

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

**Title:** Changes to Policy Delineating End-of-Grade and End-of-Course Retests and Review Procedures

**Type of Executive Summary:**

- Consent
- Action
- Action on First Reading
- Discussion
- Information

**Policy Implications:**

- Constitution \_\_\_\_\_
- General Statute # \_\_\_\_\_
- SBE Policy # GCS-C-031
- SBE Policy Amendment
- SBE Policy (New)
- APA # \_\_\_\_\_
- APA Amendment
- APA (New)
- Other \_\_\_\_\_

**Presenter(s):** Ms. Angela H. Quick (Deputy Chief Academic Officer, Curriculum, Instruction, Technology and Accountability Services) and Dr. Louis M. Fabrizio (Director of Accountability Policy & Communications)

**Description:**

In the best interest of students, the NCDPI requests that the option for LEAs to administer a third administration (i.e., Retest 2) of end-of-grade and end-of-course tests be removed from the testing and accountability program effective with the 2009–10 school year. Retest 2 is no longer required by the State, and scores are not included in ABCs or AYP. Following Retest 1, schools may use the results from both the Regular administration and Retest 1 along with other available information (e.g., formative or benchmark data, portfolios) to make promotion decisions. After Retest 1 the standard error of measurement may be used at the discretion of the LEA.

Additionally, edits to the policy have been made regarding the references to LEP students.

**Resources:**

DPI Staff

**Input Process:**

Selected DPI Staff

**Stakeholders:**

LEAs, General Assembly, parents, teachers, administrators, and the public

**Timeline For Action:**

Because it is in the best interest of students, this item must be approved by the SBE at its November meeting as Action on First Reading so it can be in effect for fall block testing.

**Recommendations:**

It is recommended the Board approve the changes to the GCS-C-031 policy for the 2009-10 school year

-----  
**Audiovisual equipment requested for the presentation:**

- Data Projector/Video (Videotape/DVD and/or Computer Data, Internet, Presentations-PowerPoint preferred)  
Specify: \_\_\_\_\_
- Audio Requirements (computer or other, except for PA system which is provided)  
Specify: \_\_\_\_\_
- Document Camera (for transparencies or paper documents – white paper preferred)  
\_\_\_\_\_

-----  
Motion By: \_\_\_\_\_ Seconded By: \_\_\_\_\_  
Vote: Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_ Abstain \_\_\_\_\_  
Approved \_\_\_\_\_ Disapproved \_\_\_\_\_ Postponed \_\_\_\_\_ Revised \_\_\_\_\_  
-----

\*Person responsible for SBE agenda materials and SBE policy updates: Lucy Medlin, 919-807-3771

**NORTH CAROLINA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION  
POLICY MANUAL**

**POLICY IDENTIFICATION**

**PRIORITY:** GLOBALLY COMPETITIVE STUDENTS

**CATEGORY:** ABCS ACCOUNTABILITY MODEL

**POLICY ID NUMBER:** GCS-C-031

**POLICY TITLE:** END-OF-GRADE AND END-OF-COURSE RETESTS AND REVIEW PROCEDURES

**CURRENT POLICY DATE:** 10/01/2009

**OTHER HISTORICAL INFORMATION:** 04/02/2009

**STATUTORY REFERENCE:**

**ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES ACT (APA) REFERENCE NUMBER AND CATEGORY:**

**\*\*\* BEGIN POLICY \*\*\* (DO NOT TAMPER WITH THIS LINE)**

**THIS POLICY HAS BEEN ADOPTED BY THE NC STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION, BUT IS STILL PENDING CODIFICATION IN THE NC ADMINISTRATIVE CODE. ALL CODIFIED RULES MAY BE ACCESSED BY GOING TO THE [OAH WEBSITE](#).**

I. End-of-Grade

A. Effective with the 2008–09 school year and beyond:

1. All public school students in grades 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8 who score Achievement Level II on the first administration of the end-of-grade reading and/or mathematics assessments and/or their alternate assessment shall be administered Retest 1. Parents of students who score Achievement Level I must be notified that they may request that their children be administered Retest 1. The higher of the original or Retest 1 scores will be used for calculating ABCs Performance Composites and AYP results.
2. All public school students in grades 5 and 8 who score Achievement Level II on the first administration of the end-of-grade science assessments and/or their alternate assessment shall be administered Retest 1. Parents of students who score Achievement Level I must be notified that they may request that their children be administered Retest 1. The higher of the original or Retest 1 scores will be used for calculating ABCs Performance Composites.

