

**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 2012-13

NORTH CAROLINA



PART I DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 20, 2013
PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 2014

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) 2012-13 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 2012-13 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, December 20, 2013**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 14, 2014**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2012-13, 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 2012-13 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 2012-13 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, 2012-13 <input type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2012-13		
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 7, 2014, 11:40:15 AM
Signature		Date

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART I**

For reporting on
School Year 2012-13



**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.

Response	Options
State has revised or changed	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 "Not Applicable" to indicate that changes were not made or will not be made in the subject area.

Acceptable responses are a school year (e.g., 2012-13) 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 content standards, describe the revisions or changes below.

The response is limited to 1,000 characters.

Common Core State Standards in English Language Arts/Reading and Mathematics and the Essential Standards in Science were adopted in 2010, aligned assessments were administered 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.

Response	Options
	No revisions or changes to academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science made or planned.
State has revised or changed	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 "Not Applicable" to indicate that changes were not made or will not be made in the subject area.

Acceptable responses are a school year (e.g., 2012-13) 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 October 2013, the State Board of Education adopted Academic Achievement Standards (cut scores) and Academic Achievement Descriptors for the new assessments in English Language Arts/Reading, Mathematics, and Science.

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.

Response	Options
	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 "Not Applicable" to indicate that changes were not made or will not be made in the subject area.

Acceptable responses are a school year (e.g., 2012-13) 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.

Assessment aligned to the new content standards were administered 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 2012-13, 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 2012-13 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)	Yes
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)	Yes
Developing or improving assessments of English language proficiency necessary to comply with Section 1111(b)(7)	Yes
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	Yes
Developing multiple measures to increase the reliability and validity of State assessment systems	No
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	Yes
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	Yes
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	Yes
Other	No Response
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.

The "Asian/Pacific Islander" row in the tables below represent either the value reported by the state to the Department of Education for the major racial and ethnic group "Asian/Pacific Islander" or an aggregation of values reported by the state for the major racial and ethnic groups "Asian" and "Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander or Pacific Islander" (and "Filipino" in the case of California). When the values reported in the Asian/Pacific Islander row represent the U. S. Department of Education aggregation of other values reported by the state, the detail for "Asian" and "Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander" are also included in the following rows. Disaggregated reporting for assessment participation data is done according to the provisions outlined within each state's Accountability Workbook. Accordingly, not every state uses major racial and ethnic groups which enable detail of Asian American/Pacific Islander (AAPI) populations.

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	794,067	789,840	99.47
American Indian or Alaska Native	10,923	10,859	99.41
Asian or Pacific Islander	21,219	21,090	99.39
Asian	20,501	20,380	99.41
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	718	710	98.89
Black or African American	208,213	206,712	99.28
Hispanic or Latino	108,966	108,373	99.46
White	415,341	413,549	99.57
Two or more races	29,405	29,257	99.50
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	106,118	104,842	98.80
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	44,337	43,956	99.14
Economically disadvantaged students	428,874	426,295	99.40
Migratory students	1,162	1,149	98.88
Male	406,250	403,745	99.38
Female	387,817	386,095	99.56
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities (IDEA) 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 (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	18,660	17.80
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	55,590	53.02
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.00
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	23,393	22.31
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	7,199	6.87
Total	104,842	////////////////////////////////////
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Participation on a particular assessment is determined by the IEP team, who confirms eligibility criteria has been met.		

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	799,756	797,088	99.67
American Indian or Alaska Native	10,946	10,913	99.70
Asian or Pacific Islander	22,126	21,984	99.36
Asian	21,386	21,249	99.36
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	740	735	99.32
Black or African American	209,056	208,155	99.57
Hispanic or Latino	110,550	110,121	99.61
White	417,550	416,484	99.74
Two or more races	29,528	29,431	99.67
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	106,274	105,574	99.34
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	46,853	46,487	99.22
Economically disadvantaged students	431,355	429,564	99.58
Migratory students	1,196	1,188	99.33
Male	409,177	407,566	99.61
Female	390,579	389,522	99.73

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

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 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	#
Recently arrived LEP students who took an assessment of English language proficiency in lieu of the State's reading/language arts assessment	2,466

1.2.4 Participation of Students with Disabilities (IDEA) 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 (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	21,269	20.15
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	49,401	46.79
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.00
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	27,655	26.19
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	7,200	6.82
LEP < 12 months, took ELP	49	0.05
Total	105,574	

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Participation on a particular assessment is determined by the IEP team, who confirms eligibility criteria has been met.

