

n o r t h c a r o l i n a

Report to the
Joint Legislative Education
Oversight Committee on the
*Student Accountability Standards
Report, 2000-01*

RECEIVED

NOV 9 2001

RESEARCH DIVISION

November 2001



Public Schools of North Carolina
State Board of Education . Department of Public Instruction
Office of Instructional and Accountability Services

State Board of Education

Phillip J. Kirk, Jr.
Chairman
Raleigh

Jane P. Norwood
Vice Chair
Charlotte

Kathy A. Taft
Greenville

Michelle Howard-Vital
Wilmington

Edgar D. Murphy
Durham

Evelyn B. Monroe
West End

Maria T. Palmer
Chapel Hill

Ronald E. Deal
Hickory

Wayne McDevitt
Asheville

Zoe W. Locklear
Pembroke

Patricia Nickens Willoughby
Raleigh

Beverly Perdue
Lieutenant Governor
New Bern

Richard Moore
State Treasurer
Kittrell

NC Department of Public Instruction

Michael E. Ward, State Superintendent

Table of Contents

	<u>page</u>
Historical Review	1
What are the Standards?	1
Background	2
Method	3
Results	4
Table 1. Gateway Standards used by LEA	4
Table 2. Frequency of Students passing Reading and Math	5
Table 3. Student Accountability Status	6
Table 4. Reasons for Student Promotion	7
Table 5. Reasons Students were Retained	7
Table 6. Student Accountability Standards by Ethnic Group for Tested Students	8
Table 7. Standard Not Met, But Promoted by Ethnic Group	9
Table 8. Promotion Standard Met, but Student Retained, by Ethnic Group	10
Table 9. Promotion Status of Tested Students by Gender	11
Table 10. Standard not met, but Student Promoted By Gender	11
Table 11. Standard Met, But Student Retained, by Gender Group	12

	<u>page</u>
Table 12. Promotion Status for tested students who Were Disabled/Non-Disabled	13
Table 13. Promotion Status of Tested LEP students	14
Table 14. Number and Percent Passing Reading and Mathematics by Ethnicity	15
Summary	16
Appendix A	17
Table 1. Promotion Status for all students by Ethnic Group	18
Table 2. Promotion/Status of Tested Migrant Students	18
Table 3. Number and Percent passing Reading, Mathematics, or both by test administration and By Disability, Limited English Proficient, and Migrant Status	19
Table 4. Promotion Status by Disabled/Non-Disabled For Tested Students	20
Appendix B	21
All LEAs and Charter Schools with a fifth grade	22 - 49

Report on the Impact of Student Accountability Standards for Grade 5

2000 – 2001

History

The 1997 General Assembly directed the State Board of Education (SBE) to:

“develop a plan to implement high school exit exams, grade-level student proficiency benchmark, student proficiency benchmarks for academic courses required for admission to constituent institutions of The University of North Carolina, student proficiency benchmarks for the knowledge and skills necessary to enter the workforce, and to establish a Committee on Standards and Accountability (GS 115C-12).”

The Committee on Standards and Accountability advised the SBE on student performance standards. This 13-member committee reviewed the work of the Education Standards and Accountability Commission, heard from local and national leaders in student accountability, and reviewed research as a part of developing its report to the SBE. The Committee presented the report to the SBE in December of 1998 and the SBE used the Committee’s report in developing the policy on student accountability standards.

The Committee on Standards and Accountability recommended four gateways through which students must pass in order to move to the next grade level; and to include appropriate intervention for students to eliminate barriers that may prevent students from reaching proficiency levels. Although the ultimate goal is for all students to reach proficiency and not be retained, “more of the same” will not work for students who are retained. Intervention strategies for students retained should be innovative and matched to individual student needs.

As a result of these recommendations, a draft policy was developed. As discussions continued, the original draft was developed and revised to reflect current thinking and input from parents, educators, business representatives, special interest groups, and other community members. This information was gathered through public input sessions, meetings of the SBE, telephone conference calls, and written correspondence. The final policy evolved from this extensive input and was adopted by the SBE on April 1, 1999.

What are the Standards?

Student Accountability Standards are considered to be the next level of accountability in the state’s ABCs. The ABCs moved accountability from the district level to the school level, and have resulted in schools and school districts being more accountable for student performance.

Social promotion is the practice of promoting students from grade to grade regardless of whether they have mastered the appropriate material and are academically prepared to do the work at the next level. In effect, the standards are designed to eliminate social promotion.

Under the Student Accountability Standards policy, promotion decisions are made according to local policy and discretion, but must include statewide accountability standards at grades 3, 5, 8, and high school. At a minimum, each local board of education must adopt procedures to ensure that students are treated fairly. The local policies must also recognize the statutory authority of the principal to make promotion decisions.

Local boards' of education policies shall be consistent with statewide student accountability policies. The policies shall include: notification and involvement of parents and an agreement of parental expectations signed by parents or guardians.

The Student Accountability Standards policy requires local boards of education to report annually on their progress in increasing the number of students who meet the standards. The specific standards are:

- Gateway 1 – In addition to meeting local promotion requirements, students in grade 3 shall demonstrate proficiency by having test scores at Level III or above on end-of-grade tests in both reading and mathematics.
Effective school year: 2001-2002.
- Gateway 2 - In addition to meeting local promotion requirements, students in grade 5 shall demonstrate proficiency by having test scores at Level III or above on end-of-grade tests in both reading and mathematics, and make adequate progress in writing, as determined by the 4th grade writing assessment with a score of 2.5 or above. Effective school year: 2000-2001.
- Gateway 3 – (The Middle School Standard) – Students shall demonstrate proficiency by having test scores at Level III or above in reading and mathematics, meet all local promotion requirements, and make adequate progress in writing, as determined by the 7th grade writing assessment with a score of 2.5 or above. Effective school year: 2001-2002.
- Gateway 4 – (The High School Standard) – Students shall meet local and state graduation requirements, make a passing score on an exit exam of essential skills, and pass the computer skills test.
Effective school years: 2005 and 2001, respectively.

The standards for grade 5 began with the 2000-2001 school year. The General Assembly and the SBE have been concerned about what impact the implementation of the standards would have on student promotion and retention. This report addresses their concerns by summarizing the results of promotion/retention data for all fifth grade students enrolled in public and charter schools during the 2000-2001 school year.

Background

Prior to 2000-2001 no mechanism existed for collecting data on the Student Accountability Standards. To address this issue, 26 Local Education Agencies (LEAs) and six Regional Accountability Coordinators (RACs) were invited to attend a meeting on April 6, 2001 at the Department of Public Instruction to provide input on a process that could be used to collect the data. The criteria used to select the LEAs were:

1. LEAs that previously had a student accountability promotion policy,
2. LEAs that represented low-wealth LEAs,
3. LEA's size (i.e., small, medium, and large student population). and

4. LEA geographic locations representative of the state.

There were 34 staff members representing 13 LEAs, two RACs, and 10 Department of Public Instruction staff members for a total of 46 individuals who attended the meeting. Dr. Henry Johnson, the Associate Superintendent for Instructional and Accountability Services facilitated the discussions at the meeting. Staff members of the Division of Accountability Services provided options on how to collect the data and requested input. It was decided by the group to use the WinScan program (the software provided to LEAs for the purpose of scoring end-of-grade tests) to collect the data. This computer program was selected because Testing Coordinators were accustomed to its use in conjunction with the state's testing program. The software program would have to be revised in order to accommodate this new feature. Unfortunately much of the data collection would involve data reporting at the school building level and manual entry of the data into WinScan at the central office. Testing Coordinators would be able to code whether or not a student had met the "gateway" with the additional information provided locally of why a student had been promoted/retained.

Discussions at the meeting focused on the rationale for promotion or retention of a student. As a result of these discussions, two distinct categories arose: (1) Reasons for promoting a student who did not make Level III, and (2) Reasons for retaining a student who made Level III.

The reasons for each category were summarized and emailed to the participants that attended the April 6 meeting. After the LEAs provided feedback, the resulting document was reviewed by the State Board attorney to ensure agreement with state policy. The final draft of the Student Accountability Standards Reasons for Student Promotion/Retention were finalized on June 5 and posted on the Accountability website on June 11, 2001.

Those reasons are:

Reason for promoting a student who did not make Level III:

1. Waiver – because a student is performing at grade level or making adequate progress to meet the requirements of the next grade level. (16 NCAC 6D.501 and 6D.0504; GS 115C-12(9b); 16 NCAC 6D.0505)
2. LEP (Limited English Proficiency) 16 NCAC 6G.0305
3. Local Policy/Principal's Decision/Other

Reason for retaining a student who made Level III:

1. Local promotion standards based on academic criteria
2. Local promotion standards based on attendance criteria
3. Principal's Decision or other criteria

As staff members in the Division of Accountability Services were creating a mechanism to collect promotion/retention data, end-of-grade testing had begun. The division began to receive telephone calls from LEA's concerning the fifth grade mathematics tests. It was discovered that the interim achievement levels for mathematics had been set too low. In light of this finding, staff members decided to proceed with collecting the student accountability data.

Method

All fifth grade multiple-choice answer sheets were merged into one data set per LEA. Students who did not meet the gateway during the first administration were given a second and third opportunity to pass the gateway after intervention strategies provided by the LEA. LEAs could implement the Gateway standard (Achievement Level III + 1 Standard Error of Measurement SEM) or use a higher standard (e.g., Achievement Level III). As can be seen (Table 1) the predominant criterion used was Achievement level III + 1 SEM. See individual LEA results in Appendix B.

Table 1

Gateway standards used by LEA and Charter Schools for each test administration

Standard	Total	
	N	Percent
End of Grade Test		
Achievement Level III	16	9.8
Achievement Level III + 1 SEM	148	90.2
Retest 1		
Achievement Level III	15	9.1
Achievement Level III + 1 SEM	141	86.0
No Retest Administered	8	4.9
Retest 2		
Achievement Level III	15	9.1
Achievement Level III + 1 SEM	122	74.4
No Retest Administered	27	16.5

Note. Not all Charter Schools have a grade 5.

The merged data sets included the data collection process for students who did not meet Gateway 2 for first testing, or Retest 1, and Retest 2. Table 2 represents the number of students who passed and failed reading and mathematics after all retests. The passing rates for both reading and math were in the ninety percent range after all the retests. Only 0.5% of fifth graders taking the test did not pass mathematics, while 7.5% did not pass reading.

Table 2

Frequency of Students passing and failing Reading and Mathematics after all retests

	Math					
	Passed		Failed		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Reading						
Passed	92,102	92.4	81	0.1	92,183	92.5
Failed	7,008	7.0	452	0.5	7,460	7.5
Total	99,110	99.5	533	0.5	99,643	100.0

Note. Percents may not add to 100% due to rounding.

Next, a student roster was generated for each school per LEA to review and verify that information provided was accurate. The principal of each school determined why a student on the roster was promoted or retained. This information was collected and entered by the Testing Coordinator at the central office of the LEA and sent to the Regional Accountability Coordinators to check and forward to the Department of Public Instruction Accountability Services Division.

