

**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 2015-16

NORTH CAROLINA



PART I DUE THURSDAY, DECEMBER 15, 2016
PART II DUE THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 9, 2017

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) 2015-16 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 2014-15, 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 *EDFacts* 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 2015-16 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Thursday, December 15, 2016**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Thursday, February 9, 2017**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2015-16, 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 2015-16 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 2015-16 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

		OMB Number: 1810-0724
		Expiration Date: 5/31/2018
Consolidated State Performance Report For State Formula Grant Programs under the Elementary And Secondary Education Act as amended in 2001		
Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2015-16 <input type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2015-16		
Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report: North Carolina		
Address: 301 North Wilmington Street Raleigh, NC 267602		
Person to contact about this report:		
Name: Karl Pond		
Telephone: 919-807-3241		
Fax: 919-807-4000		
e-mail: karl.pond@dpi.nc.gov		
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): June Atkinson		
		<u>Wednesday, December 14, 2016, 1:53:43 PM</u>
Signature		Date

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART I**

For reporting on
School Year 2015-16



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 15, 2016
5PM EST**

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

This section requests descriptions of the State's implementation of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)*, as amended, 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
<u>State has revised or changed</u>	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., 2015-16) or Not Applicable.

	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Academic Content Standards	SY 2016-17	N/A	N/A

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.

The State Board of Education approved revisions to the high school mathematics content standards. These changes were not significant and did not have an impact on the NC Math 1 assessment which is used for federal reporting at the high school level.

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.
<u>No Revisions or changes</u>	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., 2015-16) or Not Applicable.

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

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.

n/a

1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics, Reading/Language Arts and Science

Indicate below whether your state has changed or is planning to change the States academic assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts or science since the States 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
<u>No Revisions or changes</u>	No changes to assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts or science made or planned.
	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., 2015-16) or Not Applicable.

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

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.

n/a

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 2015-16, 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 2015-16 that were used for purposes other than the costs of the development of the State assessments and standards required by section 1111(b), for what purposes did your State use the funds? (Enter "yes" for all that apply and "no" for all that do not apply).

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

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENT²

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

Note: States are not required to report these data by the racial/ethnic groups shown in the table below; 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 have been mapped from the major racial and ethnic groups identified in their workbooks to the racial/ethnic groups shown.

² 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	808,111	804,218	99.52
American Indian or Alaska Native	10,274	10,223	99.50
Asian or Pacific Islander	25,042	24,905	99.45
Asian	24,063	23,935	99.47
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	979	970	99.08
Black or African American	206,024	204,606	99.31
Hispanic or Latino	131,961	131,264	99.47
White	402,669	401,237	99.64
Two or more races	32,141	31,983	99.51
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	108,436	107,350	99.00
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	41,501	41,081	98.99
Economically disadvantaged students	397,715	395,530	99.45
Migratory students	1,155	1,144	99.05
Male	414,369	412,136	99.46
Female	393,742	392,082	99.58

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Increased Migrant counts are related to both an increased presence in the field and added accuracy and timeliness of data collection.

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	19,270	17.95
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	79,857	74.39
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	65	0.06
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	8,158	7.60
Total	107,350	////////////////////////////////////

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The 65 students on the modified is not for 2015-16 administrations but rather banked scores for previous years' administrations. The banked scores are used for the federal reporting of students who have a Math I score by the end of 10th grade.

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	815,986	812,375	99.56
American Indian or Alaska Native	10,300	10,249	99.50
Asian or Pacific Islander	26,037	25,937	99.62
Asian	25,028	24,938	99.64
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	1,009	999	99.01
Black or African American	207,162	205,853	99.37
Hispanic or Latino	134,635	133,897	99.45
White	405,559	404,297	99.69
Two or more races	32,293	32,142	99.53
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	108,654	107,668	99.09
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	45,355	44,955	99.12
Economically disadvantaged students	400,828	398,652	99.46
Migratory students	1,214	1,206	99.34
Male	418,433	416,347	99.50
Female	397,553	396,028	99.62

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Increased Migrant counts are related to both an increased presence in the field and added accuracy and timeliness of data collection.

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	3,697

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	19,245	17.87
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	80,186	74.48
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	9	0.01
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	8,166	7.58
LEP < 12 months, took ELP	62	0.06
Total	107,668	////////////////////////////////////
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The 9 students on the modified is not for 2015-16 administrations but rather banked scores for previous years' administrations. The banked scores are used for the federal reporting of students who have an English II score by the end of 10th grade.		