Note: Students identified as limited English proficient (LEP) in their first year in U.S schools who score below Level 4 Expanding on the state English language **proficiency**

placement reading subtest are exempt from Retest 1 because these students' scores are not used in state or federal accountability.

- B. LEAs must ensure that all original administrations and Retest 1 administrations are completed by the end of the testing window and scores are submitted to the NCDPI by the deadline for accountability data submission.
- C. Following Retest 1, schools can use the results from both the original administration and Retest 1 along with other available information (e.g., formative or benchmark data, portfolios) to make promotion decisions.
- D. For any student who does not score at Level III or above on Retest 1 for reading and/or mathematics, the following review procedures will apply at grades 3, 5, and 8 to ensure students meet the Student Accountability Standards as outlined in Section I of 16 NCAC 6D .0502 (GCS-N-003):
  1. A teacher or a parent may request a promotion for a student scoring below Level III.
  2. Based on the needs of the student, the LEA will determine whether or not to require the student to be subject to
    - (a) focused intervention **and/or**
      - i. Focused intervention involves extended instructional opportunities which are different from and supplemental to regular grade level or high school course work and which are specifically designed to improve the student's performance to proficient.
      - ii. Strategies may include but are not limited to alternative learning models, special homework, smaller classes, tutorial sessions, extended school day, Saturday school, modified instructional programs, parental involvement, summer school instruction, or retention.
    - ~~(b) — a third administration of the test (i.e., Retest 2). Third administration (i.e., Retest 2) scores will not be included in ABCs or AYP.~~
  3. Upon a request by the parent or teacher, or at the discretion of school administration, and when deemed appropriate by the LEA, a review committee will be convened to review a promotion request.
  4. The review committee will be appointed by the LEA, and will be comprised of teachers, principals, and/or central office administrators from the district. Special education personnel must be included if the student is identified as a special needs student. English as a second language staff must be included if the student is identified as LEP.
  5. The committee will review documentation presented by teachers on behalf of the student, including but not limited to: student work samples; test data other than the EOG; information from parents; information from the IEP, if applicable; and any other information tending to verify that the student is at grade level.
  6. The student's parent shall be invited to the review and allowed to speak on the student's behalf.
  7. The recommendation of the review committee is subject to the principal's

authority to grade and classify pupils (G.S. §115C-288(a)).

II. End-of-Course

A. Effective with the 2009–10 school year and beyond:

All public school students who score Achievement Level II on the first administration of an end-of-course assessment (i.e., Algebra I, Algebra II, Geometry, Biology, Physical Science, Civics and Economics, U.S. History, and English I) and/or their alternate assessment (i.e., including NCEXTEND2 OCS reading, math, and science and NCEXTEND1 at grade 10) shall be administered Retest 1, and the higher of the original or Retest 1 scores will be used for calculating ABCs Performance Composites and AYP results (where applicable). Parents of students who score Achievement Level I must be notified that they may request that their children be administered Retest 1.

Note: Students identified as limited English proficient (LEP) in their first year in U.S. schools who score below Level 4 Expanding on the state English language ~~proficiency placement~~ reading subtest are exempt from Retest 1 because these students' scores are not used in state or federal accountability.

B. LEAs must ensure that all original administrations and Retest 1 administrations are completed by the end of the testing window (i.e., fall/spring block or traditional) and scores are submitted to the NCDPI by the deadline for accountability data submission.