It was noted during this process by staff members in the Division of Accountability Services that errors occurred while entering data after all the retesting had been completed. For example, some students' social security numbers were missing, gender and ethnicity codes were missing, students with reading scores missing math scores; similarly, there were students with math scores missing reading scores. Although guidance was provided and definitions of terms were incorporated in the WinScan program, some of the definitions provided by the program were not interpreted as intended. This observation is based on telephone calls received from several Testing Coordinators that indicated some confusion with the terms and/or directions. Based on this data collection experience, further refinements for data collection in the future will be implemented.

Results

The results are reported statewide, and are disaggregated by ethnicity, gender, disability status, LEP status, and Migrant status. In the tables, empty cells are indicated by an asterisk (*). The asterisk indicates that data were missing for that table cell or the number of students in that cell was less than 15. Table 3 provides statewide testing results for the Student Accountability Standards for grade 5.

The number of fifth grade students participating in end-of-grade tests for reading and math who met Gateway 2 and were promoted was 91,830 (92.2% of tested students), and the number of students who did not meet Gateway 2 and were retained was 1,995 (2.0% of tested students). The total number of promoted students (standard met, promoted + standard not met, promoted) was 97,236. The total number of retained students (standard not met, retained + standard met, retained) was 2,407.

Table 3

Student Accountability Status

Student Accountability Status	Number of Students	Percent of Tested Students	Percent of All Students
Standard Met, Promoted	91,830	92.2	86.8
Standard Not Met, Promoted	5,406	5.4	5.1
Standard Not Met, Retained	1,995	0.4	0.4
Standard Met, Retained	412	2.0	1.9
LEP, Transfer, Alternate Assessment	6,187		5.8
Total	105,830	100.0	100.0

There were 5,406 (5.4% of tested students) students who were promoted without meeting the gateway, and 412 (.4% of tested students) students who were retained even though they met the gateway. The number of LEP (Limited English Proficiency) students, students who transferred to another school prior to a promotion decision, and students who took alternate assessments was 6,187 (5.8%). These students were not subject to the Gateway standard.

Examining the reasons for promotion when students did not meet the Gateway, Table 4 shows that 2,888 students (53.4%) were promoted without meeting the standard based on either a local policy, the principal's decision or other reasons.

Table 4
Reasons for Student Promotion

Reasons Promoted, Standard Not Met	Students Promoted	
	Number	Percent
Waiver Due to Adequate Progress	2,354	43.5
LEP (Limited English Proficient)	162	3.0
Local Policy/Principal's Decision/Other	2,888	53.4
Reason Not Given	*	0.0
Total	5,406	99.9

Note. Full precision though not shown here, is carried throughout all calculations. Percents may not add to 100% due to rounding. The asterisk indicates that data were missing for that table cell or the number of students in that cell was less than 15.

The total number of retained students was 2407(2.4%) of tested students. Some students were retained even though they met the standard. In Table 5, there were 361 (87.6%) students retained due to Local Promotion Standards/Academic reasons, and 31 (9.7%) students retained based on the principal's decision and other reasons.

Table 5
Reasons Students were Retained, Standards Met

Reasons Retained, But Standard Met	Students Retained	
	Number	Percent
Local Promotion Standards/Academic	361	87.6
Local Promotion Standards/Attendance	*	*
Principal's Decision/Other	31	9.7
Reason Not Given	*	*
Total	412	100

Note. The asterisk indicates that data were missing for that table cell or the number of students in that cell was less than 15.

Table 6 shows the results by ethnicity for students tested in Grade 5. For additional details see Tables 1 and 2 in Appendix A.

Table 6
Student Accountability Standards by Ethnic Group for Tested Students

Ethnic Group	Standard Met					Standard Not Met			
	Total N	Promoted n	%	Retained n	%	Promoted n	%	Retained N	%
American Indian	1,392	1,221	87.7	*	*	104	7.5	63	4.5
Asian	1,761	1,659	94.2	*	*	78	4.4	20	1.1
African American	29,466	25,265	85.7	211	0.7	2,921	9.9	1,069	3.6
Hispanic	3,648	3,101	85.0	*	*	404	11.1	129	3.5
Multi-Racial	1,384	1,321	95.4	*	*	39	2.8	18	1.3
White	61,965	59,238	95.6	173	0.3	1,859	3.0	695	1.1
Other	22	21	95.5	*	*	*	*	*	*
Total	99,638	91,826	92.2	412	0.4	5,406	5.4	1,994	2.0

Note. There were five students in the data file without ethnic codes.

The asterisk indicates that data were missing for that table cell or the number of students in that cell was less than 15.

Full precision though not shown here, is carried throughout all calculations.

The number of White students who met the gateway and were promoted was 59,238 (95.6%), and the number of African Americans who met the gateway and were promoted was 25,265 (85.7%). Only 1.1% or 695 White students did not meet the gateway and were retained. Among African American students, 1,069 (3.6%) did not meet the gateway and were retained. African American students 2,921 (9.9%) were nearly 3 to 4 times as likely to be promoted without meeting the gateway than White students 1,859 (3.0%). Also, fewer White students 173 (.3%) were retained who had met the gateway than African American students 211 (.7%).

The results for all students including LEP, transfer students and students participating in alternate assessments is shown in appendix A, Table 1. The number of students who passed the gateway and those students who did not meet the gateway are the same as above. Only the total number of students is different because the table in Appendix A reflects all students in the fifth grade rather than just those students who were subject to the gateway and took end-of-grade tests.

The predominant reason a student was promoted (Table 7) without meeting the accountability gateway was “local policy, a principal’s decision, or other reasons.” This was true across all ethnic groups. This was generally followed by the reason “waiver due to adequate progress” except among Asians and Hispanics, where “LEP” was more frequently given as a reason.

Table 7
Standard not met, but student promoted by Ethnic Group

Ethnic Group	Total N	Waiver Due to Adequate Progress		LEP (Limited English Proficient)		Local Policy/Principal's Decision/Other		Reason Not Given	
		n	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
American Indian	104	51	49.0	*	*	52	50.0	*	*
Asian	78	18	23.1	24	30.8	36	46.2	*	*
African American	2,921	1,248	42.7	*	0.2	1,667	57.1	*	*
Hispanic	404	121	30.0	126	31.2	157	38.9	*	*
Multi-Racial	39	18	46.2	*	*	21	53.8	*	*
White	1,859	898	48.3	*	*	954	51.3	*	*
Other	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Total	5,406	2,354	43.5	162	3.0	2,888	53.4	*	*

Note. The asterisk indicates that data were missing for that table cell or the number of students in that cell was less than 15.

Table 8 represents the reasons students were retained, even though they met the gateway. The most frequently given reason was Local Promotion Standards/Academic (361 or 87.6%). Principal's Decision/Other accounted for 40 (9.7%) retained students who met the standard. Most ethnic groups had very small numbers (less than 15), and their results are shown in the table as asterisks.

Table 8
Promotion Standard Met, but student Retained, by Ethnic group

Ethnic Group	Local Promotion Standards					Principals Decision/Other		Reason Not Given	
	Total	Academic		Attendance		N	%	N	%
	N	N	%	N	%				
American Indian	*	*	*			*	*		
Asian	*	*	*						
African American	211	196	92.9	*	*	*	*	*	*
Hispanic	*	*	*			*	*	*	*
Multi-Racial	*	*	*			*	*		
White	173	143	82.7	*	*	24	13.9	*	*
Total	412	361	87.6	*	1.7	40	9.7	*	*

Note. The asterisk indicates that data were missing for that table cell or the number of students in that cell was less than 15. A blank space means there is no data for that cell.

Promotion data were also disaggregated by gender, Table 9. More females met the gateway and were promoted than males. Conversely, more males (1,255 or 2.5%) failed to meet the gateway and were retained in comparison to females (7,399 or 1.5%).

Table 9
Promotion Status of Tested Students by Gender

Gender	N	Standard Met				Standard Not Met			
		Promoted		Retained		Promoted		Retained	
		n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Female	49,075	46,149	94.0	136	0.3	2,051	4.2	739	1.5
Male	50,566	45,680	90.3	276	0.5	3,355	6.6	1,255	2.5
Total	99,641	91,829	92.2	412	0.4	5,406	5.4	1,994	2.0

Note. There were two students in the data file without gender codes.

The predominant reason given for promoting students who did not meet the gateway by gender (Table 10) was Local Policy, a principal's decision, or other reasons, followed by waiver due to adequate progress.

Table 10
Standard not met but Student Promoted, by Gender

Gender	Total	Waiver Due to Adequate Progress		LEP (Limited English Proficient)		Local Policy/Principal's Decision/Other		Reason Not Given	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Female	2,051	873	42.6	73	3.6	1,104	53.8	*	*
Male	3,355	1,481	44.1	89	2.7	1,784	53.2	*	*

Note. The asterisk indicates that data were missing for that table cell or the number of students in that cell was less than 15.

Respectively, more males (3,355 or 44.1%) were promoted without meeting the gateway than females (2,051 or 42.6%). Also, more males (1,481 or 44.1%) were promoted without meeting the gateway than females (873 or 42.6%) based on waiver due to adequate progress.

In addition, more males (287) were retained who met the gateway than females (136). See Table 11. The number one reason males and females were retained was Local Promotion Standards/Academic. There were 242 (87.7%) of the males being retained in comparison to 119 (87.5%) of the females being retained. Local Policy/Principal's Decision accounted for 27 (9.8%) of the males being retained; there were too few females to report.

Table 11
Standard Met, But Student Retained, by Gender Group

Gender	Total N	Local Promotion				Principal's Decision/Other		Reason Not Given	
		Academic		Attendance		n	%	n	%
Female	136	119	87.5	*	*	*	9.6	*	*
Male	276	242	87.7	*	*	27	9.8	*	*

Note. The asterisk indicates that data were missing for that table cell or the number of students in that cell was less than 15.

Table 12 represents the promotion status of tested students who were disabled and non-disabled. More non-disabled students (353) were retained who met the gateway than disabled students (59). There are 14 categories of disability. They include: behaviorally/emotionally disabled, hearing impaired, educable mentally disabled, specific learning disabled, speech language impaired, visually impaired, other health impaired, orthopedically impaired, traumatic brain injury, autistic, severe profound mentally disabled, multi handicapped, deaf blind, and trainable mentally disabled. Students classified as non-disabled were: not identified as an exceptional student or were academically and intellectually gifted (AG).

Table 12

Promotion Status for tested students who were Disabled/Non-Disabled

Group	Total	Standard Met				Standard Not Met			
		Promoted		Retained		Promoted		Retained	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Disabled	11,464	8,241	71.9	59	0.5	2,584	22.5	580	5.1
Non Disabled	88,101	83,544	94.8	353	0.4	2,812	3.2	1,392	1.6
Total	99,565	91785	92.2	412	0.4	5396	5.4	1972	2.0

Note. There were 78 students in the data file without disability codes.

A higher percentage of disabled students were promoted without meeting the Gateway (22.5%) compared to non-disabled students (3.2%). Approximately 47.9% of disabled students were promoted without meeting the Gateway standard. More non-disabled students met the gateway and were promoted (83,544) than disabled students (8,241). It is important to note that more American Indian, Asian, Black, and Hispanic disabled students were promoted who did not meet the gateway (See Table 4 in Appendix A).