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	325,578	321,046	98.61
American Indian or Alaska Native	4,452	4,358	97.89
Asian or Pacific Islander	8,714	8,501	97.56
Asian	8,404	8,197	97.54
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	310	304	98.06
Black or African American	85,876	84,433	98.32
Hispanic or Latino	41,054	40,414	98.44
White	173,813	171,838	98.86
Two or more races	11,669	11,502	98.57
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	40,907	39,869	97.46
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	14,140	13,684	96.78
Economically disadvantaged students	165,685	163,146	98.47
Migratory students	411	400	97.32
Male	165,276	162,670	98.42
Female	160,302	158,376	98.80

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

1.2.6 Participation of Students with Disabilities (IDEA) 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 (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	9,808	24.60
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	18,321	45.95
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.00
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	8,634	21.66
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	3,106	7.79
Total	39,869	

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Participation on a particular assessment is determined by the IEP team, who confirms eligibility criteria has been met.

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.

The "Asian/Pacific Islander" row in the tables below represent either the value reported by the state to the Department of Education for the major racial and ethnic group "Asian/Pacific Islander" or an aggregation of values reported by the state for the major racial and ethnic groups "Asian" and "Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander or Pacific Islander" (and "Filipino" in the case of California). When the values reported in the Asian/Pacific Islander row represent the U. S. Department of Education aggregation of other values reported by the state, the detail for "Asian" and "Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander" are also included in the following rows. Disaggregated reporting for academic achievement data is done according to the provisions outlined within each state's Accountability Workbook. Accordingly, not every state uses major racial and ethnic groups which enable detail of Asian American/Pacific Islander (AAPI) populations.

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.

1.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts

This section is similar to 1.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State's reading/language arts assessment, and the difference noted in the paragraph below.

The student group "limited English proficient (LEP) students" does not include recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months unless a state chooses to include these students. Do not include former LEP students.

1.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science

This section is similar to 1.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State's science assessment administered at least one in each of the following grade spans: 3 through 5, 6 through 9, and 10 through 12.

Limited English Proficient (LEP) students 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	107,427	50,300	46.82
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,357	465	34.27
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,042	2,174	71.47
Asian	2,959	2,134	72.12
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	83	40	48.19
Black or African American	26,506	7,125	26.88
Hispanic or Latino	16,587	5,864	35.35
White	55,528	32,584	58.68
Two or more races	4,407	2,088	47.38
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	14,785	2,851	19.28
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	11,048	3,060	27.70
Economically disadvantaged students	60,331	19,523	32.36
Migratory students	225	48	21.33
Male	55,136	25,563	46.36
Female	52,291	24,737	47.31
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The State Board of Education adopted Academic Achievement Standards for the new assessments in Mathematics which are aligned with the Common Core State Standards.			

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	107,424	48,537	45.18
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,357	430	31.69
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,038	1,895	62.38
Asian	2,955	1,856	62.81
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	83	39	46.99
Black or African American	26,508	7,197	27.15
Hispanic or Latino	16,582	4,526	27.29
White	55,532	32,352	58.26
Two or more races	4,407	2,137	48.49
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	14,790	2,576	17.42
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	11,042	1,807	16.36
Economically disadvantaged students	60,332	18,092	29.99
Migratory students	225	41	18.22
Male	55,134	23,301	42.26
Female	52,290	25,236	48.26
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The State Board of Education adopted Academic Achievement Standards for the new assessments in English Language Arts/Reading which are aligned with the Common Core State Standards.			

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 or Pacific Islander			
<i>Asian</i>			
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
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 Grade 3 Science assessment.			

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	115,752	55,111	47.61
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,575	495	31.43
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,207	2,314	72.15
<i>Asian</i>	3,113	2,267	72.82
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	94	47	50.00
Black or African American	29,055	7,745	26.66
Hispanic or Latino	17,514	6,381	36.43
White	59,781	35,931	60.10
Two or more races	4,620	2,245	48.59
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	16,615	3,086	18.57
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	7,276	1,258	17.29
Economically disadvantaged students	64,910	21,288	32.80
Migratory students	182	58	31.87
Male	59,293	28,626	48.28
Female	56,459	26,485	46.91
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The State Board of Education adopted Academic Achievement Standards for the new assessments in Mathematics which are aligned with the Common Core State Standards.			

