

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

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

For reporting on
School Year 2016-17

NORTH CAROLINA



PART I DUE THURSDAY, DECEMBER 14, 2017
PART II DUE THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 2018

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202

INTRODUCTION

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

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

The *ESEA* Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2016-17 consists of two Parts, Part I and Part II.

PART I

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

- | **Performance Goal 1:** By SY 2016-17, all students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.
- | **Performance Goal 2:** All limited English proficient students will become proficient in English and reach high academic standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.
- | **Performance Goal 3:** By SY 2005-06, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.
- | **Performance Goal 4:** All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free, and conducive to learning.
- | **Performance Goal 5:** All students will graduate from high school.

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

PART II

Part II of the CSPR consists of information related to State activities and outcomes of specific *ESEA* programs. While the information requested varies from program to program, the specific information requested for this report meets the following criteria:

1. The information is needed for Department program performance plans or for other program needs.
2. The information is not available from another source, including program evaluations pending full implementation of required *EDFacts* submission.
3. The information will provide valid evidence of program outcomes or results.

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 2016-17 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Thursday, December 14, 2017**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Thursday, February 8, 2018**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2016-17, 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 2016-17 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 2016-17 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

		OMB Number: 1810-0724
		Expiration Date: 5/31/2018
Consolidated State Performance Report For State Formula Grant Programs under the Elementary And Secondary Education Act as amended in 2001		
Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2016-17 <input type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2016-17		
Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report: North Carolina		
Address: 301 North Wilmington Street Raleigh, NC 267602		
Person to contact about this report:		
Name: Karl Pond		
Telephone: 919-807-3241		
Fax: 919-807-4000		
e-mail: karl.pond@dpi.nc.gov		
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Mark Johnson		
		<u>Tuesday, December 12, 2017, 2:16:29 PM</u>
Signature _____		Date

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART I**

For reporting on
School Year 2016-17



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 14, 2017
5PM EST**

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

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

1.1.1 Academic Content Standards

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

Response	Options
<u>State has revised or changed</u>	No revisions or changes to academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science made or planned.
	State has revised or changed its academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science or is planning to make revisions to or change its academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Indicate below the year these changes were or will be implemented or "Not Applicable" to indicate that changes were not made or will not be made in the subject area.

Acceptable responses are a school year (e.g., 2016-17) or Not Applicable.

Academic Content Standards	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Academic Content Standards	SY 2018-19	SY 2018-19	N/A

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

The response is limited to 1,000 characters.

N/A

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

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

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

Response	Options
<u>No Revisions or changes</u>	No revisions or changes to academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science made or planned.
	State has changed its academic achievement standards or is planning to change its academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Indicate below either the school year in which these changes were or will be implemented or "Not Applicable" to indicate that changes were not made or will not be made in the subject area.

Acceptable responses are a school year (e.g., 2016-17) or Not Applicable.

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

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

The response is limited to 1,000 characters.

N/A

1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics, Reading/Language Arts and Science

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

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

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

Acceptable responses are a school year (e.g., 2016-17) or Not Applicable.

Academic Assessments	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Regular Assessments in Grades 3-8	SY 2018-19	SY 2019-20	N/A
Regular Assessments in High School	SY 2018-19	SY 2019-20	N/A
Alternate Assessments Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards (if applicable)	N/A	N/A	N/A
Alternate Assessments Based on Modified Achievement Standards (if applicable)	N/A	N/A	N/A
Alternate Assessments Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	SY 2018-19	SY 2019-20	SY 2019-20

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

The response is limited to 1,000 characters.

N/A

1.1.3 Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities**1.1.3.1 Percentages of Funds Used for Standards and Assessment Development and Other Purposes**

For funds your State had available under *ESEA* section 6111 (Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities) during SY 2016-17, estimate what percentage of the funds your State used for the following (round to the nearest ten percent).

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

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

For funds your State had available under *ESEA* section 6111 (Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities) during SY 2016-17 that were used for purposes other than the costs of the development of the State assessments and standards required by section 1111(b), for what purposes did your State use the funds? (Enter "yes" for all that apply and "no" for all that do not apply).

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

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENT ²

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

Note: States are not required to report these data by the racial/ethnic groups shown in the table below; instead, they are required to report these data by the major racial and ethnic groups that are identified in their Accountability Workbooks. The charts below display racial/ethnic data that have been mapped from the major racial and ethnic groups identified in their workbooks to the racial/ethnic groups shown.

