

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

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

For reporting on
School Year 2006-07

NORTH CAROLINA



**PART I DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 28, 2007
PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 2008**

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

INTRODUCTION

Sections 9302 and 9303 of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)*, as amended by the *No Child Left Behind Act* of 2001 (*NCLB*) provide to States the option of applying for and reporting on multiple *ESEA* programs through a single consolidated application and report. Although a central, practical purpose of the Consolidated State Application and Report is to reduce "red tape" and burden on States, the Consolidated State Application and Report 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*
- Title I, Part D – *Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk*
- Title I, Part F – *Comprehensive School Reform*
- Title II, Part A – *Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund)*
- Title II, Part D – *Enhancing Education through Technology*
- 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 IV, Part B – *21st Century Community Learning Centers.*
- 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 *NCLB* Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2006-07 consists of two information collections.

PART I

Part I of the CSPR requests information related to the five *ESEA* Goals, established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application, and information required for the Annual State Report to the Secretary, as described in Section 1111(h)(4) of the *ESEA*. The five *ESEA* Goals established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application are:

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

Starting with SY 2005-06, collection of data for the Education of Homeless Children and Youths was added to Part I in order to provide timely data for the program's performance measures. This change allowed ED to retire OMB collection 1810-0650. For SY 2006-07, Migrant Education Program child count information that is used for funding purposes is now collected via Part I. This change allowed ED to retire OMB collection 1810-0519

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.
3. The information will provide valid evidence of program outcomes or results.
4. The CSPR is the best vehicle for collection of the data.

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 2006-07 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, December 28, 2007**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 22, 2008**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2006-07, 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 2006-07 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 2006-07 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

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

| | | |
|---|--|------------------------------------|
| | | OMB Number: 1810-0614 |
| | | Expiration Date: 10/31/2010 |
| <p>Consolidated State Performance Report For State Formula Grant Programs under the Elementary And Secondary Education Act as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001</p> | | |
| Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2006-07 <input type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2006-07 | | |
| Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report: NC Department of Public Instruction | | |
| Address: 6301 Mail Service Center Raleigh, NC 27699-6301 | | |
| Person to contact about this report: | | |
| Name: Karl R. Pond | | |
| Telephone: 919-807-3241 | | |
| Fax: 919-807-4300 | | |
| e-mail: kpond@dpi.state.nc.us | | |
| Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): June St. Clair Atkinson | | |
| | | Friday, March 7, 2008, 10:16:37 AM |
| Signature | | Date |

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT:
PART I**

For reporting on
School Year 2006-07



PART I DUE DECEMBER 28, 2007

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

This section requests descriptions of the State's implementation of the *NCLB* 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

In the space below, provide a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Indicate specifically in what year your state expects the changes to be implemented.

If the State has not made or is not planning to make revisions or changes, respond "No revisions or changes to content standards taken or planned."

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

North Carolina has recently revised its content standards in the areas of reading/English language Arts (2004) mathematics (2003) and science (2004). The revisions are on a five-year cycle although policymakers are exploring the feasibility of moving the cycle to a longer period. No revisions or changes to content standards are planned for adoption until 2008 for Mathematics 2009 for reading/English language arts and 2009 for science.

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

Note: Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts has been added to this data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts

In the space below, provide a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's assessments in mathematics or reading/language arts required under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*. As applicable, include any assessment (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*. Indicate specifically in what year your state expects the changes to be implemented.

If the State has not made or is not planning to make revisions or changes, respond "No revisions or changes to assessments made or planned."

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

North Carolina plans to implement new general reading/English arts end-of-grade assessments at grades 3-8 in 2007-08 (spring 2008)â€”the alternate end-of-grade reading grades 3-8 assessments revised in 2007-08 are NCCLAS (LEP and IEP checklist format) NCEXTEND2 (modified standards) and NCEXTEND1 (alternate assessment for students with significant cognitive disabilities). New general science assessments at grades 5 8 and 10 were implemented operationally effective with the 2007-08 school year (all alternates as stated above were revised and implemented). The English I EOC test was revised effective with the 2006-07 school year. The NCEXTEND2 OCS assessment in English I was implement initially in 2007-08 as an operational alternate assessment for students in grade 10 who are following the Occupational Course of Study.

The revised general mathematics end-of-grade assessments at grades 3-8 were implemented in 2005-06 and Algebra I in 2006-07. All alternate assessments in mathematics at grades 3-8 and Algebra I (grade 10) were also revised on the same schedule as the general mathematics assessments.

The test revisions in reading/English language arts and mathematics are all on a five-year cycle.

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

Note: The subject of science has been removed from this data element.

1.1.3 Academic Achievement Standards in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts

In the space below, provide a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's academic achievement standards in mathematics or reading/language arts implemented to meet the requirements under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*. As applicable, include alternate achievement standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities and modified academic achievement standards implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*. Indicate specifically in what year your state expects the changes to be implemented.

If the State has not made or is not planning to make revisions or changes, respond "No revisions or changes to content standards taken or planned."

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

North Carolina revised the academic achievement standards on all of the mathematics end-of-grade assessments in grades 3-8 effective with the 2005-06 school year and for Algebra I in 2006-07. The academic achievement standards for the mathematics end-of-grade tests were established during the summer of 2006. The corresponding EOG alternate assessments in mathematics at grades 3-8 (NCCLAS and NCEXTEND2) were established during the summer of 2006. The mathematics EOG academic achievement standards for the alternate assessment for the most significant cognitive disabled students (NCEXTEND1) were established in the summer of 2007 upon completion of the first operational administration. The academic achievement standards for the reading end-of-grade assessments at grades 3-8 and the corresponding alternate assessments in reading (NCCLASNCEXTEND2 NCEXTEND1) will be revised at the end of the 2007-08 school year upon the completion of the reading assessments. The academic achievement standards for the English I end-of course tests and the NCCLAS EOC English I alternate assessment (IEP and LEP) are being reset during the 2007-08 school year.

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

Note: The subject of science has been removed from this data element.

1.1.4 Assessments in Science

In the space below, provide a description of the State's progress in developing and implementing assessments in science that meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA in the required grade levels, including remaining major milestones (e.g., field testing) and a timeline for them. As applicable, include any assessment (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.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

North Carolina has fully implemented its science assessments as operational EOG tests in grades 5 8 and 10 (Biology EOC) effective with the 2007-08 school year. The science assessments at grades 5 and 8 were field tested in 2005-06 piloted in 2006-07. and are planned to be administered operationally in the spring 2008. The Biology EOC test was revised and field tested in 2006-07 and will be administered operationally in fall/spring 2007-08. The alternate assessments for the grades 5 and 8 EOG science assessments are NCCLAS (IEP and LEP) NCEXTEND2 (modified) and NCEXTEND1 (alternate content and academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities). In addition at grade 10 we have the NCCLAS EOC alternate assessment in the area of Biology (IEP and LEP) the NCEXTEND1 in the area of Biology for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities and the NCEXTEND2 OCS in Life Skills Science for students with disabilities who are enrolled in the Occupational Course of Study.

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

Note: This table was formerly part of Section 1.1.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.1.5 Academic Achievement Standards in Science

In the space below, provide a description of the State's progress in developing and implementing academic achievement standards in science that meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) in the required grade levels, including remaining major milestones and a timeline for them. As applicable, include alternate achievement standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The academic achievement standards for the science assessments at grades 5 and 8 were established during the 2007-08 school year at the December 2007 State Board of Education meeting. The academic achievement standards for the NCCLAS (IEP and LEP) for EOG science at grades 5 and 8 were adopted at the December 2007 meeting of the State Board of Education (SBE). The academic achievement standards for the NCEXTEND2 OCS Life skills Science were also adopted by the SBE at the December 2007 meeting. The academic achievement standards for the revised regular EOC Biology tests and the NCCLAS EOC Biology assessment (IEP and LEP students) are expected to be adopted by the SBE at its February 2008 meeting. The academic achievement standards for the NCEXTEND1 EOG science at grades 5 8 and 10 for students with the most significant cognitive disabled students are expected to be adopted by the SBE at its meeting during the summer of 2008 when all NCEXTEND1 2007-08 test data are available.

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

Note: This table was formerly part of Section 1.1.3 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

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

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 *NCLB* 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 were tested in mathematics. The percentage of students who were tested for mathematics will be calculated automatically.

The student group "children with disabilities (*IDEA*)" includes children who were tested using regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments.

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

| Student Group | # Students Enrolled | # Students Tested | Percent of Students Tested |
|---|---------------------|-------------------|----------------------------|
| All students | 749062 | 746971 | 99.7 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 10682 | 10646 | 99.7 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 16746 | 16708 | 99.8 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 212017 | 211138 | 99.6 |
| Hispanic | 67476 | 67160 | 99.5 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 419177 | 418417 | 99.8 |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 93701 | 93126 | 99.4 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 36488 | 36339 | 99.6 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 280270 | 279271 | 99.6 |
| Migratory students | 484 | 483 | 99.8 |
| Male | 382259 | 381009 | 99.7 |
| Female | 366803 | 365962 | 99.8 |
| Comments: We have used the authoritative source for the data collection. | | | |

Source – The table above is produced through EDFacts. The SEA submits the data in file N/X081 that includes data group 588, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly Section 1.2.1.1 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. For the SY 2006-07 CSPR, the total number of students enrolled has been added to this data collection.

1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Mathematics Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of children with disabilities (IDEA) tested during the State's testing window for 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 were tested in mathematics for each type of assessment will be calculated automatically. The total number of children with disabilities (IDEA) tested will also be calculated automatically.

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

| Type of Assessment | # Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Tested | Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Tested, Who Took the Specified Assessment |
|---|--|---|
| Regular Assessment without Accommodations | 637825 | 84.4 |
| Regular Assessment with Accommodations | 92420 | 12.2 |
| Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards | 3419 | 0.5 |
| Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards | 16672 | 2.2 |
| Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards | 5394 | 0.7 |
| Total | 755730 | |
| Comments: We are using authoritative source data. | | |

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

Note: This table was formerly Section 1.2.2.1 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

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 *NCLB* reading/language arts assessment.

| Student Group | # Students Enrolled | # Students Tested | Percent of Students Tested |
|---|---------------------|-------------------|----------------------------|
| All students | 754234 | 750423 | 99.5 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 10770 | 10740 | 99.7 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 16955 | 16532 | 97.5 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 213454 | 212565 | 99.6 |
| Hispanic | 67845 | 66249 | 97.6 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 422113 | 421310 | 99.8 |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 95049 | 94520 | 99.4 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 36635 | 35959 | 98.2 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 281776 | 280327 | 99.5 |
| Migratory students | 484 | 479 | 99.0 |
| Male | 384949 | 382782 | 99.4 |
| Female | 369285 | 367641 | 99.6 |
| Comments: We were unable to provide data on male and female for 2005-06. | | | |

Source – The same file specification as 1.2.1 is used, but with data group 589 instead of 588.

Note: This table was formerly Section 1.2.1.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. For the SY 2006-07 CSPR, the total number of students enrolled has been added to this data collection.

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

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

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

| Type of Assessment | # Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Tested | Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Tested, Who Took the Specified Assessment |
|---|--|---|
| Regular Assessment without Accommodations | 640053 | 84.8 |
| Regular Assessment with Accommodations | 87459 | 11.6 |
| Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards | 2331 | 0.3 |
| Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards | 19753 | 2.6 |
| Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards | 5385 | 0.7 |
| Total | 754981 | |
| Comments: We are using authoritative source data. | | |

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

Note: This table was formerly Section 1.2.2.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

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

1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics

In the format of the table below, provide the number of students who completed the State *NCLB* 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 were tested using regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments.

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

1.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts

This section is similar to 1.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State's *NCLB* reading/language arts assessment.