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	115,737	50,562	43.69
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,576	440	27.92
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,200	1,917	59.91
<i>Asian</i>	3,106	1,876	60.40
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	94	41	43.62
Black or African American	29,058	7,465	25.69
Hispanic or Latino	17,502	4,708	26.90
White	59,783	33,928	56.75
Two or more races	4,618	2,104	45.56
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	16,618	2,497	15.03
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	7,258	536	7.38
Economically disadvantaged students	64,903	18,385	28.33
Migratory students	182	37	20.33
Male	59,282	24,761	41.77
Female	56,455	25,801	45.70
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The State Board of Education adopted Academic Achievement Standards for the new assessments in English Language Arts/Reading which are aligned with the Common Core State Standards.			

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 or Pacific Islander			
Asian			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (IDEA)			
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	115,760	55,270	47.75
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,500	483	32.20
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,174	2,369	74.64
<i>Asian</i>	3,062	2,319	75.73
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	112	50	44.64
Black or African American	29,909	8,356	27.94
Hispanic or Latino	17,111	6,820	39.86
White	59,668	35,151	58.91
Two or more races	4,398	2,091	47.54
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	16,593	2,634	15.87
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,748	1,300	19.26
Economically disadvantaged students	64,765	21,657	33.44
Migratory students	201	63	31.34
Male	59,304	27,927	47.09
Female	56,456	27,343	48.43
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The State Board of Education adopted Academic Achievement Standards for the new assessments in Mathematics which are aligned with the Common Core State Standards.			

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	115,760	45,679	39.46
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,500	388	25.87
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,169	1,796	56.67
<i>Asian</i>	3,057	1,758	57.51
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	112	38	33.93
Black or African American	29,905	6,275	20.98
Hispanic or Latino	17,109	4,044	23.64
White	59,679	31,361	52.55
Two or more races	4,398	1,815	41.27
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	16,599	2,110	12.71
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,740	356	5.28
Economically disadvantaged students	64,765	15,832	24.45
Migratory students	201	30	14.93
Male	59,302	22,159	37.37
Female	56,458	23,520	41.66
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The State Board of Education adopted Academic Achievement Standards for the new assessments in English Language Arts/Reading which are aligned with the Common Core State Standards.			

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	115,747	52,566	45.41
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,498	514	34.31
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,173	2,046	64.48
Asian	3,062	2,002	65.38
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	111	44	39.64
Black or African American	29,895	7,777	26.01
Hispanic or Latino	17,112	5,413	31.63
White	59,672	34,732	58.20
Two or more races	4,397	2,084	47.40
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	16,593	2,893	17.44
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,747	739	10.95
Economically disadvantaged students	64,753	20,088	31.02
Migratory students	200	40	20.00
Male	59,290	28,169	47.51
Female	56,457	24,397	43.21
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The State Board of Education adopted Academic Achievement Standards for the new assessments in Science.			

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	117,644	45,795	38.93
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,606	363	22.60
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,058	2,112	69.06
Asian	2,960	2,081	70.30
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	98	31	31.63
Black or African American	31,195	5,934	19.02
Hispanic or Latino	16,437	4,866	29.60
White	61,066	30,916	50.63
Two or more races	4,282	1,604	37.46
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	16,008	1,558	9.73
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,533	600	10.84
Economically disadvantaged students	65,174	15,689	24.07
Migratory students	162	48	29.63
Male	60,259	22,715	37.70
Female	57,385	23,080	40.22
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The State Board of Education adopted Academic Achievement Standards for the new assessments in Mathematics which are aligned with the Common Core State Standards.			

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	117,649	54,556	46.37
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,607	490	30.49
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,054	1,926	63.06
Asian	2,956	1,890	63.94
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	98	36	36.73
Black or African American	31,199	8,646	27.71
Hispanic or Latino	16,431	5,213	31.73
White	61,077	36,269	59.38
Two or more races	4,281	2,012	47.00
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	16,012	2,039	12.73
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,522	399	7.23
Economically disadvantaged students	65,174	20,170	30.95
Migratory students	162	42	25.93
Male	60,266	26,329	43.69
Female	57,383	28,227	49.19
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The State Board of Education adopted Academic Achievement Standards for the new assessments in English Language Arts/Reading which are aligned with the Common Core State Standards.			

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 or Pacific Islander			
Asian			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (IDEA)			
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 Grade 6 Science assessment.			

