DRAFT MINUTES

JOINT LEGISLATIVE EDUCATION OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE

November 9, 2009

The Joint Legislative Education Oversight Committee met on Monday, November 9, 2009, at 1:00 p.m. in room 544 of the Legislative Office Building. Senator Tony Foriest, Senate Co-Chairman, presided and the following senators were in attendance: Senators Apodaca, Atwater, Dannelly, Hartsell, Queen, Nesbitt, Stevens, and Tillman. The following House members were also present: Representative Douglas Yongue, House Co-Chairman; Representatives Bell, Blackwood, Cotham, Fisher, Johnson, Lucas, McLawhorn, Parmon, Rapp, Warren, and Wiley. The following members of the Legislative Research staff were in attendance: Shirley Iorio, Drupti Chauhan, Kara McCraw, Sara Kamprath and Dee Atkinson. Members of the Fiscal Research Division were present. Committee Clerks Jackie Ray and Katie Stanley were present as well. Members of the sergeant-at-arms were present.

Chairman Foriest convened the meeting and welcomed members, staff and guests. He noted the importance of examining many of the programs, budgets and policies of the Department of Public Instruction, the State Board of Education, the NC Community College System, the UNC Board of Governors, the University of North Carolina System and constituent institutions, and all of the things that make up education here in North Carolina. He stated that educating our youth was vitally important and that the Committee was taking a significant role in determining what is going on with education and how it can implement changes to make things better than they presently are.

Middle Grade Transition to High School

Chairman Foriest introduced Dr. Gene Bottoms, Senior Vice President of the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB), who addressed the Committee relative to middle grade transition to high school (Attachment 1).

Chairman Doug Yongue commented to the Committee that he and Representative Rick Glazier had heard Dr. Bottoms' presentation during the last SREB meeting in San Antonio, Texas. They both thought the presentation was very dynamic and that it would be imperative to share with the Committee. Chairman Yongue further noted that SREB is prominent in 32 states and has maintained a lot of good data which would be helpful to this Committee.

The SREB was created in 1948 by southern governors - led by significant political and educational leaders from North Carolina and Florida. It was built on the idea of a report issued in 1939 by President Roosevelt that the South's educational level was an embarrassment to the nation. Coming out of WWII, the group of southern governors thought that the best way to move the South forward would be to first improve higher education. For the next 32 years, the mission of SREB was to improve higher education across the South. In 1980, the board of directors was composed of the 16 Southern governors, key legislative members, key members from public schools/higher education and private sector. Since that time, the focus has been to improve K-12 education. In the year 2000, SREB set up 12 goals for the region. One of those

goals was to improve the middle grades to ninth grade transition. SREB has a staff of people who work with middle schools. Most of the information shared today has come from SREB's "on the ground" work inside schools - referred to as a "bottoms up" strategy.

Dr. Bottoms noted that the majority of his information today would be drawn from the following:

- 1) Differences between a group of middle schools that made a lot of progress/improvements, compared to a group which had not made much progress/improvements;
- 2) Their latest report, "Keeping Middle Grades Students on the Path to Success in High School" noting a critical report on adolescent reading; and
- 3) Exemplary practices by some of the SREB states in terms of middle grade education.

He indicated that the transition from middle school to high school was one of the most difficult transitions that students have to make. The following middle grade achievement benchmarks were given:

- Meet readiness standards for high school in reading and math
- Close achievement gaps
- Meet national averages for number of students at NAEP (National Assessment of Educational Progress) Proficient level; all students at basic or higher
- Prepare students to enroll in Algebra I or be ready for it by the end of eighth grade

Dr. Bottoms talked about the state of Maryland, in comparison to North Carolina and the United States as a whole, and what it has done to improve NAEP eighth-grade reading results. He stated that Maryland requires high school teachers (those teaching in grades seven through 12) to have two courses in how to teach reading in content area. Maryland also requires elementary teachers (those certified kindergarten through eighth) to have four courses in the teaching of reading. Dr. Bottoms noted that Maryland has embedded its reading standards in the reading grades into each core course – reading standards for math, science, and social studies. He indicated that most states embed reading standards in English only; however, this is not the problem. The problem is not engaging kids in reading expository materials in other subject areas.

There was discussion on math achievements in the middle grades – comparing North Carolina to Texas and the United States as a whole. He noted that achieving math at the basic level does not necessarily mean that a student is ready for high school level math. Dr. Bottoms talked about the state of Texas, who has jumped ahead of all states at the basic level in math. He noted that Texas has a "no majority" yet very diverse population. Dr. Bottoms indicated that although Texas made a major investment in increasing NAEP eighth-grade math results, it was not a one-year quick fix. This effort spanned over several years whereby states set very consistent initiatives over time. Dr. Bottoms indicated that Texas has set out to teach everyone at the grade-level standards in math. He stressed that schools cannot remediate to grade level standards because remedial standards are always below grade level. Dr. Bottoms also noted that Texas has made heavy investments in teacher retraining on the content of math and how

math is taught. He pointed to the special math center provided by the University of Austin, which is being utilized by the state of Texas, and how it plays a major role in leading this educational effort. Dr. Bottoms indicated that Texas is a state to study if you want to increase math standards in terms of a sustained emphasis over a period of time.

Dr. Bottoms spoke on narrowing achievement gaps for racial/ethnic groups. He believes that the message is simple – it takes a comprehensive multi-strategy approach that you must stay with over time if you plan to have an impact in any of these areas. He indicated that it also takes top staff leading this effort as well as major investments in staff development.

There was discussion on reducing the percentage of students coming in to ninth grade who fail. Effective middle grade benchmarks based on the success rate of students in grade nine are needed. The following improvements for transitioning from middle grades to high schools were discussed:

- Make adolescent reading an immediate and sustained priority
- Accelerate curriculum for all students
- Better prepare students for Algebra I by grade eight or nine
- Set policies and standards for hands-on and inquiry-based science that is embedded with mathematics and literacy
- Support professional development of teachers and school principals
- Build student aspirations for college, advanced training and careers by engagement in exploring and planning for future career and educational opportunities
- Develop and adopt a vision for the middle grades to prepare more students for challenging high school studies

Dr. Bottoms noted that in order to improve high schools you must improve middle grade schools. Emphasis should be placed on modeling schools where progress is being made in the middle grades. The redesigned effort is to have more students coming into high schools better prepared.

There was discussion on how science should be expanded to include a greater use for reading and math whereby middle graders become more interested and involved. Dr. Bottoms stated that the trend shows that we are losing more males in middle schools, high schools, and college.

Dr. Bottoms noted that in order to improve the quality of schools, you must have well-prepared instructors, and, more importantly, principals who know curriculum instruction. He talked about the following things that he would advocate the Committee to think about as an assessment system for comparing, supporting, and evaluating middle grades principals:

- 1) Principals should be able to lead the faculty in aligning the curriculum for high school readiness standards;
- 2) Principals should be able to establish a culture of continuous improvement;
- 3) Principals should be able to use time, personnel and other resources for providing extending learning needs for more students;
- 4) Principals should be able to spend at least one-half of their time in the classrooms (even if you have to hire someone with a degree to do paperwork);
- 5) Principals should be able to support teachers with common planning time and with staff development;
- 6) Principals should be able to support teachers who embed reading and writing in all classes; and
- 7) Principals should be able to conduct teacher evaluation with specific feedback and support for improvement.

Dr. Bottoms expressed how it is important to help middle grade students become more interested in math and science through understanding why they need it. SREB has advocated with a group from New York about a middle grades technology curriculum that deals with robotics, electronics, space, engineering, etc. as a way for kids to begin to see the real need for math and science.