Table 13 represents the promotion status of tested LEP students. There were 837 (77.0%) LEP students who met the standard and were promoted; only 56 LEP students or (5.2%) were retained. A higher percentage (17.8%) of LEP students were promoted without meeting the gateway than was the case for non-LEP students (5.3%). Overall, 3.6% of students who were promoted, but did not meet the standard were LEP students.

Table 13

Promotion Status of Tested LEP Students

Group	Total	Standard Met				Standard Not Met			
		Promoted		Retained		Promoted		Retained	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
LEP	1,087	837	77.0	*	*	193	17.8	56	5.2
Not LEP	98,556	90,993	92.3	411	0.4	5,213	5.3	1,939	2.0
Total	99,643	91,830	92.2	412	0.4	5,406	5.4	1,995	2.0

Note. The asterisk indicates that data were missing for that table cell or the number of students in that cell was less than 15.

The majority of fifth grade students (86.4%) passed reading and mathematics on the first test administration (Table 14). Approximately 92.1% of all white fifth grade students passed the first test administration and 75.6% of all fifth grade black students passed the first test administration. Among other ethnic groups, students passed the first test administration at the rate of 77% or better.

After the final retest for reading and mathematics, 86.1% of all black fifth grade students and 95.8% of all white fifth grade students passed both reading and mathematics. Other ethnic groups had similar results.

Mathematics had a higher passing percentage than reading (99.5% and 92.5% respectively). It is important to note here that the higher passing percentage for mathematics may be partly due to the achievement levels for the new fifth grade math test being set too low.

Table 14

Number and Percent Passing Reading and Mathematics by Ethnicity

Test Administration		Ethnic								
		All	Asian	Black	Hispanic	American Indian	Multi-Racial	Other	White	
End of Grade Test	Subject									
	Reading	Number	86,299	1,598	22,369	2,822	1,097	1,253	19	57,137
		Percent	86.6	90.7	75.9	77.4	78.8	90.5	86.4	92.2
	Math	Number	98,422	1,752	28,766	3,581	1,364	1,374	21	61,560
		Percent	98.8	99.5	97.6	98.2	98.0	99.3	95.5	99.3
	Both	Number	86,127	1,597	22,262	2,816	1,091	1,251	19	57,087
Percent		86.4	90.7	75.6	77.2	78.4	90.4	86.4	92.1	
Retest 1	Reading	Number	4,480	48	2,276	215	93	54	1	1,793
		Percent	36.3	32.0	34.0	29.1	33.9	44.6	33.3	41.1
	Math	Number	758	4	479	41	16	9		209
		Percent	79.7	80.0	79.6	77.4	72.7	90.0		81.0
	Both	Number	98		52	6	3	2		35
		Percent	12.7		10.8	12.5	17.6	25.0		16.7
Cumulative After Retest 1	Reading	Number	90,535	1,645	24,477	3,031	1,188	1,307	20	58,863
		Percent	90.9	93.4	83.1	83.1	85.3	94.4	90.9	95.0
	Math	Number	99,013	1,756	29,123	3,615	1,377	1,381	21	61,736
		Percent	99.4	99.7	98.8	99.1	98.9	99.8	95.5	99.6
	Both	Number	90,457	1,645	24,431	3,027	1,184	1,306	20	58,840
		Percent	90.8	93.4	82.9	83.0	85.1	94.4	90.9	95.0
Retest 2	Reading	Number	1,753	16	979	85	45	23	1	604
		Percent	28.5	21.9	27.0	24.9	28.5	43.4	50.0	31.9
	Math	Number	153		101	4	3		1	44
		Percent	80.1		75.9	80.0	100.0		100.0	91.7
	Both	Number	21		11				1	9
		Percent	13.3		10.0				100.0	22.5
Cumulative After Retest 2	Reading	Number	92,183	1,661	25,400	3,113	1,232	1,329	21	59,423
		Percent	92.5	94.3	86.2	85.3	88.5	96.0	95.5	95.9
	Math	Number	99,110	1,756	29,185	3,617	1,380	1,381	22	61,765
		Percent	99.5	99.7	99.0	99.2	99.1	99.8	100.0	99.7
	Both	Number	92,102	1,661	25,361	3,107	1,227	1,328	21	59,393
		Percent	92.4	94.3	86.1	85.2	88.1	96.0	95.5	95.8

Summary

The results of the data analysis suggest that implementation of the gateway standards in grade 5 did not increase the number of students retained in the 2000-2001 school year as much as projected. A majority, in excess of 90%, of fifth graders who participated in end-of-grade tests for reading and math met the gateway (promoted), while slightly more than 2% did not meet the gateway (retained). Ethnic differences were noted in the passing rate for the gateway in the fifth grade.

When students were promoted without meeting the gateway, it is apparent that local policy/principal's decision/other played a key role in that decision. This reason accounted for 53.4% of all students promoted without meeting the gateway. Local policy also played a key role in determining why a student was retained while meeting the accountability gateway. This reason accounted for 87.6% of retained students who met the accountability standard.

Some gender differences were noted with more females passing the gateway than males, although there were more males in the population than females. Local Policy/Principal's Decision/Other also played a key role in deciding the promotion of students who had not met the gateway. Likewise, local policy played a key role in why a student was retained even though she or he had met the gateway.

A higher percentage of disabled students were promoted without meeting the gateway than non-disabled students. More American Indian, Asian, Black, and Hispanic disabled students were promoted who did not meet the gateway than White disabled students. Likewise, a higher percentage of LEP students were promoted without meeting the gateway than non-LEP students.

The majority of students passed both reading and mathematics on the first test administration. Fifth grade students had a higher passing percentage for mathematics than reading.

Generally, educators had expected that the percentage of students likely to be retained would increase from 3% to 5% above current levels with implementation of the Student Accountability Standards. For the fifth grade, it was estimated that as many as 5,955 students or 6.2% would be retained in 2000-2001. Those estimates were too high.

In 1999-2000 there were 1,431 (1.4%) students retained in the fifth grade. In 2000 - 2001, 2,406 students or 2.3% were retained. (It is important to note that due to interim achievement levels for mathematics being set too low, it is not known what impact this may have had on the number of students promoted in the fifth grade). Although this figure is twice the number of retained students in 1999-2000, it is below previous projections. This would suggest that the state's ABCs, along with the implementation of higher student accountability standards, may have prompted schools to focus on the Standard Course of Study, and resulted in higher student performance, and fewer than projected students failing to pass the fifth grade gateway.

APPENDIX

A

Table 1
Promotion Status for all students, by Ethnic Group

Ethnic Group	Standard Met					Standard Not Met				LEP, Transfer, Alternate Assessment	
	N	Promoted		Retained		Promoted		Retained			
		n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
American Indian	1,526	1,221	80.0	*	0.3	104	6.8	63	4.1	134	8.8
Asian	1,934	1,659	85.8	*	0.2	78	4.0	20	1.0	173	8.9
African American	31,969	25,265	79.0	211	0.7	2,921	9.1	1,069	3.3	2,503	7.8
Hispanic	4,805	3,101	64.5	*	0.3	404	8.4	129	2.7	1,157	24.1
Multi-Racial	1,443	1,321	91.5	*	0.4	39	2.7	18	1.2	59	4.1
White	64,105	59,238	92.4	173	0.3	1,859	2.9	695	1.1	2,140	3.3
Other	24	21	87.5			*	*			*	*
Total	105,806	91,826	86.8	412	0.4	5,406	5.1	1,994	1.9	6,168	5.8

Note. The asterisk indicates that data were missing for that table cell or the number of students in that cell was less than 15.

Table 2
Promotion /Status of Tested Migrant students

Group	Total	Standard Met				Standard Not Met			
		Promoted		Retained		Promoted		Retained	
		n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Migrant	536	423	78.9			73	13.6	40	7.5
Not Migrant	98,965	91,314	92.3	409	0.4	5,322	5.4	1,920	1.9
Total	99,501	91,737	92.2	409	0.4	5,395	5.4	1,960	2.0

Table 3

Number and Percent passing Reading, Mathematics, or both by test administration and by Disability, Limited English Proficient, and Migrant Status

Test Administration		Subject		Disability		Limited English Proficient		Migrant Status	
				All	Disabled	Not Disabled	LEP	Not LEP	Migrant
End of Grade Test	Reading	Number	86,299	6,979	79,278	1,056	85,243	368	85,841
		Percent	86.6	60.9	90.0	64.5	87.0	68.7	86.7
	Math	Number	98,422	10,903	87,469	1,595	96,827	524	97,795
		Percent	98.8	95.1	99.3	97.5	98.8	97.8	98.8
	Both	Number	86,127	6,916	79,170	1,051	85,076	367	85,670
		Percent	86.4	60.3	89.9	64.2	86.8	68.5	86.6
Retest 1	Reading	Number	4,480	1,019	3,457	130	4,350	42	4,432
		Percent	36.3	26.4	40.9	24.9	36.8	28.4	36.4
	Math	Number	758	310	448	28	730	8	748
		Percent	79.7	76.5	82.1	73.7	80.0	88.9	79.6
	Both	Number	98	30	68	4	94	2	96
		Percent	12.7	8.8	15.9	11.8	12.8	25.0	12.6
Cumulative After Retest 1	Reading	Number	90,535	7,958	82,531	1,183	89,352	408	90,031
		Percent	90.9	69.4	93.7	72.3	91.2	76.1	91.0
	Math	Number	99,013	11,151	87,812	1,619	97,394	532	98,376
		Percent	99.4	97.3	99.7	99.0	99.4	99.3	99.4
	Both	Number	90,457	7,926	82,487	1,180	89,277	407	89,955
		Percent	90.8	69.1	93.6	72.1	91.1	75.9	90.9
Retest 2	Reading	Number	1,753	378	1,369	53	1,700	17	1,728
		Percent	28.5	18.9	33.1	20.6	28.8	22.1	28.6
	Math	Number	153	66	86	4	149		151
		Percent	80.1	78.6	81.9	66.7	80.5		80.3
	Both	Number	21	7	14		21		21
		Percent	13.3	9.3	17.3		13.7		13.5
Cumulative After Retest 2	Reading	Number	92,183	8,307	83,824	1,236	90,947	425	91,654
		Percent	92.5	72.5	95.1	75.6	92.8	79.3	92.6
	Math	Number	99,110	11,195	87,864	1,621	97,489	532	98,471
		Percent	99.5	97.7	99.7	99.1	99.5	99.3	99.5
	Both	Number	92,102	8,273	83,784	1,233	90,869	424	91,583
		Percent	92.4	72.2	95.1	75.4	92.7	79.1	92.5