² The "Asian/Pacific Islander" row in the tables below represent either the value reported by the state to the Department of Education for the major racial and ethnic group "Asian/Pacific Islander" or an aggregation of values reported by the state for the major racial and ethnic groups "Asian" and "Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander or Pacific Islander" (and "Filipino" in the case of California). When the values reported in the Asian/Pacific Islander row represent the U. S. Department of Education aggregation of other values reported by the state, the detail for "Asian" and Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander" are also included in the following rows. Disaggregated reporting for assessment participation data is done according to the provisions outlined within each state's Accountability Workbook. Accordingly, not every state uses major racial and ethnic groups which enable detail of Asian American/Pacific Islander (AAPI) populations.

1.2.1 Participation of All Students in Mathematics Assessment

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

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	818,451	814,447	99.51
American Indian or Alaska Native	9,990	9,942	99.52
Asian or Pacific Islander	26,386	26,269	99.56
Asian	25,398	25,287	99.56
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	988	982	99.39
Black or African American	207,848	206,366	99.29
Hispanic or Latino	140,039	139,242	99.43
White	400,029	398,628	99.65
Two or more races	34,159	34,000	99.53
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	109,380	108,317	99.03
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	40,212	39,716	98.77
Economically disadvantaged students	407,814	405,432	99.42
Migratory students	1,178	1,169	99.24
Male	419,948	417,629	99.45
Female	398,503	396,818	99.58

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

1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities (*IDEA*) in Mathematics Assessment

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	21,863	20.18
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	78,049	72.06
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	8	0.01
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	8,397	7.75
Total	108,317	////////////////////////////////////

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The eight students on the modified is not for 2016-17 administrations but rather banked scores for previous years' administrations. The banked scores are used for the federal reporting of students who have a NC Math 1 score by the end of 10th grade.

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	827,180	823,465	99.55
American Indian or Alaska Native	10,020	9,974	99.54
Asian or Pacific Islander	27,466	27,368	99.64
Asian	26,446	26,357	99.66
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	1,020	1,011	99.12
Black or African American	209,015	207,565	99.31
Hispanic or Latino	143,435	142,703	99.49
White	402,917	401,691	99.70
Two or more races	34,327	34,164	99.53
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	109,618	108,587	99.06
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	45,109	44,719	99.14
Economically disadvantaged students	411,501	409,093	99.41
Migratory students	1,246	1,240	99.52
Male	424,463	422,230	99.47
Female	402,717	401,235	99.63

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

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

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

Recently Arrived LEP Students	#
Recently arrived LEP students who took an assessment of English language proficiency in lieu of the State's reading/language arts assessment	4,788

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

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

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	25,775	23.74
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	74,346	68.47
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	2	0.00
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	8,402	7.74
LEP < 12 months, took ELP	62	0.06
Total	108,587	////////////////////////////////////

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The two students on the modified is not for 2016-17 administrations but rather banked scores for previous years' administrations. The banked scores are used for the federal reporting of students who have a English II score by the end of 10th grade.

1.2.5 Participation of All Students in the Science Assessment

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	339,449	337,049	99.29
American Indian or Alaska Native	4,188	4,151	99.12
Asian or Pacific Islander	10,921	10,832	99.19
Asian	10,503	10,417	99.18
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	418	415	99.28
Black or African American	85,933	85,058	98.98
Hispanic or Latino	54,123	53,645	99.12
White	170,837	169,999	99.51
Two or more races	13,447	13,364	99.38
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	43,060	42,492	98.68
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	11,007	10,723	97.42
Economically disadvantaged students	158,798	157,477	99.17
Migratory students	391	384	98.21
Male	172,866	171,556	99.24
Female	166,583	165,493	99.35

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

1.2.6 Participation of Students with Disabilities (IDEA) in Science Assessment

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	11,810	27.79
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	26,994	63.53
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	5	0.01
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	3,683	8.67
Total	42,492	////////////////////////////////////

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The five students on the modified is not for 2016-17 administrations but rather banked scores for previous years' administrations. The banked scores are used for the federal reporting of students who have a Biology score by the end of 11th grade.