1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 3

| Grade 3 | # Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|--|--|--|--|
| All students | 111462 | 79064 | 70.9 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 1694 | 1059 | 62.5 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 2491 | 2102 | 84.4 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 30109 | 15548 | 51.6 |
| Hispanic | 11857 | 7386 | 62.3 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 61069 | 49912 | 81.7 |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 2243 | 1070 | 47.7 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 5882 | 3094 | 52.6 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 41309 | 24809 | 60.1 |
| Migratory students | 82 | 46 | 56.1 |
| Male | 57009 | 40778 | 71.5 |
| Female | 54453 | 38286 | 70.3 |

Comments: The data collected for 2006-07 are more accurate than that collected from previous years.

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

| Grade 3 | # Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|--|--|--|--|
| All students | 111439 | 91237 | 81.9 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 1695 | 1260 | 74.3 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 2486 | 2195 | 88.3 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 30111 | 21304 | 70.8 |
| Hispanic | 11829 | 8425 | 71.2 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 61075 | 54484 | 89.2 |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 2244 | 1245 | 55.5 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 5875 | 3562 | 60.6 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 41311 | 30649 | 74.2 |
| Migratory students | 82 | 51 | 62.2 |
| Male | 57002 | 44943 | 78.8 |
| Female | 54437 | 46294 | 85.0 |

Comments: The data collected for 2006-07 are more accurate than that collected from previous years.

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 4

| Grade 4 | # Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|--|--|--|--|
| All students | 108340 | 73414 | 67.8 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 1553 | 846 | 54.5 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 2560 | 2179 | 85.1 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 29721 | 14257 | 48.0 |
| Hispanic | 10822 | 6403 | 59.2 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 59686 | 47061 | 78.8 |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 2042 | 830 | 40.6 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 6843 | 3729 | 54.5 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 39886 | 22579 | 56.6 |
| Migratory students | 89 | 45 | 50.6 |
| Male | 55224 | 37259 | 67.5 |
| Female | 53116 | 36155 | 68.1 |

Comments: The data collected for 2006-07 are more accurate than that collected from previous years.

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED Facts in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

| Grade 4 | # Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|--|--|--|--|
| All students | 108325 | 92470 | 85.4 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 1553 | 1198 | 77.1 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 2558 | 2358 | 92.2 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 29728 | 22469 | 75.6 |
| Hispanic | 10800 | 8334 | 77.2 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 59688 | 54631 | 91.5 |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 2044 | 1209 | 59.1 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 6840 | 4993 | 73.0 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 39888 | 31615 | 79.3 |
| Migratory students | 89 | 67 | 75.3 |
| Male | 55214 | 45710 | 82.8 |
| Female | 53111 | 46760 | 88.0 |

Comments: The data collected for 2006-07 are more accurate than that collected from previous years.

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED Facts in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 5

| Grade 5 | # Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|--|--|--|--|
| All students | 106594 | 71230 | 66.8 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 1574 | 868 | 55.1 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 2446 | 2065 | 84.4 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 29277 | 13901 | 47.5 |
| Hispanic | 10372 | 6126 | 59.1 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 59362 | 45883 | 77.3 |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 1867 | 690 | 37.0 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 5945 | 3072 | 51.7 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 38318 | 20960 | 54.7 |
| Migratory students | 92 | 38 | 41.3 |
| Male | 54396 | 36348 | 66.8 |
| Female | 52198 | 34882 | 66.8 |

Comments: The data collected for 2006-07 are more accurate than that collected from previous years.

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

| Grade 5 | # Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|--|--|--|--|
| All students | 106585 | 95375 | 89.5 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 1575 | 1355 | 86.0 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 2438 | 2282 | 93.6 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 29279 | 24178 | 82.6 |
| Hispanic | 10361 | 8424 | 81.3 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 59368 | 55885 | 94.1 |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 1869 | 1140 | 61.0 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 5942 | 4488 | 75.5 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 38321 | 32343 | 84.4 |
| Migratory students | 92 | 68 | 73.9 |
| Male | 54390 | 47588 | 87.5 |
| Female | 52195 | 47787 | 91.6 |

Comments: The data collected for 2006-07 are more accurate than that collected from previous years.

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 6

| Grade 6 | # Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|--|--|--|--|
| All students | 107858 | 69743 | 64.7 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 1559 | 786 | 50.4 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 2250 | 1895 | 84.2 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 30877 | 13427 | 43.5 |
| Hispanic | 9720 | 5305 | 54.6 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 60081 | 46143 | 76.8 |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 1812 | 603 | 33.3 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 5344 | 2336 | 43.7 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 43539 | 22151 | 50.9 |
| Migratory students | 66 | 30 | 45.5 |
| Male | 55497 | 35426 | 63.8 |
| Female | 52361 | 34317 | 65.5 |

Comments: The data collected for 2006-07 are more accurate than that collected from previous years.

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

| Grade 6 | # Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|--|--|--|--|
| All students | 107859 | 89048 | 82.6 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 1559 | 1132 | 72.6 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 2246 | 2040 | 90.8 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 30892 | 21849 | 70.7 |
| Hispanic | 9701 | 6985 | 72.0 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 60093 | 54174 | 90.2 |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 1817 | 913 | 50.2 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 5342 | 3304 | 61.8 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 43546 | 32155 | 73.8 |
| Migratory students | 66 | 36 | 54.5 |
| Male | 55492 | 44109 | 79.5 |
| Female | 52367 | 44939 | 85.8 |

Comments: The data collected for 2006-07 are more accurate than that collected from previous years.

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.3.9 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 7

| Grade 7 | # Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|--|--|--|--|
| All students | 110226 | 70029 | 63.5 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 1623 | 806 | 49.7 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 2341 | 1960 | 83.7 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 32668 | 14238 | 43.6 |
| Hispanic | 9266 | 4893 | 52.8 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 61257 | 46135 | 75.3 |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 1826 | 541 | 29.6 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 4652 | 2028 | 43.6 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 43500 | 21997 | 50.6 |
| Migratory students | 55 | 20 | 36.4 |
| Male | 56490 | 35270 | 62.4 |
| Female | 53736 | 34759 | 64.7 |

Comments: The data collected for 2006-07 are more accurate than that collected from previous years.

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

| Grade 7 | # Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|--|--|--|--|
| All students | 110254 | 95225 | 86.4 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 1629 | 1302 | 79.9 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 2334 | 2146 | 91.9 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 32711 | 25405 | 77.7 |
| Hispanic | 9244 | 7039 | 76.1 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 61262 | 56583 | 92.4 |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 1830 | 1038 | 56.7 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 4652 | 3079 | 66.2 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 43524 | 34675 | 79.7 |
| Migratory students | 55 | 33 | 60.0 |
| Male | 56514 | 47107 | 83.4 |
| Female | 53740 | 48118 | 89.5 |

Comments: The data collected for 2006-07 are more accurate than that collected from previous years.

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.3.11 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 8

| Grade 8 | # Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|--|--|--|--|
| All students | 109355 | 71188 | 65.1 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 1544 | 809 | 52.4 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 2263 | 1916 | 84.7 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 32784 | 14780 | 45.1 |
| Hispanic | 8338 | 4526 | 54.3 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 61657 | 47342 | 76.8 |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 1738 | 559 | 32.2 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 4117 | 1868 | 45.4 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 41696 | 21636 | 51.9 |
| Migratory students | 57 | 24 | 42.1 |
| Male | 55713 | 35567 | 63.8 |
| Female | 53642 | 35621 | 66.4 |

Comments: The data collected for 2006-07 are more accurate than that collected from previous years.

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

| Grade 8 | # Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|--|--|--|--|
| All students | 109355 | 96177 | 87.9 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 1545 | 1286 | 83.2 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 2257 | 2063 | 91.4 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 32794 | 26165 | 79.8 |
| Hispanic | 8328 | 6366 | 76.4 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 61661 | 57767 | 93.7 |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 1738 | 1014 | 58.3 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 4115 | 2718 | 66.1 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 41698 | 33886 | 81.3 |
| Migratory students | 57 | 36 | 63.2 |
| Male | 55708 | 47751 | 85.7 |
| Female | 53647 | 48426 | 90.3 |

Comments: The data collected for 2006-07 are more accurate than that collected from previous years.

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.3.13 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - High School

| High School | # Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|--|---|---|---|
| All students | 89401 | 72809 | 81.4 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 1080 | 766 | 70.9 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 1881 | 1688 | 89.7 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 25093 | 17058 | 68.0 |
| Hispanic | 5217 | 3761 | 72.1 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 54322 | 48026 | 88.4 |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 1709 | 837 | 49.0 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 2790 | 1753 | 62.8 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 29388 | 21153 | 72.0 |
| Migratory students | 34 | 22 | 64.7 |
| Male | 44404 | 35161 | 79.2 |
| Female | 44997 | 37648 | 83.7 |

Comments: The data collected for 2006-07 are more accurate than that collected from previous years.

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

| High School | # Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|--|---|---|---|
| All students | 94571 | 48570 | 51.4 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 1168 | 390 | 33.4 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 2090 | 1234 | 59.0 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 26530 | 9786 | 36.9 |
| Hispanic | 5586 | 1965 | 35.2 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 57256 | 34066 | 59.5 |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 1944 | 444 | 22.8 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 2937 | 618 | 21.0 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 30893 | 11559 | 37.4 |
| Migratory students | 34 | 10 | 29.4 |
| Male | 47093 | 20882 | 44.3 |
| Female | 47478 | 27688 | 58.3 |

Comments: The data collected for 2006-07 are more accurate than that collected from previous years.

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY

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

1.4.1 All Schools and Districts Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public elementary and secondary schools and districts in the State and the total number of those schools and districts that made AYP based on data for the SY 2006-07 school year. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

| Entity | Total # | # That Made AYP in SY 2006-07 | Percentage That Made AYP in SY 2006-07 |
|------------------|---------|-------------------------------|--|
| Schools | 2297 | 1030 | 44.8 |
| Districts | 115 | 3 | 2.6 |
| Comments: | | | |

Source – The table above is produced through *EDFacts*. The SEA submits the data in N/X103 for data group 32.

1.4.2 Title I School Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public Title I schools by type and the total number of those schools that made AYP based on data for the SY 2006-07 school year. 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 2006-07 | Percentage of Title I Schools That Made AYP in SY 2006-07 |
|---|-------------------|---|---|
| All Title I schools | 1093 | 486 | 44.5 |
| Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools | 909 | 399 | 43.9 |
| Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools | 184 | 87 | 47.3 |
| Comments: | | | |

Source – The table above is produced through *EDFacts*. The SEA submits the data in N/X101 for data group 22 and N/X103 for data group 32.

Note: New for the SY 2006-07 CSPR is the data collection requirement to report for public schools and to include data for schoolwide (SWP) and targeted assistance (TAS) Title I Schools.

1.4.3 Accountability of Districts That Received Title I Funds

In the table below, provide the total number of districts that received Title I funds and the total number of those districts that made AYP based on data for SY 2006-07. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

| # Districts That Received Title I Funds | # Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2006-07 | Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2006-07 |
|---|--|--|
| 115 | 3 | 2.6 |
| Comments: | | |

Source – Initially, pre-populated by *EDFacts* file N/X103 that is data group 32 and 582. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly part of Section 1.4.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.4.4 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

1.4.4.1 List of Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

In the following table, provide a list of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 for the SY 2007-08 based on the data from SY 2006-07. For each school on the list, provide the following:

- District Name and NCES ID Code
- School Name and NCES ID Code
- Whether the school missed the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the school missed the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the school missed the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school missed the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2007-08 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: School Improvement – Year 1, School Improvement – Year 2, Corrective Action, Restructuring Year 1 (planning), or Restructuring Year 2 (implementing))¹
- Whether the school is a Title I school (This column is optional and is used only by States that choose to list all schools in improvement.)

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter School Data.

Download template: [Question 1.4.4.1_0607.xls](#) ([Get MS Excel Viewer](#))

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: Identification as Title I school is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

¹ The school improvement statuses are defined in *LEA and School Improvement Non-Regulatory Guidance*. This document may be found on the Department's Web page at <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/schoolimprovementguid.doc>.