Table 4

Promotion Status by Disabled/Non-Disabled for Tested Students

Ethnic Group		Total	Standard Met, Promoted		Standard Met, Retained		Standard Not Met, Promoted		Standard Not Met, Retained	
		N	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
American Indian	Not Disabled	1,240	1,120	90.3	4	0.3	62	5.0	54	4.4
	Disabled	149	100	67.1			42	28.2	7	4.7
Asian	Not Disabled	1,691	1,611	95.3	4	0.2	57	3.4	19	1.1
	Disabled	68	46	67.6			21	30.9	1	1.5
Black	Not Disabled	25,785	23,151	89.8	190	0.7	1,636	6.3	808	3.1
	Disabled	3,650	2,096	57.4	21	0.6	1,278	35.0	255	7.0
Hispanic	Not Disabled	3,345	2,935	87.7	14	0.4	293	8.8	103	3.1
	Disabled	297	163	54.9			111	37.4	23	7.7
Multi-Racial	Not Disabled	1,242	1,206	97.1	5	0.4	15	1.2	16	1.3
	Disabled	142	115	81.0	1	0.7	24	16.9	2	1.4
White	Not Disabled	54,782	53,505	97.7	136	0.2	749	1.4	392	0.7
	Disabled	7,148	5,712	79.9	37	0.5	1,107	15.5	292	4.1
Other	Not Disabled	14	14	100.0						
	Disabled	8	7	87.5			1	12.5		
Total		99,561	91,781	92.2	412	0.4	5,396	5.4	1,972	2.0

APPENDIX

B

Promotion Status for All Students and by Ethnic Group by LEA

			Standard Met, Promoted		Standard Met, Retained		Standard Not Met, Promoted		Standard Not Met, Retained		LEP, Transfer, Alternate Assessment		
			Total	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
			N	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
	North Carolina	All Students	105,806	91,826	86.8	412	0.4	5,406	5.1	1,994	1.9	6,168	5.8
010	Alamance-Burlington	All Students	1,748	1,513	86.6			100	5.7	26	1.5	109	6.2
		Asian	16	16	100.0								
		Black	443	351	79.2			45	10.2	15	3.4	32	7.2
		Hispanic	136	79	58.1			15	11.0	*	*	39	28.7
		American Indian	5	*	*			*	*				
		Multi-Racial	23	19	82.6			*	*	*	*	*	*
		White	1,125	1,044	92.8			38	3.4	7	0.6	36	3.2
01B	River Mill	All Students	27	25	92.6			*	*			*	*
		Multi-Racial	*	*	*								
		White	25	23	92.0			*	*			*	*
020	Alexander County	All Students	424	369	87.0	*	*	11	2.6	10	2.4	31	7.3
		Asian	17	11	64.7			5	29.4	*	*		
		Black	29	21	72.4	*	*	*	*			6	20.7
		Hispanic	13	10	76.9							*	*
		Multi-Racial	*	*	*								
		White	363	325	89.5	*	*	5	1.4	9	2.5	22	6.1
030	Alleghany County	All Students	130	117	90.0			*	*	*	*	8	6.2
		Black	*	*	*								
		Hispanic	*	*	*			*	*	*	*		
		White	125	114	91.2			*	*	*	*	8	6.4
040	Anson County	All Students	383	294	76.8					60	15.7	29	7.6
		Asian	6	5	83.3							*	*
		Black	242	165	68.2					56	23.1	21	8.7
		Hispanic	*	*	*								
		American Indian	*	*	*								
		White	131	120	91.6					*	*	7	5.3

		Total	Standard Met, Promoted		Standard Met, Retained		Standard Not Met, Promoted		Standard Not Met, Retained		LEP, Transfer, Alternate Assessment		
			N	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
050	Ashe County	All Students	232	214	92.2			13	5.6	*	*	*	*
		Asian	*	*	*								
		Black	*	*	*								
		Hispanic	*	*	*							*	*
		American Indian	*	*	*								
		Multi-Racial	*	*	*								
		White	223	207	92.8			13	5.8	*	*	*	*
060	Avery County	All Students	167	140	83.8			6	3.6	*	*	19	11.4
		Hispanic	*	*	*							*	*
		Multi-Racial	*	*	*								
		White	163	138	84.7			6	3.7	*	*	17	10.4
070	Beaufort County	All Students	573	492	85.9	*	*	30	5.2	20	3.5	29	5.1
		Black	245	201	82.0			22	9.0	11	4.5	11	4.5
		Hispanic	15	8	53.3					*	*	5	33.3
		Multi-Racial	5	*	*					*	*		
		White	308	279	90.6	*	*	8	2.6	6	1.9	13	4.2
080	Bertie County	All Students	281	238	84.7	*	*	32	11.4	7	2.5	*	*
		Black	229	191	83.4	*	*	28	12.2	6	2.6	*	*
		Hispanic	*	*	*								
		Multi-Racial	*	*	*								
		White	50	45	90.0			*	*	*	*		
090	Bladen County	All Students	472	385	81.6	*	*	23	4.9	10	2.1	53	11.2
		Black	245	193	78.8	*	*	14	5.7	8	3.3	29	11.8
		Hispanic	21	11	52.4					*	*	9	42.9
		American Indian	*	*	*								
		Multi-Racial	*									*	*
		White	201	177	88.1			9	4.5	*	*	14	7.0
100	Brunswick County	All Students	896	771	86.0	*	*	29	3.2	11	1.2	83	9.3
		Asian	*	*	*								
		Black	193	147	76.2			13	6.7	*	*	30	15.5
		Hispanic	20	7	35.0			*	*	*	*	11	55.0
		American Indian	*	*	*							*	*
		Multi-Racial	16	15	93.8			*	*				
		White	662	599	90.5	*	*	14	2.1	7	1.1	40	6.0

			Total		Standard Met, Promoted		Standard Met, Retained		Standard Not Met, Promoted		Standard Not Met, Retained		LEP, Transfer, Alternate Assessment					
			N		Percent		N		Percent		N		Percent		N		Percent	
			N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
110	Buncombe County	All Students	1,950	91.2	1,778	91.2			49	2.5	13	0.7	110	5.6				
		Asian	9	66.7	6	66.7			*	*			*	*				
		Black	111	88.3	98	88.3			*	*	*	*	9	8.1				
		Hispanic	46	71.7	33	71.7			*	*			12	26.1				
		American Indian	14	92.9	13	92.9			*	*								
		Multi-Racial	42	90.5	38	90.5			*	*			*	*				
		White	1,728	92.0	1,590	92.0			40	2.3	12	0.7	86	5.0				
111	Asheville City	All Students	299	84.3	252	84.3			16	5.4	14	4.7	17	5.7				
		Black	133	72.9	97	72.9			15	11.3	10	7.5	11	8.3				
		Hispanic	5	100.0	5	100.0												
		Multi-Racial	9	77.8	7	77.8					*	*	*	*				
		White	152	94.1	143	94.1			*	*	*	*	5	3.3				
11A	Evergreen Cmty Chtr	All Students	35	88.6	31	88.6							*	*				
		Black	*	*	*	*							*	*				
		Multi-Racial	5	100.0	5	100.0												
		White	28	89.3	25	89.3							*	*				
11K	F Delany New Sch	All Students	22	63.6	14	63.6			*	*			7	31.8				
		Black	10	*	*	*			*	*			6	60.0				
		Hispanic	*	*	*	*												
		White	11	90.9	10	90.9							*	*				
120	Burke County	All Students	1,209	90.5	1,094	90.5			67	5.5	5	0.4	43	3.6				
		Asian	118	90.7	107	90.7			8	6.8	*	*	*	*				
		Black	86	79.1	68	79.1			9	10.5	*	*	8	9.3				
		Hispanic	52	71.2	37	71.2			*	*			11	21.2				
		American Indian	*	*	*	*												
		Multi-Racial	15	86.7	13	86.7							*	*				
		White	936	92.6	867	92.6			46	4.9	*	*	20	2.1				
130	Cabarrus County	All Students	1,607	86.9	1,397	86.9	*	*	129	8.0	8	0.5	71	4.4				
		Asian	17	88.2	15	88.2			*	*			*	*				
		Black	215	68.4	147	68.4			50	23.3	*	*	16	7.4				
		Hispanic	81	55.6	45	55.6			17	21.0	*	*	18	22.2				
		American Indian	9	88.9	8	88.9			*	*								
		Multi-Racial	23	82.6	19	82.6	*	*	*	*			*	*				
		White	1,262	92.2	1,163	92.2	*	*	58	4.6	5	0.4	35	2.8				

		Total	Standard Met, Promoted		Standard Met, Retained		Standard Not Met, Promoted		Standard Not Met, Retained		LEP, Transfer, Alternate Assessment		
			N	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
132	Kannapolis City	All Students	360	321	89.2			21	5.8	*	*	14	3.9
		Asian	*	*	*								
		Black	101	83	82.2			12	11.9	*	*	*	*
		Hispanic	30	22	73.3			*	*			6	20.0
		American Indian	*	*	*								
		Multi-Racial	5	5	100.0								
		White	221	208	94.1			7	3.2	*	*	*	*
140	Caldwell County	All Students	1,031	940	91.2	*	*	34	3.3	9	0.9	46	4.5
		Asian	8	8	100.0								
		Black	66	55	83.3			6	9.1	*	*	*	*
		Hispanic	22	15	68.2			*	*	*	*	*	*
		Multi-Racial	11	10	90.9					*	*		
		White	924	852	92.2	*	*	27	2.9	5	0.5	38	4.1
150	Camden County	All Students	109	100	91.7	*	*	*	*			5	4.6
		Asian	*	*	*								
		Black	18	15	83.3			*	*			*	*
		Hispanic	*	*	*								
		White	88	82	93.2	*	*	*	*			*	*
160	Carteret County	All Students	649	589	90.8	*	*	*	*	*	*	50	7.7
		Asian	*	*	*							*	*
		Black	65	56	86.2					*	*	7	10.8
		Hispanic	9	5	55.6			*	*			*	*
		American Indian	*	*	*								
		Multi-Racial	5	5	100.0								
		White	566	520	91.9	*	*	*	*	*	*	39	6.9
16B	Tiller Sch	All Students	15	12	80.0					*	*	*	*
		Black	*							*	*		
		Multi-Racial	*	*	*								
		White	13	11	84.6							*	*
170	Caswell County	All Students	292	256	87.7	*	*	27	9.2	*	*	6	2.1
		Black	132	114	86.4	*	*	17	12.9				
		Hispanic	9	5	55.6					*	*	*	*
		Multi-Racial	*	*	*								
		White	148	134	90.5			10	6.8	*	*	*	*