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT³

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

Note: States are not required to report these data by the racial/ethnic groups shown in the table below; instead, they are required to report these data by the major racial and ethnic groups that are identified in their Accountability Workbooks. The charts below display racial/ethnic data that have been mapped from the major racial and ethnic groups identified in their workbooks to the racial/ethnic groups shown.

1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics

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

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

1.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts

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

The student group "limited English proficient (LEP) students" does not include recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months and who took an assessment of English language proficiency in lieu of the States reading/language arts assessment. Do not include former LEP students.

1.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science

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

Limited English Proficient (LEP) students include recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months. Do not include former LEP students.

³ The "Asian/Pacific Islander" row in the tables below represent either the value reported by the state to the Department of Education for the major racial and ethnic group "Asian/Pacific Islander" or an aggregation of values reported by the state for the major racial and ethnic groups "Asian" and "Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander or Pacific Islander" (and "Filipino" in the case of California). When the values reported in the Asian/Pacific Islander row represent the U. S. Department of Education aggregation of other values reported by the state, the detail for "Asian" and Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander" are also included in the following rows. Disaggregated reporting for assessment participation data is done according to the provisions outlined within each state's Accountability Workbook. Accordingly, not every state uses major racial and ethnic groups which enable detail of Asian American/Pacific Islander (AAPI) populations.

1.3.1.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	121,848	63,467	52.09
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,448	551	38.05
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,060	3,113	76.67
<i>Asian</i>	3,881	3,022	77.87
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	179	91	50.84
Black or African American	31,493	10,483	33.29
Hispanic or Latino	22,342	9,692	43.38
White	57,108	36,856	64.54
Two or more races	5,397	2,772	51.36
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	16,031	3,641	22.71
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	13,817	4,831	34.96
Economically disadvantaged students	64,360	24,775	38.49
Migratory students	227	87	38.33
Male	62,442	32,535	52.10
Female	59,406	30,932	52.07

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

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

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	121,817	56,142	46.09
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,448	434	29.97
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,052	2,665	65.77
<i>Asian</i>	3,874	2,593	66.93
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	178	72	40.45
Black or African American	31,489	9,119	28.96
Hispanic or Latino	22,328	6,708	30.04
White	57,106	34,590	60.57
Two or more races	5,394	2,626	48.68
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	16,028	2,973	18.55
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	13,791	2,406	17.45
Economically disadvantaged students	64,339	20,070	31.19
Migratory students	227	46	20.26
Male	62,430	27,469	44.00
Female	59,387	28,673	48.28

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

1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 3

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

1.3.1.2 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	121,749	61,930	50.87
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,497	518	34.60
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,140	3,196	77.20
<i>Asian</i>	3,970	3,112	78.39
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	170	84	49.41
Black or African American	30,827	9,343	30.31
Hispanic or Latino	22,573	9,436	41.80
White	57,423	36,851	64.17
Two or more races	5,289	2,586	48.89
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	16,772	3,300	19.68
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,217	960	15.44
Economically disadvantaged students	63,262	22,932	36.25
Migratory students	206	77	37.38
Male	62,597	32,300	51.60
Female	59,152	29,630	50.09

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Data are accurate as reported. In 2016-2017, the English proficiency standards were raised for the ACCESS 2.0 annual assessment. Students were required to demonstrate higher language skills in 2016-2017 to achieve the same proficiency level scores in previous years. As expected, the number of students demonstrating proficiency dropped from last year.

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

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	121,745	53,194	43.69
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,495	429	28.70
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,137	2,645	63.94
<i>Asian</i>	3,968	2,574	64.87
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	169	71	42.01
Black or African American	30,830	7,943	25.76
Hispanic or Latino	22,565	6,641	29.43
White	57,427	33,122	57.68
Two or more races	5,291	2,414	45.62
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	16,777	2,464	14.69
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,202	316	5.10
Economically disadvantaged students	63,264	18,134	28.66
Migratory students	207	58	28.02
Male	62,595	26,479	42.30
Female	59,150	26,715	45.16

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Data are accurate as reported. In 2016-2017, the English proficiency standards were raised for the ACCESS 2.0 annual assessment. Students were required to demonstrate higher language skills in 2016-2017 to achieve the same proficiency level scores in previous years. As expected, the number of students demonstrating proficiency dropped from last year.