1.4.4.2 Actions Taken for Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

In the space below, describe the measures being taken to address the achievement problems of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring. Include a discussion of the technical assistance provided by and supported by the State, including a description of the statewide systems of support under *NCLB* (e.g., the number of schools served, the nature and duration of assistance provided, etc.).

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

North Carolina provides a statewide system of support and improvement for local educational agencies (LEAs) and schools receiving funds. Regional Title I consultants utilize monitoring visits to determine areas of focus for technical assistance. Assistance is consequently provided to accommodate both specific and ubiquitous needs. Initiatives include but are not limited to institutes and individual training sessions focusing on program model implementations processes for conducting comprehensive needs assessment scientifically researched-based best practices and a systems approach for improving schools. Beginning with the 2007-2008 school year Title I services will be coordinated with other state initiatives through a redesigned cross-agency model of comprehensive support for districts and schools. Schools are selected for support by first examining the LEA's existing capacity to sustain the improvement efforts of every school in the district. Services to individual schools are coordinated and customized through cross-functional councils within the agency. This intensive Comprehensive Framework for Support to Schools and Districts is designed to increase the opportunity for all students to meet the State's rigorous academic content standards and to sustain those positive results.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: The inclusion of the discussion of technical assistance provided by and supported by the State is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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 *NCLB* are being implemented.

| Corrective Action | # of Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action Is Being Implemented |
|---|--|
| Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program | 10 |
| Extension of the school year or school day | 7 |
| Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance | 8 |
| Significant decrease in management authority at the school level | 7 |
| Replacement of the principal | 1 |
| Restructuring the internal organization of the school | 10 |
| Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school | 14 |
| Comments: | |

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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 *NCLB* are being implemented.

| Restructuring Action | # of Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented |
|--|---|
| Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal) | 3 |
| Reopening the school as a public charter school | 0 |
| Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school | 0 |
| Take over the school by the State | 0 |
| Other major restructuring of the school governance | 0 |
| Comments: | |

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.4.5 Districts That Received Title I Funds Identified for Improvement

1.4.5.1 List of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Were Identified for Improvement

In the following table, provide a list of districts that received Title I funds and were identified for improvement or corrective action under Section 1116 for the SY 2007-08 based on the data from SY 2006-07. For each district on the list, provide the following:

- District Name and NCES ID Code
- Whether the district missed the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the district missed the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the district met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2007-08 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: Improvement or Corrective Action²)
- Whether the district is a district that received Title I funds (This column is optional and is used only by States that choose to list all districts in improvement.)

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter School Data.

Download template: [Question 1.4.5.1_0607.xls](#) ([Get MS Excel Viewer](#))

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: Identification of a district as receiving Title I funds is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

² The district improvement statuses are defined in *LEA and School Improvement Non-Regulatory Guidance*. This document may be found on the Department's Web page at <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/schoolimprovementguid.doc>.

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

In the space below, 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.

North Carolina provides a statewide system of support and improvement for local educational agencies (LEAs) receiving funds. Regional Title I consultants utilize monitoring visits to determine areas of focus for technical assistance. Assistance is consequently provided to accommodate both specific and ubiquitous needs. Initiatives include but are not limited to institutes and individual training sessions focusing on program model implementations support for conducting comprehensive needs assessment scientifically researched-based best practices and a systems approach for improving schools. Beginning with the 2007-2008 school year Title I services will be coordinated with other state initiatives through a redesigned cross-agency model of comprehensive support for districts and schools. The primary aims are to improve student academic performance and build internal capacity at the district level for supporting schools for continual growth. Districts are selected for state support based on multiple risk factors to include current performance relative to both state and federal accountability standards and an assessment of the districts existing capacity to sustain the improvement efforts in schools. Services to districts are coordinated and customized through cross-functional councils within the agency. This intensive Comprehensive Framework for Support to Schools and Districts is designed to increase the opportunity for all students to meet the State's rigorous academic content standards and to sustain those positive results.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: The inclusion of the discussion of technical assistance provided by the State is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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 *NCLB* are being implemented.

| Corrective Action | # of Districts in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action Is Being Implemented |
|--|--|
| Implementing a new curriculum based on State standards | 26 |
| 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 SYs 2005-06 and 2006-07 as a corrective action) | |
| Comments: Better alignment of the state-mandated curriculum is the corrective action that is being implemented | |

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.4.6 Dates of AYP and Identification Determinations

In the table below, provide the dates (MM/DD/YY) when your State provided final school and district AYP and identification for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring to schools and districts based on SY 2006-07 assessments. If applicable, also provide the dates for preliminary determinations provided to schools and districts.

| | Districts | Schools |
|---|-----------|----------|
| Final AYP and identification determinations | 09/06/07 | 09/06/07 |
| Preliminary school AYP and identification determinations (if applicable) | 07/30/07 | 07/30/07 |
| Comments: The preliminary data were released to middle and elementary schools on 07/30/07; data were released to high schools on 08/17/06. | | |

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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 2006-07 data and the results of those appeals.

| | # Appealed Their AYP Designations | # Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation |
|------------------|-----------------------------------|---|
| Districts | 0 | 0 |
| Schools | 0 | 0 |
| Comments: | | |

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

| | |
|---|--|
| Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2006-07 data was complete | |
|---|--|

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.4.8 Section 1003(a) Funds

In the space below, describe your State's use of Section 1003(a) of ESEA funds. Specifically, address the following:

- Describe briefly any priorities the State uses in allocating these funds to schools.
- Describe briefly the State's methods for distributing these funds (e.g., formula, competitive, etc.).
- Describe briefly the types of activities supported by the Section 1003(a) funds.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Section 1003(a) funds are used to provide assistance for schools which have been identified as being in School Improvement Corrective Action and Restructuring. To be eligible to receive these funds a LEA/charter school must have one or more schools identified for school improvement under Title I. Applications must be approved prior to the LEA/charter school receiving the allotment. Funds will be allotted based on approval of an application submitted by the LEA or charter school on behalf of schools participating in Title I School Improvement. Each LEA or charter school will receive funds determined by a formula outlined in the North Carolina Allotment Policy Manual. The allotment formula includes a base amount plus a per child amount. The base amount will be calculated based on the number of schools in Title I School Improvement: 1 school base equals \$15 000; 2-5 schools base equals \$30000; 6-10 schools base equal \$45000; 10 or more schools base equals \$60000. The per child amount will be calculated using the Best of 1 of 2 Actual ADM of schools participating in Title I School Improvement. The per child amount will be calculated using the Best of 1 or 2 actual average daily membership (ADM) of schools designated as being in Title I School Improvement. Funds are available only as long as the LEA has schools in Title I School Improvement. The status of each school will be reviewed annually based on ABC's assessment data. This factor should be considered when decisions regarding how funds are to be used are made. Funds can be used to implement strategies designed to improve the school implement public school choice (if applicable) or implement supplemental education services (if applicable). The activities to be carried out with Title I School Improvement Funds should be directly related to improving the academic achievement of students in the areas of reading and mathematics.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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.

1.4.9.1.1 Schools Using Public School Choice

In the table below, provide the number of public schools *from which* and *to which* students transferred under the provisions for public school choice in Section 1116 of ESEA.

| | # Schools |
|---|-----------|
| Title I schools <i>from which</i> students transferred for public school choice | 149 |
| Public Schools <i>to which</i> students transferred for public school choice | 352 |
| Comments: | |

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly part of section 1.4.5.1 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

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 for public school choice, and the number who transferred under the provisions for public school choice in Section 1116 of ESEA.

Students who are eligible for public school choice includes:

- (1) Students currently enrolled in a school identified for improvement
- (2) Students who transferred in the current school year under the public school choice provisions of section 1116, and
- (3) Students who previously transferred under section 1116 and are continuing to transfer for the current school year under section 1116.

| | # Students |
|---|------------|
| Eligible for public school choice | 102333 |
| Who applied to transfer | 3228 |
| Who transferred to another school under Title I public school choice provisions | 3228 |

Indicate in the table below the categories of students that are included in the count of eligible students.

| | Yes/No |
|--|------------|
| 1. Enrolled in a school identified for improvement | <u>Yes</u> |
| 2. Transferred in the current school year, only | <u>Yes</u> |
| 3. Transferred in a prior year and in the current year | <u>Yes</u> |
| Comments: | |

Source – Initially, pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X010 that includes data groups 579, 574 and 544. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly part of section 1.4.5.1 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

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 in Section 1116 of ESEA.

| | Amount |
|--|---------------|
| Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice | \$ 1822348 |
| Comments: | |

Source – Initially, pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X102 that includes data group 652. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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 options to eligible students due to any of the following reasons:

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

| | # LEAs |
|---|---------------|
| LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice | 8 |
| Comments: | |

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

FAQs about public school choice:

- a. *How should States report data on Title I public school choice for those LEAs that have open enrollment and other choice programs?* An LEA may consider a student as eligible for and participating in Title I public school choice, and may consider costs for transporting that student towards its funds spent on transportation for public school choice, if the student meets the following conditions:
 - Has a "home" or "neighborhood" school (to which the student would have been assigned, in the absence of a 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.³
- b. *How do States report on public school choice for those LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice (e.g., LEAs in which all schools in a grade level are in school improvement, LEAs that have only a single school at that grade level, or LEAs whose schools are so remote from one another that choice is impracticable)?* For those LEAs, States should count as eligible all students who attend identified Title I schools. States should report that no eligible schools or students were provided the option to transfer and should provide an explanation why choice is not possible within the LEA in the Comment Section.

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

1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

1.4.9.2.1 Schools with Students Eligible for Supplemental Educational Services

In the table below, provide the number of Title I schools identified as in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring whose students received supplemental educational services under Section 1116 of ESEA. A Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) section related to supplemental educational services is below the table.

| | # Schools |
|---|-----------|
| Title I schools whose students received supplemental educational services | 156 |
| Comments: | |

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly part of section 1.4.5.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

FAQ about supplemental education services

How should a State define the phrase "students who received supplemental educational services"? States should consider students who "received" supplemental educational services as those students who enrolled and participated in some hours of services. States have the discretion to determine the minimum number of hours of participation necessary for a student to have "received" services.

1.4.9.2.2 Supplemental Educational Services - Students

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

| | # Students |
|---|------------|
| Eligible for supplemental educational services | 71035 |
| Who applied for supplemental educational services | 12767 |
| Who received supplemental educational services | 9790 |
| Comments: | |

Source – Initially, pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X102 that includes data groups 578, 575, and 546. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly part of Section 1.4.5.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services

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

| | Amount |
|--|------------|
| Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services | \$ 6478615 |
| Comments: | |

Source – Initially, pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X102, which includes data group 651. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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 each of the school types listed and the number of those core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified (as the term is defined in section 9101(23) of the *ESEA*) 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. The percentages used for high- and low-poverty schools and the poverty metric used to determine those percentages are reported in 1.5.3.

| School Type | # of Core Academic Classes (Total) | # of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified | Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified | # of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified | Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified |
|------------------------|------------------------------------|--|---|--|---|
| All schools | 75853 | 73697 | 97.2 | 2156 | 2.8 |
| Elementary level | | | | | |
| High-poverty schools | 8301 | 8156 | 98.3 | 145 | 1.7 |
| Low-poverty schools | 11500 | 11404 | 99.2 | 96 | 0.8 |
| All elementary schools | 40361 | 39793 | 98.6 | 568 | 1.4 |
| Secondary level | | | | | |
| High-poverty schools | 6715 | 6214 | 92.5 | 501 | 7.5 |
| Low-poverty schools | 9362 | 9049 | 96.7 | 313 | 3.3 |
| All secondary schools | 35492 | 33904 | 95.5 | 1588 | 4.5 |
| Comments: | | | | | |

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

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

If the answer above is no, please explain:

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

| |
|--|
| Full day self-contained classroom equals one class |
|--|

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: The data collection requirement to submit data for core classes taught by teachers who are NOT highly qualified has been added for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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 percent 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. See Question A-14 in the August 3, 2006, Non-Regulatory Guidance for additional information. Report classes in grade 6 through 8 consistent with how teachers have been classified to determine their highly qualified status, regardless 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 were 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 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. The poverty quartile breaks are reported later in this section.
- h. *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. The poverty quartile breaks are reported later in this section.