			Standard Met, Promoted		Standard Met, Retained		Standard Not Met, Promoted		Standard Not Met, Retained		LEP, Transfer, Alternate Assessment		
			Total	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
			N	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
180	Catawba County	All Students	1,306	1,156	88.5	*	*	49	3.8	13	1.0	87	6.7
		Asian	87	71	81.6			*	*	*	*	10	11.5
		Black	90	69	76.7			*	*	*	*	14	15.6
		Hispanic	45	30	66.7			5	11.1			10	22.2
		American Indian	*	*	*								
		Multi-Racial	14	14	100.0								
		White	1,069	971	90.8	*	*	36	3.4	8	0.7	53	5.0
181	Hickory City	All Students	374	323	86.4			10	2.7	9	2.4	32	8.6
		Asian	42	36	85.7			*	*	*	*	*	*
		Black	95	83	87.4			*	*	*	*	7	7.4
		Hispanic	37	16	43.2			*	*	*	*	18	48.6
		Multi-Racial	13	10	76.9			*	*			*	*
		White	187	178	95.2			*	*	*	*	*	*
182	Newton-Conover City	All Students	227	200	88.1			8	3.5	*	*	18	7.9
		Asian	15	13	86.7			*	*			*	*
		Black	47	38	80.9			*	*	*	*	*	*
		Hispanic	22	16	72.7			*	*			5	22.7
		Multi-Racial	*	*	*								
		White	139	129	92.8			*	*			8	5.8
18B	Engelmann Art/Sci	All Students	29	26	89.7			*	*				
		Black	5	*	*			*	*				
		Multi-Racial	*	*	*								
		White	23	21	91.3			*	*				
190	Chatham County	All Students	597	522	87.4	*	*	21	3.5	22	3.7	31	5.2
		Asian	*	*	*					*	*		
		Black	130	102	78.5			9	6.9	9	6.9	10	7.7
		Hispanic	74	45	60.8			*	*	6	8.1	20	27.0
		American Indian	5	5	100.0								
		Multi-Racial	18	17	94.4					*	*		
		White	367	351	95.6	*	*	9	2.5	5	1.4	*	*
19A	Chatham Charter	All Students	16	15	93.8			*	*				
		Asian	*	*	*								
		Black	*	*	*								
		White	14	13	92.9			*	*				

			Standard Met, Promoted		Standard Met, Retained		Standard Not Met, Promoted		Standard Not Met, Retained		LEP, Transfer, Alternate Assessment		
			Total N	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
19B	Woods Charter	All Students	9	7	77.8			*	*	*	*		
		Black	5	5	100.0								
		White	*	*	*			*	*	*	*		
200	Cherokee County	All Students	285	248	87.0			6	2.1	7	2.5	24	8.4
		Asian	*	*	*								
		Black	8	7	87.5							*	*
		Hispanic	*	*	*							*	*
		American Indian	8	7	87.5			*	*				
		Multi-Racial	*	*	*								
		White	260	226	86.9			5	1.9	7	2.7	22	8.5
20A	The Learning Ctr	All Students	12	11	91.7							*	*
		Black	*	*	*							*	*
		White	9	9	100.0								
210	Edenton/Chowan	All Students	166	146	88.0			5	3.0	*	*	14	8.4
		Black	92	77	83.7			*	*	*	*	11	12.0
		Hispanic	*	*	*								
		White	72	67	93.1			*	*			*	*
220	Clay County	All Students	87	77	88.5			6	6.9			*	*
		Asian	*	*	*								
		Hispanic	*	*	*								
		Multi-Racial	*	*	*								
		White	84	74	88.1			6	7.1			*	*
230	Cleveland County	All Students	827	709	85.7			65	7.9	27	3.3	26	3.1
		Asian	*	*	*							*	*
		Black	198	151	76.3			29	14.6	11	5.6	7	3.5
		Hispanic	11	*	*			*	*	*	*	*	*
		American Indian	*	*	*								
		Multi-Racial	8	7	87.5			*	*				
		White	607	545	89.8			33	5.4	15	2.5	14	2.3
231	Kings Mountain	All Students	383	365	95.3			10	2.6	*	*	6	1.6
		Asian	9	9	100.0								
		Black	89	82	92.1			*	*			*	*
		Hispanic	5	*	*							*	*
		Multi-Racial	7	7	100.0								
		White	273	263	96.3			7	2.6	*	*	*	*

			Standard Met, Promoted		Standard Met, Retained		Standard Not Met, Promoted		Standard Not Met, Retained		LEP, Transfer, Alternate Assessment		
			Total	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
			N	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
232	Shelby City	All Students	274	238	86.9			*	*	10	3.6	23	8.4
		Black	166	137	82.5			*	*	9	5.4	18	10.8
		Hispanic	*							*	*	*	*
		Multi-Racial	*	*	*								
		White	102	98	96.1			*	*			*	*
240	Columbus County	All Students	577	424	73.5	5	0.9	85	14.7	6	1.0	57	9.9
		Black	250	153	61.2	*	*	54	21.6	*	*	39	15.6
		Hispanic	12	7	58.3			*	*			*	*
		American Indian	34	27	79.4			*	*			*	*
		Multi-Racial	*	*	*								
		White	279	235	84.2	*	*	26	9.3	*	*	11	3.9
241	Whiteville City	All Students	216	186	86.1			12	5.6	*	*	15	6.9
		Black	104	83	79.8			8	7.7	*	*	12	11.5
		Hispanic	5	*	*			*	*			*	*
		American Indian	*	*	*			*	*				
		Multi-Racial	*	*	*								
		White	102	96	94.1			*	*	*	*	*	*
250	Craven County	All Students	1,201	1,090	90.8	6	0.5	38	3.2	7	0.6	60	5.0
		Asian	9	9	100.0								
		Black	409	348	85.1			24	5.9	*	*	35	8.6
		Hispanic	36	32	88.9			*	*			*	*
		American Indian	*	*	*								
		Multi-Racial	16	12	75.0	*	*					*	*
		White	727	685	94.2	5	0.7	13	1.8	5	0.7	19	2.6
260	Cumberland County	All Students	4,093	3,619	88.4	20	0.5	301	7.4	40	1.0	113	2.8
		Asian	60	56	93.3			*	*			*	*
		Black	1,894	1,576	83.2	13	0.7	219	11.6	22	1.2	64	3.4
		Hispanic	194	172	88.7	*	*	9	4.6	*	*	9	4.6
		American Indian	64	55	85.9			6	9.4	*	*	*	*
		Multi-Racial	91	82	90.1			6	6.6			*	*
		White	1,785	1,673	93.7	5	0.3	60	3.4	15	0.8	32	1.8
		Other	5	5	100.0								

		Total	Standard Met, Promoted		Standard Met, Retained		Standard Not Met, Promoted		Standard Not Met, Retained		LEP, Transfer, Alternate Assessment		
			N	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
270	Currituck County	All Students	287	260	90.6	*	*	9	3.1	*	*	12	4.2
		Black	24	16	66.7	*	*	*	*			*	*
		Hispanic	*	*	*							*	*
		American Indian	*	*	*								
		Multi-Racial	*	*	*								
		White	255	237	92.9	*	*	7	2.7	*	*	7	2.7
280	Dare County	All Students	411	364	88.6	*	*	16	3.9	5	1.2	25	6.1
		Asian	*	*	*								
		Black	15	9	60.0			*	*	*	*	*	*
		Hispanic	7	*	*			*	*			*	*
		Multi-Racial	5	*	*					*	*	*	*
		White	383	349	91.1	*	*	12	3.1	*	*	18	4.7
290	Davidson County	All Students	1,565	1,402	89.6	7	0.4	63	4.0	55	3.5	38	2.4
		Asian	10	9	90.0			*	*				
		Black	33	25	75.8			*	*	*	*	*	*
		Hispanic	24	18	75.0			*	*	*	*	*	*
		American Indian	*	*	*								
		Multi-Racial	14	11	78.6			*	*	*	*		
		White	1,481	1,336	90.2	7	0.5	55	3.7	50	3.4	33	2.2
291	Lexington City	All Students	261	216	82.8			14	5.4			31	11.9
		Asian	18	14	77.8			*	*			*	*
		Black	110	100	90.9			5	4.5			5	4.5
		Hispanic	48	29	60.4			5	10.4			14	29.2
		American Indian	*									*	*
		Multi-Racial	11	11	100.0								
		White	73	62	84.9			*	*			8	11.0
292	Thomasville City	All Students	217	156	71.9	*	*	21	9.7	7	3.2	31	14.3
		Asian	*	*	*			*	*			*	*
		Black	94	69	73.4			12	12.8	*	*	9	9.6
		Hispanic	31	13	41.9	*	*	*	*	*	*	15	48.4
		Multi-Racial	5	*	*							*	*
		White	83	69	83.1	*	*	7	8.4	*	*	*	*

			Total		Standard Met, Promoted		Standard Met, Retained		Standard Not Met, Promoted		Standard Not Met, Retained		LEP, Transfer, Alternate Assessment					
			N		Percent		N		Percent		N		Percent		N		Percent	
			N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
300	Davie County	All Students	490	451	92.0				11	2.2	8	1.6	20	4.1				
		Asian	*	*	*													
		Black	41	36	87.8				*	*			*	*				
		Hispanic	15	8	53.3				*	*	*	*	5	33.3				
		Multi-Racial	*	*	*								*	*				
		White	429	403	93.9				9	2.1	7	1.6	10	2.3				
310	Duplin County	All Students	661	553	83.7				29	4.4	10	1.5	69	10.4				
		Asian	*	*	*													
		Black	231	177	76.6				16	6.9	6	2.6	32	13.9				
		Hispanic	95	62	65.3				*	*	*	*	26	27.4				
		Multi-Racial	*	*	*				*	*								
		White	332	312	94.0				9	2.7			11	3.3				
320	Durham County	All Students	2,547	2,120	83.2				187	7.3	90	3.5	150	5.9				
		Asian	56	36	64.3				*	*	*	*	17	30.4				
		Black	1,540	1,245	80.8				149	9.7	77	5.0	69	4.5				
		Hispanic	133	77	57.9				13	9.8	*	*	42	31.6				
		American Indian	5	*	*				*	*			*	*				
		Multi-Racial	61	56	91.8				*	*	*	*	*	*				
		White	751	702	93.5				20	2.7	9	1.2	20	2.7				
		Other	*	*	*													
32A	Maureen Joy Charter	All Students	31	19	61.3	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	6	19.4				
		Black	31	19	61.3	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	6	19.4				
32B	Healthy Start Acad	All Students	47	40	85.1				*	*	5	10.6						
		Black	45	38	84.4				*	*	5	11.1						
		Multi-Racial	*	*	*													
32C	Carter Community	All Students	19	14	73.7				*	*			*	*				
		Black	19	14	73.7				*	*			*	*				
32E	Turning Point Acad	All Students	20	12	60.0				5	25.0	*	*	*	*				
		Black	19	11	57.9				5	26.3	*	*	*	*				
		Multi-Racial	*	*	*													
32G	Omuteko Gwamaziima	All Students	10	9	90.0				*	*								
		Black	10	9	90.0				*	*								
32H	Research Tri Chtr	All Students	*	*	*						*	*						
		Black	*	*	*						*	*						
		White	*	*	*													