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	332,943	330,545	99.28
American Indian or Alaska Native	4,179	4,133	98.90
Asian or Pacific Islander	10,048	9,977	99.29
Asian	9,664	9,601	99.35
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	384	376	97.92
Black or African American	85,181	84,317	98.99
Hispanic or Latino	49,969	49,562	99.19
White	171,076	170,139	99.45
Two or more races	12,490	12,417	99.42
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	42,211	41,627	98.62
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	11,647	11,420	98.05
Economically disadvantaged students	153,691	152,476	99.21
Migratory students	404	399	98.76
Male	169,322	167,998	99.22
Female	163,621	162,547	99.34

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

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	10,291	24.72
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	27,781	66.74
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	106	0.25
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	3,449	8.29
Total	41,627	////////////////////////////////////

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The 106 students on the modified is not for 2015-16 administrations but rather banked scores for previous years' administrations. The banked scores are used for the federal reporting of students who have a Biology score by the end of 11th grade.

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT³

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

Note: States are not required to report these data by the racial/ethnic groups shown in the table below; 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 have been mapped from the major racial and ethnic groups identified in their workbooks to the racial/ethnic groups shown.

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 States 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 and who took an assessment of English language proficiency in lieu of the States reading/language arts assessment. 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 States science assessment administered at least once 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.

³ 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.

1.3.1.1 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	121,310	62,744	51.72
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,521	618	40.63
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,002	3,058	76.41
<i>Asian</i>	3,825	2,964	77.49
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	177	94	53.11
Black or African American	30,859	10,251	33.22
Hispanic or Latino	22,203	9,600	43.24
White	57,637	36,675	63.63
Two or more races	5,088	2,542	49.96
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	16,114	3,551	22.04
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	13,612	4,805	35.30
Economically disadvantaged students	63,676	24,476	38.44
Migratory students	250	94	37.60
Male	62,314	32,146	51.59
Female	58,996	30,598	51.86
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. n/a			

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	121,279	57,928	47.76
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,521	478	31.43
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,997	2,644	66.15
<i>Asian</i>	3,820	2,558	66.96
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	177	86	48.59
Black or African American	30,854	9,511	30.83
Hispanic or Latino	22,184	7,168	32.31
White	57,634	35,559	61.70
Two or more races	5,089	2,568	50.46
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	16,113	2,962	18.38
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	13,592	2,712	19.95
Economically disadvantaged students	63,667	21,361	33.55
Migratory students	250	57	22.80
Male	62,298	27,887	44.76
Female	58,981	30,041	50.93
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. n/a			

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. North Carolina does not offer 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	118,024	60,348	51.13
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,441	505	35.05
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,878	2,981	76.87
<i>Asian</i>	3,714	2,892	77.87
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	164	89	54.27
Black or African American	30,065	9,229	30.70
Hispanic or Latino	20,825	8,819	42.35
White	57,015	36,416	63.87
Two or more races	4,800	2,398	49.96
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	16,793	3,422	20.38
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,471	1,322	20.43
Economically disadvantaged students	60,372	22,299	36.94
Migratory students	184	58	31.52
Male	60,449	30,928	51.16
Female	57,575	29,420	51.10
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. n/a			

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	118,009	54,002	45.76
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,440	443	30.76
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,875	2,520	65.03
<i>Asian</i>	3,711	2,448	65.97
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	164	72	43.90
Black or African American	30,062	8,492	28.25
Hispanic or Latino	20,810	6,403	30.77
White	57,019	33,908	59.47
Two or more races	4,803	2,236	46.55
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	16,795	2,623	15.62
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,457	546	8.46
Economically disadvantaged students	60,373	18,674	30.93
Migratory students	184	45	24.46
Male	60,440	26,127	43.23
Female	57,569	27,875	48.42
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. n/a			

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			
<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. North Carolina does not offer Grade 4 Science Assessment.			