Dr. Bottoms stressed the need for the Committee to look at authorizing the State Board of Education to set up a special commission to put together a thoughtful product on what an effective middle school would look like. There should be a team of people within a state agency whose sole job is to bring focus to middle grades and keep it aligned with elementary and high school. Dr. Bottom noted that many state agencies are not focused on middle school years in that regard. He referenced states that have comprehensive plans for improving middle schools – Virginia, Tennessee, Florida, and Maryland. Maryland has the most comprehensive report on what good middle schools look like and it notes the following:

- 1) Extend the school day/year as dictated by the needs of certain learning
- 2) Integrate math, science and technology instruction with a focus on problem-solving in real world applications
- 3) Teach skills essential to school success e.g. encouraging middle school study teams

Dr. Bottoms summarized that these are possible suggestions and actions to think about as it relates to improving the transition from middle school to high school.

There were questions and comments taken from Committee members regarding SREB's approach to middle school transitioning and Dr. Bottoms answered and/or addressed accordingly. With regard to integrating technology, Dr. Bottoms noted that their studies have shown that students who maintain electronic portfolios generally have significant higher reading achievement. He stressed that building technology into classrooms and linking it to standards drives up academic achievement and engages the student in the process. With regard to funding for investments in education, Dr. Bottoms suggested targeting Title I funds that would be coming to North Carolina. With regard to teacher retraining, Dr. Bottoms indicated that teachers should understand strategies in their respective subject area including project-

based teaching approaches. He noted that the intent was not to make a science teacher into a reading teacher. The intent is how to have the science teacher, for example, use reading standards to get students to master science. This method increases reading achievement and should be a statewide priority. With regard to learning strategies for youth, Dr. Bottoms talked about enhancing motivation through tapping into students' talents and interests and building academics around that. He stated that the contextual learning strategy is a good way of teaching students. With regard to what some of the successful things being done with education by other states, Dr. Bottoms noted that Virginia had funded a series of STEM initiatives in high schools whereby business partners are brought in to help design curriculums. South Carolina has adopted a national pre-engineering curriculum, Project Lead the Way. Indiana has made large investments in implementing a bio medical science curriculum. Dr. Bottoms also talked about the Gateway to Technology curriculum in middle schools designed to introduce that area linking it to math and science.

Chairman Yongue commented on Singapore's leading educational system with emphasis on learning through hands on strategies. He noted how Singapore's students seem to be very enthusiastic about learning. He acknowledged that legislative members traveling to Singapore were in for a special time and that they would witness a different learning atmosphere.

Chairman Foriest thanked Dr. Bottoms for his presentation.

Charter Schools

Chairman Foriest introduced Jack Moyer, Director, Office of Charter Schools, NC Department of Public Instruction; Paul LeSieur, Director, School Business Administration, NC Department of Public Instruction; and Dr. Bill Harrison, Chair, State Board of Education, who addressed the Committee regarding charter schools.

Mr. Moyer addressed the Committee regarding the structure and governance of charter schools. He noted that, by definition, charter schools must be a 501(c)(3) non-profit corporation. Charter schools are made up of the board of directors who appoint a principal who works with the board of directors in hiring the staff. Mr. Moyer referenced a charter school directory provided to the Committee. Information was also provided on charter school application statistics, relinquished and revoked charter schools, and comparison of charter schools LEAs (Attachment 2). With regard to charter school governance, Mr. Moyer noted how the charter schools are monitored by the Office of Charter Schools (Office). The Office works closely with the schools in following general statutes and policies. The application process for charter schools begins in February, two years proceeding when the school will open. Between February and April, a review committee goes over applications. In April, applications go to before a Leadership For Innovation (LFI) Committee of the State Board of Education. The LFI interviews all applications that have gotten to that point and makes recommendations to the State Board of Education. The State Board of Education has discussions in May and a final vote is made in June. The following March is when those schools with preliminary charters are recommended to receive a final charter by the State Board of Education.

Mr. Paul LeSieur addressed the Committee regarding funding allocation for charter schools. He noted that charter schools receive state, local, and federal funding. Under G.S.115C-238.29h, it tells the state how to fund charter school from the state and local funds. The State Board of Education is required to allocate on average a per pupil amount based on the school district in which the charter school is housed. Local funds are based on the school district in which the student resides in. Initial allotments are projected on average daily membership for the upcoming year. Per pupil amounts distributed to charter schools are determined by the total allocations going out to school districts, based on initial allotments, divided by local school district's average daily membership. Charter schools report average daily memberships (ADMs) through the reporting process. The ADM is calculated and revisions are made based on first month ADM. Funding for children with disabilities is allocated based on head count, not ADM, and is calculated separately. Local education agencies calculate on a per pupil basis for the purpose of distributing funds to charter schools with children that come from their school district. Charter schools are eligible to receive federal funds based on student population or percentage of students determined to be low wealth with regard to Title 1 population of the school district. There are different types of funding that charter schools are eligible for. However, not all charter schools apply for federal funding. Funding is generally distributed with 34% given the first month, 68% given after the first month, and then the following March the balance, 32%, is given. If additional funding is needed, charter schools are able to come back to the Department to request an increase. Planning and budget development for the next fiscal year is based on ADM for the first two months, projection of a 10% increase for charter schools, and fall enrollment and/or expansion information.

Dr. Bill Harrison addressed the Committee regarding the role of the LFI and the role of the adhoc committee on charter schools. He noted when an entity applies for a charter, the Office determines which applicants meet the requirements set forth by statutes to become a charter school. There were seven (7) potential schools that met the criteria this spring. These schools go before the LFI Committee, which ranks the charter schools using a tally formula. After rankings, applications go before the entire Board and the Board determines which applicants are granted a charter. The LFI also plays a role in whether charter schools are non-renewed or revoked based upon the recommendation of the Office. The adhoc committee's role is to access the role of the LFI. Dr. Harrison noted that the Governor asked the Board to look at the charter school process and have some type of rubric mechanism in place to evaluate whether or not a charter school is going to be innovative and doing things differently than is being done in traditional public schools. Dr. Harrison stated that they are looking at a process to deal with charter schools that are not performing. He indicated that charter schools are overly represented among higher performing schools across the state, and they are also overly represented among lower performing schools. They are in the process of developing specific criteria that charter schools need to adhere to or face revocation. They are looking at diversity provisions among charter schools as well as a clearly defined role for the Office – being a support system or an oversight system. Dr. Harrison commented that an adhoc committee is looking at recommendations from the Blue Ribbon Commission on Charter Schools which submitted a report over one and one-half years ago.

There was a question and answer session regarding charter schools. Dr. Harrison noted that the Governor had written a letter to U.S. Department of Education Secretary Duncan about the different type of innovations that North Carolina has relating to charter schools. He noted that Secretary Duncan has spoken pretty strongly about states having charter school caps being a disadvantage. Guidelines are scheduled to come out next week. Dr. Harrison commented that in order to have a high probability for success, we would need to have a solid application process that considers innovation and a solid accountability model.

Chairman Foriest thanked Mr. Moyer, Mr. LeSieur, and Dr. Harrison for their presentations.

Common Core Standards

Chairman Foriest introduced Angela Quick, Deputy Chief Academic Officer, Academic Services and Instructional Support, Department of Public Instruction (DPI), who addressed the Committee regarding common standards that have been reported in the media, how these standards relate to the DPI's work referred to as ACRE (Accountability and Curriculum Revision Effort), and international assessments (Attachment 4).

Ms. Quick explained that the Common Core is led by the National Governors Association and the Chief Council of School State Officers. Standards are being driven by each state participating in the collaboration. Common Core standards are currently being looked at for English and math at this time (science is being looked at and may be added in the next phase). These standards are in line with the ACRE project with emphasis on:

- Fewer, higher and clearer standards
- State led initiatives
- Ensuring competitiveness with anyone, anywhere
- Comparable assessment data across country
- Saving money
- Giving students access to larger set of resources
- Research-based efforts

The time line for Common Core spans from August 2009 for drafts to early 2010 for adoption.