		Total	Standard Met, Promoted		Standard Met, Retained		Standard Not Met, Promoted		Standard Not Met, Retained		LEP, Transfer, Alternate Assessment		
			N	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
330	Edgecombe County	All Students	597	472	79.1	*	*	55	9.2	36	6.0	32	5.4
		Black	330	242	73.3	*	*	42	12.7	20	6.1	24	7.3
		Hispanic	20	13	65.0			*	*	*	*	*	*
		Multi-Racial	*	*	*								
		White	246	216	87.8			10	4.1	15	6.1	5	2.0
340	Forsyth County	All Students	3,718	3,187	85.7	*	*	245	6.6	53	1.4	229	6.2
		Asian	39	29	74.4							10	25.6
		Black	1,390	1,079	77.6			177	12.7	34	2.4	100	7.2
		Hispanic	252	157	62.3			21	8.3	7	2.8	67	26.6
		American Indian	13	11	84.6							*	*
		Multi-Racial	61	57	93.4			*	*			*	*
		White	1,963	1,854	94.4	*	*	44	2.2	12	0.6	49	2.5
34F	Forsyth Acad	All Students	71	58	81.7			11	15.5			*	*
		Black	36	29	80.6			7	19.4				
		Hispanic	*	*	*			*	*				
		Multi-Racial	*	*	*								
		White	31	26	83.9			*	*			*	*
350	Franklin County	All Students	648	560	86.4	*	*	35	5.4	29	4.5	22	3.4
		Asian	*	*	*							*	*
		Black	238	196	82.4	*	*	23	9.7	12	5.0	6	2.5
		Hispanic	25	14	56.0			*	*	*	*	6	24.0
		American Indian	*	*	*								
		Multi-Racial	6	6	100.0								
		White	373	339	90.9	*	*	8	2.1	16	4.3	9	2.4
360	Gaston County	All Students	2,494	2,162	86.7	*	*	174	7.0	51	2.0	103	4.1
		Asian	37	32	86.5			*	*			*	*
		Black	488	379	77.7			70	14.3	13	2.7	26	5.3
		Hispanic	84	54	64.3			*	*	*	*	25	29.8
		American Indian	*	*	*								
		Multi-Racial	16	13	81.3			*	*			*	*
		White	1,865	1,680	90.1	*	*	95	5.1	37	2.0	49	2.6
36B	Piedmont Community	All Students	25	20	80.0			*	*	*	*		
		Black	8	*	*			*	*	*	*		
		Multi-Racial	*	*	*								
		White	16	15	93.8			*	*				

		Total	Standard Met, Promoted		Standard Met, Retained		Standard Not Met, Promoted		Standard Not Met, Retained		LEP, Transfer, Alternate Assessment		
			N	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
370	Gates County	All Students	181	156	86.2			*	*			23	12.7
		Asian	*	*	*								
		Black	75	60	80.0			*	*			13	17.3
		Multi-Racial	*	*	*								
		White	104	94	90.4							10	9.6
380	Graham County	All Students	93	83	89.2			6	6.5	*	*	*	*
		American Indian	10	9	90.0			*	*				
		White	83	74	89.2			5	6.0	*	*	*	*
390	Granville County	All Students	741	599	80.8	20	2.7	69	9.3	19	2.6	34	4.6
		Asian	5	*	*			*	*				
		Black	300	221	73.7	8	2.7	40	13.3	12	4.0	19	6.3
		Hispanic	27	10	37.0			12	44.4			5	18.5
		American Indian	*	*	*								
		Multi-Racial	*	*	*								
		White	404	360	89.1	12	3.0	15	3.7	7	1.7	10	2.5
		Other	*					*	*				
400	Greene County	All Students	239	204	85.4	*	*	14	5.9	*	*	19	7.9
		Black	135	113	83.7	*	*	11	8.1			10	7.4
		Hispanic	18	15	83.3			*	*	*	*	*	*
		White	86	76	88.4			*	*			8	9.3
410	Guilford County	All Students	5,170	4,596	88.9	*	*	114	2.2	211	4.1	245	4.7
		Asian	215	180	83.7			8	3.7	9	4.2	18	8.4
		Black	2,140	1,789	83.6	*	*	78	3.6	165	7.7	107	5.0
		Hispanic	191	127	66.5			5	2.6	7	3.7	52	27.2
		American Indian	26	23	88.5					*	*	*	*
		Multi-Racial	118	114	96.6							*	*
		White	2,479	2,362	95.3	*	*	23	0.9	29	1.2	62	2.5
		Other	*	*	*								
41B	Greensboro Acad	All Students	79	77	97.5			*	*				
		Black	*	*	*								
		Hispanic	*					*	*				
		Multi-Racial	*	*	*								
		White	71	70	98.6			*	*				

		Total	Standard Met, Promoted		Standard Met, Retained		Standard Not Met, Promoted		Standard Not Met, Retained		LEP, Transfer, Alternate Assessment		
			N	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
41D	Phoenix Acad Inc	All Students	12	11	91.7			*	*				
		Black	*	*	*								
		White	10	9	90.0			*	*				
420	Halifax County	All Students	474	381	80.4	*	*	28	5.9	10	2.1	54	11.4
		Black	408	327	80.1			25	6.1	10	2.5	46	11.3
		Hispanic	*	*	*								
		American Indian	16	15	93.8			*	*				
		Multi-Racial	*	*	*								
		White	48	37	77.1	*	*	*	*			8	16.7
421	Roanoke Rapids City	All Students	234	211	90.2			15	6.4	*	*	5	2.1
		Asian	5	5	100.0								
		Black	42	32	76.2			5	11.9	*	*	*	*
		Hispanic	*	*	*								
		American Indian	*	*	*								
		Multi-Racial	*	*	*								
		White	181	168	92.8			10	5.5	*	*	*	*
422	Weldon City	All Students	109	85	78.0			14	12.8	7	6.4	*	*
		Black	102	80	78.4			12	11.8	7	6.9	*	*
		Multi-Racial	*	*	*								
		White	6	*	*			*	*				
430	Harnett County	All Students	1,301	1,120	86.1			71	5.5	36	2.8	74	5.7
		Asian	*	*	*								
		Black	405	314	77.5			32	7.9	19	4.7	40	9.9
		Hispanic	74	49	66.2			9	12.2	*	*	14	18.9
		American Indian	13	12	92.3			*	*				
		Multi-Racial	28	27	96.4					*	*		
		White	780	717	91.9			29	3.7	14	1.8	20	2.6
43A	Harnett Early Child	All Students	9	*	*			*	*			*	*
		Black	8	*	*			*	*			*	*
		White	*									*	*

			Standard Met, Promoted		Standard Met, Retained		Standard Not Met, Promoted		Standard Not Met, Retained		LEP, Transfer, Alternate Assessment		
			Total	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
			N	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
440	Haywood County	All Students	631	583	92.4	*	*	15	2.4	*	*	30	4.8
		Asian	*	*	*								
		Black	*	*	*								
		Hispanic	12	9	75.0					*	*	*	*
		American Indian	*	*	*								
		Multi-Racial	8	8	100.0								
		White	602	557	92.5	*	*	15	2.5			28	4.7
450	Henderson County	All Students	923	860	93.2			20	2.2	5	0.5	38	4.1
		Asian	6	6	100.0								
		Black	36	27	75.0			*	*			7	19.4
		Hispanic	58	43	74.1			5	8.6			10	17.2
		American Indian	*	*	*								
		Multi-Racial	12	12	100.0								
		White	809	770	95.2			13	1.6	5	0.6	21	2.6
45A	Mountain Cmty Sch	All Students	17	13	76.5							*	*
		White	17	13	76.5							*	*
460	Hertford County	All Students	320	224	70.0			48	15.0	29	9.1	19	5.9
		Black	269	180	66.9			43	16.0	29	10.8	17	6.3
		American Indian	*	*	*								
		White	50	43	86.0			5	10.0			*	*
470	Hoke County	All Students	553	452	81.7	*	*	70	12.7	9	1.6	21	3.8
		Asian	6	*	*			*	*			*	*
		Black	264	208	78.8	*	*	42	15.9	*	*	9	3.4
		Hispanic	32	23	71.9			*	*	*	*	*	*
		American Indian	87	68	78.2			14	16.1	*	*	*	*
		Multi-Racial	10	10	100.0								
		White	154	139	90.3			9	5.8	*	*	*	*
480	Hyde County	All Students	71	54	76.1	*	*	*	*	*	*	7	9.9
		Black	36	24	66.7	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
		Hispanic	*									*	*
		White	33	30	90.9	*	*					*	*

		Total	Standard Met, Promoted		Standard Met, Retained		Standard Not Met, Promoted		Standard Not Met, Retained		LEP, Transfer, Alternate Assessment		
			N	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
490	Iredell-Statesville	All Students	1,422	1,249	87.8	*	*	106	7.5	16	1.1	50	3.5
		Asian	34	26	76.5			*	*			5	14.7
		Black	238	177	74.4			42	17.6	5	2.1	14	5.9
		Hispanic	74	41	55.4			12	16.2			21	28.4
		American Indian	*	*	*								
		Multi-Racial	12	12	100.0								
		White	1,062	991	93.3	*	*	49	4.6	11	1.0	10	0.9
491	Mooreville City	All Students	345	303	87.8	*	*	24	7.0	10	2.9	7	2.0
		Asian	5	*	*							*	*
		Black	70	51	72.9			15	21.4	*	*	*	*
		Hispanic	8	6	75.0							*	*
		Multi-Racial	*	*	*								
		White	260	240	92.3	*	*	9	3.5	8	3.1	*	*
49A	Am Renaissance	All Students	24	20	83.3					*	*		
		Black	5	*	*					*	*		
		White	19	16	84.2					*	*		
500	Jackson County	All Students	303	266	87.8			21	6.9	6	2.0	10	3.3
		Black	*	*	*								
		Hispanic	5	*	*			*	*			*	*
		American Indian	28	25	89.3			*	*			*	*
		Multi-Racial	*	*	*								
		White	265	233	87.9			18	6.8	6	2.3	8	3.0
50A	Summit Charter	All Students	16	14	87.5			*	*				
		White	16	14	87.5			*	*				
510	Johnston County	All Students	1,798	1,474	82.0	20	1.1	176	9.8	7	0.4	121	6.7
		Asian	5	*	*							*	*
		Black	360	237	65.8	8	2.2	64	17.8	*	*	50	13.9
		Hispanic	132	78	59.1			28	21.2	*	*	23	17.4
		American Indian	*	*	*			*	*				
		Multi-Racial	23	20	87.0	*	*	*	*				
		White	1,274	1,133	88.9	11	0.9	81	6.4	*	*	46	3.6

			Total		Standard Met, Promoted		Standard Met, Retained		Standard Not Met, Promoted		Standard Not Met, Retained		LEP, Transfer, Alternate Assessment			
			N		N		Percent		N		Percent		N		Percent	
			N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
520	Jones County	All Students	121		98	81.0			6	5.0	5	4.1	12	9.9		
		Asian	*		*	*										
		Black	71		53	74.6			6	8.5	*	*	10	14.1		
		Hispanic	*		*	*										
		White	47		42	89.4					*	*	*	*		
530	Lee County	All Students	757		649	85.7	*	*	72	9.5	16	2.1	19	2.5		
		Asian	5		5	100.0										
		Black	179		141	78.8			30	16.8	8	4.5				
		Hispanic	126		93	73.8			16	12.7	*	*	15	11.9		
		American Indian	6		5	83.3			*	*						
		Multi-Racial	11		9	81.8			*	*	*	*				
		White	430		396	92.1	*	*	24	5.6	5	1.2	*	*		
540	Lenoir County	All Students	793		671	84.6	*	*	20	2.5	*	*	96	12.1		
		Asian	*		*	*							*	*		
		Black	370		306	82.7	*	*	12	3.2			49	13.2		
		Hispanic	24		13	54.2			*	*			10	41.7		
		American Indian	*		*	*										
		Multi-Racial	10		8	80.0							*	*		
		White	383		340	88.8	*	*	7	1.8	*	*	33	8.6		
54A	Children's Acad	All Students	17		11	64.7							6	35.3		
		Black	15		10	66.7							5	33.3		
		Multi-Racial	*		*	*							*	*		
550	Lincoln County	All Students	878		757	86.2	*	*	57	6.5	13	1.5	50	5.7		
		Asian	*		*	*										
		Black	87		65	74.7	*	*	13	14.9	*	*	6	6.9		
		Hispanic	62		35	56.5			10	16.1	*	*	16	25.8		
		American Indian	*		*	*										
		Multi-Racial	12		11	91.7							*	*		
		White	713		642	90.0			34	4.8	10	1.4	27	3.8		