C. For any student who does not score at Level III or above on Retest 1 for EOCs required for meeting the exit standards (i.e., Algebra I, Biology, Civics and Economics, English I, U.S. History), the following review procedures will apply to ensure students meet the Student Accountability Standards for High School as outlined in Section II of 16 NCAC 6D .0502 (GCS-N-003):

1. A teacher or a parent may request a promotion for a student scoring below Level III.
2. Prior to convening an exit standard review hearing, the LEA will determine whether or not to require the student to be subject to focused intervention, ~~and/or to take a third administration (i.e., Retest 2). Third administrations (i.e., Retest 2) scores will not be included in ABCs or AYP.~~
3. Upon a request by the parent or teacher, or at the discretion of school administration, and when deemed appropriate by the LEA, a review committee will be convened to review a request for meeting the exit standard(s).
4. The review committee will be appointed by the LEA, and will be comprised of teachers, principals, and/or central office staff from the district. Special education personnel must be included if the student is identified as a special needs student. English as a second language staff must be included if the student is identified as LEP.
5. The committee will review documentation presented by teachers on behalf of the student, including but not limited to: student work samples; test data other than the EOC; information from parents; information from the IEP, if applicable; and any other information tending to verify that the student is proficient.
6. The student's parent shall be invited to the review and allowed to speak on the student's behalf.

7. The recommendation of the review committee is subject to the principal's authority to grade and classify pupils (G.S. §115C-288(a)).

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY****Title:** Discussion of North Carolina's Proposed New Accountability Model**Type of Executive Summary:**

Consent   
 Action   
 Action on First Reading   
 Discussion   
 Information

**Policy Implications:**

- Constitution \_\_\_\_\_  
 General Statute # \_\_\_\_\_  
 SBE Policy # \_\_\_\_\_  
 SBE Policy Amendment  
 SBE Policy (New)  
 APA # \_\_\_\_\_  
 APA Amendment  
 APA (New)  
 Other SBE's "Framework for Change"

**Presenter(s):** Ms. Angela H. Quick (Deputy Chief Academic Officer, Curriculum, Instruction, Technology and Accountability Services) Dr. Louis M. Fabrizio (Director of Accountability Policy & Communications) and Dr. Bill Sanders and Dr. June Rivers from the SAS Institute

**Description:**

The Department of Public Instruction established the Accountability and Curriculum Revision Effort (ACRE) to develop and implement a response to the Framework for Change adopted by the State Board of Education (SBE). In the Framework for Change (June 5, 2008), the SBE directed the Department to examine the K-8 accountability model with a 21<sup>st</sup> century focus and to develop a new high school accountability model (p. 5, items 6 and 7). The ACRE Assessment and Accountability Committee drafted a proposal for a new accountability model to address both K-8 and high school accountability. Components of the proposed model include student performance, value-added performance for teachers, schools and districts, long-term (longitudinal) growth, graduation rate, Future Ready Core, and postsecondary readiness. However, there are decision-points related to each proposed component that merit discussion and input from the SBE before moving ahead with the proposed plan. The attached two-page document (originally shared with the SBE at its October meeting) provides a vehicle for discussion of key issues and identifies questions for consideration by the SBE.

Dr. Bill Sanders and Dr. June Rivers will present the EVAAS<sup>®</sup> system to the GCS Committee at the November meeting.

**Resources:**

Framework for Change, historical documentation of the ABCs, research on accountability and growth

**Input Process:**

ACRE committee meetings surveys of LEA superintendents and testing coordinators discussion by Technical Advisory Consultants (TAC) for accountability

**Stakeholders:**

State Board of Education, Department of Public Instruction, General Assembly, Governor's Office, Local Education Agencies, public schools and charter schools, students, parents

**Timeline For Action:**

This item was discussed at the October 2009 SBE meeting and is returned for further discussion and input at the November 2009 meeting of the SBE.

**Recommendations:**

The State Board of Education is asked to discuss and provide guidance to the Department.

-----  
Audiovisual equipment requested for the presentation:

Data Projector/Video (Videotape/DVD and/or Computer Data, Internet, Presentations-PowerPoint preferred)  
Specify: \_\_\_\_\_

Audio Requirements (computer or other, except for PA system which is provided)  
Specify: \_\_\_\_\_

Document Camera (for transparencies or paper documents – white paper preferred)  
\_\_\_\_\_

-----  
Motion By: \_\_\_\_\_

Seconded By: \_\_\_\_\_

Vote: Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

Abstain \_\_\_\_\_

Approved \_\_\_\_\_ Disapproved \_\_\_\_\_

Postponed \_\_\_\_\_ Revised \_\_\_\_\_

-----  
\*Person responsible for SBE agenda materials and SBE policy updates: Lucy Medlin, 919-807-3771