1.3.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 4

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

1.3.1.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	118,645	63,903	53.86
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,389	466	33.55
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,041	3,225	79.81
<i>Asian</i>	3,866	3,128	80.91
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	175	97	55.43
Black or African American	29,982	10,148	33.85
Hispanic or Latino	21,205	9,917	46.77
White	57,023	37,523	65.80
Two or more races	5,005	2,624	52.43
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	16,842	3,105	18.44
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,061	596	14.68
Economically disadvantaged students	60,157	23,698	39.39
Migratory students	181	73	40.33
Male	60,669	32,116	52.94
Female	57,976	31,787	54.83

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. data are accurate as reported. In 2016-2017, the English proficiency standards were raised for the ACCESS 2.0 annual assessment. Students were required to demonstrate higher language skills in 2016-2017 to achieve the same proficiency level scores in previous years. As expected, the number of students demonstrating proficiency dropped from last year.

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

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	118,643	50,491	42.56
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,389	359	25.85
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,038	2,592	64.19
<i>Asian</i>	3,865	2,519	65.17
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	173	73	42.20
Black or African American	29,988	7,493	24.99
Hispanic or Latino	21,192	5,863	27.67
White	57,028	31,996	56.11
Two or more races	5,008	2,188	43.69
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	16,842	2,342	13.91
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,047	194	4.79
Economically disadvantaged students	60,157	16,491	27.41
Migratory students	181	35	19.34
Male	60,660	24,313	40.08
Female	57,983	26,178	45.15

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

1.3.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	118,630	70,078	59.07
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,385	693	50.04
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,041	3,161	78.22
<i>Asian</i>	3,866	3,060	79.15
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	175	101	57.71
Black or African American	29,984	12,012	40.06
Hispanic or Latino	21,197	10,140	47.84
White	57,018	41,035	71.97
Two or more races	5,005	3,037	60.68
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	16,829	4,191	24.90
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,057	584	14.39
Economically disadvantaged students	60,146	27,201	45.22
Migratory students	181	71	39.23
Male	60,657	36,368	59.96
Female	57,973	33,710	58.15

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. data are accurate as reported. In 2016-2017, the English proficiency standards were raised for the ACCESS 2.0 annual assessment. Students were required to demonstrate higher language skills in 2016-2017 to achieve the same proficiency level scores in previous years. As expected, the number of students demonstrating proficiency dropped from last year.

1.3.1.4 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	115,338	52,304	45.35
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,376	406	29.51
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,680	2,792	75.87
<i>Asian</i>	3,565	2,736	76.75
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	115	56	48.70
Black or African American	28,908	7,340	25.39
Hispanic or Latino	19,936	7,308	36.66
White	56,757	32,465	57.20
Two or more races	4,681	1,993	42.58
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	15,489	2,009	12.97
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,589	327	9.11
Economically disadvantaged students	58,187	17,202	29.56
Migratory students	153	40	26.14
Male	59,068	25,833	43.73
Female	56,270	26,471	47.04

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

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

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	115,331	58,179	50.45
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,376	492	35.76
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,679	2,593	70.48
<i>Asian</i>	3,564	2,533	71.07
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	115	60	52.17
Black or African American	28,914	9,062	31.34
Hispanic or Latino	19,929	7,309	36.68
White	56,754	36,322	64.00
Two or more races	4,679	2,401	51.31
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	15,488	2,225	14.37
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,577	151	4.22
Economically disadvantaged students	58,185	19,956	34.30
Migratory students	153	39	25.49
Male	59,076	28,296	47.90
Female	56,255	29,883	53.12

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. data are accurate as reported. In 2016-2017, the English proficiency standards were raised for the ACCESS 2.0 annual assessment. Students were required to demonstrate higher language skills in 2016-2017 to achieve the same proficiency level scores in previous years. As expected, the number of students demonstrating proficiency dropped from last year.

1.3.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 6

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

1.3.1.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	108,390	46,620	43.01
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,326	378	28.51
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,434	2,583	75.22
<i>Asian</i>	3,321	2,539	76.45
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	113	44	38.94
Black or African American	26,790	5,888	21.98
Hispanic or Latino	17,806	5,625	31.59
White	54,391	30,170	55.47
Two or more races	4,643	1,976	42.56
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	14,950	1,252	8.37
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,160	319	7.67
Economically disadvantaged students	53,035	13,738	25.90
Migratory students	156	33	21.15
Male	55,897	23,076	41.28
Female	52,493	23,544	44.85

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. data are accurate as reported; NC comparison shows a difference of less than 5% for this subgroup and considers that insignificant.