Ms. Quick spoke on how Common Core standards are related to international standards. She talked about the following three (3) international tests being used at DPI work on essential standards work:

- 1) PISA (Program for International Student Assessment) math, science and reading tests designed for 15-year olds
- 2) TIMSS (Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study) math and science tests designed for fourth and eighth graders
- 3) PIRLS (Progress in International Reading Literacy Study) reading and reading comprehension skills test for fourth graders

Ms. Quick noted that the TIMSS test is the one out of the three mentioned that can be modified to be more aligned with their national assessment.

The following reference websites were given:

- www.corestandards.org to check progress related to the Common Core
- <u>www.ncpublicschools.org/acre/</u> to compare the work of the Common Core with the work of DPI

Chairman Foriest thanked Ms. Quick for her presentation.

There was a question and answer session in which Ms. Quick and State Superintendent June Atkinson addressed concerns. Ms. Quick noted that although there was not a strong track record of comparison of international tests to our tests, scores from other tests, including NAEP, were being looked at for linking studies. She indicated that it was important to compare students' proficiencies in awareness and learning with other states and to ensure that students are globally competitive. Costs for these tests are expensive; however, tests should be done appropriately and aligned with what is actually being taught. The goal is not to create more tests, but to use tests that are already being used to create different metrics for the accountability system. Ms. Quick noted that documentation from the Blue Ribbon Commission was used with the State of Education and the ACRE project in redesigning assessment and accountability models.

Superintendent June Atkinson addressed the issue of a state led initiative to have national voluntary core standards in English, language arts and reading. She noted that the initiative is designed where states can come together and have assessments where comparisons can be made. The national initiative, led by the State, is a way to get students to the point where they need to be and where assessments are developed. Dr. Atkinson noted that they were not promoting the TIMSS, PIRLS, or PISA tests to be a part of the testing suite. These tests were presented for informational purposes.

Chairman Foriest noted that the Committee will meet again tomorrow, November 10, 2009, at 9:00 a.m.

The meeting adjourned at 3:44 p.m.

Approved at 4127/10 meeting

DRAFT MINUTES Joint Legislative Education Oversight Committee November 10, 2009

The Joint Legislative Education Oversight Committee met on Wednesday, November 10, 2009 at 9:00 am in Room 544 of the Legislative Office Building. House Co-Chairman, Representative Doug Yongue presided. This meeting was attended by Representatives Bell, Blackwood, Cotham, Fisher, Glazier, Jeffus, Lucas, McLawhorn, Parmon, Rapp, Tolson, Warren, and Wiley, in addition to Senators Dannelly, Dorsett, Foriest, Hartsell, Queen, Stevens, Swindell, and Tillman. Chairman Yongue welcomed members, committee staff, presenters, and the public, as well as, the Sergeant-at-Arms staff. The agenda, attendance record, and list of visitors are attached (Attachments 1-3).

Dual Enrollment for High School Students

As the first order of business, Chairman Yongue invited Mr. Van Wilson, Associate Vice-President, Student Services, NC Community Colleges System, discussed the three distinct dual enrollment programs. The first of which is the Huskins Program, established in 1983, where courses are taught at the high school. These courses generate FTE with exception of general education courses, but covers math, science, and English. The second classification is dual enrollment or dual credit courses, which are offered to students age 16 or above. These classes are taught on the community college campus and non-public students may enroll. These courses generate FTE, with the exception of general education courses, but includes math, science, and English. The third category is Learn and Earn Online, where courses are offered to public and non-public high school students, grades 9-12, with no restrictions based on region or residency. All Learn and earn courses generate FTE. Please see the attached "Joint High School Partnership Programs" document (Attachment 4). Mr. Wilson offered a wealth of information to distinguish between the three, evaluating service area, fee and textbook cost, credit usage, approval process, eligibility, contracts and agreements between school, etc. Mr. Wilson welcomed legislators to consider ways to eliminate confusion between these programs. Chairman Yongue opened the floor to questions. Senator Tillman asked if a student is at the public school for a half day and attending community college courses for a half day, how is the student funded? Ms. Jennifer Haygood, Chief Financial Officer, NCCCS, said the public school gets ADM for a whole day, while the community college gets FTE for only the courses in which the student is enrolled. So there is more accountability on the community college level as it relates to funding. Representative Blackwood asked why a student may only generate FTE when taking a math, science, or English course, but not when enrolled in philosophy or religion, etc. Representative Rapp, also Co-Chair of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Education, responded by saying the state was forced to make cuts in the 2009 budget and saw that students were doubly funded in many cases. They considered that math, science, and English were more critical areas of study. Representative Blackwood asked if a student can enroll and pay out of pocket. He encouraged the committee to consider covering the cost with state dollars. Representative Rapp also acknowledged that school boards and LEAs certainly have the authority and sometimes have the funds to cover these costs at the local level. Representative Bell asked if there are different distinctions between students in Early College programs. Mr. Wilson noted that the Early Colleges are completely different than dual enrollment. Senator

Stevens asked if there are estimates available to account for those students who may have enrolled in the past but did not enroll since state funding was cut? Ms. Jennifer Haygood stated that the cut accounted for \$14,6 million with equates to 2,770 FTE. These same students may have lost the state funded benefit of Huskins enrollment and Dual enrollment, but are still covered when taking Learn and Earn courses online. Senator Dorsett asked for the definition of a 'service delivery area'. Mr. Kennon Briggs, Vice President, NCCCS, explained that the State Board of Community Colleges defines the service area for each community college. There may be cooperative agreements between colleges for the purpose of eliminating duplication. Please see the auhorizing legislation attached (Attachment 5).

Mr. Kennon Briggs noted that students, parents, and colleges may be easily confused in trying to distinguish between these three dual enrollment programs. Mr. Briggs suggested that courses could and should be more efficiently funded and administered in two groups: (1) cooperative and innovative high school program (Early College, Middle College, etc.) and (2) all other high school program. Chairman Yongue, Senator Swindell, and Representative Glazier all expressed the need to streamline and simplify these offerings. Representative Glazier expressed the need to review the mission of the community colleges.

UNC Tech Transfer

Dr. Steve Leath, Vice President for Research, UNC briefed members of the committee on the many research efforts of the University of North Carolina. Dr. Leath informed the committee on the current UNC effort to overhaul technology transfer. The UNC System has the 3rd largest research system in the nation. Research opportunities continue to grow as federal stimulus funds flow to states. The system has already captured over \$6 billion dollars in stimulus funds. They are currently working to organize and manage these efforts in order to promote seamless technology transfer. For more detail on examples of specific grants awarded, please see the attached handout (Attachment 6). The North Carolina Research Center in Kannapolis, NC is open and operating. This recently funded campus employees 94 UNC researchers and support staff, which includes 12 graduate students. Dr. Leath highlighted a few products developed as a result of research conducted at one of the UNC institutions. The Entegrion Stasilon wound dressing is considered to be cutting-edge as it is used to promote coagulation of the blood. Researchers at North Carolina State University has found a way to add value to apples by preparing and preslicing apples. These apples are preserved using a modified plant hormone, so as not to ripen too soon.. East Carolina University has developed an anti-stuttering device and developed an early stage vaccine for patients with Multiple Sclerosis. Changes to be implemented over the next year include simplifications of IP negotiations, recognition of faculty entrepreneurial activity, and identification and expansion of each campus' unique research strengths. Senator Stevens asked for a document outlining the various research dollars at each university. Dr. Leath provided the document at a later date and it is included at Attachment 7. Representative Lucas asked if the Research arm of the UNC system could be utilized to save NC jobs or create new jobs. Dr. Leath indicated that as the data is more accessible to industry, the information could be used to better serve our citizens. Representative Wiley asked for clarification on intellectual property rights. Dr. Leath said the inventor has first right of refusal. He also expressed the need to better address intellectual property so as to offer more incentives to researchers. Representative Glazier asked if there is a need for policy changes to accomplish

these goals. Dr. Leath did not foresee the need for policy changes. Representative Glazier asked if these efforts can be disseminated and published so that people will know how much is accomplished at each university.