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	115,533	62,361	53.98
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,412	516	36.54
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,623	2,872	79.27
<i>Asian</i>	3,495	2,797	80.03
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	128	75	58.59
Black or African American	28,927	9,841	34.02
Hispanic or Latino	19,640	9,273	47.21
White	57,375	37,552	65.45
Two or more races	4,556	2,307	50.64
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	16,222	3,071	18.93
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,770	909	19.06
Economically disadvantaged students	57,168	22,543	39.43
Migratory students	171	70	40.94
Male	59,092	31,226	52.84
Female	56,441	31,135	55.16

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

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

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	115,536	49,789	43.09
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,412	408	28.90
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,617	2,242	61.99
<i>Asian</i>	3,488	2,183	62.59
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	129	59	45.74
Black or African American	28,929	7,146	24.70
Hispanic or Latino	19,638	5,603	28.53
White	57,383	32,398	56.46
Two or more races	4,557	1,992	43.71
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	16,227	2,317	14.28
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,756	249	5.24
Economically disadvantaged students	57,180	16,092	28.14
Migratory students	171	38	22.22
Male	59,095	24,026	40.66
Female	56,441	25,763	45.65

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

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	115,483	71,357	61.79
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,408	759	53.91
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,623	2,891	79.80
<i>Asian</i>	3,495	2,812	80.46
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	128	79	61.72
Black or African American	28,906	12,542	43.39
Hispanic or Latino	19,638	10,026	51.05
White	57,354	42,288	73.73
Two or more races	4,554	2,851	62.60
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	16,198	4,491	27.73
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,768	943	19.78
Economically disadvantaged students	57,139	27,593	48.29
Migratory students	170	73	42.94
Male	59,045	36,962	62.60
Female	56,438	34,395	60.94
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.3.1.4 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	107,833	47,771	44.30
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,329	410	30.85
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,320	2,504	75.42
<i>Asian</i>	3,209	2,452	76.41
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	111	52	46.85
Black or African American	26,734	6,191	23.16
Hispanic or Latino	17,399	5,926	34.06
White	54,496	30,785	56.49
Two or more races	4,555	1,955	42.92
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	15,244	1,732	11.36
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,116	437	10.62
Economically disadvantaged students	53,661	15,119	28.18
Migratory students	165	41	24.85
Male	55,654	23,719	42.62
Female	52,179	24,052	46.10

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

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

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	107,823	53,433	49.56
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,329	468	35.21
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,317	2,340	70.55
<i>Asian</i>	3,206	2,276	70.99
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	111	64	57.66
Black or African American	26,737	8,245	30.84
Hispanic or Latino	17,384	6,074	34.94
White	54,501	33,975	62.34
Two or more races	4,555	2,331	51.17
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	15,253	2,145	14.06
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,105	258	6.29
Economically disadvantaged students	53,664	18,068	33.67
Migratory students	164	33	20.12
Male	55,654	25,485	45.79
Female	52,169	27,948	53.57

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

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			
<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. North Carolina does not offer 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	116,204	48,824	42.02
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,486	351	23.62
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,565	2,583	72.45
<i>Asian</i>	3,433	2,530	73.70
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	132	53	40.15
Black or African American	29,215	6,468	22.14
Hispanic or Latino	18,390	5,760	31.32
White	58,826	31,794	54.05
Two or more races	4,722	1,868	39.56
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	15,434	1,340	8.68
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,347	325	7.48
Economically disadvantaged students	56,629	14,622	25.82
Migratory students	141	39	27.66
Male	59,715	24,263	40.63
Female	56,489	24,561	43.48

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

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

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	116,212	54,804	47.16
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,488	449	30.17
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,560	2,438	68.48
<i>Asian</i>	3,428	2,373	69.22
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	132	65	49.24
Black or African American	29,227	8,215	28.11
Hispanic or Latino	18,375	6,196	33.72
White	58,839	35,322	60.03
Two or more races	4,723	2,184	46.24
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	15,444	1,946	12.60
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,327	232	5.36
Economically disadvantaged students	56,643	17,656	31.17
Migratory students	141	30	21.28
Male	59,728	26,316	44.06
Female	56,484	28,488	50.44

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

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			
<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. North Carolina does not offer 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	116,252	44,717	38.47
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,474	343	23.27
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,446	2,377	68.98
<i>Asian</i>	3,310	2,325	70.24
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	136	52	38.24
Black or African American	29,865	5,681	19.02
Hispanic or Latino	17,908	5,018	28.02
White	59,139	29,680	50.19
Two or more races	4,420	1,618	36.61
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	15,238	1,123	7.37
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,924	359	7.29
Economically disadvantaged students	55,607	12,521	22.52
Migratory students	151	31	20.53
Male	59,664	22,084	37.01
Female	56,588	22,633	40.00