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

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	108,380	53,055	48.95
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,328	468	35.24
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,431	2,464	71.82
<i>Asian</i>	3,317	2,409	72.63
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	114	55	48.25
Black or African American	26,796	7,892	29.45
Hispanic or Latino	17,791	6,268	35.23
White	54,391	33,622	61.82
Two or more races	4,643	2,341	50.42
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	14,949	1,982	13.26
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,150	222	5.35
Economically disadvantaged students	53,033	17,233	32.49
Migratory students	156	37	23.72
Male	55,900	25,502	45.62
Female	52,480	27,553	52.50

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. data are accurate as reported; NC comparison shows a difference of less than 5% for this subgroup and considers that insignificant.

1.3.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 7

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

1.3.1.6 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	116,512	46,150	39.61
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,462	293	20.04
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,695	2,616	70.80
<i>Asian</i>	3,567	2,567	71.97
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	128	49	38.28
Black or African American	29,131	5,695	19.55
Hispanic or Latino	18,762	5,406	28.81
White	58,700	30,359	51.72
Two or more races	4,762	1,781	37.40
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	15,104	1,142	7.56
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,534	324	7.15
Economically disadvantaged students	55,748	12,972	23.27
Migratory students	137	25	18.25
Male	59,857	23,091	38.58
Female	56,655	23,059	40.70

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

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

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	116,502	48,558	41.68
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,459	360	24.67
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,690	2,303	62.41
<i>Asian</i>	3,562	2,250	63.17
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	128	53	41.41
Black or African American	29,121	7,027	24.13
Hispanic or Latino	18,753	5,437	28.99
White	58,717	31,474	53.60
Two or more races	4,762	1,957	41.10
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	15,107	1,535	10.16
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,522	196	4.33
Economically disadvantaged students	55,740	14,509	26.03
Migratory students	137	25	18.25
Male	59,860	22,614	37.78
Female	56,642	25,944	45.80

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

1.3.3.6 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	116,447	77,101	66.21
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,453	754	51.89
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,697	3,084	83.42
<i>Asian</i>	3,568	2,996	83.97
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	129	88	68.22
Black or African American	29,106	13,373	45.95
Hispanic or Latino	18,753	10,417	55.55
White	58,680	46,272	78.85
Two or more races	4,758	3,201	67.28
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	15,076	4,401	29.19
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,536	845	18.63
Economically disadvantaged students	55,695	28,639	51.42
Migratory students	137	57	41.61
Male	59,816	39,760	66.47
Female	56,631	37,341	65.94
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.3.1.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - High School

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	111,965	49,687	44.38
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,444	388	26.87
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,219	2,305	71.61
<i>Asian</i>	3,117	2,267	72.73
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	102	38	37.25
Black or African American	29,235	7,170	24.53
Hispanic or Latino	16,618	5,723	34.44
White	57,226	32,281	56.41
Two or more races	4,223	1,820	43.10
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	13,129	1,419	10.81
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,338	170	5.09
Economically disadvantaged students	50,683	14,278	28.17
Migratory students	109	32	29.36
Male	57,099	24,721	43.29
Female	54,866	24,966	45.50

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. data are accurate as reported; comparing student cohorts across assessments does not make sense in NC, as a student may take Math 1 as early as 8th grade, and Science or RLA in 10th or 11th grade. An expectation that these populations would "match" would assume that all assessments are administered in the same academic year, which is not the case.

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

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	116,259	59,077	50.81
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,467	458	31.22
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,534	2,461	69.64
<i>Asian</i>	3,419	2,406	70.37
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	115	55	47.83
Black or African American	29,964	9,390	31.34
Hispanic or Latino	17,205	6,759	39.29
White	59,714	37,794	63.29
Two or more races	4,375	2,215	50.63
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	13,334	1,784	13.38
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,642	141	3.87
Economically disadvantaged students	51,720	17,328	33.50
Migratory students	116	37	31.90
Male	59,147	26,786	45.29
Female	57,112	32,291	56.54

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. ata are accurate as reported; comparing student cohorts across assessments does not make sense in NC, as a student may take Math 1 as early as 8th grade, and Science or RLA in 10th or 11th grade. An expectation that these populations would "match" would assume that all assessments are administered in the same academic year, which is not the case.