With no further discussion, Chairman Yongue announced the date of the next meeting: December 8, 2009. The meeting adjourned at 10:50 a.m.

			ii.	

	Lead Administrator	Telephone	Address	City	Zip Code	County	LEA ID	Dist	Grade Span	08-09 Best 1 of 2	Year Approved	Year Oper
Alpha Academy	Eugene Slocum	910.223.7711	907 Hay St.	Fayetteville	28305	Cumberland	26B	4	K-8	190	2000	2000
American Renaissance School	Stephen Gay	704.878.6009	217 South Center Street	Statesville	28677	Iredell	49B	7	K-8	503	1999	1999
Arapahoe Charter School	Tom McCarthy	252.249.2599	9005 Hwy 306S	Arapahoe	28510	Pamlico	69A	2	K-8	337	1997	1997
Arts Based Elementary	Robin Hollis	336.748.4116	1380 N Martin Luther King Jr. Dr	Winston-Salem	27101	Forsyth	34G	5	K-5	291	2000	2002
ArtSpace Charter School	Lori Cozzi	828.298.2787	2030 US Hwy 70	Swannanoa	28778	Buncombe	11B	8	K-8	344	2000	2001
Bethany Community Middle School	Vicky Bethel	336.951.2500	181 Bethany Rd	Reidsville	27320	Rockingham	79A	5	6-8	180	2000	2000
Bethel Hill Charter School	John Betterton	336.599.2823	401 Bethel Hill School Rd	Roxboro	27573	Person	73A	5	K-6	369	2000	2000
Brevard Academy	Shirley Reed	828.885.2665	299 Andante Lane	Brevard	28712	Transylvania	88A	8	K-8	154	1998	1998
Bridges	Paul Welborn	336.874.2721	2587 Pleasant Ridge Rd	StateRoad	28676	Wilkes	97D	7	K-8	154	1997	1997
Cape Fear Center for Inquiry	Brian Corrigan	910.362.9822	3131B Randall Parkway	Wilmington	28403	New Hanover	65A	2	K-8	365	2000	2000
Cape Lookout Marine Science HS	Susan Smith	252.726.1601	1108 Bridges St	Morehead City	28577	Carteret	16A	2	9-12	117	1998	1998
Carolina International School	Carole Forbes	704.455.3847	8810 Hickory Ridge Rd	Harrisburg	28075	Cabarrus	13A	6	K-10	444	2003	2004
Carter Community School	Gail Taylor	919.416.9025	1305 West Club Blvd	Durham	27705	Durham	32C	3	K-8	279	1998	1998
Casa Esperanza Montessori	Janice Bonham West	919.855.9811	2600 Sumner Blvd #130	Raleigh	27616	Wake	92R	3	K-6	345	2002	2003
Charlotte Secondary School	Jeremy Spielman	704.295.0137	8310 McAlpine Park Dr	Charlotte	28211	Mecklenburg	60K	6	6	132	2006	2007
Charter Day School	Jennifer Beamer	910.655.1215	7055 Bacon's Way	Leland	28451	Brunswick	10A	2	K-8	745	2000	2000
Chatham Charter School	Ronnie Joyce	919.742.4550	PO Box 245	Siler City	27344	Chatham	19A	5	K-8	301	1997	1997
CIS Academy	Ronald Bryant	910.521.1669	PO Box 706	Lumberton	28359	Robeson	78A	4	6-8	103	1997	1997
Clover Garden		336.586.9440	2454 Altamahaw-Union Ridge Rd.	Burlington	27217	Alamance	01C	5	K-12	484	2001	2001
Columbus Charter School	Steve Smith	910.641.4042	35 Bacon's Way	Whiteville	28472	Columbus	24N	4	K-3	255	2006	2007
Community School of Davidson	Joy K. Warner	704.896.6262	565 Griffith S	Davidson	28036	Mecklenburg	601	6	K-6	683	2003	2004
Crosscreek Charter	Robin Jackson	919.497.3198	P O Box 1075	Louisburg	27549	Franklin	35A	3	K-8	90	2001	2001
Crossnore Academy	Sharon Smith Wise	828.733.5241	PO Box 309	Crossnore	28616	Avery	06B	7	K-12	144	1999	1999
Crossroads Charter High	Gentry Campbell	704.597.5100	5500 N. Tryon St.	Charlotte	28213	Mecklenburg	60H	6	9-12	241	2001	2001
Dillard Academy	Hilda Hicks	919.581.0166	504 West Elm St	Goldsboro	27530	Wayne	96C	2	K-4	146	1998	1998
East Wake Academy	Brandon Smith	919.404.0444	400 NMC Dr.	Zebulon	27597	Wake	92G	3	K-12	939	1998	1998
Endeavor Charter School	Steve McAdams	919-848-0333	9400 Forum Drive	Raleigh	27615	Wake	925	3	K-8	378	2008	2008
Evergreen Community Charter School	Dr. Susan Gottfried	828.298.2173	50 Bell Road	Asheville	28805	Buncombe	11A	8	K-8	384	1999	1999
Exploris Middle School	Kevin Piacenza	919.715.3690	401 Hillsborough Street	Raleigh	27603	Wake	92B	3	6-8	147	1997	1997
Forsyth Academies	Lori Hill	336.922.1121	5426 Shattalon Dr.	Winston-Salem	27106	Forsyth	34F	5	K-8	675	1999	1999
Francine Delany New School for Children	Buffy Fowler	828.236.9441	PO Box 16161	Asheville	28816	Buncombe	11K	8	K-8	939	1997	1997
Gaston College Preparatory	Christine Barford; Tammi Sutton	252.308.6932	320 Pleasant Hill Road	Gaston	27832	Northampton	66A	3	5-12	631	2001	2001
Grandfather Academy	Byron Jones	828.898.3868	PO Box 98	Banner Elk	28604	Avery	06A	7	5-12	43	1997	1997
Gray Stone Day School				Misenheimer	28109	Stanly	84B	6	9-12	281	2002	2002
Greensboro Academy	Rudy Swofford	336.286.8404	4049 Battleground Ave	Greensboro	27410	Guilford	41B	5	K-8	722	1999	1999
Guilford Prep Academy	Robin Buckrham	336.954.1344	2207A E. Cone Blvd	Greensboro	27405	Guilford	41C	5	K-8	276	1999	2001