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

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

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	116,238	48,292	41.55
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,473	395	26.82
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,444	2,142	62.20
<i>Asian</i>	3,309	2,085	63.01
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	135	57	42.22
Black or African American	29,875	7,395	24.75
Hispanic or Latino	17,881	5,140	28.75
White	59,144	31,366	53.03
Two or more races	4,421	1,854	41.94
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	15,245	1,568	10.29
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,899	237	4.84
Economically disadvantaged students	55,615	14,713	26.46
Migratory students	151	26	17.22
Male	59,661	22,339	37.44
Female	56,577	25,953	45.87

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

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	116,174	74,910	64.48
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,467	733	49.97
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,447	2,849	82.65
<i>Asian</i>	3,311	2,764	83.48
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	136	85	62.50
Black or African American	29,832	13,411	44.96
Hispanic or Latino	17,905	9,676	54.04
White	59,103	45,325	76.69
Two or more races	4,420	2,916	65.97
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	15,231	4,301	28.24
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,922	1,004	20.40
Economically disadvantaged students	55,547	27,862	50.16
Migratory students	151	70	46.36
Male	59,623	38,779	65.04
Female	56,551	36,131	63.89
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.3.1.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - High School

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	109,062	47,395	43.46
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,560	445	28.53
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,071	2,148	69.94
<i>Asian</i>	2,949	2,094	71.01
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	122	54	44.26
Black or African American	28,941	6,850	23.67
Hispanic or Latino	14,899	4,868	32.67
White	56,749	31,490	55.49
Two or more races	3,842	1,594	41.49
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	12,305	1,348	10.95
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,841	138	4.86
Economically disadvantaged students	48,417	13,471	27.82
Migratory students	82	15	18.29
Male	55,248	23,437	42.42
Female	53,814	23,958	44.52

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The NC Math 1 scores include scores from previous years which are banked for federal reporting at grade 10.

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	113,581	57,964	51.03
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,582	538	34.01
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,377	2,294	67.93
<i>Asian</i>	3,244	2,227	68.65
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	133	67	50.38
Black or African American	29,812	9,626	32.29
Hispanic or Latino	15,444	5,855	37.91
White	59,400	37,620	63.33
Two or more races	3,966	2,031	51.21
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	12,529	1,638	13.07
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,122	113	3.62
Economically disadvantaged students	49,536	17,090	34.50
Migratory students	88	20	22.73
Male	57,498	25,925	45.09
Female	56,083	32,039	57.13

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The English II scores include scores from previous years which are banked for federal reporting at grade 10.

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	98,888	47,976	48.52
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,258	455	36.17
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,907	1,904	65.50
<i>Asian</i>	2,795	1,848	66.12
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	112	56	50.00
Black or African American	25,579	7,266	28.41
Hispanic or Latino	12,019	4,491	37.37
White	53,682	32,182	59.95
Two or more races	3,443	1,678	48.74
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	10,198	1,684	16.51
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,730	98	5.66
Economically disadvantaged students	39,790	12,986	32.64
Migratory students	78	20	25.64
Male	49,330	24,218	49.09
Female	49,558	23,758	47.94

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The Biology scores include scores from previous years which are banked for federal reporting at grade 11.

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

Per the *Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA)* FAQs located at the following link, some data in this section are no longer required: <http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/essa/faq/essa-faqs.pdf>

For an SEA that has not received ESEA flexibility, or an SEA that received availability 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 2015-16. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2015-16	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2015-16
Schools			
Districts			

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. no longer required

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 ⁴ based on data for SY 2015-16. The percentage will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Met All AMOs, 95 Percent Participation Rate, and Other Academic Indicator in SY 2015-16	Percentage that Met All AMOs, 95 Percent Participation Rate and Other Academic Indicator in SY 2015-16
Schools			
Districts			

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. no longer required

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

1.4.2 Title I School Accountability

Per the *ESSA* FAQs located at the following link, some data in this section are no longer required: <http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/essa/faq/essa-faqs.pdf>

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 2015-16. 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 2015-16	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2015-16
All Title I schools			
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools			
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools			

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. no longer required

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 ⁵ based on data for SY 2015-16. 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 2015-16	Percentage of Title I Schools that Met All AMOs, 95 Percent Participation Rate, and Other Academic Indicator in SY 2015-16
All Title I schools			
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools			
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools			

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. no longer required

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

1.4.3 Accountability of Districts That Received Title I Funds

Per the ESSA FAQs located at the following link, some data in this section are no longer required: <http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/essa/faq/essa-faqs.pdf>