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	116,477	44,862	38.52
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,736	404	23.27
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,029	2,127	70.22
Asian	2,920	2,096	71.78
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	109	31	28.44
Black or African American	31,136	5,804	18.64
Hispanic or Latino	15,272	4,368	28.60
White	61,202	30,649	50.08
Two or more races	4,102	1,510	36.81
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	15,125	1,198	7.92
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,403	508	9.40
Economically disadvantaged students	62,783	14,586	23.23
Migratory students	153	25	16.34
Male	59,578	22,217	37.29
Female	56,899	22,645	39.80

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The State Board of Education adopted Academic Achievement Standards for the new assessments in Mathematics which are aligned with the Common Core State Standards.

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	116,489	55,701	47.82
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,738	551	31.70
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,023	1,995	65.99
Asian	2,913	1,951	66.98
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	110	44	40.00
Black or African American	31,142	8,878	28.51
Hispanic or Latino	15,266	5,267	34.50
White	61,214	37,005	60.45
Two or more races	4,106	2,005	48.83
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	15,143	2,010	13.27
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,390	423	7.85
Economically disadvantaged students	62,789	20,441	32.56
Migratory students	153	34	22.22
Male	59,586	27,004	45.32
Female	56,903	28,697	50.43

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The State Board of Education adopted Academic Achievement Standards for the new assessments in English Language Arts/Reading which are aligned with the Common Core State Standards.

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 or Pacific Islander			
Asian			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (IDEA)			
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 Grade 7 Science assessment.			

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	113,987	38,946	34.17
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,626	328	20.17
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,912	1,823	62.60
Asian	2,797	1,779	63.60
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	115	44	38.26
Black or African American	30,807	4,737	15.38
Hispanic or Latino	14,050	3,450	24.56
White	60,670	27,336	45.06
Two or more races	3,922	1,272	32.43
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	14,494	1,002	6.91
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,451	491	9.01
Economically disadvantaged students	59,872	11,786	19.69
Migratory students	133	21	15.79
Male	58,004	19,639	33.86
Female	55,983	19,307	34.49
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The State Board of Education adopted Academic Achievement Standards for the new assessments in Mathematics which are aligned with the Common Core State Standards.			

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	113,995	46,721	40.99
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,625	432	26.58
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,906	1,653	56.88
Asian	2,791	1,606	57.54
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	115	47	40.87
Black or African American	30,813	7,237	23.49
Hispanic or Latino	14,047	4,147	29.52
White	60,679	31,564	52.02
Two or more races	3,925	1,688	43.01
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	14,512	1,461	10.07
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,445	363	6.67
Economically disadvantaged students	59,870	15,470	25.84
Migratory students	134	21	15.67
Male	58,013	21,556	37.16
Female	55,982	25,165	44.95
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The State Board of Education adopted Academic Achievement Standards for the new assessments in English Language Arts/Reading which are aligned with the Common Core State Standards.			

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	113,828	67,269	59.10
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,620	730	45.06
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,909	2,202	75.70
<i>Asian</i>	2,794	2,128	76.16
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	115	74	64.35
Black or African American	30,737	11,960	38.91
Hispanic or Latino	14,022	6,892	49.15
White	60,620	43,071	71.05
Two or more races	3,920	2,414	61.58
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	14,438	3,699	25.62
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,438	1,254	23.06
Economically disadvantaged students	59,759	26,702	44.68
Migratory students	132	37	28.03
Male	57,894	35,339	61.04
Female	55,934	31,930	57.09
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The State Board of Education adopted Academic Achievement Standards for the new assessments in Science.			

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	102,793	39,498	38.42
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,459	425	29.13
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,668	1,657	62.11
Asian	2,569	1,617	62.94
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	99	40	40.40
Black or African American	28,104	5,782	20.57
Hispanic or Latino	11,402	3,364	29.50
White	55,634	26,929	48.40
Two or more races	3,526	1,341	38.03
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	11,222	1,106	9.86
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,497	133	5.33
Economically disadvantaged students	48,460	11,835	24.42
Migratory students	93	9	9.68
Male	52,171	19,103	36.62
Female	50,622	20,395	40.29

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The State Board of Education adopted Academic Achievement Standards for the new assessments in Mathematics which are aligned with the Common Core State Standards.