	Carroll Reed	919.567.9955	PO Box 100	Holly Springs	27540	Wake	92P	3	9-12	952	2000	2000
Southern Wake Academy			202 Treybrooke Dr.	Morrisville	27560	Wake	92E	3	K-8	424	1997	1997
Sterling Montessori Academy	Bill Zajic	919.462.8889			28687	Iredell	49D	7	K-8		2000	2000
Success Institute	Tenna Williams	704.881.0441	P O Box 1332	Statesville				6	K-8	94	1998	1999
Sugar Creek Charter School	Cheryl Ellis	704.509.5470	4101 N Tryon St	Charlotte	28206	Mecklenburg	60B			607		
Summit Charter School	Dr. Jack Talmadge	828.743.5755	PO Box 1339	Cashiers	28717	Jackson	50A	8	K-8	167	1997	1997
	Allyson Schoen	910.757.0401	12588 Hwy. 15-501	Aberdeen	28315	Moore	63A	4	K-8	161	1997	1997
The Academy of Moore County		336,723.6838	437 Gold Floss St	Winston-Salem	27127	Forsyth	34D	5	K-12		1997	1997
The Carter G. Woodson School of Challenge	Ruth Hopkins	336.723.0838	437 0012 11033 01							94		
	Carolyn Kirkland; John	919.682.1200	724 Foster St.	Durham	27701	Durham	32K	3	K-5		2002	2003
The Central Park School for Children	Heffernan	323000								607	1997	1997
The Children's Village Academy	Gloria Battle	252.939.1958	PO Box 2206	Kinston	28502	Lenoir	54A	2	K-6	136		
The Community Charter School	Kristi Dahlstrom	704.377.3180	510 S. Torrence St.	Charlotte	28204	Mecklenburg	60A	6	K-5	148	1997	1997
		336.748.3838	280 S. Liberty St.	Winston-Salem	27101	Forsyth	34C	5	5-8	323	1997	1997
The Downtown Middle School	Ed Herring		604 Franklin St	Wake Forest	27587	Wake	92F	3	K-12		1998	1998
The Franklin Academy	Denise Kent K-5; David Mahaley 6-12	919.554.4911	604 Frankiiii St	Wake Forest						1,212		
		336,376,1122	P.O. Box 162	Saxapahaw	27340	Alamance	01D	5	9-12	81	1998	1998
The Hawbridge School	Dr. Marcia Huth			Hendersonville	28792	Henderson	45A	8	K-8	168	1999	1999
The Mountain Community School	Chad Hamby	828.696.8480	613 Glover Street		28655	Burke	12A	7	K-5		2001	2001
The New Dimensions School	Larry Wilkerson	828.437.5753	501 East Concord Street	Morganton				5	1-12	82	1998	1998
The Woods Charter School	Harrell Rentz	919.960.8353	PO Box 5008	Chapel Hill	27517	Chatham	19B			252	1999	1999
Thomas Jefferson Classical Academy	Joseph A. Maimone;	828.657.9998	2527 Hwy 221-A	Mooresboro	28114	Rutherford	81A	8	K-12		1999	1999
Thomas series son classical statement,	Jason Cole							<u> </u>	K-5	948	1998	1998
Tiller School	Lynsey Plume	252.728.1995	1950 Hwy 70 E	Beaufort	28516	Carteret	16B	2		135		1999
Torchlight Academy	Cynthia McQueen	919.829.9500	3211 Bramer Drive	Raleigh	27604	Wake	92L	3	K-5	373	1999	
	Hakan Orak	336-621-0061	900 Sixteenth Street	Greensboro	27405	Guilford	41F	5	K-7	252	2008	2008
TRIAD Math & Science		828 262.5411	1018 Archie Carroll Rd	Boone	28607	Watauga	95A	8	K-8	150	2004	2005
Two Rivers Community School	June Gilch	4		Monroe	28110	Union	90A	6	K-11	990	2000	2000
Union Academy	Raymond Reinsant	704.238.8883	675 N. M.L. King Jr. Blvd			Vance	91A	3	K-8		1999	1999
Vance Charter School	Dr. John von Rohr	252.431.0641	1227 Dabney Drive	Henderson	27536	1577175	P.C.	3	4-8	481	2006	2007
Voyager Academy	Carl Forsyth	919.433.3301	P.O. Box 71567	Durham	27704	Durham	32L			439	2000	2000
Washington Montessori	Steve Jones	252.946.1977	2330 Old Bath Highway	Washington	27889	Beaufort	07A	1	K-8	272		
Wilmington Preparatory Academy	Margaret Franklin	910,799,6776	606 South College Road	Wilmington	28403	New Hanover	65B	2	K-4	117	2006	2007
ACCOUNTS OF PREDATALOTY ACQUEINY												

Charter School Application Statistics

Year of Final Approval	# of Applications Submitted	# of Applications Receiving Approval	# of Voluntary Relinquishments of Year Approved	# of Non Renewals of Year Approved	# of Revocations of Year Approved	
1997	65	34	5	0	7	32
1998	66	32	11	2	3	61
1999	53	28	11	1	0	78
2000	54	17	1	0	1	91
2001	33	9	2	0	0	96
2002	17	2	0	0	0	94
2002	26	4	0	0	0	97
2003	19	2	0	0	0	99
2004	12	1	0	0	0	97
2003	19	7	0	0	0	93
2007	12	6	0	0	0	98
	6	2	0	0	0	100
2008	No slots available		0	0	0	97
2010	24					
Totals	406	144	30	3	11	

2

REVOCATIONS & VOLUNTARY RELIX SHMENTS OF CHARTER SCHOOLS 1997-2008 Updated 6/9/2008

COUNTY	CHARTER SCHOOL	YEAR APPROVED	YEAR OPENED	ACTION	DATE	REASON FOR ACTION
1. Pitt	Right Step Academy	1997	1997	Revocation	January 2001	Financial Noncompliance
2. Forsyth	LIFT Academy	1997	1997	Revocation	December 1999	Financial Noncompliance
3. Wilkes	Elizabeth Grinton Charter School	1997	1997	Revocation	December 1999	Exceptional Children Noncompliance
4 117	Bright Horizons	1997	1997	Revocation	August 1999	Student Enrollment/Business
4. Wayne 5. Caldwell	Nguza Saba Charter School	1997	1997	Revocation	January 1999	Student Enrollment/Business
6. Wake	Bonner Academy	1997	1997	Revocation	May 1998	Financial/Governance Noncompliance
g 0 1	DILACE Anadamy	1998	1998	Revocation	December 2000	Financial Noncompliance
7. Onslow 8. Orange/Chapel	PHASE Academy School in the Community	1997	1997	Relinquishment	May 1999	Enrollment/Business
Hill City School 9. Orange	Odyssey Charter School	1997	Withdrew – Did not open(one delay)	Relinquishment	January 1998	Incomplete Planning
10. Martin	Bear Grass Charter School	1998	Withdrew-Did not open	Relinquishment	August 2001	Incomplete Planning
11. Wake	Sankore	1998	1998	Relinquishment	March 2001	Enrollment/Business
12. Cumberland	OMA's Inc. Charter School	1998	1998	Relinquishment	December 2000	Enrollment/Business
13. Durham	Partnership Academy	1998	Withdrew - Did not open (one year delay)	Relinquishment	August 2000	Incomplete Planning
14. Wilkes	Arts and Basics Charter	1998	1998	Relinquishment	October 1999	Enrollment/Business
15. Wayne	Change for Youth	1998	1998	Relinquishment	September 1999	Enrollment/Business
16. Catawba	Catawba Valley Tech	1998	Withdrew – Did not open	Relinquishment	April 1999	Enrollment
17. Wilkes	Wilkes Technical High	1998	1998	Relinquishment	November 1998	Enrollment/Business
18. Iredell	Developmental Day School	1999	1999	Relinquishment	January 2002	Inadequate funding/Declinin Enrollment
19. Wake	Hope Elementary School	1999	Withdrew - Did not open (one year delay)	Relinquishment	February 2000	Incomplete Planning
20. Harnett	Harnett Technical High School	1999	Withdrew - Did not open	Relinquishment	September 1999	Incomplete Planning
21. Wilkes	United Children's Ability Nook	1997	1997	Relinquishment	December, 1999	Enrollment/Business
22. Cabarrus	Caburrus County Charter School	1999	Withdrew - Did not open	Relinquishment	February 2000	Incomplete Planning
23. Mecklenburg	Tarheel Challenge-West	1999	Withdrew – Did not open	Relinquishment	May 1999	Unresolved Legal Issues
24. Sampson	Tarheel Challenge-East	1999	Withdrew-Did not open	Relinquishment	May 1999	Unresolved Legal Issues