# DRAFT



## **Big Questions Worksheet: A Proposed New Accountability Model (Updated October 22)**

*Note:*  
As we engage in ongoing discussions this fall and winter about the design of the new accountability model, we will use the two-pager that was first presented to the Board in October of 2009 to record the consensus that we are building. This tool is a thinking tool and in **no way represents finalized decisions** from the Globally Competitive Students (GCS) Committee of the State Board of Education or the Department of Public Instruction. We encourage feedback as we record our thinking on what indicators should go into the model. We will use this document (and additional thinking tools as necessary) to track a building consensus based on our discussions and regular stakeholder involvement. **Emerging points of consensus are tracked in yellow highlights and included in the tables below.**

### **Emerging points of consensus from October SBE Discussion**

Post-Secondary Readiness  
We are moving forward exploring and planning for **Option B (pg. 3)** (using a widely used assessment(s) like the ACT, SAT, WorkKeys or Accuplacer) in the accountability model to measure post-secondary readiness. The GCS has generally expressed a desire to use a national test or tests as a measure of post-secondary readiness, a viewpoint echoed by external stakeholder groups.

### **Emerging points of consensus from November SBE Discussion**

*To come*

### **Emerging points of consensus from December SBE Discussion**

*To come*

## Big Questions Worksheet: A Proposed New Accountability Model

### Components

*What components might be in the new accountability model, and how are these components defined?*

#### Performance

Criterion-referenced student performance, as measured by the next generation of EOG and EOC assessments aligned to the Essential Standards.

##### End-of-Grade

Reading - grades 3-8  
Mathematics - grades 3-8  
Science - grades 5 and 8

##### End-of-Course

Math A	Civics and Economics
Math BC	U. S. History
Biology	Physical Science
English II	



Are these the right tests?

When and how many constructed-response items should be used?

What are the policy implications of reporting delays that will result from the time involved in scoring constructed-response items (25% policy, reporting timeline for ABCs/AYPs, retesting)?

#### Longitudinal Growth

Developmental scale scores on math and reading based on growth modeled as a function of time.

#### Value-Added Models (EVAAS®)

Value-added measures for teachers, schools and/or districts.

-----{Additionally in High School}-----

#### Graduation Rate

5-year cohort



Should measures of matriculation/retention grade-to-grade be included?

#### Future-Ready Core Participation

A measure of the ambition of the courses that a student takes in high school.



How should participation in the future-ready core be counted in the model? Is it redundant with the graduation rate? Should Algebra II completion be used? Concentration in CTE, Arts, etc.? Graduation Project? Credentials?

## Post-Secondary Readiness Measure

A measure of the preparedness of a student for the workforce or post-secondary education.

?

Should NC use

- Actual outcomes {success in college or workforce}
- A widely used assessment(s) {ACT, SAT, WorkKeys, Accuplacer, etc.}
- EOC assessments aligned to Essential Standards?

Option B:  
Potential  
Point of  
Consensus

## Consequences

*How do we classify schools? What are the rewards, sanctions and incentives?*

### Classification of Schools

Grouping schools based on results, both on an absolute scale and on year-to-year improvement.

?

Are our current categories (a mixture of achievement and improvement measures) the best way to categorize schools and LEAs? How else might we approach categorization?

### Incentives

The rewards and sanctions in place to ensure adult ownership and responsibility for student outcomes. Recommended incentives to be included are:

- Adequate Yearly Progress sanctions
- Public reporting of results and proactive measures to deliver understandable results into the hands of the schools and the public
- Classifications of schools (e.g. Schools of Excellence, Low-performing)

?

Should we build a model that will allow teachers to be rewarded based on student outcomes? (LEA and school-based rewards and sanctions are assumed?)