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	107,568	56,238	52.28
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,503	539	35.86
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,877	1,857	64.55
Asian	2,768	1,786	64.52
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	109	71	65.14
Black or African American	29,321	9,742	33.23
Hispanic or Latino	11,891	4,871	40.96
White	58,300	37,209	63.82
Two or more races	3,676	2,020	54.95
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	11,851	1,708	14.41
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,624	132	5.03
Economically disadvantaged students	50,086	18,045	36.03
Migratory students	96	20	20.83
Male	54,661	25,634	46.90
Female	52,907	30,604	57.84

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The State Board of Education adopted Academic Achievement Standards for the new assessments in English Language Arts which are aligned with the Common Core State Standards.

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	91,471	46,629	50.98
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,240	434	35.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,419	1,685	69.66
<i>Asian</i>	2,341	1,639	70.01
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	78	46	58.97
Black or African American	23,801	7,328	30.79
Hispanic or Latino	9,280	3,725	40.14
White	51,546	31,787	61.67
Two or more races	3,185	1,670	52.43
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	8,838	1,777	20.11
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,499	90	6.00
Economically disadvantaged students	38,634	13,602	35.21
Migratory students	68	30	44.12
Male	45,486	23,552	51.78
Female	45,985	23,077	50.18
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The State Board of Education adopted Academic Achievement Standards for the new assessments in Science.			

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

For an SEA that has not received ESEA flexibility, or an SEA that received ESEA flexibility without the optional waiver to not make AYP determinations for LEAs and schools:

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 2012-13. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2012-13	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2012-13
Schools			
Districts			

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

For an SEA with an approved ESEA flexibility request that includes the optional waiver to not make AYP determinations for LEAs and schools:

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 all of their AMOs, the 95 percent participation rate, and other academic indicator ³ based on data for SY 2012-13. The percentage will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Met All AMOs, 95 Percent Participation Rate, and Other Academic Indicator in SY 2012-13	Percentage that Met All AMOs, 95 Percent Participation Rate and Other Academic Indicator in SY 2012-13
Schools	2,439	840	34.44
Districts	115	7	6.09

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

³ For a high school, the other academic indicator is always graduation rate.

1.4.2 Title I School Accountability

For an SEA that has not received ESEA flexibility, or an SEA that received ESEA flexibility without the optional waiver to not make AYP determinations for LEAs and schools:

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 2012-13. 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 2012-13	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2012-13
All Title I schools			
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools			
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools			

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

For an SEA with an approved ESEA flexibility request that includes the optional waiver to not make AYP determinations for LEAs and schools:

In the table below, provide the total number of public Title I schools by type and the total number of those schools that made all of their AMOs, the 95 percent participation rate, and the other academic indicator ⁴ based on data for SY 2012-13. Include only public Title I schools. Do not include Title I programs operated by LEAs in private schools. The percentage will be calculated automatically.

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools that Met All AMOs, 95 Percent Participation Rate, and Other Academic Indicator in SY 2012-13	Percentage of Title I Schools that Met All AMOs, 95 Percent Participation Rate, and Other Academic Indicator in SY 2012-13
All Title I schools	1,283	329	25.64
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	1,230	302	24.55
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	53	27	50.94

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. NC does not understand the way that the SWP schools are being calculated and has raised concerns with the number that is being displayed above. We have reviewed both the CSPR/EDEN crosswalk as well as the Data Key provided by PSP and have yet to get a satisfactory explanation for how this number was derived. We are at the deadline and have been instructed to Certify in spite of our concerns, and reserve the right to request a reopen once we have been provided enough information to fully understand this prepop.

⁴ For a high school, the other academic indicator is always graduation rate.

1.4.3 Accountability of Districts That Received Title I Funds

For an SEA that has not received ESEA flexibility, or an SEA that received ESEA flexibility without the optional waiver to not make AYP determinations for LEAs and schools:

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 2012-13. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds in SY 2012-13	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2012-13	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2012-13

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

For an SEA with an approved ESEA flexibility request that includes the optional waiver to not make AYP determinations for LEAs and schools:

In the table below, provide the total number of districts that received Title I funds and the total number of those districts that met all of their AMOs, the 95 percent participation rate, and other academic indicator ⁵ based on data for SY 2012-13. The percentage will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds in SY 2012-13	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Met All AMOs, 95 percent Participation Rate, and Other Academic Indicator	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Met All AMOs, 95 percent Participation Rate, and Other Academic Indicator
115	7	6.09

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

⁵ For a high school, the other academic indicator is always graduation rate.