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

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

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

| | Percentage |
|--|------------|
| Elementary School Classes | |
| Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE | 10.0 |
| 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 | 14.0 |
| Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program) | 76.0 |
| Other (please explain) | |
| Total | 100.0 |

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

| | Percentage |
|--|------------|
| Secondary School Classes | |
| Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers) | 3.0 |
| Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects | 32.0 |
| Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program) | 65.0 |
| Other (please explain) | |
| Total | 100.0 |
| Comments: | |

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

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 | 77.0 | 40.0 |
| Poverty metric used | Percent free and reduced lunch students in elementary school. | |
| Secondary schools | 60.0 | 33.0 |
| Poverty metric used | Percent free and reduced lunch in secondary school. | |
| Comments: | | |

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

- a. *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.
- b. *Since the poverty data are collected at the school and not classroom level, how do we classify schools as either elementary or secondary for this purpose?* States may include as elementary schools all schools that serve children in grades K through 5 (including K through 8 or K through 12 schools) and would therefore include as secondary schools those that exclusively serve children in grades 6 and higher.

1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

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

Throughout this section:

- "AYP grades" is sometimes used to reference grades used for accountability determinations (grades 3 through 8 and one year of high school)
- "Non-AYP grades" is used to reference grades not used for accountability determinations.

1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs (formerly 1.1. of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, provide the number of Title III subgrantees that use each type of language instruction educational program, as defined in Section 3301(8).

Note: Numbers reflected in 1.6.1 can be duplicative due to subgrantees' use of more than one type of program. The number for each type of program should be equal to or less than the total number of subgrantees in 1.6.4.1.

Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

- # Using Program** = Number of subgrantees that reported using a specific type of language instruction educational program. Subgrantees may use multiple programs. **(a.)** If multiple programs are used, count one for each program type used. **(b.)** Consortium is always counted as **one if all members used the same type of program**. If consortium members used different types of programs, count all members using the same type of program as one for each type. Do not count the members of the consortium individually as one, unless each member used a different type of program (e.g., use the same method of counting as one subgrantee using multiple types of programs in **(a.)**)
- Type of Program** = Type of programs described in the subgrantee's local plan (as submitted to the State or as implemented) that is closest to the descriptions in <http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/expert/glossary.html>.
- Other Language** = Name of the language of instruction, other than English, used in the program.
- % Language of Instruction** = Average percentages of English and the other language used as a language of instruction in the program or use the percentage of the most common practice in the State (applies **only** to the first five bilingual program types).
- OLOI** = Other Language of Instruction used in the bilingual language instruction educational program.

| # Using Program | Type of Program | Other Language | % Language of Instruction | |
|-----------------|--|----------------|---------------------------|------|
| | | | English | OLOI |
| 9 | Dual language | Spanish | 50.0 | 50.0 |
| 9 | Two-way immersion | Spanish | 50.0 | 50.0 |
| 3 | Transitional bilingual | Spanish | 50.0 | 50.0 |
| 1 | Developmental bilingual | Spanish | 50.0 | 50.0 |
| 26 | Heritage language | Spanish | 10.0 | 90.0 |
| 48 | Sheltered English instruction | | | |
| 0 | Structured English immersion | | | |
| 0 | Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE) | | | |
| 66 | Content-based ESL | | | |
| 84 | Pull-out ESL | | | |
| 60 | Other (explain) | | | |

Comments: Other programs are elective ESL classes in grades 6-12

For the 9 LEAs that provide Dual language one also provides instruction in English/French 50/50 and one also provides English/Chinese 50/50

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.2 Student Demographic Data

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

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

| | # |
|---|-------|
| LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year. | 87629 |
| Comments: The number referenced is from the October 1 headcount, whereas the number given in the response to 1.6.3.1.2 is based on tests administered in the subsequent March; the LEP population typically grows during the year. | |

Source – The SEA submits the data in file N/X116 that contains data group 648, category set A.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.2.2 Most Commonly Spoken Languages in the State

In the table below, provide the five most commonly spoken languages, other than English, in the State. The top five languages should be determined by the highest number of students speaking each of those languages listed.

| Language | # LEP Students |
|--------------------------------|----------------|
| Spanish | 73002 |
| Hmong/Hmong-Mien/Hmongie/Chang | 2390 |
| Vietnamese | 1566 |
| Arabic/Egyptian/Lebanese | 1145 |
| French | 859 |

For additional significant languages please use comment box.

Comments:

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly in Section 1.6.3.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.6.3 Student Performance Data

This section collects data on LEP student English language proficiency and LEP academic content performance data (e.g., LEP tested in native language tables and MFLEP/AYP Grades results table).

1.6.3.1 Student English Language Proficiency Testing Status

This section collects data on the number of ALL LEP students and Title III-served LEP students in the State by testing status for English language proficiency.

1.6.3.1.1 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Testing Status

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of ALL LEP students in the State by testing status for English language proficiency. ALL LEP students includes the following students:

- Newly enrolled and continually enrolled LEP students in the State for the year of this report, whether or not they receive services in a Title III language Instruction educational program;
- All students assessed for English language proficiency (ELP) using an annual State English Language proficiency (ELP) assessment as required under Section 1111(b)(7) of the ESEA in the reporting year and who meet the LEP definition in Section 9101 (25).

Table 1.6.3.1.1. Definitions:

- **Tested/State Annual ELP** = Number of LEP students who took the annual State English language proficiency assessment as required under Section 1111(b)(7) of the *ESEA* in this reporting year.
- **Not Tested/State Annual ELP** = Number of LEP students enrolled at the time of testing but did not take the annual State English language proficiency assessment.
- **Subtotal** = Sum of "Tested/State Annual ELP" and "Not Tested/State Annual ELP" (i.e., the number of LEP students enrolled at the time of testing).
- **LEP/One Data Point** = Number of LEP students who took the annual State English language proficiency assessment as required under Section 1111(b)(7) for the first time in this reporting year. Note that "LEP/One Data Point" is a subset of those students reported as Tested on the annual State English Language proficiency assessment.

| ALL LEP Testing Status | # |
|---|----------|
| Tested/State annual ELP | 90869 |
| Not tested/State annual ELP | 1307 |
| Subtotal | 92176 |
| LEP/One Data Point | 22941 |
| Comments: - The number referenced is from the October 1 headcount, whereas the number given in the response to 1.6.3.1.2 is based on tests administered in the subsequent March; the LEP population typically grows during the year. | |
| - 1.6.3.1.1 relates to ALL LEP students, whereas 1.6.2.1 is for LEP students in subgrantee LEAs only. | |

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.1.2 Title III Student English Language Proficiency Testing Status

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of Title III-served LEP students in the State by testing status for English language proficiency.

Table 1.6.3.1.2. Definitions:

- **Tested/State Annual ELP** = Number of LEP students in Title III language instruction educational programs who took the annual State English language proficiency assessment.
- **Not Tested/State Annual ELP** = Number of LEP students in Title III language instruction educational programs enrolled at the time of testing but did not take the annual State English language proficiency assessment.
- **Subtotal** = Sum of "Tested/State Annual ELP" and "Not Tested/State Annual ELP" (i.e., the number of LEP students in Title III language instruction educational programs enrolled at the time of testing).
- **LEP/One Data Point** = Number of LEP students in Title III language instructional programs who took the annual State English language proficiency assessment for the first time in this reporting year. Note that "LEP/One Data Point" is a subset of those students reported as Tested on the annual State English Language proficiency assessment.

| Title III LEP Testing Status | # |
|--|----------|
| Tested/State annual ELP | 89747 |
| Not tested/State annual ELP | 1295 |
| Subtotal | 91042 |
| | |
| LEP/One Data Point | 22615 |
| Comments: The response to 1.6.3.1.2 is based on tests administered in March, whereas the number referenced in 1.6.2.1 is from the previous October 1 headcount; the LEP population typically grows during the year. | |

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.2 Student English Language Proficiency Results

This section collects data on the results from the annual State English language proficiency assessment(s) for LEP students. Before completing Table 1.6.3.2.2 or 1.6.3.2.3, please indicate your State's use of the flexibility to apply annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) to all LEP students.

1.6.3.2.1 Application of Title III English Language Proficiency Annual Assessment and AMAOs (formerly 1.6.8 of the Title III Biennial Collection, reformatted)

In the table below, indicate the State application of the following:

| | |
|---|------------|
| State applied the Title III English language proficiency annual assessment to all LEP students in LEAs receiving Title III funds. | <u>Yes</u> |
| State applied the annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) to ALL LEP students in LEAs receiving Title III funds. | <u>Yes</u> |
| Comments: | |

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.2.2 All LEP English Language Proficiency Results

Please report information in this section **ONLY** if the State checked "Yes" in section 1.6.3.2.1 (row 2), that annual measurable achievement objectives are applied to all LEP students in LEAs receiving Title III funds.

Report the results from the annual State English language proficiency assessment(s) for ALL LEP students in grades K through 12.

Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:

1. **Making Progress** = Number of LEP students who met the definition of "Making Progress" as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
2. **No Progress** = Number of LEP students who did not meet the State definition of "Making Progress."
3. **ELP Attainment** = Number of LEP students who attained English language proficiency as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
4. **Target** = AMAO target for the year as established by the State and submitted to OELA in the CSA (September 2003 submission), or as amended, for each of "Making Progress" and "Attainment" of ELP.
5. **Results** = Number and percent of LEP students who met the State definition of "Making Progress" and the definition of "Attainment" of English language proficiency.
6. **Met/Y** = Met the annual target, "Met/N" = did not meet annual target. This cell will be automatically populated, based on the Target % and the Results %.

| | Target | Results | | Met |
|-----------------|--------|---------|---|-----|
| | % | # | % | Y/N |
| Making progress | | | | |
| No progress | | | | |
| ELP attainment | | | | |

Comments: No numbers were given because NC did not implement AMAO 1 (progress) and AMAO 2 (attainment) for 2006-07 consistent with permission given by the U.S. Department of Education (excerpt follows):

"It is the Department's understanding that because of a one-time problem with the State's annual English language proficiency assessment (the IPT Form B), the State does not have accurate and reliable data to make AMAO determinations for AMAO 1 (progress) and AMAO 2 (attainment) for districts receiving Title III funds for the 2006-07 school year. The State has proposed calculating AMAO determinations for the 2006-07 school year based on AMAO 3 only-adequate yearly progress (AYP) for the limited English proficient (LEP) subgroup.

The Department finds this proposal acceptable ..."

--from Acting Assistant Deputy Secretary Margarita Pinkos (December 2007)

In addition, the resolution for NC not reporting AMAO 1 and 2 is referenced in an e-mail dated March 3, 2008 from Abigail Potts, OESE, to Bobbi Stettner-Eaton, OPEPD; "With regards to North Carolina, the letter looks like it is a unique situation for that particular state. It appears North Carolina will be unable to make AMAO determinations 1 & 2 due to an equating error in the English Language Proficiency assessment. As a result, NC will only be using the AMAO 3 - AYP for the LEP subgroup. For the CSPR, the state should leave the AMAO questions 1&2 blank and reference this letter in the comment box."

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

If a State does not count "ELP attainment" students as also "Making Progress", the number for "No Progress" should be the "Subtotal" in 1.6.3.1.1 minus the number "Making Progress" and "Attainment." If a State counts "ELP attainment" students as also "Making Progress", the number for "No Progress" should be the "Subtotal" in 1.6.3.1.1 minus "Making Progress".

1.6.3.2.3 Title III LEP English Language Proficiency Results

Please report information in this section **ONLY** if the State checked "No" in section in 1.6.3.2.1 (row 2), reporting that annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) are applied to LEP students served by Title III.

In the table below, provide the results from the annual State English language proficiency assessment for Title III LEP students who participated in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12.