COUNTY	CHARTER SCHOOL	YEAR APPROVED	YEAR OPENED	ACTION	DATE	REASON FOR ACTION
25. Harnett	Harnett Early Childhood Acad	1998	1998	Relinquishment	February 2002	Enrollment/Business
26. Durham	Turning Point Academy	1998	1998	Relinquishment	August 2002	Enrollment/Business
27. Durham	Success Academy	1999	1999	Relinquishment	August 2002	Enrollment/Business
28. Stanly	Stanly County Outreach	1999	1999	Relinquishment	August 2002	Low Enrollment
29. Bladen	Tar Heel Charter High School	2000	Withdrew-Did not open	Relinquishment	May 2002	Facilities
30. Guilford	Oak Ridge Charter School	2001	Withdrew-Did not open	Relinquishment	July 2002	Facilities
31. Wayne	Wayne Technical Academy	1998	1999	Renewal not approved	July 2003	Business, enrollment, reporting, governance
32. Forsyth	East Winston Primary School	1998	1998	Revocation	November 2005	Governance, business, reporting, financial
33. Alamance	Lakeside Charter (01A)	1997	1997	Relinquishment	December 2005	Closing of Children's Facility
34. Durham	Ann Atwater (32J)	2001	2002	Relinquishment	December 2005	Low enrollment
35. Rowan	Rowan Academy (80A)	1999	1999	Relinquishment	February 2006	Finance
	Visions Charter (18B)	1997	1997	Relinquishment	March 2006	Low enrollment/Finance
36. Catawba 37. Scotland	Laurinburg Charter School (83A)	1998	1998	Non Renewal	June, 2006	Governance, Finance, Enrollment
38. Guilford	Imani Institute Charter School (41A)	1998	1998	Revocation	July, 2006	Governance, Finance
39. Wake	John H. Baker, Jr. High School (92C)	1997	1997	Revocation	Effective 6/30/07	Governance
40. Iredell	American Renaissance Elem. (49A)	1998	1998	Relinquishment	March, 2007	Consolidated with Amer. Renaissance Middle school
41. Wake	SPARC Academy (92I)	1998	1998	Non Renewal	Effective 6/30/08	Governance
42. Durham	Omuteko Gwamaziima (32G)	1999	1999	Relinquishment	June, 2008	Low Enrollment
43. Scotland	The Laurinburg Homework (83B)	1999	1999	Relinquishment	June 30, 2008	Low Enrollment
44. Lee	Provisions Academy (53A) (Pending Litigation)	1999	1999	Non Renewal	June 30, 2009	Student Reporting Noncompliance

K - 8 EOG Comparisons Charter Schools/ Local LEA's/ State 2008 - 2009

School Year 2008-2009		Reading	Math	Grade 5 Science	Grade 8 Science
STATE AVERAGE		67.6	80	60.8	67.6
				Grade 5	Grade 8
Charter School	LEA#	Reading	Math	Science	Science
Alpha Academy	26B	57.6	68.5	38.5	33.3
Cumberland	260	65	73.2	54.5	59.3
Am. Renaissance	49B	69.2	72.2	65	69.8
Iredell	490	73.6	86.9	65	73.2
Arapahoe Charter	69A	67.7	77.9	51.3	71.4
Pamlico	690	74	86.9	79.6	80.6
ArtsBased Elem.	34G	67.1	81.9	69	N/A
Forsyth	340	64.5	78	60,9	61.9
ArtSpace Charter	11B	73.9	80	81.6	85.7
Buncombe	110	73.1	84.5	62.7	76.3
Bethany Comm. MS	79A	68.5	80.9	N/A	65.9
Rockingham	790	60	75.8	56.4	61.3
Bethel Hill Charter Sch	73A	77.8	87.9	84.6	N/A
Person	730	63.5	78.2	64.3	57.4
Brevard Academy	88A	82.8	87.4	>95	82.4
Transylvania	880	79.2	87.3	79.8	88.1
Bridges	97D	65.8	71.1	45.5	69.2
Wilkes	970	70.1	84.1	62.1	77.5
Cape Fear Cnt for Inq.	65A	85.4	91.6	92.9	78.4
New Hanover	650	71.9	82	61.1	73,8
Carolina International	13A	82.7	84.3	58.1	82.1
Cabarrus	130	72.2	82.1	62.9	76.8
Carter Community	32C	64.1	82.9	6.7	>95
Durham	320	52.9	66.3	48.9	54.5
Casa Esperanza	92R	77.3	84.9	76.9	N/A
Wake	920	73.4	83.4	65.2	74.3
Charlotte Secondary	60K	72.9	76.7	N/A	N/A
Mecklenburg	600	67.3	78.6	60.1	63.9
Charter Day School	10A .	74.9	92	75.3	>95
Brunswick	100	68.9	79.9	63.7	70.8
Chatham Charter	19A	79.6	88.88	78.1	84
Chatham	190	69.2	80.5	68.9	76.7
CIS Academy	78A	31	66	N/A	31.6
Robeson	780	48.6	68.6	40.3	43.1
Clover Garden	01C	75.3	90	68.8	89.7
Alamance	10	63.2	80.4	48.2	63.5
Columbus Charter	24N	70.8	93.8	N/A	N/A
Whiteville City Schools	241	69.2	82.3	64.7	75.4
Comm Sch of Davidson	601	92.4	>95	88.2	N/A
Mecklenburg	600	67.3	78.6	60.1	63.9
Crosscreek Charter	35A	67.1	68.4	55.6	87.5
Franklin	350	66.5	78.4	52.7	73.7
Dillard Academy	96C	34	69.8	N/A	N/A
Wayne	960	63	77.1	51.1	61.3
East Wake Academy	92G	80.5	86.7	81.2	85.1
Wake	920	73.4	83.4	65.2	74.3

School Year 2008-2009	1	Reading	Math	Grade 5 Science	Grade 8 Science
STATE AVERAGE		67.6	80	60.8	67.6
JIAIL AVEINAGE	-	07.0			
Charter School	LEA #	Reading	Math	Grade 5 Science	Grade 8 Science
Endeavor Charter School	92S	89.7	>95.1	94.2	N/A
Wake	920	73.4	83.4	65.2	74.3
Evergreen Comm.	11A	87.6	88	84.6	92.5
Buncombe	110	73.1	84.5	62.9	76.3
Exploris Middle School	92B	89.5	93.2	N/A	93.4
Wake :	920	73.4	83.4	65.2	74.3
Forsyth Academies	34F	62.4	75.3	55.7	41.4
Forsyth	340	64.5	78	60.4	61.9
Francine Delany	11K	71.4	76.5	64.7	81.3
Buncombe	: 110	73.1	84.5	62.9	76.3
Gaston College Prep	66A	78.5	84.9	85.3	>95
Northampton	660	48.9	69.9	47.1	47.5
Greensboro Academy	41B	92.6	94	69.1	86.4
Guilford	410	65.6	80	57.1	62.3
Guilford Prep	41C	59.6	63.9	34.5	84.6
Guilford	410	65.6	80	57.1	62.3
Haliwa-Saponi	93A	s 50	54.8	33.3	85.7
Warren	930	49.6	61.8	50.3	52.2
Healthy Start Academy	32B	38.7	49.2	18.9	37
Durham	320	52.9	66.3	48.9	54.5
Hope Elementary	92Q	56.1	78	61.5	N/A
Wake	920	73.4	83.4	65.2	74.3
Kestrel Heights	32D	78.7	81.2	N/A	63.8
Durham	320	52.9	66.3	48.9	54.5
Kinston Charter	54B	48.6	53.7	8	54.5
Lenoir	540	60.2	72.3	57.2	48.7
KIPP Charlotte	60L	59.1	67.1	70.8	N/A
Mecklenburg	600	67.3	78.6	60.1	63.9
Lake Norman Charter	60D	92.2	94.1	84.2	>95
Mecklenburg	600	67.3	78.6	60.1	63.9
Learning Center	20A	90.9	88.6	93.3	>95
Cherokee	200	75.1	83.7	73.8	80.6
Lincoln Charter School	55A	82.6	92	70.8	88.9
Lincoln	550	71.6	85.4	72.2	78.7
Magellan Charter Sch.	92D	>95	>95	>95	>95
Wake	920	73.4	83.4	65.2	74.3
Maureen Joy Charter	32A	54.1	75	40	47.4
Durham	320	52.9	66.3	48.9	54.5
Metrolina Regional	60F	>95	>95	95	>95
Mecklenburg	600	67.3	78.6	60.1	63.9
Millennium Charter	86T	78.1	82.1	60	75.9
Mt Airy City Schools	862	69.3	85.1	67.3	76.6
Mountain Discovery	87A	70.5	70.5	66.7	73.3
Swain	870	69.7	81.5	76.6	69.2
Neuse Charter School	51A	74.8	85.4	>95	N/A
Johnston	510	73.9	87	69.5	78.7