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 2012-13 (based on SY 2011-12 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2012-13
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	
Extension of the school year or school day	
Replacement of staff members, not including the principal, relevant to the school's low performance	
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	
Replacement of the principal	
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Through its ESEA Flexibility Request, North Carolina has an approved waiver to the requirements in ESEA section 1111 for an SEA to identify for improvement or corrective action, as appropriate, a school that, for two consecutive years or more, fails to make AYP, and for a school so identified to take certain corrective actions. The waiver was approved on May 29, 2012. Therefore no schools were identified for corrective action in 2012-13.	

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 2012-13 (based on SY 2011-12 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)	
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	
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Through its ESEA Flexibility Request, North Carolina has an approved waiver to the requirements in ESEA section 1111 for an SEA to identify for improvement or corrective action, as appropriate, a school that, for two consecutive years or more, fails to make AYP, and for a school so identified to take certain restructuring actions. The waiver was approved on May 29, 2012. Therefore no schools were identified for restructuring action in 2012-13.	

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.

N/A

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.

Through its ESEA Flexibility Request, North Carolina has an approved waiver to the requirements in ESEA section 1116(c) for an SEA to identify for improvement or corrective action, as appropriate, an LEA that, for two consecutive years or more, fails to make AYP, and for an LEA so identified and its SEA to take certain improvement actions. The waiver was approved on May 29, 2012. Therefore no districts were identified for corrective action in 2012-13.

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 2012-13 (based on SY 2011-12 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 2012-13
Implemented a new curriculum based on State standards	
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	
Restructured the district	
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2011-12 and beginning of SY 2012-13 as a corrective action)	

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Through its ESEA Flexibility Request, North Carolina has an approved waiver to the requirements in ESEA section 1116(c) for an SEA to identify for improvement or corrective action, as appropriate, an LEA that, for two consecutive years or more, fails to make AYP, and for an LEA so identified and its SEA to take certain improvement actions. The waiver was approved on May 29, 2012. Therefore no districts were identified for corrective action in 2012-13.

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 2012-13 data and the results of those appeals.

Entity	# 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. None

In the table below, provide the data by which processing appeals based on SY 2012-13 data was complete.

Processing Appeals completion	Date
Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2012-13 data was complete	0

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

In the section below, "schools in improvement" refers to Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of *ESEA*.

1.4.8.5 Use of Sections 1003(a) and (g) School Improvement Funds.

1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2012 (SY 2012-13) 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*: ____ %

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

The data for this question are reported through ED Facts files and compiled in the EDEN012 "Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Allocations to LEAs and Schools" report in the ED Facts Reporting System (ERS). The ED Facts files and data groups used in this report are listed in the C SPR Crosswalk. The C SPR Data Key contains more detailed information on how the data are populated into the report.

Before certifying Part I of the C SPR, a state user must run the EDEN012 report in ERS and verify that the state's data are correct. The final, certified data from this report will be made publicly available alongside the state's certified C SPR PDF.

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 2012-13.

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 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 2012-13 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.

North Carolina has an approved waiver to the requirements in ESEA section 1116(b) for an LEA to identify for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring, as appropriate, a Title I school that fails, for two consecutive years or more, to make AYP, and for a school so identified and its LEA to take certain improvement actions. NC received approval on May 29, 2012, so no Title I schools were identified for improvement in 2012-13.

Title I schools not receiving funds under 1003(a) or 1003(g) are supported through a Statewide System of Support. North Carolina's statewide system of support is coordinated and monitored through three interlocking roundtables. The roundtable structure includes a Strategic Roundtable, an Agency Roundtable, and eight Regional Roundtables. The Strategic Roundtable is comprised of NCDPI senior leadership and meets quarterly to manage the selection of districts and schools that will receive the most intensive support as well as monitoring progress toward the State's priority objectives.

The Agency Roundtable is comprised of all NCDPI division directors and meets monthly to facilitate ongoing initiatives within the statewide system of support. The state's Title I Director serves on this roundtable. The Roundtable identifies current initiatives being provided to the region by the agency; reviews comprehensive needs assessment outcomes; identifies gaps and redundancies; targets available resources to identified needs; and routes continued services through NCDPI staff assigned to regions, districts, and schools.

The eight Regional Roundtables are comprised of regional NCDPI staff and representatives of the Regional Education Services Areas (RESAs). The Regional Roundtables meet monthly to identify current initiatives underway in each district in the region, to identify common needs across each region, and to coordinate technical assistance provided for the districts and schools identified as having the greatest need for support. Regional Roundtables are facilitated by NCDPI Regional Leads, one assigned to each of the eight regions across North Carolina. These Regional Leads attend the Agency Roundtable to ensure that communication regarding the needs of districts and schools, as well as initiatives addressing those needs, are continually reassessed and adjusted as appropriate. A Title I consultant serves on each Regional Roundtable in order to ensure that statutory requirements are understood by all parties and appropriate services and support are brokered for Title I schools.