		Total	Standard Met, Promoted		Standard Met, Retained		Standard Not Met, Promoted		Standard Not Met, Retained		LEP, Transfer, Alternate Assessment		
			N	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
560	Macon County	All Students	308	284	92.2	*	*	9	2.9	*	*	12	3.9
		Asian	*	*	*								
		Black	*					*	*			*	*
		Hispanic	5	*	*							*	*
		American Indian	*	*	*								
		Multi-Racial	*	*	*								
		White	293	275	93.9	*	*	7	2.4	*	*	8	2.7
570	Madison County	All Students	201	178	88.6			5	2.5	*	*	17	8.5
		Hispanic	*	*	*							*	*
		White	199	177	88.9			5	2.5	*	*	16	8.0
580	Martin County	All Students	384	300	78.1	14	3.6	51	13.3	10	2.6	9	2.3
		Asian	*	*	*								
		Black	228	168	73.7	10	4.4	35	15.4	9	3.9	6	2.6
		Hispanic	8	6	75.0			*	*			*	*
		American Indian	*	*	*								
		Multi-Racial	*	*	*								
		White	145	123	84.8	*	*	15	10.3	*	*	*	*
590	McDowell County	All Students	560	498	88.9	*	*	25	4.5	11	2.0	24	4.3
		Asian	11	8	72.7			*	*			*	*
		Black	27	23	85.2			*	*			*	*
		Hispanic	13	9	69.2			*	*			*	*
		American Indian	*	*	*					*	*	*	*
		White	505	456	90.3	*	*	21	4.2	10	2.0	16	3.2
600	Charlotte/Mecklenburg	All Students	8,406	7,181	85.4	145	1.7	481	5.7			599	7.1
		Asian	354	310	87.6	*	*	16	4.5			24	6.8
		Black	3,703	2,907	78.5	97	2.6	361	9.7			338	9.1
		Hispanic	495	315	63.6	10	2.0	40	8.1			130	26.3
		American Indian	34	29	85.3	*	*	*	*			*	*
		Multi-Racial	47	43	91.5	*	*					*	*
		White	3,773	3,577	94.8	32	0.8	62	1.6			102	2.7
60A	Community Charter Sch	All Students	10	9	90.0							*	*
		Black	7	6	85.7							*	*
		White	*	*	*								

			Standard Met, Promoted		Standard Met, Retained		Standard Not Met, Promoted		Standard Not Met, Retained		LEP, Transfer, Alternate Assessment		
			Total	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
			N	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
60B	Sugar Creek Charter	All Students	68	50	73.5			12	17.6	*	*	*	*
		Asian	*	*	*								
		Black	64	46	71.9			12	18.8	*	*	*	*
		Hispanic	*	*	*								
		Multi-Racial	*	*	*								
60D	Lake Norman Charter	All Students	117	116	99.1					*	*		
		Asian	*	*	*								
		Black	*	*	*					*	*		
		White	110	110	100.0								
		Other	*	*	*								
60F	Metrolina Reg Scholars	All Students	9	9	100.0								
		Asian	*	*	*								
		Black	*	*	*								
		White	7	7	100.0								
610	Mitchell County	All Students	188	174	92.6			6	3.2	*	*	6	3.2
		Hispanic	*	*	*								
		White	186	172	92.5			6	3.2	*	*	6	3.2
620	Montgomery County	All Students	386	280	72.5			71	18.4	28	7.3	7	1.8
		Asian	12	10	83.3			*	*	*	*		
		Black	110	59	53.6			38	34.5	11	10.0	*	*
		Hispanic	51	37	72.5			8	15.7	*	*	*	*
		Multi-Racial	*	*	*			*	*				
		White	209	171	81.8			23	11.0	13	6.2	*	*
630	Moore County	All Students	993	872	87.8			46	4.6	10	1.0	65	6.5
		Asian	*	*	*								
		Black	248	200	80.6			19	7.7	*	*	25	10.1
		Hispanic	56	35	62.5			8	14.3			13	23.2
		American Indian	14	10	71.4			*	*	*	*	*	*
		Multi-Racial	14	13	92.9							*	*
		White	657	610	92.8			18	2.7	*	*	25	3.8
63A	Mast School	All Students	10	8	80.0			*	*				
		Black	*	*	*			*	*				
		Multi-Racial	*	*	*								
		White	7	6	85.7			*	*				

			Total		Standard Met, Promoted		Standard Met, Retained		Standard Not Met, Promoted		Standard Not Met, Retained		LEP, Transfer, Alternate Assessment	
			N		N Percent		N Percent		N Percent		N Percent		N Percent	
			N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
63B	STAR Charter	All Students	13	8	61.5			*	*	*	*	*	*	*
		Black	8	*	*			*	*	*	*	*	*	*
		White	5	*	*			*	*					
640	Nash/Rocky Mount	All Students	1,452	1,262	86.9	*	*	49	3.4	17	1.2	123	8.5	
		Asian	15	15	100.0									
		Black	777	635	81.7			36	4.6	13	1.7	93	12.0	
		Hispanic	48	37	77.1			*	*			9	18.8	
		American Indian	6	*	*			*	*	*	*			
		Multi-Racial	15	12	80.0			*	*			*	*	
		White	590	559	94.7	*	*	8	1.4	*	*	19	3.2	
		Other	*									*	*	
64A	Rocky Mount Charter	All Students	72	61	84.7			*	*	*	*	5	6.9	
		Asian	*	*	*									
		Black	44	38	86.4			*	*	*	*	*	*	
		Hispanic	*	*	*					*	*			
		American Indian	*									*	*	
		White	24	21	87.5			*	*			*	*	
650	New Hanover County	All Students	1,696	1,532	90.3			37	2.2	25	1.5	102	6.0	
		Asian	13	12	92.3					*	*			
		Black	463	379	81.9			24	5.2	15	3.2	45	9.7	
		Hispanic	44	34	77.3			*	*	*	*	8	18.2	
		American Indian	8	8	100.0									
		Multi-Racial	42	39	92.9							*	*	
		White	1,125	1,059	94.1			12	1.1	8	0.7	46	4.1	
		Other	*	*	*									
65A	Cape Fear Ctr for Inq	All Students	20	20	100.0									
		Multi-Racial	*	*	*									
		White	18	18	100.0									
660	Northampton County	All Students	312	265	84.9			17	5.4	*	*	27	8.7	
		Black	264	222	84.1			16	6.1	*	*	24	9.1	
		Multi-Racial	*	*	*									
		White	47	42	89.4			*	*	*	*	*	*	

			Total		Standard Met, Promoted		Standard Met, Retained		Standard Not Met, Promoted		Standard Not Met, Retained		LEP, Transfer, Alternate Assessment	
			N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
670	Onslow County	All Students	1,635	89.4	1,462	12	0.7	35	2.1	20	1.2	106	6.5	
		Asian	16	93.8	15							*	*	
		Black	386	83.2	321	*	*	13	3.4	9	2.3	40	10.4	
		Hispanic	70	85.7	60					*	*	6	8.6	
		American Indian	20	85.0	17			*	*			*	*	
		Multi-Racial	82	95.1	78							*	*	
		White	1,061	91.5	971	9	0.8	21	2.0	7	0.7	53	5.0	
680	Orange County	All Students	578	89.3	516			22	3.8	*	*	36	6.2	
		Asian	*	*	*									
		Black	136	82.4	112			8	5.9	*	*	14	10.3	
		Hispanic	16	56.3	9			*	*	*	*	*	*	
		American Indian	*	*	*							*	*	
		Multi-Racial	13	100.0	13									
		White	406	92.6	376			11	2.7	*	*	18	4.4	
681	Chapel Hill/Carrboro	All Students	808	91.3	738			18	2.2	*	*	51	6.3	
		Asian	70	88.6	62							8	11.4	
		Black	126	84.9	107			14	11.1			5	4.0	
		Hispanic	54	55.6	30			*	*			20	37.0	
		Multi-Racial	18	94.4	17							*	*	
		White	540	96.7	522					*	*	17	3.1	
68A	Orange Co Charter	All Students	17	82.4	14			*	*	*	*	*	*	
		Hispanic	*	*	*									
		Multi-Racial	*	*	*									
		White	15	80.0	12			*	*	*	*	*	*	
68K	Village Charter	All Students	21	81.0	17					*	*			
		Asian	*	*	*									
		Black	12	66.7	8					*	*			
		Multi-Racial	*	*	*									
		White	7	100.0	7									
690	Pamlico County	All Students	117	92.3	108			*	*			6	5.1	
		Black	42	83.3	35			*	*			*	*	
		Hispanic	*	*	*									
		White	74	97.3	72							*	*	

		Total	Standard Met, Promoted		Standard Met, Retained		Standard Not Met, Promoted		Standard Not Met, Retained		LEP, Transfer, Alternate Assessment		
			N	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
69A	Arapahoe Charter	All Students	38	37	97.4						*	*	
		Black	*	*	*								
		Multi-Racial	*	*	*								
		White	32	32	100.0								
		Other	*	*	*							*	*
700	Pasquotank County	All Students	504	425	84.3			39	7.7	*	*	38	7.5
		Asian	*	*	*								
		Black	247	195	78.9			30	12.1	*	*	20	8.1
		Hispanic	*	*	*								
		Multi-Racial	7	7	100.0								
		White	244	217	88.9			9	3.7			18	7.4
710	Pender County	All Students	534	491	91.9			13	2.4	6	1.1	24	4.5
		Black	171	154	90.1			7	4.1	*	*	9	5.3
		Hispanic	21	13	61.9							8	38.1
		Multi-Racial	7	7	100.0								
		White	335	317	94.6			6	1.8	5	1.5	7	2.1
720	Perquimans County	All Students	134	121	90.3			5	3.7	*	*	7	5.2
		Asian	*	*	*							*	*
		Black	49	40	81.6			*	*			5	10.2
		Hispanic	*	*	*								
		White	82	79	96.3			*	*	*	*	*	*
730	Person County	All Students	492	439	89.2	5	1.0	13	2.6	7	1.4	28	5.7
		Asian	*	*	*								
		Black	181	154	85.1	*	*	6	3.3	5	2.8	13	7.2
		Hispanic	17	10	58.8			*	*	*	*	5	29.4
		American Indian	*	*	*								
		Multi-Racial	7	5	71.4							*	*
		White	284	267	94.0	*	*	6	2.1	*	*	8	2.8
73A	Bethel Hill Charter	All Students	20	17	85.0	*	*			*	*		
		Black	6	6	100.0								
		White	14	11	78.6	*	*			*	*		