K - 8 EOG Comparisons Charter Schools/ Local LEA's/ State 2008 - 2009

Sc. J Year				Grade 5	Grade 8
2008-2009		Reading	Math	Science	Science
STATE AVERAGE		67.6	80	60.8	67.6
Charter School	LEA#	Reading	Math	Grade 5 Science	Grade 8 Science
Orange Charter School	68A	70.7	80.2	55	72.2
Orange	680	72	83.5	68.3	72.3
hoenix Academy	41D	82.8	86.1	66.7	N/A
Guilford	410	65.6	80	57.1	62.3
Piedmont Comm. Sch.	36B	76.3	83.3	70.6	80.4
Gaston	360	66	77.4	52.2	69.3
Pine Lake Prep.	49E	89	94.6	90.7	93.8
Iredell	490	73.6	86.9	65	73.2
PreEminent Charter	92M	43.2	50.7	11.9	34.5
Wake	920	73.4	83.4	65.2	74.3
Quality Education	34B	77.4	90.3	70.6	66.7
Forsyth	340	64.5	78	60.4	61.9
Queen's Grant Comm.	60G	83.2	87.6	75	69.2
Mecklenburg	600	67.3	78.6	60.1	63.9
Quest Academy	92N	>95	>95	93.3	>95
Wake	920	73.4	83.4	65.2	74.3
Research Triangle	32H	55.4	68.9	31.9	47.2
am Sold SA	320	52.9	66.3	48.9	54.5
River Mill Academy	01B	77.6	88.3	59.6	89.6
Alamance	10	63.2	80.4	48.2	63.5
Rocky Mount Prep	64A	66.5	69	72.9	61.4
Nash	640	60.5	75	55.2	59.7
Roxboro Community	73B	86.5	94.2	N/A	79.5
Person	730	63.5	78.2	64.3	57.4
Sallie B. Howard	98A	47	73.5	30.3	41
Wilson	980	63.4	79.9	51.7	58.8
STARS	63B	62.5	67.1	25.8	37.5
Moore	630	72.5	82.4	66	76.3
Socrates	60J	89.4	95.7	N/A	N/A
Mecklenburg	600	67.3	78.6	60.1	63.9
Sterling Montessori	92E	84,6	90.3	75	78.9
Wake	920	73.4	83.4	65.2	74.3
Success Charter	49D	58.5	71.7	44.4	64.3
Iredell	490	73.6	86.9	65	73.2
Sugar Creek Charter	60B	55.5	74.9	34.4	41.3
Mecklenburg	600	67.3	78.6	60.1	63.9
Summit Charter	50A	87.5	87.5	72.7	>95
Jackson	500		84.6	79.5	79.4
The Acad, of Moore Co.	63A	47.7	51.2	10	50
Moore	63	72.5	82.4	66	76.3
The Carter G. Woodson	34D	40.6	72.1	27.5	63
·yth	34	+	78	60.4	61.9

School Year				Grade 5	Grade 8
2008-2009		Reading	Math	Science	Science
STATE AVERAGE		67.6	80	60.8	67.6
Charter School	LEA #	Reading	Math	Grade 5 Science	Grade 8 Science
The Central Pk. Sch.	32K	78.9	81	52.3	N/A
Durham	320	52.9	66.3	48.9	54.5
The Children's Village	54A	51.6	71.9	33.3	N/A
Lenoir	540	60.2	72,3	57.2	48.7
The Community Charter	60A	65.6	56.3	37.5	N/A
Mecklenburg	600	67.3	78.6	60.1	63.9
The Downtown Middle	34C	51.4	61.3	11.1	40
Forsyth	340	64.5	78	60.4	61.9
The Franklin Academy	92F	89.9	89.9	85.6	89.7
Wake	920	73.4	83.4	65.2	74.3
The Mountain Comm.	45A	82.5	90.4	77.8	85
Henderson	450	79.5	90.4	77.5	82.9
The New Dimensions	12A	60	66.7	20	N/A
Burke	120	72.7	88.1	72	79.2
The Woods Charter	19B	89.8	92.4	90	92.9
Chatham	190	69.2	80.5	68.9	76.7
Thomas Jefferson	81A	88	91.7	67.2	83.5
Rutherford	810	66.6	81.4	63.6	65.3
Tiller School	16B	88.2	90.2	81	N/A
Carteret	160	79.2	89.4	75.6	85
Torchlight Academy	92L	48.3	73.9	41.4	N/A
Wake	920	73.4	83.4	65.2	74.3
TRIAD Math and Sci.	41F	73.4	80.6	82.8	N/A
Guilford	410	65.6	80	57.1	62.3
Two Rivers Community	95A:	88.6	81.8	60	68.8
Watauga	950	83.9	91.7	78.2	87.5
Union Academy	90A	87.2	92.7	75	92.3
Union	900	77.8	89.4	69.4	72.8
Vance Charter School	91A	85	95	89.2	88.6
Vance	910	55.1	73	49	45.5
Voyager Academy	32L	79.9	89.3	78	89.8
Durham	320	52.9	66.3	48.9	54.5
Washington Montessori	07A	72.1	75.7	68.2	64.7
Beaufort	- 70	63	77.1	49.9	58.6
Wilmington Prep.	65B	29.5	31.8	12.5	N/A
New Hanover	65	71.9	82	61.1	73.8

High School EOC Comparisons Charter Schools/Local LEA's/State 2008 - 2009

High School Course		English I	Algebra I	Algebra II	Geometry	Biology	Chemistry	Physical Science	Physics	Civics & Economics	US History
STATE AVERAGE	-	73.8	67.7	72.9	73.3	71.2	77.7	62.7	85.9	71.4	71.2