## Other Questions:

**Will we continue to have and use the gateways?**

**Do we need to develop a model that can make a single "up or down" decision for an LEA, school, or teacher?**

**How should we balance the components in the model – particularly in high school – in terms of balancing achievement, growth, value-add, graduation rate, FRC, and post-secondary readiness?**

**Are there other components in the model that should be added (attendance, parental participation)?**

**What set of additional incentives could be put in place to support school improvement and student achievement?**

**Extra points for increasing number of Level IV students?**

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY****Title: Report on LEA Status for Title III Improvement****Type of Executive Summary:**

Consent     Action     Action on First Reading     Discussion     Information

**Policy Implications:**

- Constitution \_\_\_\_\_  
 General Statute # \_\_\_\_\_  
 SBE Policy # GCS-A-012  
 SBE Policy Amendment  
 SBE Policy (New)  
 APA # \_\_\_\_\_  
 APA Amendment  
 APA (New)  
 Other NCLB

**Presenter(s):** Ms. Angela H. Quick (Deputy Chief Academic Officer, Curriculum, Instruction, Technology and Accountability Services) and Dr. Louis M. Fabrizio (Director of Accountability Policy & Communications)

**Description:**

As a part of the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB), LEAs receiving Title III funds must meet a series of Annual Measurable Assessment Objectives (AMAOs). The three objectives are:

- AMAO 1 (Progress): The percent of students who demonstrate progress (improve at least one proficiency level) in at least one of the subtests (reading, writing, speaking, and listening) on the required state identified English language proficiency test,
- AMAO 2 (Proficiency): An annual increase in the percentage of students identified as limited English proficient who attain English language proficiency on the required state identified English language proficiency test. Effective with the 2008-09 school year and beyond, students must meet the Comprehensive Objective Composite (COC) as set by the State Board of Education. The COC defines the attainment of English language proficiency by the student reaching an overall composite score of 4.8, with at least a 4.0 on the reading subtest and at least a 4.0 on the writing subtest on the state's annual English language proficiency test, and
- AMAO 3 (AYP for the LEP subgroup): The LEP Subgroup must annually meet AYP in academic proficiency in reading and mathematics.

LEAs that do not meet their AMAO targets in the same set two years in a row will be required to develop a detailed improvement plan as required by NCLB. Attached is information regarding 2008-09 Title III LEA subgrantee status.

**Resources:**

NCDPI staff for technical assistance, LEA staff for improvement plan

**Input Process:**

N/A

**Stakeholders:**

LEAs, students, parents, legislators

**Timeline For Action:**

This item is presented as a Consent item at the November 2009 SBE Meeting

**Recommendations:**

N/A

-----  
Audiovisual equipment requested for the presentation:

Data Projector/Video (Videotape/DVD and/or Computer Data, Internet, Presentations-PowerPoint preferred)  
Specify: \_\_\_\_\_

Audio Requirements (computer or other, except for PA system which is provided)  
Specify: \_\_\_\_\_

Document Camera (for transparencies or paper documents – white paper preferred)  
\_\_\_\_\_

-----  
Motion By: \_\_\_\_\_

Seconded By: \_\_\_\_\_

Vote: Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

Abstain \_\_\_\_\_

Approved \_\_\_\_\_ Disapproved \_\_\_\_\_

Postponed \_\_\_\_\_ Revised \_\_\_\_\_

-----  
\*Person responsible for SBE agenda materials and SBE policy updates: Lucy Medlin, 919-807-3771

**NORTH CAROLINA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION  
Policy Manual**

**Policy Identification**

**Priority:** Globally Competitive Students

**Category:** Testing

**Policy ID Number:** GCS-A-012

**Policy Title:** Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives for NCLB Title III

**Current Policy Date:** 09/03/2009

**Other Historical Information:** 08/25/2003,11/03/2005,05/01/2008

**Statutory Reference:**

**Administrative Procedures Act (APA) Reference Number and Category:**

No Child Left Behind Title III, Section 3122 requires States to develop annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) for students identified as limited English proficient (LEP) with respect to making annual progress in English, attaining English proficiency on the state identified English language proficiency (ELP) assessment, and making adequate yearly progress (AYP) in attaining academic proficiency in reading and mathematics. Accountability for Title III is only at the local education agency (LEA) level, not at the school level. Title III subgrantees (i.e. LEAs, charter schools, or consortia of LEAs) that receive Title III subgrants are held accountable for meeting the following three AMAOs.

**Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives**

AMAO 1. Students identified as limited English proficient shall demonstrate progress (improve at least one proficiency level in at least one of the subtests of reading, writing, speaking, or listening) on the required state identified English language proficiency test.

<b>English Language Proficiency Targets</b>	<b>Percent of Limited English Proficient Students Making Progress in at Least One Subtest (reading, writing, speaking, or listening)</b>
2003-2004	40
2004-2005	45

<b>English Language Proficiency Targets</b>	<b>Percent of Limited English Proficient Students Making Progress in at Least One Subtest (reading, writing, speaking, or listening)</b>
2005-2006	50
2006-2007	55
2007-2008	60
2008-2009	65
2009-2010	70
2010-2011	TBD
2011-2012	TBD
2012-2013	TBD
2013-2014	TBD

- AMAO 2. There must be an annual increase in the percentage of students identified as limited English proficient who attain English language proficiency on the required state identified English language proficiency test. Effective with the 2008-09 school year and beyond, students must meet the Comprehensive Objective Composite (COC) as set by the state. The COC defines the attainment of English language proficiency by the student reaching an overall composite score of 4.8, with at least a 4.0 on the reading subtest and at least a 4.0 on the writing subtest on the state’s annual English language proficiency test.

<b>English Language Proficiency Targets</b>	<b>Percent of all LEP Students Attaining English Language Proficiency</b>
2003-2004	20
2004-2005	25
2005-2006	30
2006-2007	35
2007-2008	17
2008-2009	14.7
2009-2010	TBD
2010-2011	TBD
2011-2012	TBD
2012-2013	TBD
2013-2014	TBD

- AMAO 3. The LEP Subgroup must annually meet AYP in academic proficiency in reading and mathematics.

Calculations for determining AMAO 3 are described in the most recently approved North Carolina Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook.

### **Sanctions for AMAOs Not Met**

In accordance with Section 3122(b)(2) of No Child Left Behind, the State Board of Education shall determine whether a Title III subgrantee has failed to meet one or more of the AMAOs.

If the Title III subgrantee has failed to make progress toward meeting the same AMAO for two (2) consecutive years, the State Board of Education shall require the Title III subgrantee to develop an improvement plan that specifically addresses the factors that prevented the Title III subgrantee from achieving such AMAO and ensures it meets such AMAO.

If the Title III subgrantee has failed to meet the same AMAO for four (4) consecutive years, the State Board of Education shall require the Title III subgrantee to modify its curriculum, program, or method of instruction.

## **A Summary Report of Title III Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (Based on 2008-09 Data)**

### **Background**

Title III, Part A of No Child Left Behind is concerned with English language acquisition and academic achievement of students who are limited English proficient, including immigrant children and youth. Funding through formula grants is provided to State and Local Education Agencies to enhance their capacity to provide high-quality instructional programs designed to prepare limited English proficient students to succeed in all English instruction settings.

### **Funding**

Funding for 2002-03 was \$6,710,455; for 2003-2004 was \$7,942,378; for 2004-2005 was \$8,883,786; for 2005-2006 was \$9,979,375; for 2006-2007 was \$11,661,881 , for 2007-2008 was \$11,707,197, and for 2008-2009 was \$11,780,011. Districts and charter schools who have too few limited English proficient students to generate at least \$10,000 in funding can only benefit from Title III language acquisition funds by forming a consortium. For 2002-03, 87 LEAs received funds; 92 LEAs were funded in 2003-04, including five consortia. For 2004-2005, 95 LEAs were funded, including four consortia. For 2005-2006, 96 LEAs and 1 Charter School were funded, including three consortia. For 2006-2007, 96 LEAs and one Charter school were funded, including two consortia. For 2007-2008, 96 LEAs, and one Charter School were funded, including two consortia. For 2008-2009, 97 LEAs, and two Charter Schools were funded, including one consortium.

### **Accountability**

Accountability for Title III is only at the district level, not the school level. In accordance with the legislation, the State Board of Education must develop annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) for progress and attainment of English language proficiency. Progress and proficiency AMAOs are set out in State Board Policy HSP-A-012 and adequate yearly progress AMAOs are described in the most recently approved North Carolina Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook.