1.3.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Science - High School

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	101,972	51,099	50.11
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,313	461	35.11
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,094	2,164	69.94
<i>Asian</i>	2,983	2,119	71.04
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	111	45	40.54
Black or African American	25,968	7,475	28.79
Hispanic or Latino	13,695	5,205	38.01
White	54,301	34,030	62.67
Two or more races	3,601	1,764	48.99
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	10,587	1,759	16.61
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,130	86	4.04
Economically disadvantaged students	41,636	13,867	33.31
Migratory students	66	15	22.73
Male	51,083	25,813	50.53
Female	50,889	25,286	49.69

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Data are accurate as reported; comparing student cohorts across assessments does not make sense in NC, as a student may take Math 1 as early as 8th grade, and Science or RLA in 10th or 11th grade. An expectation that these populations would "match" would assume that all assessments are administered in the same academic year, which is not the case. In addition, in 2016-2017, the English proficiency standards were raised for the ACCESS 2.0 annual assessment. Students were required to demonstrate higher language skills in 2016-2017 to achieve the same proficiency level scores in previous years. As expected, the number of students demonstrating proficiency dropped from last year.

1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY

This section collects data on accountability.

1.4.4.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for schools in corrective action, provide the number of schools for which the listed corrective actions under *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2016-17 (based on SY 2015-16 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2016-17
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	
Extension of the school year or school day	
Replacement of staff members, not including the principal, relevant to the school's low performance	
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	
Replacement of the principal	
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) was signed into law on December 10, 2015. To facilitate a smooth transition to the full implementation of ESSA in the 2017-18 school year, the U.S. Department of Education provided exceptions to a limited number of specific requirements under the No Child Left Behind Act, including the identification of schools based on adequate yearly progress (AYP).	

1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2

In the table below, for schools in restructuring – year 2 (implementation year), provide the number of schools for which the listed restructuring actions under *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2016-17 (based on SY 2015-16 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Restructuring Action	# of Title I Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	
Reopening the school as a public charter school	
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	
Takeover the school by the State	
Other major restructuring of the school governance	
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) was signed into law on December 10, 2015. To facilitate a smooth transition to the full implementation of ESSA in the 2017-18 school year, the U.S. Department of Education provided exceptions to a limited number of specific requirements under the No Child Left Behind Act, including the identification of schools based on adequate yearly progress (AYP).	

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

n/a

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

1.4.5.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for districts in corrective action, provide the number of districts in corrective action in which the listed corrective actions under *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2016-17 (based on SY 2015-16 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Corrective Action	# of Districts receiving Title I funds in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2016-17
Implemented a new curriculum based on State standards	
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	
Restructured the district	
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2015-16 and beginning of SY 2016-17 as a corrective action)	

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

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

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

1.4.8.5 Use of Sections 1003(a) and (g) School Improvement Funds.**1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations**

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2016 (SY 2016-17) Title I, Part A allocation that the SEA reserved in accordance with Section 1003(a) of *ESEA* and §200.100(a) of ED's regulations governing the reservation of funds for school improvement under Section 1003(a) of *ESEA*: 4.00 %

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

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

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

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

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

Section 1003(g)(8) of *ESEA* allows States to reserve up to five percent of Section 1003(g) funds for administration and to meet the evaluation and technical assistance requirements for this program. In the space below, identify and describe the specific Section 1003(g) evaluation and technical assistance activities that your State conducted during SY 2016-17.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The U.S. Department of Education issued the State application for Section 1003(g) School Improvement Grant funds in April of 2016. NC's application was approved on August 18, 2016. Consequently FY14, FY15 and FY16 funds were not awarded until December 16, 2016. Therefore, limited funds were used for administration, evaluation or technical assistance activities for 2016-17 reporting. The SEA primarily used funding to provide remote technical assistance to all applicants and awardees.

