—consolidated accurately)?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1. Before adding a student to each local database a search is done at the state server to avoid duplicate records. Three times a year each Regional Data Specialist runs reports that allow it to check for possible duplicated students. The criteria used are: same student's last name, student's first name, student's middle initial, student's DOB, mother's last name and mother's first name. Two records or more matching these criteria will be considered duplicates. Duplicates are merged into a single record once the state database manager executes the merge job from the state server. The job does not run automatically based on the description of the matching fields. Individual COEs are checked by the Data Specialist to ensure the merge report names match respective hard copies of COEs and that we are not deleting students by mistake. In addition, the Data Specialist makes sure the fields for the merge criteria are the same in any records found to be duplicated. School history is not checked in the determination of duplicated records but histories from both records are kept in the merged record.

2. Throughout the year the state MEP take five more steps to verify accuracy of data in MIS2000:

1. Desk Monitoring: student records are formally revised once a year. The MEP consultant verifies that data in the system is accurate and updated. This process is done by visually revising a random sample of student's records for LEAs included in formal monitoring or Program Quality Review visits. Revising records in the system allow us to verify if data is accurate and updated. Some of the data monitored during this process are: school history, test, credit accrual, family, supplemental programs, and eligibility data. The COE Comments Report is also used to verify eligibility data in COEs.

2. Eligibility data check: every LEA and Regional Recruiter verifies once a year that the eligibility information of every current family is correct. This is done by running the COE Summary Report and reviewing the data displayed there. The report shows eligibility data of current families. A formal report is sent to the state ID&R coordinator indicating corrections and action plan.

3. Site visit: throughout the year the MEP monitoring team visits LEAs during Monitoring or Program Quality Reviews and interviews local MEP staff in order to learn how they collect and enter data into MIS2000. Some reports are run from the system to verify data status and evaluate them along with local staff.

4. Data Quality Reviews: twice a year regional data specialists run reports to verify different items on the data statewide. The most common reports are Student Data Verification and Services Report. Items like DOB, QAD, Student Grade, Race/Ethnicity, Date of Services, Date of Enrollments, etc. are reviewed on all students. Data specialists rotate on the items they check so that a same item is checked by a different person each time. If errors are found, the person who entered the data erroneously is contacted and asked to verify and fix errors immediately. A report on the type of errors, number of errors and in what LEAs the errors are found is sent to the MEP Data Manager once a year.

5. Ongoing basis: the state MEP data manager is available to LEAs on an ongoing basis to meet LEA needs and resolve questions. Webinars are scheduled as needed. Data manager has the opportunity to verify how data is being entering into MIS2000 by talking to Data Specialist, visually revising records in the system, and running reports.

3. In addition to those reports, the state has implemented the Enrollment Verification Procedure since the 07-08 year. LEAs and Regional Recruiters are required to run this report from the system, verify the eligibility and residency of every child in the report, and to re-enroll them in MIS2000 if they meet the requirements. In this way, this report helps LEAs and Regional Recruiters in verifying that only children who need to be re-enrolled are re-enrolled and that every child who has to be re-enrolled is re-enrolled.

In the space below, respond to the following question: What final steps are taken by State staff to verify the child counts produced by your student information system(s) are accurate counts of children in Category 1 and Category 2 prior to their submission to ED?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1. A copy of the state database is made before getting the final counts from the system. In this way, if the counts need to be obtained again, they will be gotten from the same data. In NC this process is called "freezing the data". Before freezing the data, the state data manager gets the preliminary category 1 and 2 counts from the state server. These counts are sent to each data specialist and LEAs for comparison. Each LEA is instructed to get the same preliminary counts from the local database, compare the local counts to the state counts, and correct the students' records or report to the state any discrepancy between the local and state counts.

2. Also, the preliminary category 1 and category 2 counts are manually revised at the state level for possible duplicate records. If duplicate records are found, they are merged into one record and the counts are obtained again from the system.

3. After freezing the data, the final category 1 and 2 are taken from the system. Because there is a lapse in time of approximately one month between when the data is frozen and when the counts are submitted to ED, these counts are reviewed one more time. In this way, every duplicate record merged or student deleted from the server after freezing the data is removed from the final file.

4. Some random students are selected from the counts and their records are reviewed in MIS2000. This action allows us to make sure that every child who is being counted meets the categories criteria.

5. Data files are sent to CEDARS team. After EDEN files are extracted from CEDARS they are compared to original counts extracted from MIS2000 to verify counts match. If there is any discrepancy a research process starts to make sure every child from MIS2000 is loaded into CEDARS and included in EDEN extracts. The same process is followed after loading EDEN files into EdFacts and CSPR report is populated.

In the space below, describe those corrective actions or improvements that will be made by the SEA to improve the accuracy of its MEP eligibility determinations in light of the prospective re-interviewing results.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

NC will take the following actions to improve the accuracy of our MEP eligibility determinations:

1. Focus on training for interviewing and re-interviewing, and assist programs in collaborating with other nearby programs to carryout re-interviewing.

2. Provide training on completing the COE Review Form and the Re-Interview Form in order to increase consistency. Update the forms according to Federal Regulations and Guidance.

3. Update the ID&R Manual, COE Instructions, and provide training to MEP Staff on its contents.

4. Work closely with Recruiters to refine skills in interviewing and determining eligibility.

Develop online training reviews to keep skills fresh through continued practice with difficult eligibility questions.

In the space below, discuss any concerns about the accuracy of the reported child counts or the underlying eligibility determinations on which the counts are based.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

N/A