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 2015-16. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds in SY 2015-16	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2015-16	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2015-16

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. no longer required

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 indicator⁶ based on data for SY 2015-16. The percentage will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds in SY 2015-16	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Met All AMOs, 95 percent Participation Rate, and Other Academic Indicator in SY 2015-16	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Met All AMOs, 95 percent Participation Rate, and Other Academic Indicator in SY 2015-16

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. no longer required

⁶ 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 2015-16 (based on SY 2014-15 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2015-16
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. The Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) was signed into law on December 10, 2015. To facilitate a smooth transition to the full implementation of ESSA in the 2017-18 school year, the U.S. Department of Education provided exceptions to a limited number of specific requirements under the No Child Left Behind Act, including the identification of schools based on adequate yearly progress (AYP).	

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 2015-16 (based on SY 2014-15 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. The Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) was signed into law on December 10, 2015. To facilitate a smooth transition to the full implementation of ESSA in the 2017-18 school year, the U.S. Department of Education provided exceptions to a limited number of specific requirements under the No Child Left Behind Act, including the identification of schools based on adequate yearly progress (AYP).	

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.

The Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) was signed into law on December 10, 2015. To facilitate a smooth transition to the full implementation of ESSA in the 2017-18 school year, the U.S. Department of Education provided exceptions to a limited number of specific requirements under the No Child Left Behind Act, including the identification of schools based on adequate yearly progress (AYP).

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 2015-16 (based on SY 2014-15 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 2015-16
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 2014-15 and beginning of SY 2015-16 as a corrective action)	

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) was signed into law on December 10, 2015. To facilitate a smooth transition to the full implementation of ESSA in the 2017-18 school year, the U.S. Department of Education provided exceptions to a limited number of specific requirements under the No Child Left Behind Act, including the identification of schools based on adequate yearly progress (AYP).

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 2015-16 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. n/a

In the table below, provide the data by which processing appeals based on SY 2015-16 data was complete.

Processing Appeals completion	Date
Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2015-16 data was complete	1/1/0000

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 2015 (SY 2015-16) Title I, Part A allocation that the SEA reserved in accordance with Section 1003(a) of *ESEA* and §200.100(a) of ED's regulations governing the reservation of funds for school improvement under Section 1003(a) of *ESEA*: 4.00 %

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Under ESEA Flexibility, no schools were identified under Section 1116 of ESEA.

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

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

Before certifying Part I of the CSPR, 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 CSPR 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 2015-16.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The U.S. Department of Education issued the State application for Section 1003(g) School Improvement Grant funds in April of 2016. NC's application was approved on August 18, 2016. Consequently FY15 funds were not awarded until after the 2015-16 school year. Therefore, no funds were available for administration, evaluation or technical assistance activities for 2015-16 reporting.

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

In the space below, describe actions (if any) taken by your State in SY 2015-16 that were supported by **funds other than Sections 1003(a) and 1003(g) funds** to address the achievement problems of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Sections 1116 of *ESEA*.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

In the fall of 2007, the NCDPI initiated a program for Comprehensive Support for District and School Transformation, an ambitious plan to redefine and redesign the way the agency delivers assistance. The Comprehensive Support for District and School Transformation initiative has broadened into a major NCDPI focus on providing statewide support for districts and schools identified as low-performing according to North Carolina General Statute and requirements of the ESEA. To date, the NCDPI completed an organizational realignment to ensure that committed leadership and the right decision-making structures are in place for the support system to be successful. North Carolina's statewide system of support is coordinated and monitored primarily through three leadership councils. The leadership structure includes a Senior Leadership Council, a Service Advisory Council, and four Service Support Teams. It is through this support structure that NCDPI customizes support to address specific needs of schools and districts and is organized within three levels of support:

1. Intensive Support with Modeling through facilitated data-based priority alignment, district and/or school leadership coaching to support effective systems and processes, and instructional modeling and coaching to support student growth and achievement.
2. Moderate Support with Coaching through collaborative leadership coaching to support effective decision-making and customized professional development for district and school personnel.
3. General Support with Consultation through consultative dialogue with agency staff.

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. The Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) was signed into law on December 10, 2015. To facilitate a smooth transition to the full implementation of ESSA in the 2017-18 school year, the U.S. Department of Education provided exceptions to a limited number of specific requirements under the No Child Left Behind Act, including the identification of schools based on adequate yearly progress (AYP).	