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

In the space below, describe actions (if any) taken by your State in SY 2016-17 that were supported by **funds other than Sections 1003(a) and 1003(g) funds** to address the achievement problems of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Sections 1116 of *ESEA*.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

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

1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational program

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

Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Push in-Small groups based upon student data Transitional ESL Block Classes Newcomer Program ExC-ELL Project GLAD
--

1.6.2 Student Demographic Data

1.6.2.1 Number of ALL LEP Students in the State

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

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

Number of ALL LEP students in the State	92,333
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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

In the table below, provide the October 1 count of LEP students in the State who received services in Title III language instructional education programs.

LEP Students Receiving Services	#
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	90,145
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.6.2.3 Most Commonly Spoken Languages in the State

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

Language	# LEP Students
Spanish; Castilian	76,447
Arabic	2,437
Chinese	1,266
Vietnamese	983
Hmong	707

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

1.6.3 Student Performance Data

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

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

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

All LEP Testing	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	93,438
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	2,310
Total	95,748
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

All LEP Results	#
Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	2,878
Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	3.08
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. NC is a member of the WIDA consortium. The annual ELP assessment was updated to a new version that is more rigorous and was also greatly affected by a new standard setting. This, along with a newly implemented criteria in the Speaking domain, which affected roughly 1,400 students in NC who did not receive a speaking or overall composite score, created a drastic drop in the number of students that have traditionally met proficiency on the State annual ELP assessment. This affected all WIDA consortium member states.	

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

In the table below, provide the number of Title III LEP students tested and not tested on annual State English language proficiency assessment.

Title III LEP Testing	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	91,373
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	2,280
Total	93,653
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

In the table below, provide the number of Title III students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time and whose progress cannot be determined. Report this number ONLY if the State did not include them in the calculations for making progress (# and % making progress).

Title III First Time Tested	#
Number of Title III students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time whose progress cannot be determined.	24,270

1.6.3.2.2 Title III LEP English Language Proficiency Results

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

Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:

- Making Progress** = Number and percent of Title III LEP students that met the definition of "Making Progress" as defined by the State and submitted to ED in the Consolidated State Application (CSA), or as amended.
- Attained Proficiency** = Number and percent of Title III LEP students that met the State definition of "Attainment" of English language proficiency submitted to ED in the Consolidated State Application (CSA), or as amended.
- Results** = Number and percent of Title III LEP students that met the State definition of "Making Progress" and the number and percent that met the State definition of "Attainment" of English language proficiency.

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

Title III Results	Results #	Results %
Making progress	15,305	22.81
Attained proficiency	2,515	2.75
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments

This section collects data on LEP students assessed in their native language (Section 1111(b)(6)).

1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language

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

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

1.6.3.5.2 Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given

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

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

1.6.3.5.3 Native Language of Reading/Language Arts Tests Given

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

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

1.6.3.5.4 Native Language of Science Tests Given

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

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

1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students

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

1.6.3.6.1 Title III Served MFLEP Students by Year Monitored

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

Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) students include:

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

Table 1.6.3.6.1 Definitions:

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

# Year One	# Year Two	Total
12,397	11,419	23,816
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

1.6.3.6.2 MFLEP Students Results for Mathematics

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

Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
17,611	7,364	41.81	10,247
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.6.3.6.3 MFLEP Students Results for Reading/Language Arts

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

Table 1.6.3.6.3 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
17,603	6,835	38.83	10,768
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.6.3.6.4 MFLEP Students Results for Science

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

Table 1.6.3.6.4 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
4,358	2,253	51.70	2,105
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.6.4 Title III Subgrantees

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

1.6.4.3 Termination of Title III Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

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

1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students

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

Note: All immigrant students are not LEP students.

1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students

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

Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:

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

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants
25,893	3,973	36

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development

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

1.6.6.1 Teacher Information

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

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

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

Title III Teachers	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	1,775
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	458

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

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

Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:

1. **Professional Development Topics** = Subgrantee professional development topics required under Title III.
2. **#Subgrantees** = Number of subgrantees who conducted each type of professional development activity. A subgrantee may conduct more than one professional development activity. (Use the same method of counting subgrantees, including consortia, as in 1.6.1 and 1.6.4.1).
3. **Total Number of Participants** = Number of teachers, administrators and other personnel who participated in each type of the professional development activities reported.
4. **Total** = Number of all participants in professional development (PD) activities.

Professional Development (PD) Topics	# Subgrantees
Instructional strategies for LEP students	88
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	87
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	80
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	69
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	77
Other (Explain in comment box)	0

PD Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	76	19,701
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	64	2,762
PD provided to principals	68	1,482
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	56	1,834
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	43	2,897
PD provided to community based organization personnel	15	190
Total	//////////	28,866

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities

This section collects data on State grant activities.