### **Sanctions**

In accordance with Section 3122(b)(2) of No Child Left Behind, the State Board of Education shall determine whether a Title III language acquisition subgrantee has failed to meet one or more of the AMAOs.

If the Title III subgrantee has failed to make progress toward meeting the same AMAO for two (2) consecutive years, the State Board of Education shall require the Title III subgrantee to develop an improvement plan that specifically addresses the factors that prevented the Title III subgrantee from achieving such AMAO and ensures it meets such AMAO.

If the Title III subgrantee has failed to meet the same AMAO for four (4) consecutive years, the State Board of Education shall require the Title III subgrantee to modify its curriculum, program, or method of instruction as detailed in an improvement plan.

**Report**

The ACCESS for ELLs® (Assessing Comprehension and Communication in English State to State for English Language Learners) was North Carolina's required assessments in 2008-09 to comply with Title III of the No Child Left Behind Legislation. NCLB requires that all students identified as limited English proficient be assessed annually in listening, speaking, reading, and writing.

For 2008-09, out of 97 LEAs and two Charter Schools that received Title III language acquisition funding, 100% (88 subgrantees) met AMAO 1; 28% (25 subgrantees) met AMAO 2; and 76% (75 LEAs/Charter Schools) met AMAO 3.

**District Improvement**

Four (4) subgrantees missed at least one sub-target of their annual measurable achievement objectives for two consecutive years, five (5) subgrantees missed at least one sub-target for three consecutive years, four (4) missed at least one sub-target for four consecutive years, and four (4) missed at least one sub-target for five consecutive years. In accordance with Title III requirements, they will be required to develop a detailed improvement plan. All subgrantees will be required to attend a meeting in the spring to focus on instructional strategies/activities that lead to improvement. Subgrantees missing an objective for two or three consecutive years will work with ESL staff to develop their improvement plan. Subgrantees missing four or five consecutive years will be required to analyze their current improvement plan and show how that plan has impacted progress. ESL staff will work with those districts in developing a new plan.

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

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

- **AMAO 1 (Progress):** To show progress, students identified as LEP must increase one full proficiency level in at least one language domain tested with state identified English language proficiency assessment (currently, the ACCESS for ELLs). For a Title III subgrantee to meet this AMAO, at least 65% of the LEP students in that subgrantee must show progress.
- **AMAO 2 (Proficiency):** To attain English language proficiency, students identified as LEP must obtain a composite score at a proficiency level of 4.8 on the ACCESS for ELLs, with minimum proficiency levels of 4.0 on both the Reading and Writing domains. For a Title III subgrantee to meet AMAO2, at least 14.7% of the LEP students in that subgrantee must attain English language proficiency as determined by the above criteria.
- **AMAO 3 (AYP for the LEP subgroup):** The LEP subgroup must meet AYP sub-targets (rates of both participation and proficiency) in Reading Grades 3-8, Reading at the high school, Mathematics Grades 3-8, and Mathematics at the high school. The AYP calculations are identical to those performed for Title I calculations.

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

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

Subgrantee	Target(s) missed for two consecutive years
Burke	AYP Reading HS (Proficiency)
New Hanover	AYP Math HS (Participation), AYP Math HS (Proficiency)
Cabarrus	AYP Math HS
Chatham	AYP Math HS

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

<b>Subgrantee</b>	<b>Target(s) missed for three consecutive years</b>
Alamance – Burlington	AMAO2 (Proficiency); AYP Reading HS
Guilford	AYP Math HS
Cumberland	AYP Math HS; AYP Reading HS
Harnett	AYP Math HS
Kannapolis City	AMAO2 (Proficiency)

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

<b>Subgrantee</b>	<b>Target(s) missed for four consecutive years</b>
Buncombe	AYP Reading HS; [ <i>AYP Math HS (3 years)</i> ]
Gaston	AYP Math HS; AYP Reading HS
Lee	AYP Reading HS; [ <i>AYP Math HS (2 years)</i> ]
Yancey	AMAO2 (Proficiency)
<u>Notes:</u> Information in brackets ([ ]) indicates additional reasons for requiring subgrantee improvement persisting for less than 4 years.	

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

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