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	Dollars Spent
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	0

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 school 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.⁷ Adapted from Public School Choice Non-Regulatory Guidance, Available at: <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/schoolchoiceguid.doc>

- 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. n/a

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 2015-16.	

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	Dollars Spent
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 initially approved on May 29, 2012 and extended for four years on March 31, 2016. Therefore no schools were identified for improvement action and no schools offered Public School Choice or Supplemental Educational Services in 2015-16.	

1.5 TEACHER QUALITY

This section collects data on "highly qualified" teachers as the term is defined in Section 9101(23) of the *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	81,525	78,540	96.34	2,985	3.66
All elementary classes	45,270	44,074	97.36	1,196	2.64
All secondary classes	36,255	34,466	95.07	1,789	4.93

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

Data table includes classes taught by special education teachers who provide direct instruction in 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.

For 2015-16SY, it was possible for classes to be counted multiple times, once for each subject taught.
--

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	25.84
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	2.33
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	17.12
Other (please explain in comment box below)	54.71
Total	100.00

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other: expired, no payroll or license on file

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)	27.66
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	17.82
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	31.63
Other (please explain in comment box below)	22.89
Total	100.00

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other: expired, no payroll or license on file

1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

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

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

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

School Type	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified
Elementary Schools			
High-poverty elementary schools	10,251	9,877	96.35
Low-poverty elementary schools	13,813	13,351	96.66
Secondary Schools			
High-poverty secondary schools	4,043	3,624	89.64
Low-poverty secondary schools	10,808	10,288	95.19

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	73.83	47.72
Poverty metric used	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	59.09	37.85
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 program.

1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational program

In the table below, place a check next to each type of language instruction educational program implemented in the State, as defined under 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.us/files/rcd/BE021775/Glossary_of_Terms.pdf.
2. **Other Language** = Name of the language of instruction, other than English, used in the programs.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Push in- Small groups based upon student data
 Transitional
 ESL Block Classes
 Newcomer Program
 ExC-ELL
 Summer Enrichment in writing
 Project GLAD
 Supplemental Instruction Program: 1 to 1 instruction

1.6.2 Student Demographic Data

1.6.2.1 Number of ALL LEP Students in the State

In the table below, provide the October 1 count of ALL LEP students in the State who meet the LEP definition under Section 9101(25).

- o 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.
- o 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	102,019
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. NC is investigating the 94% for testing population for 1516SY; our testing data reflects 1200 missing EDEN participation statuses for LEP students. Should our investigation result in a need to resubmit, NC shall do so.	

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

In the table below, provide the October 1 count 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.	93,927
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. NC is investigating the 94% for testing population for 1516SY; our testing data reflects 1200 missing EDEN participation statuses for LEP students. Should our investigation result in a need to resubmit, NC shall do so.	

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	84,532
Arabic	2,455
Chinese	1,585
Vietnamese	1,153
Hmong	861

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	95,448
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	53
Total	95,501
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. NC is investigating the 94% for testing population for 1516SY; our testing data reflects 1200 missing EDEN participation statuses for LEP students. Should our investigation result in a need to resubmit, NC shall do so.	

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

All LEP Results	#
Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	18,611
Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	19.49
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 and not tested on annual State English language proficiency assessment.

Title III LEP Testing		#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment		87,863
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment		50
Total		87,913
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. NC is investigating the 94% for testing population for 1516SY; our testing data reflects 1200 missing EDEN participation statuses for LEP students. Should our investigation result in a need to resubmit, NC shall do so.		

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.		19,220

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 #	Results %	Targets #	Targets %
Making progress	40,359	58.80	52,718	60.00
Attained proficiency	16,535	18.82	13,179	15.10
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.

Native Language Testing	Yes/No
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
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
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
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
13,698	13,805	27,503
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
19,712	8,426	42.75	11,286
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
19,719	6,413	32.52	13,306
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.6.3.6.4 MFLEP Students Results for Science

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

Table 1.6.3.6.4 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
10,559	5,428	51.41	5,131
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

Per the ESSA FAQs located at the following link, this section is no longer required: <http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/essa/faq/essa-faqs.pdf>

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	100
Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	0
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO 1	0
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO 2	0
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO 3	0
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 2014-15 and 2015-16)	0
Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2015-16 for not meeting Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years	0
Number of subgrantees that have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2012-13, 2013-14, 2014-15, and 2015-16)	0

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. If applicable, also please note if this method is the same or different from the previous year.