Na haal	1 E V #	English I	Algebra l	Algebra II	Geometry	Biology	Chemistry	Physical Science	Physics	Civics & Economics	US History
School	-	English I		57.1	>95	80	N/A	58.1	N/A	80.8	83.3
Cape Lookout Marine HS		55.9	53.1 71	73.8	70.7	70.2	82.3	56.5	93.1	75.5	75.5
New Hanover	160	77.1		-		65	N/A	N/A	N/A	61.9	N/A
Carolina International	13A	93.8	65.1	57.1	78.6 85	80.2	84.6	70.7	86.2	82.6	79.2
Cabarras	130	78	74.1	81.9		86.4	N/A *	86.3	N/A	>95	57.1
Clover Garden	01C	91.2	65.4	75	90.6	69.2	84.7	62.5	84.7	73.1	68
Alamance Alamance	10		68	69.4	66.4		-	N/A	N/A	78.3	65.9
East Wake Academy	92G	88.2	58.5	47.5 81.6	60.7 81	78.5 80.2	47.9 87.3	67.2	92.1	80.4	77.6
Wake	920	80.7	76.5			>95	75.6	N/A	71.4	>95	92.7
Gaston College Prep	66A	95 47.9	71.1	45.2 28.7	73.2	48.2	66	59.1	87.5	54.2	48.9
North Hampton	- 66			85.2	94.4	>95	86.2	N/A	85.7	>95	87.8
Gray Stone Day	84B	>95	78.8 78.1	84.5	80.9	73.3	88.1	69.6	88.9	71.5	64.2
Stanly	840	-	-			42.9	42.9	78.6	N/A	53.8	37.5
Haliwa-Saponi Tribal Sch	100	73.3	60	25	30.8	56.1	65.5	42.9	66.7	33.8	48.2
Warren	930	-	49.2	24.1	-	62.2	N/A	39.5	10.5	66.7	54.5
Kestrel Heights	32D	66.7	46.7	29	38.3	61.2	61.6	38.2	80.7	59.6	63.8
Durham	320	-	46.8	49	51.6	-		N/A	N/A	94.6	N/A
Lake Norman Charter	60D	93.4	78.3	>95	88.7	>95	N/A	61	87.2	77.1	78.9
Mecklenburg	600	76.6	74.7	75.6	73	78.2	75.1	-	-	91.5	94
Lincoln Charter	55A	86.7	84.8	66.7	79.7	82.5	70.4	76.7	90	77.6	77.9
Lincoln	55	75.2	79.5	70.8	82.9	81.8	76.4	72	92.1		
PACE Academy	68N	42.1	92.3	N/A	N/A	33.3	N/A	66.7	N/A	70	61.5 83.2
Orange	68	78.2	76	82.3	76.4	68.2	75.6	52.4	91.2		
Piedmont Community	36B	89.4	63.8	14.3	58.3	60	17.6	N/A	N/A	61.8	43.8
Gaston	36	0 71.5	72.8	70.2	73.5	70.4	73	57.4	87.5	71.2	77.7
Pine Lake Prep	49E	91.7	82.6	59.2	70.1	81.5	84.8	N/A	75	N/A	91.7
Iredell	49	0 79.7	71.3	78.1	83.7	77.7	90.8	63.9	>95	75.1	71.2
Quality Education	34B	64.3	45.5	11.1	38.7	43.5	N/A	85.7	N/A	90	84
Forsyth	34	1	60.6	65.6	65.2	64.7	71.7	48	75.2	67.2	69.9
Queen's Grant Commun	i 60G	82.2	61.6	69.6	77.3	65.7	61.5	61.7			70.8
Mecklenburg	60				73	78.2	75.1	61	87.2	77.1	78.9
Raleigh Charter HS	92K	-	90.2		>95	>95	91.9	N/A	>95	>95	>95
Wake	92				81	80.2		67.2	92.1	80.4	77.6
River Mill Academy	01B	_		61.8	65.2	76.9	51.9	89.5	N/A	71.8	68.4
Alamance	_	72.5		69.4		69.2		62.5	84.7	73.1	68

High School EOC Comparisons Charter Schools/Local LEA's/State 2008 - 2009

High School Course		English I	Algebra I	Algebra II	Geometry	Biology	Chemistry	Physical Science	Physics	Civics & Economics	US History
STATE AVERAGE		73.8	67.7	72.9	73.3	71.2	77.7	62.7	85.9	71.4	71.2
				weens or						V-11-11-11-11-11-11-11-11-11-11-11-11-11	
Rocky Mt. Prep.	64A	74.3	53	66.7	74.2	46.2	35.9	N/A	3.7	55.6	62.5
Nash	640	64.4	74	80	77.6	58.8	90.9	56.6	94.7	59.9	70.2
Roxboro Community	73B	90.1	72.4	68	56.8	73.3	83.3	N/A	N/A	78.8	66,7
Person	730	66.8	48.1	70.3	52.9	66.2	69.8	35.4	52.6	58.7	62.7
Southern Wake Acad.	92P	80	50	50	62.5	63.2	N/A	29	N/A	52.4	45.5
Wake	920	80.7	76.5	81.6	81	80.2	87.3	67.2	92.1	80.4	77.6
The Carter G. Woodson	34D	62.5	60.6	37.5	53.8	66.7	N/A	71.4	N/A	87.5	45.8
Forsyth	340	70.9	60.6	65.6	65.2	64.7	71.7	48	75.2	67.2	69.9
The Franklin Academy	92F	>95	91	94.6	91.8	85.2	>95	95	>95	88.6	90.3
Wake	920	80.7	76.5	81.6	81	80.2	87.3	67.2	92.1	80.4	77.6
The Hawbridge School	01D	83.3	66.7	75	85	>95	N/A	>95	N/A	93.3	81.8
Alamance	10	72.5	68	69.4	66.4	69.2	84.7	62.5	84.7	73.1	68
The Woods Charter Sch.	19B	>95	93.3	60	82.5	95.8	68.6	N/A	N/A	>95	91.7
Chatham	190	77.4	62.8	66	71.1	74.9	78.5	57.8	86.1	74.8	75.6
Thomas Jefferson	81A	>95	87.4	93.1	83.5	84.2	93.5	90	80	>95	81.6
Rutherford	810	68.4	58.2	60.1	61.8	62.7	68.1	53.6	60	56	60.7
U Academy	90A	94.9	71.1	41.7	88.6	68.4	60.7	70.2	N/A	72.9	60.5
Union	900		78.7	81	80.5	76	84.3	76.2	92.4	77.6	78.2

^{*} This chart does not include any alternative charter schools.

EOC Algebra I and Geometry Comparisons for K-8 Charter Schools and LEA's 2008-2009

State Average		Algebra I	Geometry	
		67.7	73.3	
School	LEA#	Algebra l	Geometry	
Am. Renaissance	49B	>95	NA	
Iredell	490	71.3	4.	
Arapahoe Charter	69A	>95	NA	
Pamlico	690	61.6		
ArtSpace Charter	11B	93.8	>95	
Buncombe	. 110	75.1	84.7	
Bethany Comm. MS	79A	>95	NA	
Rockingham	790	76.2		
Brevard Academy	88A	88.9	NA NA	
Transylvania	880	73.4		
Cape Fear Cnt for Inq.	65A	>95	>95	
New Hanover	650	71	70.7	
Charter Day School	10A	>95	NA	
Brunswick	100	71.5	- 1052 F	
Chatham Charter	19A	>95	NA	
Chatham Charter	190	62.8		
Crosscreek Charter	35A	>95	NA	
Franklin	350	63.6	150.104	
Evergreen Community Sch	11A	91.7	NA	
Buncombe	110	75.1		
Exploris Middle School	92B	>95	>95	
Wake	920	76.5	81	
Forsyth Academies	34F	94.1	NA	
Forsylh	340	60.6		
Francine Delany	11K	>95	NA NA	
Buncombe	110	75.1	7000	
Greensboro Academy	41B	92.8	>95	
Guilford	410	56.9	66	
Guilford Preparatory	41C	>95	NA	
Guilford	410	56.9		
Magellan Charter School	92D	>95	>95	
Wake	920	76.5	81	

State Average		Algebra I	Geometry	
		67.7	73.3	
School	LEA#	Algebra I	Geometry	
Metrolina Regional Scholars	60F	>95	>95	
Mecklenburg	600	74.7	73	
Millennium Charter	86T	>95	NA	
Mt. Airy City Schools	862	91.3		
Mountain Discovery	87A	>95	>95	
Swain	870	56.3	75.2	
Orange Charter	68A	81.8	NA	
Orange	680	76		
PreEminent Charter	92M	22.7	NA	
Wake.	920	76.5	45.5	
Quest Academy	92N	>95	NA	
Wake	920	76.5		
Research Triangle	32H	>95	NA	
Durham	320	46.8		
Sterling Montessori	92E	>95	>95	
Wake	920	76.5	81	
Sugar Creek	60B	>95	NA	
Mecklenberg	600	74.7		
Summit	50A	43.8	NA	
Jackson	500	65.5		
The Downtown Middle Sch	34C	83.3	NA	
Forsyth	340	60.6	Ma Table	
The Mountain Comm. Sch	45A	>95	NA	
Henderson	450	71.2		
Voyager Academy	32L	88.6	>95	
Durham	320	46.8	51.6	
Washington Montessori	07A	90	NA	
Beauford	70	62.2		

Note: State and LEA math EOC averages reflect ALL STUDENTS who took Algebra I or Geometry EOC's as there is no way to separate the middle school students from the high school students in this data.