1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process

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

Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:

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

Example: State received SY 2016-17 funds July 1, 2016, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2016, for SY 2016-17 programs. Then the "# of days/\$\$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
7/26/17	10/5/17	69
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

State shortened process by 28 days from last year due to joining a consolidated application platform and State continues to evaluate the process for improvement.

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/unsafechoice.doc>.

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

1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS PROGRAM

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

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

LEAs	#	# LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	235	235
LEAs with subgrants	49	49
Total	284	284
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. There are 48 McKinney Vento Sub-grant awards with one award being a consortium of 2 districts with totals the 49.		

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

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

1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youth

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

Age/Grade	# of Homeless Children/Youth Enrolled in Public School in LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youth Enrolled in Public School in LEAs With Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	105	915
K	483	2,106
1	480	2,092
2	443	2,094
3	474	2,125
4	441	2,019
5	406	1,917
6	366	1,745
7	353	1,605
8	335	1,651
9	412	1,907
10	324	1,491
11	253	1,300
12	383	1,660
Ungraded	1	3
Total	5,259	24,630

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. File spec does not count grade 13, which is included in 1.9.1.2.

1.9.1.2 Primary Nighttime Residence of Homeless Children and Youth

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

Primary Nighttime Residence	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs With Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing	446	2,404
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	3,995	17,417
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	97	1,048
Hotels/Motels	729	3,789
Total	5,267	24,658

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. File spec contains Grade 13, which is not included in 1.9.1.1

FAQ on reporting homeless students:

When should States use S or STH to report homeless students? The primary nighttime residence of students who are deemed homeless under the awaiting foster care provision should be indicated as "S" for shelters, transitional housing, and awaiting foster care. After a state is no longer permitted to use the awaiting foster care placement designation for students, the primary nighttime residence of students who are in shelters or transitional housing should be coded as "STH". The majority of states may only include children and youth identified as homeless due to their status as awaiting foster care placement if they were identified prior to December 10, 2016. States covered under P.L. 114-95, Section 9105(c) may include children awaiting foster care placement until December 10, 2017. Covered states are those states that have a law that describes or defines the phrase awaiting foster care placement for the purposes of a program under the McKinney-Vento Act.

1.9.1.3 Subgroups of Homeless Students Enrolled

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

Special Population	# Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs With Subgrants
Unaccompanied homeless youth	537	2,138
Migratory children/youth	33	39
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	742	3,947
Limited English Proficient (LEP) students	225	1,449

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

1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

1.9.2.1 Young Homeless Children Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

Age/Grade	# Homeless Children/Youth Served by Subgrants
Age Birth Through 2	488
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	414
Total	902
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.9.3 Academic Achievement of Homeless Students

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

1.9.3.1 Reading Assessment

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

Grade	LEAs Without Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	LEAs Without Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs Without Subgrants - % of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs With Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	LEAs With Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs With Subgrants - % of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient
3	394	100	25.38	1,785	383	21.46
4	365	91	24.93	1,726	321	18.60
5	344	82	23.84	1,642	274	16.69
6	307	82	26.71	1,472	348	23.64
7	281	83	29.54	1,338	282	21.08
8	275	50	18.18	1,393	226	16.22
High School	220	74	33.64	1,103	267	24.21

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

1.9.3.2 Mathematics Assessment

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

Grade	LEAs Without Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	LEAs Without Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs Without Subgrants - % of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs With Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	LEAs With Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs With Subgrants - % of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient
3	394	109	27.66	1,789	469	26.22
4	362	101	27.90	1,725	412	23.88
5	344	107	31.10	1,641	423	25.78
6	306	61	19.93	1,481	275	18.57
7	283	49	17.31	1,335	180	13.48
8	275	35	12.73	1,394	166	11.91
High School	211	53	25.12	1,061	196	18.47

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

1.9.3.3 Science Assessment

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

Grade	LEAs Without Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	LEAs Without Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs Without Subgrants - % of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs With Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	LEAs With Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs With Subgrants - % of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient
3						
4						
5	344	128	37.21	1,641	522	31.81
6						
7						
8	273	105	38.46	1,387	524	37.78
High School	179	42	23.46	923	220	23.84

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