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The increase in subgrantees is due to the funding cycle for Title III funding for Charters consortiums. AMAO 3 is based on annual measurable objectives in regular reading and math, which is no longer available. Proficiency is based on targets that were no longer required for the 1516SY.

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).

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

1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students

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

Note: All immigrant students are not LEP students.

1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students

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

Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:

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

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants
21,478	20,936	26

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.	1,771
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	503

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.

* 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 1.6.4.1).
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	83
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	86
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	81
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	67
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	71
Other (Explain in comment box)	0

PD Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	78	16,689
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	67	3,209
PD provided to principals	57	1,323
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	52	1,302
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	43	373
PD provided to community based organization personnel	16	2,061
Total	//////////	24,957

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 U.S. 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 2015-16 funds July 1, 2015, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2015, for SY 2015-16 programs. Then the "# of days/\$\$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
7/1/15	10/8/15	97
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Delay for 2015 was a result in overall delay in funds distribution across all program areas.		

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.

NC DPI EL division plans to join the CCIP grants application for approval of applications which should significantly shorten the application timeframe and also the time needed for approval.

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	225	225
LEAs with subgrants	49	49
Total	274	274
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. There are 48 McKinney Vento Sub-grant awards with one award being a consortium of 2 districts with totals the 49.		

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 Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youth Enrolled in Public School in LEAs With Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	87	491
K	434	2,032
1	382	2,127
2	366	2,031
3	400	1,990
4	384	1,869
5	314	1,643
6	293	1,511
7	320	1,628
8	353	1,570
9	263	1,759
10	202	1,295
11	190	1,162
12	289	1,465
Ungraded	1	1
Total	4,278	22,574

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. For the 15-16SY, Specification C118 requires counts for Grade 13; that headcount is not included in this table, which accounts for the discrepancy with table 1.9.1.2, which does count students in Grade 13.

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 Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs With Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	370	2,365
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	3,248	16,134
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	126	1,043
Hotels/Motels	546	3,042
Total	4,290	22,584

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. For the 15-16SY, Specification C118 requires counts for Grade 13; that headcount is not included in this table, which accounts for the discrepancy with table 1.9.1.2, which does count students in Grade 13.

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	377	2,096
Migratory children/youth	45	54
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	727	3,976
Limited English Proficient (LEP) students	231	1,355

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	98
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	312
K	1,389
1	1,471
2	1,409
3	1,376
4	1,316
5	1,122
6	1,039
7	1,090
8	1,077
9	1,131
10	831
11	760
12	944
Ungraded	0
Total	15,365

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. For the 15-16SY, Specification 118 requires counts for Grade 13; that headcount is included in this table, which accounts for the discrepancy with table 1.9.1.1, which does not reflect students in Grade 13.

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	1,328
Migratory children/youth	49
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	2,925
Limited English Proficient (LEP) students	1,084
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 and percentage of those tested who scored at or above proficient. Provide data for grades 9 through 12 only for those grades tested for ESEA.

Grade	LEAs Without Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	LEAs Without Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs Without Subgrants - % of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs With Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	LEAs With Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs With Subgrants - % of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient
3	324	94	29.01	1,710	389	22.75
4	313	77	24.60	1,595	333	20.88
5	266	63	23.68	1,437	277	19.28
6	246	67	27.24	1,284	281	21.88
7	256	69	26.95	1,390	278	20.00
8	288	61	21.18	1,357	247	18.20
High School	144	50	34.72	981	234	23.85

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	LEAs Without Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	LEAs Without Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs Without Subgrants - % of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs With Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	LEAs With Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs With Subgrants - % of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient
3	325	100	30.77	1,713	452	26.39
4	313	80	25.56	1,594	392	24.59
5	265	88	33.21	1,436	384	26.74
6	246	48	19.51	1,292	216	16.72
7	257	45	17.51	1,391	190	13.66
8	287	41	14.29	1,353	163	12.05
High School	137	32	23.36	926	164	17.71

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	LEAs Without Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	LEAs Without Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs Without Subgrants - % of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs With Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	LEAs With Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs With Subgrants - % of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient
3						
4						
5	266	112	42.11	1,435	502	34.98
6						
7						
8	288	117	40.62	1,348	492	36.50
High School	141	44	31.21	826	198	23.97

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Science Assessments are not given in NC for grades 3, 4, 6 or 7.