Table 1.6.3.2.3 Definitions:

1. **Making Progress** = Number of Title III LEP students who met the definition of "Making Progress" as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
2. **No Progress** = Number of Title III LEP students who did not meet the State definition of "Making Progress."
3. **ELP Attainment** = Number of Title III LEP students who attained English language proficiency as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
4. **Target** = AMAO target for the year as established by the State and submitted to OELA in the CSA (September 2003 submission), or as amended, for each of "Making Progress" and "Attainment" of ELP.
5. **Results** = Number and percent of Title III LEP students who met the State definition of "Making Progress" and the definition of "Attainment" of English language proficiency.
6. **Met/Y** = Met the annual target, "Met/N" = did not meet annual target. This cell will be automatically populated, based on the Target % and the Results %.

| | Target | Results | | Met |
|-----------------|--------|---------|---|--------|
| | % | # | % | Yes/No |
| Making progress | | | | |
| No progress | | | | |
| ELP attainment | | | | |

Comments: No numbers were given because NC did not implement AMAO 1 (progress) and AMAO 2 (attainment) for 2006-07 consistent with permission given by the U.S. Department of Education (excerpt follows):

"It is the Department's understanding that because of a one-time problem with the State's annual English language proficiency assessment (the IPT Form B), the State does not have accurate and reliable data to make AMAO determinations for AMAO 1 (progress) and AMAO 2 (attainment) for districts receiving Title III funds for the 2006-07 school year. The State has proposed calculating AMAO determinations for the 2006-07 school year based on AMAO 3 only-adequate yearly progress (AYP) for the limited English proficient (LEP) subgroup.

The Department finds this proposal acceptable ..."

--from Acting Assistant Deputy Secretary Margarita Pinkos (December 2007)

In addition, the resolution for NC not reporting AMAO 1 and 2 is referenced in an e-mail dated March 3, 2008 from Abigail Potts,OESE, to Bobbi Stettner-Eaton, OPEPD; "With regards to North Carolina, the letter looks like it is a unique situation for that particular state. It appears North Carolina will be unable to make AMAO determinations 1 & 2 due to an equating error in the English Language Proficiency assessment. As a result, NC will only be using the AMAO 3 - AYP for the LEP subgroup. For the CSPR, the state should leave the AMAO questions 1&2 blank and reference this letter in the comment box."

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

If a State does not count "ELP attainment" students as also "Making Progress", the number for "No Progress" should be the "Subtotal" in 1.6.3.1.2 minus the number "Making Progress" and "Attainment." If a State counts "ELP attainment" students as also "Making Progress", the number for "No Progress" should be the "Subtotal" in 1.6.3.1.2 minus "Making Progress".

1.6.3.4 LEP Subgroup Academic Content Assessment Results (formerly 3.2.3/MFLEP of the Title III Biennial Collection)

This section collects data on the academic content assessment results for LEP students.

1.6.3.4.1 LEP Subgroup Flexibility

In the table below, report whether the State exercises the LEP flexibility afforded States through the new regulation for monitored former LEP (MFLEP), in AYP determination.

| | |
|------------------|-----|
| MFLEP | Yes |
| Comments: | |

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.4.3 Status of Monitored Former LEP Students (MFLEP) (formerly 3.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection, modified)

In the table below, report the unduplicated count of MFLEP students in K-12 for each of the two years monitored during the SY 2006-07, which includes both MFLEP students in AYP grades and in non-AYP grades in row 1 and MFLEP students only in AYP grades in row 2.

Table 1.6.3.4.3 Definitions:**1. Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) includes:**

- Students that have transitioned into classrooms that are not designed for LEP students;
- Students that are no longer receiving LEP services; and who are being monitored for academic content achievement for 2 years after transition.

2. Total MFLEP = State aggregated number of all MFLEP students in grades K through 12.**3. MFLEP/AYP Grades =** State aggregated number of MFLEP students in grades used for accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school). These students may be included in the LEP subgroup AYP calculations.

| | # |
|---|------|
| Total MFLEP | 7822 |
| MFLEP/AYP grades | 5857 |
| Comments: There are multiple factors contributing to a difference in the numbers. There were several transitions in assessment and data collection during the biennium. A new version of the IPT was utilized for the first time in 2005-06. Data collections relied on authoritative sources, supplemented by software for updating the data base when discrepancies were found. There were concomitant improvements in the technology used to support data collection. There was also a difference in the calculations between the 2005-06 biennial report and the 2006-07 CSPR submission. The way in which the "year exited" was counted was slightly different in the two calculations. In 2006-07 the "first year" was the year following the student's exit, whereas in 2005-06, the year of the exit was counted as first year. These gradual improvements in the data collection and analysis system contributed to an improvement in accuracy over the biennium. | |

Source – Initially, pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X126, which contains data group 668, category set A. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.4.4 LEP Students in Non-AYP Grades (formerly 2.3 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the total number of LEP students in grade ranges that were not tested for AYP in SY 2006-07.

Table 1.6.3.4.4 Definitions:

- LEP K-2 =** All LEP students in these grades. Do not include pre-K students.
- LEP HS/Non-AYP =** High school students (grades 9 through 12 or 10 through 12 [State specific]) who are in the high school grades that are not tested for AYP in the State (e.g., if the State tested grade 10 for AYP, then the State should provide the aggregated number of LEP students in grades 9, 11 and 12).
- LEP Other Grades =** Number of LEP students enrolled in public schools but not in grades K through 12. Students in non-graded grades or grade spans. Do not report LEP students in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school) in this row.

| Grade | # |
|------------------|-------|
| LEP K-2 | 38147 |
| LEP HS/Non-AYP | 8942 |
| LEP other grades | 0 |
| Comments: | |

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments

This section collects data on LEP students assessed in their native language.

1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language (formerly 2.4.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

| | |
|--|----|
| State offers the State mathematics or reading/language arts content tests in the students' native language(s). | No |
| Comments: | |

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

* If "No", proceed to 1.6.3.6.

1.6.3.5.2 Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given (formerly 2.4.2 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the language(s) in which native language assessments are given at each grade used for NCLB accountability determinations for mathematics.

| Grade | Language |
|------------------|----------|
| 3 | |
| 4 | |
| 5 | |
| 6 | |
| 7 | |
| 8 | |
| HS | |
| Comments: | |

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.5.3 Native Language of Reading/Language Arts Tests Given (formerly 2.4.2 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the language(s) in which native language assessments are given at each grade used for NCLB accountability determinations for reading/language arts.

| Grade | Language |
|------------------|----------|
| 3 | |
| 4 | |
| 5 | |
| 6 | |
| 7 | |
| 8 | |
| HS | |
| Comments: | |

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.5.4 Native Language Version of State NCLB Mathematics Assessment Results (formerly 2.4.3 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the number of LEP students who took a mathematics assessment in their native language across all grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school).

Table 1.6.3.5.4 Definitions:

1. **# Tested** = Number of LEP students in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school) who took the native language version of the mathematics assessment.
2. **# At or Above Proficient** = Number of students tested through the native language version of the mathematics assessment who scored at or above proficient.
3. **% Results** = Automatically calculated based on the number who scored at or above proficient divided by the number tested.

| # Tested | # At or Above Proficient | % Results |
|------------------|--------------------------|-----------|
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Comments: | | |

Source – Initially pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X049 that is data group 272, category set A. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.5.5 Native Language Version of State NCLB Reading/Language Arts Assessment Results (formerly 2.4.3 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the number of LEP students who took a reading/language arts assessment in their native language across all grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school).

Table 1.6.3.5.5 Definitions:

1. **# Tested** = Number of LEP students in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school) who took the native language version of the reading/language arts assessment.
2. **# At or Above Proficient** = Number of students tested through the native language version of the reading/language arts assessment who scored at or above proficient.
3. **% Results** = Automatically calculated based on the number who scored at or above proficient divided by the number tested.

| # Tested | # At or Above Proficient | % Results |
|------------------|--------------------------|-----------|
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Comments: | | |

Source – Initially pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X049 that is data group 272, category set A. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP Students

This section collects data on the performance of former LEP students.

1.6.3.6.1 Title III Served MFLEP Students by Year Monitored (formerly 3.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

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.

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 |
|---|------------|-------|
| 1168 | 5008 | 6176 |
| Comments: There are multiple factors contributing to a difference in the numbers. There were several transitions in assessment and data collection during the biennium. A new version of the IPT was utilized for the first time in 2005-06. Data collections relied on authoritative sources, supplemented by software for updating the data base when discrepancies were found. There were concomitant improvements in the technology used to support data collection. There was also a difference in the calculations between the 2005-06 biennial report and the 2006-07 CSPR submission. The way in which the "year exited" was counted was slightly different in the two calculations. In 2006-07 the "first year" was the year following the student's exit, whereas in 2005-06, the year of the exit was counted as first year. These gradual improvements in the data collection and analysis system contributed to an improvement in accuracy over the biennium. | | |

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.6.2 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students in AYP Grades Results for Mathematics (formerly 3.2 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the number of monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students who took the annual mathematics assessment.

Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:

1. **# Tested** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in mathematics for AYP.
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 in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school) who did not score proficient on the State *NCLB* mathematics assessment. This will be automatically calculated.

| # Tested | # At or Above Proficient | % Results | # Below Proficient |
|----------|--------------------------|-----------|--------------------|
| 5374 | 4339 | 80.7 | 1035 |

The number tested should be the same or near the total in 1.6.3.4.3 row 2, if not explain the difference in the comment box below.

Comments: There are multiple factors contributing to a difference in the numbers. There were several transitions in assessment and data collection during the biennium. A new version of the IPT was utilized for the first time in 2005-06. Data collections relied on authoritative sources, supplemented by software for updating the data base when discrepancies were found. There were concomitant improvements in the technology used to support data collection. There was also a difference in the calculations between the 2005-06 biennial report and the 2006-07 CSPR submission. The way in which the "year exited" was counted was slightly different in the two calculations. In 2006-07 the "first year" was the year following the student's exit, whereas in 2005-06, the year of the exit was counted as first year. These gradual improvements in the data collection and analysis system contributed to an improvement in accuracy over the biennium. Also, NC did report all MFLEP students as flexibility regulation required.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.6.3 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students in AYP Grades Results for Reading/Language Arts (formerly 3.2 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, provide the number of monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students who took the annual reading/language arts assessment.

Table 1.6.3.6.3 Definitions:

1. **# Tested** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in reading/language arts for AYP.
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.
4. **# Below proficient** = State-aggregated number MFLEP students in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school) who did not score proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment. This will be automatically calculated.

| # Tested | # At or Above Proficient | % Results | # Below Proficient |
|----------|--------------------------|-----------|--------------------|
| 5362 | 5012 | 93.5 | 350 |

The number tested should be the same or near the total in 1.6.3.4.3 row 2, if not explain the difference in the comment box below.

Comments: There are multiple factors contributing to a difference in the numbers. There were several transitions in assessment and data collection during the biennium. A new version of the IPT was utilized for the first time in 2005-06. Data collections relied on authoritative sources, supplemented by software for updating the data base when discrepancies were found. There were concomitant improvements in the technology used to support data collection. There was also a difference in the calculations between the 2005-06 biennial report and the 2006-07 CSPR submission. The way in which the "year exited" was counted was slightly different in the two calculations. In 2006-07 the "first year" was the year following the student's exit, whereas in 2005-06, the year of the exit was counted as first year. These gradual improvements in the data collection and analysis system contributed to an improvement in accuracy over the biennium. Also, NC did report all MFLEP students as flexibility regulation required.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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 (formerly 4.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the number of Title III subgrantees meeting the criteria described in the table. Use the same method of counting consortia as in 1.6.1 (consortia regardless of number of members is only counted as one). 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. The total of the # met all three AMAOs + # met 2 AMAOs only + # Met one AMAO + # Met zero AMAOs=total # of subgrantees for the year.