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 Title I school 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.

Public School Choice	# Students
Eligible for public school choice	
Applied to transfer	
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Through its ESEA Flexibility Request, North Carolina has an approved waiver to the requirements in ESEA section 1111 for an SEA to identify for improvement or corrective action, as appropriate, a school that, for two consecutive years or more, fails to make AYP, and for a school so identified to take certain improvement actions. The waiver was approved on May 29, 2012. Therefore no schools were identified for improvement action and no schools offered Public School Choice or Supplemental Educational Services in 2012-13.	

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.

Transportation for Public School Choice	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$

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.

Unable to Provide Public School Choice	# LEAs
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	

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.

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.

The number of students who received supplemental educational services should include all students who were enrolled with a provider and participated in some hours of services. States and LEAs have the discretion to determine the minimum number of hours of participation needed by a student to be considered as having received services.

Supplemental Educational Services	# Students
Eligible for supplemental educational services	
Applied for supplemental educational services	
Received supplemental educational services	
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Through its ESEA Flexibility Request, North Carolina has an approved waiver to the requirements in ESEA section 1111 for an SEA to identify for improvement or corrective action, as appropriate, a school that, for two consecutive years or more, fails to make AYP, and for a school so identified to take certain improvement actions. The waiver was approved on May 29, 2012. Therefore no schools were identified for improvement action and no schools offered Public School Choice or Supplemental Educational Services in 2012-13.	

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.

Spending on Supplemental Educational Services	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Through its ESEA Flexibility Request, North Carolina has an approved waiver to the requirements in ESEA section 1111 for an SEA to identify for improvement or corrective action, as appropriate, a school that, for two consecutive years or more, fails to make AYP, and for a school so identified to take certain improvement actions. The waiver was approved on May 29, 2012. Therefore no schools were identified for improvement action and no schools offered Public School Choice or Supplemental Educational Services in 2012-13.	

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.

Classes	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 <u>NOT</u> Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are <u>NOT</u> Highly Qualified
All classes	83,851	82,626	98.54	1,225	1.46
All elementary classes	45,074	44,795	99.38	279	0.62
All secondary classes	38,777	37,831	97.56	946	2.44

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.

In North Carolina, elementary schools may report their classes as a full-day self-contained classroom or use a departmentalized approach. It is the school's decision as to which they use and they may use both. For example, a K-5 school may use a self-contained approach for grades K-3 and a departmentalized approach for grades 4 and 5.
--

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.

1.5.2.1 Elementary School Classes	
Elementary School Classes	Percentage
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	38.30
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	7.40
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	22.10
Other (please explain in comment box below)	32.20
Total	100.00

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.5.2.2 Secondary School Classes	
Secondary School Classes	Percentage
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)	27.00
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	25.40
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	32.60
Other (please explain in comment box below)	15.00
Total	100.00

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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	9,953	9,855	99.02
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	13,537	13,456	99.40
Secondary Schools			
High Poverty secondary Schools	4,625	4,324	93.49
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	11,688	11,467	98.11

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	78.20	45.40
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.	
Secondary schools	67.20	36.70
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.	

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, Arabic, and Cherokee
<u>No</u>	Two-way immersion	
<u>Yes</u>	Transitional bilingual programs	Spanish
<u>Yes</u>	Developmental bilingual	Spanish
<u>Yes</u>	Heritage language	Spanish, French
<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 and Newcomer Program

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	102,311
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 in the State who received services in Title III language instructional education programs.

LEP Students Receiving Services	#
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	101,143
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	85,572
Arabic	1,911
Vietnamese	1,406
Chinese	1,403
Hmong	1,201

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).

All LEP Testing	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	97,608
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	222
Total	97,830
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

All LEP Results	#
Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	16,913
Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	17.50
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.

Title III LEP Testing		#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment		96,399
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment		222
Total		96,621
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).

Title III First Time Tested		#
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.		20,653

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:

- Annual Measureable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs)** = State targets for the number and percent of students making progress and attaining proficiency.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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%).