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

| | # |
|---|----|
| Total number of subgrantees for the year | 84 |
| Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs | |
| Number of subgrantees that met only 2 AMAOs | |
| Number of subgrantees that met AMAOs of Making Progress and ELP Attainment | |
| Number of subgrantees that met AMAOs of Making Progress and AYP | |
| Number of subgrantees that met AMAOs of ELP Attainment and AYP | |
| Number of subgrantees that met only 1 AMAO | 36 |
| Number of subgrantees that met AMAO of Making Progress | |
| Number of subgrantees that met AMAO of Attainment of ELP | |
| Number of subgrantees that met AMAO AYP | 36 |
| Number of subgrantees that did not meet any AMAOs | 48 |
| Number of subgrantees that did not meet AMAOs for two consecutive years | 13 |
| Number of subgrantees with an improvement plan for not meeting Title III AMAOs | 28 |
| Number of subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (beginning in SY 2007-08) | 4 |
| Comments: NC determined subgrantee performance based on AMAO 3 (AYP) as referenced in the letter from the US Department of Education. | |
| "It is the Department's understanding that because of a one-time problem with the State's annual English language proficiency assessment (the IPT Form B), the State does not have accurate and reliable data to make AMAO determinations for AMAO 1 (progress) and AMAO 2 (attainment) for districts receiving Title III funds for the 2006-07 school year. The State has proposed calculating AMAO determinations for the 2006-07 school year based on AMAO 3 only-adequate yearly progress (AYP) for the limited English proficient (LEP) subgroup. | |
| The Department finds this proposal acceptable ..." | |
| --from Acting Assistant Deputy Secretary Margarita Pinkos (December 2007) | |
| In addition, the resolution for NC not reporting AMAO 1 and 2 is referenced in an e-mail dated March 3, 2008 from Abigail Potts,OESE, to Bobbi Stettner-Eaton, OPEPD; "With regards to North Carolina, the letter looks like it is a unique situation for that particular state. It appears North Carolina will be unable to make AMAO determinations 1 & 2 due to an equating error in the English Language Proficiency assessment. As a result, NC will only be using the AMAO 3 - AYP for the LEP subgroup. For the CSPR, the state should leave the AMAO questions 1&2 blank and reference this letter in the comment box." | |

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly in section 1.6.10 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.6.4.2 State Accountability (formerly 4.2 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

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

Note: Meeting all three Title III AMAOs means meeting each State-set target for each objective: Making Progress, Attaining Proficiency, and Making AYP for the LEP subgroup.

| | |
|--|-----------|
| State met <u>all</u> three Title III AMAOs | <u>No</u> |
| Comments: | |

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly in Section 1.6.10 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.6.4.3 Termination of Title III Language Instruction Educational Programs (formerly 6.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

| | |
|---|-----------|
| Any Title III language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> programs and activities for immigrant children and youth terminated for failure to reach program goals. | <u>No</u> |
| If yes, provide the number of language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> programs and activities for immigrant children and youth terminated. | |
| Comments: | |

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students (formerly 5.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

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

1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students

In the table below, report the unduplicated number of immigrant students enrolled in the State and 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 in 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 receive services in Title III LIEPs under Sections 3114(a) & 3115(a) ONLY.
- 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 LIEP subgrants made under Sections 3114(a) & 3115(a) that have immigrant students enrolled in them.

| # Immigrant Students Enrolled | # Students in 3114(d)(1) Program | # of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants |
|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------|
| 25159 | 14443 | 39 |

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

Comments: The number of subgrantees increased because LEAs/Charters that were not eligible for "language acquisition" funds were eligible for "significant increase" funds. This was a change from previous NC requirements. Also, the criterion for significant increase was decreased from 5% to 4%, which allowed a greater number of LEAs/Charters to be eligible.

More LEP students in NC are born in the US than in previous years and there are fewer new immigrants coming to NC than in prior years.

Source – Initially, the first column of the table is pre-populated by ED Facts file N/X045 that contains data group 519, grand total. The second and third columns are manual entry by the SEA.

Note: This table was formerly in section 1.6.4 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.6.5.2 Distribution of Immigrant Funds (formerly 5.3 of the Title III Biennial Collection, reformatted)

In the table below, report how the State distributes the funds reserved for the education of immigrant children and youth to subgrantees.

| Subgrant award cycle | | | |
|--------------------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Annual | <u>Yes</u> | Multi-year | <u>No</u> |
| Type of subgrant awarded | | | |
| Competitive | <u>No</u> | Formula | <u>Yes</u> |

If the State checked more than one item in each category, explain in the comment box.

Comments:

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development

This section collects data on teachers in Title III language instruction education programs.

1.6.6.1 Teacher Information (formerly 7.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection, modified)

In the table below, report the number of teachers who are working in the Title III language instruction educational programs as defined in Section 3301(8) and reported in table 1.6.1 (Types of language instruction educational programs).

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 and a second language.

| | # |
|--|------|
| Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs. | 4459 |
| Number of certified/licensed/endorsed ESL/BE teachers in the state currently working with LEP students (e.g., ESL/BE teachers for ALL LEP students), if the State has such requirements. <u>Or</u> number of teachers with professional development points or course work in ESL/BE, if the State does not require such certification/licensure/endorsement. | 1453 |
| Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*. | 1122 |

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

Comments:

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

* 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 (PD) Activities of Subgrantees Related to the Teaching and Learning of LEP Students
(formerly 7.4 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, provide the number of professional development activities that specifically address only the teaching of LEP students or are related to the learning of LEP students. These professional development activities must meet the requirements of the Title III subgrantee required activities.

Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:

1. **Types of Professional Development Activity** = Subgrantee activities for professional development 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 1.6.1.1 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 (PD) activities reported.
4. **Total** = Number of all participants in PD activities.

| Type of Professional Development Activity | # Subgrantees | |
|---|---------------|----------------|
| Instructional strategies for LEP students | 78 | |
| Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students | 74 | |
| Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students | 63 | |
| Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards | 42 | |
| Subject matter knowledge for teachers | 61 | |
| Other (Explain in comment box) | 32 | |
| Participant Information | # Subgrantees | # Participants |
| PD provided to content classroom teachers | 65 | 18991 |
| PD provided to LEP classroom teachers | 73 | 1779 |
| PD provided to principals | 57 | 1082 |
| PD provided to administrators/other than principals | 47 | 1015 |
| PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative | 40 | 1676 |
| PD provided to community-based organization personnel | 17 | 435 |
| Total | | 24978 |
| Comments: | | |

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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 in the format MM/DD/YY.

Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:

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

Example: State received SY 2006-07 funds July 1, 2006, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2006, for SY 2006-07 programs. Then the "# of days/\$\$ Distribution" is 30 days.

| Date State Received Allocation | Date Funds Available to Subgrantees | # of Days/\$\$ Distribution |
|--------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 07/13/06 | 09/20/06 | 67 |
| Comments: | | |

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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.

NC plans to shorten the process of distributing Title III funds to subgrantees by implementing a Title III Application Review Team consisting of the NC Title III Consultants, expert NC LEP coordinators and trained NC Lead Teachers. This improved process will reduce the time frame of distributing funds by approximately 30 days.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS

In the table below, provide the number of schools identified as persistently dangerous, as determined by the State, by the start of the school year. For further guidance on persistently dangerous schools, refer to section B "Identifying Persistently Dangerous Schools" in the Unsafe School Choice Option Non-Regulatory Guidance, available at:

<http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/unsafeschoolchoice.pdf>.

| | |
|--------------------------------|---|
| Persistently Dangerous Schools | 0 |
| Comments: | |

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.8 GRADUATION RATES AND DROPOUT RATES

This section collects graduation and dropout rates.

1.8.1 Graduation Rates

In the table below, provide the graduation rates calculated using the methodology that was approved as part of the State's accountability plan for the **previous school year** (SY 2005-06). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

| Student Group | Graduation Rate |
|---|-----------------|
| All Students | 70.3 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 51.2 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 75.5 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 60.8 |
| Hispanic | 52.3 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 74.1 |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 50.4 |
| Limited English proficient | 55.1 |
| Economically disadvantaged | 55.8 |
| Migratory students | 38.5 |
| Male | 64.4 |
| Female | 73.1 |
| Comments: Data are unavailable for migratory students. | |

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X041 that is data group 563, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

FAQs on graduation rates:

- a. *What is the graduation rate?* Section 200.19 of the Title I regulations issued under the *No Child Left Behind Act* on December 2, 2002, defines graduation rate to mean:
 - The percentage of students, measured from the beginning of high school, who graduate from public high school with a regular diploma (not including a GED or any other diploma not fully aligned with the State's academic standards) in the standard number of years; or,
 - Another more accurate definition developed by the State and approved by the Secretary in the State plan that more accurately measures the rate of students who graduate from high school with a regular diploma; and
 - Avoids counting a dropout as a transfer.
- b. *What if the data collection system is not in place for the collection of graduate rates?* For those States that are reporting transitional graduation rate data and are working to put into place data collection systems that will allow the State to calculate the graduation rate in accordance with Section 200.19 for all the required subgroups, please provide a detailed progress report on the status of those efforts.

1.8.2 Dropout Rates

In the table below, provide the dropout rates calculated using the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's (NCES) Common Core of Data (CCD) for the **previous school year** (SY 2005-06). Below the table is an FAQ about the data collected in this table.

| Student Group | Dropout Rate |
|--|---------------------|
| All Students | 4.5 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 8.0 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 2.2 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 5.4 |
| Hispanic | 6.0 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 3.9 |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 6.0 |
| Limited English proficient | 9.8 |
| Economically disadvantaged | 2.4 |
| Migratory students | 4.7 |
| Male | 5.3 |
| Female | 3.7 |

Comments:

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 NCLB are being implemented.

Corrective Action # of Districts in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action Is Being Implemented

Implementing 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 or districts abolished between the SYs 2005-06 and 2006-07 as a corrective action)

Comments:

characters Left

Source - Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

Data for 2006-07 are more accurate than in previous years.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

FAQ on dropout rates:

What is a dropout? A dropout is an individual who: 1) was enrolled in school at some time during the previous school year; and 2)

was not enrolled at the beginning of the current school year; and 3) has not graduated from high school or completed a State- or district-approved educational program; and 4) does not meet any of the following exclusionary conditions: a) transfer to another public school district, private school, or State- or district-approved educational program (including correctional or health facility programs); b) temporary absence due to suspension or school-excused illness; or c) death.

1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS PROGRAM

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

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

| | # | # LEAs Reporting Data |
|------------------------|-----|-----------------------|
| LEAs without subgrants | 84 | 84 |
| LEAs with subgrants | 25 | 25 |
| Total | 109 | 109 |
| Comments: | | |

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly Section 1.9.1.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

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

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

1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youths

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

| Age/Grade | # of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants | # of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants |
|------------------------------------|---|--|
| Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten) | 56 | 51 |
| K | 504 | 803 |
| 1 | 525 | 854 |
| 2 | 459 | 811 |
| 3 | 447 | 703 |
| 4 | 410 | 735 |
| 5 | 386 | 660 |
| 6 | 298 | 658 |
| 7 | 321 | 626 |
| 8 | 323 | 670 |
| 9 | 270 | 702 |
| 10 | 146 | 382 |
| 11 | 166 | 259 |
| 12 | 198 | 225 |
| Ungraded | <N | 6 |
| Total | | 8145 |
| Comments: | | |

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly section 1.9.1.3 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.9.1.2 Primary Nighttime Residence of Homeless Children and Youths

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

| | # of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants | # of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants |
|---|--|---|
| Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care | 398 | 792 |
| Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family) | 2143 | 4581 |
| Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings) | 97 | 46 |
| Hotels/Motels | 261 | 527 |
| Total | 2899 | 5946 |
| Comments: There are 1615 homeless youth in LEAs without subgrants for whom the primary nighttime residence is unknown. There are 2199 youth in LEAs with subgrants for whom the primary nighttime residence is unknown. "Primary Residence" was NOT mandatory for collection, but will be in the 2007-08 data collection effort. | | |

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly section 1.9.1.4 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

1.9.2.1 Homeless Children and Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

| Age/Grade | # Homeless Children/Youths Served by Subgrants |
|------------------------------------|--|
| Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten) | 55 |
| K | 922 |
| 1 | 925 |
| 2 | 889 |
| 3 | 790 |
| 4 | 812 |
| 5 | 745 |
| 6 | 708 |
| 7 | 668 |
| 8 | 709 |
| 9 | 738 |
| 10 | 393 |
| 11 | 280 |
| 12 | 248 |
| Ungraded | |
| Total | 8882 |
| Comments: | |

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X043 that is data group 560, category set A. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

1.9.2.2 Subpopulations of Homeless Students Served

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

| | # Homeless Students Served |
|--|----------------------------|
| Unaccompanied youth | 620 |
| Migratory children/youth | 34 |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 428 |
| Limit English proficient students | 253 |
| Comments: | |

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X043 that is data group 560, category sets B, C, D, and E. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly Sections 1.9.2.3, 1.9.2.4, and 1.9.2.5 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. For the SY 2006-07 CSPR, the data collection has been changed to show the total number of students served.

1.9.2.3 Educational Support Services Provided by Subgrantees

In the table below, provide the number of subgrantee programs that provided the following educational support services with McKinney-Vento funds.

| | # McKinney-Vento Subgrantees That Offer |
|---|---|
| 1. Tutoring or other instructional support | 18 |
| 2. Expedited evaluations | 3 |
| 3. Staff professional development and awareness | 9 |
| 4. Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services | 10 |
| 5. Transportation | 18 |
| 6. Early childhood programs | 1 |
| 7. Assistance with participation in school programs | 4 |
| 8. Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs | 8 |
| 9. Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment | 9 |
| 10. Parent education related to rights and resources for children | 11 |
| 11. Coordination between schools and agencies | 8 |
| 12. Counseling | 6 |
| 13. Addressing needs related to domestic violence | 3 |
| 14. Clothing to meet a school requirement | 10 |
| 15. School supplies | 16 |
| 16. Referral to other programs and services | 8 |
| 17. Emergency assistance related to school attendance | 7 |
| 18. Other (optional) | 6 |
| 19. Other (optional) | |
| 20. Other (optional) | |
| Comments: | |

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly Section 1.9.2.6 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.9.2.4 Barriers To The Education Of Homeless Children And Youth

In the table below, provide the number of subgrantees that reported the following barriers to the enrollment and success of homeless children and youths.

| | # Subgrantees Reporting |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| 1. Eligibility for homeless services | 22 |
| 2. School Selection | 5 |
| 3. Transportation | 10 |
| 4. School records | 6 |
| 5. Immunizations | 2 |
| 6. Other medical records | 2 |
| 7. Other Barriers | 10 |
| Comments: | |

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly Section 1.9.2.7 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. Immunizations and Other Medical Records have been changed to two separate data collections for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.9.2.5 Academic Progress of Homeless Students

The following questions collect data on the academic achievement of homeless children and youths served by McKinney-Vento subgrants.

1.9.2.5.1 Reading Assessment

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

| Grade | # Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Reading Assessment Test | # Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient |
|------------------|--|---|
| 3 | 484 | 309 |
| 4 | 496 | 346 |
| 5 | 442 | 340 |
| 6 | 407 | 232 |
| 7 | 394 | 281 |
| 8 | 386 | 292 |
| High School | 204 | 84 |
| Comments: | | |

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category set G. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly part of section 1.9.2.9 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. Grades 9 through 12 have been changed to High School for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.9.2.5.2 Mathematics Assessment

This section is similar to 1.9.2.5.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State *NCLB* mathematics assessment.

| Grade | # Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Mathematics Assessment Test | # Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient |
|------------------|--|---|
| 3 | 491 | 228 |
| 4 | 498 | 195 |
| 5 | 441 | 182 |
| 6 | 405 | 144 |
| 7 | 395 | 154 |
| 8 | 383 | 132 |
| High School | 178 | 121 |
| Comments: | | |

Source – Similar to 1.9.2.5.1 but the file specification is N/X075 that is data group 583, category set G.

Note: This table was formerly part of section 1.9.2.9 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. Grades 9 through 12 have been changed to High School for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.10 MIGRANT CHILD COUNTS

This section collects the Title I, Part C, Migrant Education Program (MEP) child counts which States are required to provide and may be used to determine the annual State allocations under Title I, Part C. The child counts should reflect the reporting period of September 1, 2006 through August 31, 2007. This section also collects a report on the procedures used by States to produce true, accurate, and valid child counts.

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

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

FAQs on Child Count:

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

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

1.10.1 Category 1 Child Count

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number by age/grade of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, resided in your State for one or more days during the reporting period of September 1, 2006 through August 31, 2007. This figure includes all eligible migrant children who may or may not have participated in MEP services. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

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

| Age/Grade | 12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can be Counted for Funding Purposes |
|------------------------------------|--|
| Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten) | 470 |
| K | 270 |
| 1 | 352 |
| 2 | 310 |
| 3 | 280 |
| 4 | 212 |
| 5 | 257 |
| 6 | 202 |
| 7 | 175 |
| 8 | 193 |
| 9 | 197 |
| 10 | 139 |
| 11 | 72 |
| 12 | 40 |
| Ungraded | 0 |
| Out-of-school | 2570 |
| Total | 5739 |
| Comments: See 1.10.1.1 | |

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X121 that is data group 634, Subtotal 1. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.10.1.1 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

North Carolina's Migrant category 1 population has declined by 2324 children (28.82%).

The decrease in category 1 students is a response to multiple factors such as:

Families are settling and establishing permanent residency within North Carolina.

New migrant families are seeking employment in other industries not related to agriculture.

The Latino/Hispanic population has become a crucial workforce for North Carolina. They also are the majority of migrant workers/families enrolled in the N.C. MEP. There has been a significant increase in the number of Latino/Hispanic families moving to the state. According to "The Economic Impact of the Hispanic Population on the State of North Carolina" a study by J. Kasarda and J. Johnson published in 2006 in 2004 7% of the state total population was Hispanic.

Although the number of worker/families in search of work in the agricultural and fishing industries increased in 2001 2002 and 2003 the pattern has changed. The number of families moving to the area in search of employment in other industries establishing a more permanent residency or both has increased. In 2005 agriculture forestry fishing and hunting took in 9.2% of Latino/Hispanic workforce while the construction industry absorbed 42.2% wholesale and retail trade 11.5% and manufacturing 10.7% (Kasarda and Johnson 2006).

North Carolina's tobacco farms no longer attract the high number of families that followed that crop. There is a decline in the production of tobacco because of the tobacco buyout.

During the years from 1997 to 2006 the number of farms in North Carolina decreased from 59120 farms to 48000 farms or a decrease of 18 percent according to the North Carolina Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services. At the same time the amount of land in farms decreased from 9.44 million acres to 8.8 million acres a decline of 6 percent. During the period from 2002 to 2005 there were declines in cash sales of many agricultural commodities especially those requiring hand labors.

Changes in the MEP law interpretation have narrowed the definition of a qualifying move to those workers/families who move with the intention to obtain or seek qualifying work. The changes in MEP Guidance have also affected ID&R practices in poultry plants. The changes in the requirements for an industrial survey have limited the partnership established with poultry plants. Therefore the numbers of identified workers/families from poultry plants has decreased significantly.

The number of H2A migrant workers has decreased 78% during the last 5 years. In 2002 the total of H2A migrant workers was 519 while in 2006 the total number was 114.

Recruiters are reluctant to go out and recruit due to recent immigration laws and possible legal actions.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.10.2 Category 2 Child Count

In the table below, enter by age/grade the unduplicated statewide number of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, were served for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods that occurred within the reporting period of September 1, 2006 through August 31, 2007. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. Count a child who moved to different schools within the State and who was served in both traditional summer and year-round school intersession programs only once. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

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

| Age/Grade | Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes |
|------------------------------------|--|
| Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten) | 297 |
| K | 91 |
| 1 | 135 |
| 2 | 118 |
| 3 | 108 |
| 4 | 71 |
| 5 | 97 |
| 6 | 71 |
| 7 | 57 |
| 8 | 65 |
| 9 | 53 |
| 10 | 38 |
| 11 | 21 |
| 12 | 11 |
| Ungraded | 0 |
| Out-of-school | 1444 |
| Total | 2677 |
| Comments: See 1.10.2.1 | |

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X122 that is data group 635, Subtotal 1. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.10.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

North Carolina's Migrant category 2 population has declined by 782 children (22.61 %).

The decrease in category 2 students is a response to the same factors that are in category 1.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.10.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures

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

1.10.3.1 Student Information System

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

North Carolina used MIS2000 for both categories.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.10.3.2 Data Collection and Management Procedures

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

How was the child count data collected?

The child count data is collected in MIS2000 through its main two windows COE data and Student data-School History. The COE data is collected from the paper COE completed during the eligibility interview. From the second year of eligibility and on the student data-school history is collected from schools migrant families and migrant OSY through the enrollment verification process.

What data were collected?

The Certificate of Eligibility (COE) data collected is standardized for the entire state. The sections of the COE contain the following data: Section I: Legal Parent; Section II: Eligibility Data; Section III: Child/Youth Data; Section IV: Parent/Guardian/Worker Consent; Section V: Eligibility Data Certification. Data collection is done year round. All information collected in the handwritten COE is loaded into MIS2000.

Section II: Eligibility Data is used specifically to determine eligibility. The information in this section includes: The child listed moved "From" (City State Country) and "To" (City State Country); "Qualifying Arrival Date" and "Residency Date"; The child moved "With" "To Join" "On his/her own"; Qualifying worker moved to "Obtain" "Seek" or "Previous"; Qualifying Work is/was: "Temporary" "Seasonal" "Agricultural Related" "Fishing Related"; "Qualifying Activity"; "Worker's Name" and "Current Parent/Guardian".

Section III: Child/Youth data is used to enroll the child/youth in the migrant program. The information in this section includes: child/youth full name (Paternal Maternal First Middle) "Generation" "Relationship to Worker" "Race" "Sex" Date of Birth "DOB Verification" "Age" "Birth Place" (Birth City State Country) "Binational" "Current School" "Enrollment Date" "Enrollment Type" and "Grade".

The School Data-School History panel collects school/migrant program enrollment information. This panel contains the following enrollment data: "School Name" "Enroll Date" "Withdraw Date" "Residency Only Verification Date" "Type" "Grade" "Termination Type" and "Termination Date".

What activities were conducted to collect the data?

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

Each LEA develops and implements an annual Identification and Recruitment (ID&R) plan. The local ID&R plan targets the recruitment and services of: Out-of-School pre-kindergarten children; Students attending schools; Out-of-school youth. The ID&R plan will focus its intervention in three major areas: local school systems; community agencies and business; county employment opportunities.

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

A North Carolina MEP data specialist or any other assigned person must be trained and authorized by the SEA or by the LEA to enter data into MIS2000. The data specialist is responsible for entering each COE and MEP/school enrollment information into MIS2000. The MEP/School enrollment information is verified every year twice a year (regular school term and summer term) by the data specialist and recruiter with schools migrant families and/or Out-of-School youths through the "Enrollment Verification" process. This process verifies eligibility/services and residency of every migrant child in the state. Every year the child is re-enrolled in the migrant program if the child is still eligible or is receiving services after the end of eligibility and if he/she is still residing in the LEA.

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

The COE is reviewed by the LEA MEP COE reviewer to verify that based on the recorded data the child/youth is eligible for MEP

services. Once the COE is signed by the COE reviewer the data specialist enters the data to his/her local database in the MIS2000 software.

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

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

Participant migrant counties have access to search and download students from the state server. Each county is responsible for maintaining and updating COEs and their databases with school history information credit accrual test data health supplemental programs student profile and family data. Data collected from COEs is loaded to the migrant server in its entire form. The upload process to the state server is maintained all year long.