Title III Results	Results		Targets	
	#	%	#	%
Making progress	44,184	58.33	42,828	57.10
Attained proficiency	16,752	17.38	13,033	13.50
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).	<u>No</u>
State offers the State mathematics content tests in the students' native language(s).	<u>No</u>
State offers the State science content tests in the students' native language(s).	<u>No</u>
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
16,742	14,603	31,345
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
24,548	10,380	42.28	14,168
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
24,600	7,552	30.70	17,048
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
11,752	4,643	39.51	7,109
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.)

Title III Subgrantees	#
Total number of subgrantees for the year	92
Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	48
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO 1	62
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO 2	86
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO 3	74
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 2011-12 and 2012-13)	4
Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2012-13 for not meeting Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years	5
Number of subgrantees that have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2009-10, 2010-11, 2011-12, and 2012-13)	9

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.

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.

State met <u>all</u> three Title III AMAOs	_No_
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?	_No_
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
12,450	1,141	25

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) – The term ‘ Language instruction educational program ’ means an instruction course – (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.

Title III Teachers	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	1,716
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	674

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 2012-2013:
 ESL Certified Teachers = 1,716
 Dual Language, Transitional, and Developmental Bilingual Teachers = 183
 Heritage Language Teachers = 83

* 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.

Professional Development (PD) Topics	# Subgrantees
Instructional strategies for LEP students	89
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	89
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	90
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	80
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	80
Other (Explain in comment box)	0

PD Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	85	21,451
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	71	1,833
PD provided to principals	65	1,075
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	52	1,055
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	16	307
PD provided to community based organization personnel	42	1,316
Total	////////////////////////////////////	27,037

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 2012-13 funds July 1, 2012, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2012, for SY 2012-13 programs. Then the "# of days/\$\$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
7/9/12	8/29/12	49
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

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 was initiated earlier in an effort to better streamline the review process and 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	#
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 youth 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 youth and the McKinney-Vento program. The totals will be automatically calculated.

LEAs	#	# LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	73	73
LEAs with subgrants	42	42
Total	115	115
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 youth in the State.

1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youth

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youth 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/Youth Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youth Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	111	208
K	506	2,116
1	510	2,158
2	438	1,840
3	355	1,788
4	385	1,854
5	383	1,754
6	391	1,692
7	340	1,651
8	344	1,558
9	372	1,761
10	292	1,332
11	262	1,117
12	379	1,472
Ungraded		
Total	5,068	22,301

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. North Carolina does not administer science assessment in grades 3, 4, 6 or 7 so these grades should be empty per requirements; have logged error ticket number 196007 and are waiting to hear back and will make adjustments if needed.

1.9.1.2 Primary Nighttime Residence of Homeless Children and Youth

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youth 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.

Primary Nighttime Residence	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	638	1,935
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	3,798	17,449
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	86	1,007
Hotels/Motels	546	1,910
Total	5,068	22,301

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

1.9.1.3 Subgroups of Homeless Students Enrolled

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

Special Population	# Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs With Subgrants
Unaccompanied homeless youth	576	2,115
Migratory children/youth	39	71
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	799	3,782
Limited English Proficient (LEP) students	273	1,592

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

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 Youth Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youth 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/Youth Served by Subgrants
Age Birth Through 2	0
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	157
K	1,947
1	1,975
2	1,714
3	1,640
4	1,717
5	1,615
6	1,546
7	1,507
8	1,429
9	1,593
10	1,170
11	972
12	1,302
Ungraded	0
Total	20,284

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.

Subgroup	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied homeless youth	1,807
Migratory children/youth	64
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	3,461
Limited English Proficient (LEP) students	1,511

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 youth.

1.9.3.1 Reading Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of enrolled homeless children and youth who were tested on the State 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	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs Without Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs Without Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs With Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs With Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient
3	266	61	1,526	345
4	313	73	1,614	330
5	288	49	1,560	272
6	316	83	1,443	323
7	278	80	1,412	340
8	282	59	1,319	215
High School	210	67	982	260

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	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs Without Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs Without Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs With Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs With Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient
3	267	58	1,526	339
4	313	72	1,614	358
5	288	62	1,560	377
6	316	44	1,440	202
7	279	41	1,414	229
8	282	26	1,321	155
High School	185	32	910	142

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	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs Without Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs Without Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs With Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs With Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient
3				
4				
5	287	62	1,557	339
6				
7				
8	280	97	1,314	410
High School	156	42	763	213

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. North Carolina does not administer science assessment in grades 3, 4, 6 or 7 so these grades should be empty per requirements; have logged error ticket number 196007 and are waiting to hear back and will make adjustments if needed.