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

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Each LEA MEP data specialist enters eligible migrant children data into their local copy of the MIS2000 software. The data specialist keys COEs into the MIS2000 software from a handwritten COE (hard copy). Data from the hard copy is entered item by item into the software and it is checked by the reviewer. This reviewer is typically a director or program coordinator. The data specialist is able to print a COE from MIS2000 to be filed along with the handwritten COE as the legal document. COEs are an electronic document with a hard copy backup.

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

Data specialists were instructed to run all the reports that find potential duplicates three times during the 06-07 year. The reports were sent to the state office and duplicate records were merged into one. The criteria used to match duplicates are: find the same student's last name student's first name middle initial DOB mother's last name and mother's first name. The merge job is done in the state migrant server and then propagated to the LEAs with duplicate records.

Uploads are done frequently to the state database to synchronize databases with the state migrant server. COE data is loaded to MIS2000 within 2 weeks of identifying students. Data entry personnel upload data to the state server as soon as changes are made to the LEA MEP database in order to keep the rest of the state with the latest student information available. In addition frequently uploading allows North Carolina to recover local database information in case of hard drive failure at the LEA.

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

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

throughout the year usually during the peak season. A second verification is done during summer.

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

During the 06-07 year NCMEP did not verify if this procedure was done in each LEA MEP. We relied on the LEA MEP director to make sure they completed this process. Nevertheless NCMEP has implemented a procedure to verify that the enrollment verification is done in each of our LEAs during the 07-08 year. This new procedure consists of asking each LEA to submit to NCMEP the list of students whose enrollment was verified. Then NCMEP will randomly select a certain amount of these students to revise their records in MIS2000 and make sure that the enrollment verification was done. The amount of students' records revised will depend on the human resources available in NCMEP at that time.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The State's Category 2 data was collected and maintained in the same way as the category 1 data was done.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.10.3.3 Methods Used To Count Children

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Children who were between age 3 through 21

The student's age must be between 3 and 21 years during the reporting year. MIS2000 computes the fields "Student ThirdBDay" is less than the end date of the report period and the "Student Twenty.SecondBDay" is greater than the start date of the reporting period.

A child will be counted if they turn 3 or 22 during the reporting period.

Children who met the program eligibility criteria (e.g. were within 3 years of a last qualifying move had a qualifying activity)

The End of Eligibility date must be greater than the beginning of the reporting period.

The Qualifying Arrival Date must be equal to or greater than 09/01/03 and be within 36 month of the Residency date.

The End of Eligibility date must be greater than the date qualifying the student (i.e. Enroll Residency Verification or Residency dates). The exceptions are Withdraw and Supplemental Program End dates. (Withdraw is defined as ending an enrollment period in a school history line). In MIS2000 the supplemental program section has a field named "End Date". This date can be the same as the Withdraw date from a history line but it can stand on its own if the Local Educational Agency wants to end a supplemental program before they are withdrawn from a school history enrollment line. End of Eligibility is not the same as Program End Date. End of Eligibility means the student has ended the 36 months of eligibility has graduated or has died.

A child will be counted in the A1 count if the qualifying arrival date plus 36 months is equal or greater than the beginning of the reporting period and if any of the following dates falls between the reporting period range: enroll date withdraw date supplemental program start date supplemental program end date or residency only verification date. Also the interview date has to be before or equal to the last date of the reporting period.

A child will be counted in the A2 count if in addition to the criteria for the A1 count the child's end of eligibility is equal to or after the beginning of the summer program and if the child's summer services were paid in whole or part with MEP funds.

For this purpose the reporting period for the A1 count and for Intersession in the A2 count goes from 09/01/06 to 08/31/07. The reporting period for Summer in the A2 count goes from 06/01/07 to 08/31/07.

Children who were resident in your State for at least 1 day during the eligibility period (September 1 through August 31)

For a child to be counted one of the following dates must be between 09/01 and 08/31 of the reporting year: Residency Verification Enroll Withdraw Supplemental Program Start or End date. Enrollment means the student has a school history line in MIS2000 showing enrollment in a school or in the migrant program (for out-of-school children). Supplemental Programs are defined in North Carolina as services above and beyond the basic educational programs provided by the local school district. Students who were resident in North Carolina for at least one day during the reporting period and who have activity in MIS2000 in any of the fields listed above will be counted in category 1 count.

Children who—in the case of Category 2—received a MEP-funded service during the summer or intersession term

For a child to be counted in category 2 count the enrollment type must be either: summer intersession or participant. Any of these three can be paid in whole or in part with migrant funds. Summer term is defined as any organized academic program by the school district during 06/01 and 08/31 of the reporting period. Intersession term is defined as any organized intersession program by the school district in a year round school. Enrollment as intersession can occur any time between 09/01- 08/31 of the reporting year. Summer participants are defined as children receiving supplemental programs either as services or basic educational programs

provided by the local school district during 06/01 - 08/31. Children served as participants include out of school youth or children that are not currently enrolled in a Regular or Summer school program.

For a child with a summer or participant enrollment type to be counted one of the following dates must fall within the specified summer time frame (default is 06/01 to 08/31): Enroll or Withdraw and Supplemental Program Start or End date. Children in schools whose regular term program ends after June 1 are not included in this count. The default summer enrollment date begins after the end of the regular program.

For a child with an intersession enrollment type to be counted one of the following dates must fall within the specified intersession time frame (default is 09/01 to 08/31): Enroll or Withdraw and Supplemental Program Start or End date.

Students who were residents in North Carolina for at least one day and have eligibility during the summer/intersession reporting period and MIS2000 confirms activity in any of the fields named above will be counted in category 2.

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

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

The data manager runs the Potential Duplicate Students report to find students with more than one record among different LEAs. If the six fields named above match the records are merged. If any of those fields are different the data manager contacts each LEA involved with the duplicated records to verify the information.

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The State's Category 2 count was generated using the same system from the Category 1 count.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

1. Using a Standardized Certificate of Eligibility (COE)

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

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

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

2. Training

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

The SEA MEP staff provides training at three different levels:

One-on-one - Upon the LEA request to the SEA the statewide recruitment coordinator state data manager or both will provide one-on-one basic training to new recruiters and data specialists.

By service area - Service area meetings are conducted three times a year during the fall winter and spring. The agenda of these meetings includes training on ID&R and data collection.

Statewide - Once a year statewide training is provided to all NC MEP staff on ID&R and data collection. The state also sponsors a statewide MEP conference that includes sessions on ID&R and data collection.

List Server - Year round serve as a forum for follow up training questions.

3. Determining Accuracy of Written Eligibility Documentation

The LEA must assign an authorized and qualified MEP staff member to review and sign each COE. The COE reviewer must be a person other than the recruiter/interviewer who originally made the eligibility determination.

The COE reviewer must sign each COE. His or her signature certifies that the COE was reviewed and that he/she verified based on the recorded data that the child or youth is eligible for MEP services.

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

4. Resolving Eligibility Questions

Each LEA establishes its own process for resolving eligibility questions which establishes the order in which MEP staff should be contacted when questions arise. It usually includes three components: reviewing written documentation on eligibility discussing any questions with local MEP staff (the local COE reviewer or the director) and consulting the ID&R coordinator or data manager. SEA staff is available as needed by phone e-mail list serve or by visiting the site.

The process for resolving eligibility questions must be included in the local ID&R plan.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

State level re-interviews:

The SEA conducts annual MEP monitoring visits to selected LEAs which include an ID&R re-interviewing component. This procedure was implemented during the 2004-2005 school year.

The goal of each monitoring visit is to re-interview 10% or 10 migrant children whichever is greater of the LEA previous year's A1 count. Due to time and human resources constrictions this goal is not reached most of the times. The re-interviews are conducted by the state ID&R coordinator or by the state program specialist.

To conduct the re-interviews three (3) random samples with 20 children each (60 children in total) are taken from the system for each LEA. The number of randomly selected children is greater than the number of children to be re-interviewed in case some of the children randomly selected have left the LEAs by the time the re-interview is done. If a child selected in the random sample is not residing in the LEA the next child in the list is verified.

During the 06-07 year nine (9) LEAs were monitored. Re-interviews specifications and outcomes are shown in the following table:

Re-interview

Date 05-06 A1 Count # of children re-interviewed # of children found no eligible # of siblings no eligible

LEA 19 10/09/06 61 8 0 0

LEA 20 10/11/06 767 7 2 2

LEA 25 11/06/06 95 13 2 4

LEA 26 11/08/06 88 12 2 3

LEA 15 12/05/06 56 6 0 0

LEA 5 02/02/07 23 8 8 1

LEA 13 02/07/07 133 9 2 5

LEA 2 03/06/07 157 5 3 6

LEA 22 04/13/07 575 6 2 2

Total 1955 74 21 23

As of 11/30/07 four (4) LEAs have been monitored during the 07-08 school year. Re-interviews specification and outcomes are shown in the following table:

Re-interview

Date 06-07 A1 Count # of children re-interviewed # of children found no eligible # of siblings no eligible

LEA 30 10/02/07 291 7 1 0

LEA 35 10/09/07 203 5 0 0

LEA 18 10/10/09 102 5 0 0

LEA 33 11/19/07 370 5 0 0

Total 966 22 1 0

All these children have been removed from the state and local database.

Local level re-interviews:

Re-interviewing workers/families at the local level was highly recommended by the SEA during the 06-07 year but it was a LEA's decision to conduct this procedure. LEAs were not required to submit a formal report to the state office but they have to report children who were found not eligible during re-interview.

According to eight (8) LEAs notification during the 06-07 and beginning of 07-08 funding years 70 migrant children were found not eligible during re-interviews. These students were removed from the state and local database upon notification.

Re-interviews at the local level are mandatory for the 07-08 year and thereafter. Once a year each LEA will have to randomly select and re-interview 5% or 5 students whichever is greater of the previous year's A1 count.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

Monitoring visit: during state monitoring visits one of the MEP data manager's tasks is to verify that data in the system is accurate and updated. This process is done by talking to the data specialist and by visually revising a random sample of student's records. Talking to the data specialist allows us to know how data is being entered into the system and the knowledge of key concepts. Revising records in the system allow us to verify if data is accurate and updated. Some of the data monitored during this process are: school history test credit accrual family supplemental programs and eligibility data. The Seasonal/Temporary Flag report is also used to verify eligibility data in COEs.

Site visit: the state MEP data manager visits each LEA as needed and by the LEA request. During this visit the data specialist has the opportunity to expound his/her concerns in regard to the data and solve doubts. At the same time the data manager has to opportunity to verify how the data is being entering into MIS2000 by talking to the data specialist visually revising records in the system and running reports.

The N.C. MEP ID&R quality control system includes the "Monitoring through MIS2000 Reports" component to address data quality after it is entered into MIS2000:

MIS2000 offers the option to develop different reports to verify the accuracy of data entered into the system. This procedure can be accomplished at the state or local level.

This component of the quality control system was optional for the LEAs during the 06-07 year but it is required this 07-08 year. The SEA uses these reports for training purposes and monitoring visits (both formal and informal visits).

The MIS2000 reports used for quality control purposes are:

"Seasonal/Temporary Flag" and "Enable Work Flag" reports: These reports determine if the data entered meets eligibility requirements on issues such as: qualifying families under "seeking" "previous" or "temporary"; accuracy of the qualifying activity and qualifying arrival date; time between school enrollment and MEP enrollment.

COE Review Up to Date report: This report determines if the COE was entered into the MIS2000 database within two weeks from the date the family was interviewed.

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

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

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

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

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

The SEA may contract with a re-interviewer who can assist LEAs in re-interviewing.

Focus on training for re-interviewing and assist programs in collaborating with other nearby programs to carry out re-interviewing.

Develop a standard questionnaire for re-interviews and use ConQIR materials to increase consistency.

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

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

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

NC MEP does not have any concerns about the accuracy of the reported child counts.

For eligibility determinations we recommend additional training of ID&R staff regarding determinations based on previous qualifying

work since most errors are found in this category.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.