		Total	Standard Met, Promoted		Standard Met, Retained		Standard Not Met, Promoted		Standard Not Met, Retained		LEP, Transfer, Alternate Assessment		
			N	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
740	Pitt County	All Students	1,710	1,399	81.8	19	1.1	102	6.0	79	4.6	111	6.5
		Asian	23	21	91.3							*	*
		Black	832	625	75.1	12	1.4	63	7.6	58	7.0	74	8.9
		Hispanic	48	22	45.8			11	22.9	*	*	13	27.1
		American Indian	*	*	*								
		Multi-Racial	19	18	94.7	*	*						
		White	786	711	90.5	6	0.8	28	3.6	19	2.4	22	2.8
750	Polk County	All Students	187	176	94.1			*	*	*	*	9	4.8
		Asian	*	*	*								
		Black	18	17	94.4							*	*
		Hispanic	8	5	62.5							*	*
		Multi-Racial	*	*	*								
		White	157	150	95.5			*	*	*	*	5	3.2
760	Randolph County	All Students	1,542	1,395	90.5	5	0.3	65	4.2	23	1.5	54	3.5
		Asian	11	11	100.0								
		Black	72	60	83.3			9	12.5	*	*	*	*
		Hispanic	85	56	65.9			5	5.9			24	28.2
		American Indian	5	5	100.0								
		Multi-Racial	22	18	81.8			*	*			*	*
		White	1,347	1,245	92.4	5	0.4	50	3.7	22	1.6	25	1.9
761	Asheboro City	All Students	377	298	79.0			28	7.4	14	3.7	37	9.8
		Asian	10	8	80.0							*	*
		Black	54	39	72.2			6	11.1	6	11.1	*	*
		Hispanic	83	47	56.6			6	7.2	*	*	26	31.3
		Multi-Racial	6	*	*			*	*	*	*	*	*
		White	224	201	89.7			15	6.7	*	*	5	2.2
770	Richmond County	All Students	682	558	81.8	7	1.0	55	8.1	25	3.7	37	5.4
		Asian	*	*	*								
		Black	269	199	74.0	5	1.9	29	10.8	13	4.8	23	8.6
		Hispanic	22	15	68.2			*	*	*	*	*	*
		American Indian	12	7	58.3			*	*	*	*	*	*
		Multi-Racial	5	5	100.0								
		White	370	328	88.6	*	*	21	5.7	9	2.4	10	2.7

		Total	Standard Met, Promoted		Standard Met, Retained		Standard Not Met, Promoted		Standard Not Met, Retained		LEP, Transfer, Alternate Assessment		
			N	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
780	Robeson County	All Students	1,938	1,485	76.6	15	0.8	106	5.5	138	7.1	194	10.0
		Asian	7	7	100.0								
		Black	592	416	70.3	10	1.7	46	7.8	65	11.0	55	9.3
		Hispanic	58	33	56.9			*	*	5	8.6	18	31.0
		American Indian	840	648	77.1	*	*	48	5.7	49	5.8	92	11.0
		Multi-Racial	8	8	100.0								
		White	433	373	86.1	*	*	10	2.3	19	4.4	29	6.7
790	Rockingham County	All Students	1,224	1,065	87.0	10	0.8	81	6.6	17	1.4	51	4.2
		Asian	6	6	100.0								
		Black	303	252	83.2	*	*	32	10.6	8	2.6	7	2.3
		Hispanic	45	31	68.9			*	*			11	24.4
		American Indian	*	*	*								
		Multi-Racial	26	23	88.5			*	*			*	*
		White	840	749	89.2	6	0.7	44	5.2	9	1.1	32	3.8
		Other	*	*	*								
800	Rowan-Salisbury	All Students	1,658	1,479	89.2	5	0.3	69	4.2	28	1.7	77	4.6
		Asian	18	16	88.9			*	*			*	*
		Black	360	295	81.9	*	*	26	7.2	11	3.1	26	7.2
		Hispanic	64	41	64.1			5	7.8	*	*	15	23.4
		American Indian	5	*	*							*	*
		Multi-Racial	27	25	92.6			*	*				
		White	1,183	1,097	92.7	*	*	35	3.0	14	1.2	34	2.9
		Other	*	*	*								
80A	Rowan Acad	All Students	16	9	56.3			*	*	*	*		
		Black	16	9	56.3			*	*	*	*		
810	Rutherford County	All Students	831	742	89.3	*	*	44	5.3			44	5.3
		Asian	*	*	*								
		Black	133	110	82.7			12	9.0			11	8.3
		Hispanic	18	16	88.9			*	*			*	*
		American Indian	*	*	*								
		Multi-Racial	11	11	100.0								
		White	663	599	90.3	*	*	31	4.7			32	4.8
		Other	*	*	*								

		Total	Standard Met, Promoted		Standard Met, Retained		Standard Not Met, Promoted		Standard Not Met, Retained		LEP, Transfer, Alternate Assessment		
			N	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
820	Sampson County	All Students	635	531	83.6	*	*	27	4.3	12	1.9	64	10.1
		Asian	*	*	*								
		Black	218	178	81.7	*	*	11	5.0	*	*	26	11.9
		Hispanic	88	55	62.5			*	*	*	*	27	30.7
		American Indian	13	10	76.9			*	*	*	*		
		Multi-Racial	*	*	*							*	*
		White	311	284	91.3			11	3.5	6	1.9	10	3.2
821	Clinton City	All Students	220	201	91.4			7	3.2	*	*	9	4.1
		Asian	*	*	*								
		Black	103	94	91.3			*	*	*	*	*	*
		Hispanic	17	11	64.7			*	*			*	*
		American Indian	5	5	100.0								
		White	93	89	95.7			*	*			*	*
830	Scotland County	All Students	562	454	80.8			37	6.6	7	1.2	64	11.4
		Asian	*	*	*								
		Black	254	181	71.3			23	9.1	5	2.0	45	17.7
		Hispanic	*	*	*								
		American Indian	60	44	73.3			8	13.3			8	13.3
		Multi-Racial	*	*	*								
		White	239	220	92.1			6	2.5	*	*	11	4.6
840	Stanly County	All Students	833	729	87.5			28	3.4	19	2.3	57	6.8
		Asian	33	25	75.8			7	21.2	*	*		
		Black	122	99	81.1			6	4.9	*	*	13	10.7
		Hispanic	18	11	61.1					*	*	5	27.8
		Multi-Racial	10	7	70.0					*	*	*	*
		White	650	587	90.3			15	2.3	11	1.7	37	5.7
850	Stokes County	All Students	594	528	88.9	*	*	16	2.7	13	2.2	35	5.9
		Asian	*									*	*
		Black	28	20	71.4			*	*	*	*	*	*
		Hispanic	10	8	80.0							*	*
		American Indian	*									*	*
		Multi-Racial	8	8	100.0								
		White	546	492	90.1	*	*	13	2.4	12	2.2	27	4.9

		Total	Standard Met, Promoted		Standard Met, Retained		Standard Not Met, Promoted		Standard Not Met, Retained		LEP, Transfer, Alternate Assessment		
			N	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
860	Surry County	All Students	706	627	88.8			43	6.1	6	0.8	30	4.2
		Asian	*	*	*			*	*				
		Black	25	15	60.0			6	24.0			*	*
		Hispanic	56	45	80.4			5	8.9			6	10.7
		American Indian	*	*	*								
		Multi-Racial	*	*	*								
		White	616	559	90.7			31	5.0	6	1.0	20	3.2
861	Elkin City	All Students	95	84	88.4			*	*	*	*	9	9.5
		Asian	*	*	*								
		Black	6	6	100.0								
		Hispanic	12	5	41.7			*	*			6	50.0
		White	76	72	94.7					*	*	*	*
862	Mount Airy City	All Students	169	148	87.6	*	*	*	*	*	*	14	8.3
		Asian	11	8	72.7			*	*			*	*
		Black	25	20	80.0	*	*					*	*
		Hispanic	*	*	*							*	*
		Multi-Racial	*	*	*								
		White	129	118	91.5	*	*	*	*	*	*	7	5.4
870	Swain County	All Students	135	122	90.4			8	5.9	*	*	*	*
		Asian	*	*	*								
		Hispanic	*	*	*								
		American Indian	20	18	90.0			*	*	*	*		
		White	111	100	90.1			7	6.3			*	*
880	Transylvania County	All Students	273	255	93.4	*	*	8	2.9	*	*	6	2.2
		Asian	*	*	*			*	*				
		Black	17	16	94.1					*	*		
		Hispanic	*	*	*								
		Multi-Racial	*	*	*			*	*				
		White	248	233	94.0	*	*	6	2.4	*	*	6	2.4
88A	Brevard Acad	All Students	16	16	100.0								
		Black	*	*	*								
		Multi-Racial	*	*	*								
		White	13	13	100.0								

			Standard Met, Promoted		Standard Met, Retained		Standard Not Met, Promoted		Standard Not Met, Retained		LEP, Transfer, Alternate Assessment		
			Total	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
			N	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
890	Tyrrell County	All Students	57	50	87.7	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	
		Black	26	20	76.9	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	
		Hispanic	*	*	*						*	*	
		White	29	29	100.0								
900	Union County	All Students	1,959	1,753	89.5			64	3.3	49	2.5	93	4.7
		Asian	17	14	82.4							*	*
		Black	354	269	76.0			39	11.0	25	7.1	21	5.9
		Hispanic	132	72	54.5			8	6.1	13	9.8	39	29.5
		American Indian	7	5	71.4					*	*		
		Multi-Racial	20	19	95.0					*	*		
		White	1,429	1,374	96.2			17	1.2	8	0.6	30	2.1
910	Vance County	All Students	673	533	79.2	*	*	33	4.9	23	3.4	82	12.2
		Asian	*	*	*							*	*
		Black	448	344	76.8	*	*	27	6.0	20	4.5	55	12.3
		Hispanic	31	18	58.1			*	*	*	*	10	32.3
		American Indian	*	*	*								
		Multi-Racial	*	*	*							*	*
		White	189	168	88.9			*	*	*	*	15	7.9
91A	Vance Charter Sch	All Students	20	16	80.0	*	*	*	*			*	*
		Black	*	*	*			*	*				
		White	16	14	87.5	*	*					*	*
920	Wake County	All Students	8,082	7,199	89.1	10	0.1	238	2.9	128	1.6	507	6.3
		Asian	323	290	89.8			5	1.5	*	*	27	8.4
		Black	2,179	1,675	76.9	*	*	168	7.7	86	3.9	247	11.3
		Hispanic	343	211	61.5	*	*	23	6.7	15	4.4	93	27.1
		American Indian	28	25	89.3			*	*			*	*
		Multi-Racial	135	127	94.1	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
		White	5,071	4,868	96.0	5	0.1	38	0.7	24	0.5	136	2.7
		Other	*	*	*								
92D	Magellan Charter	All Students	65	65	100.0								
		Asian	*	*	*								
		Black	9	9	100.0								
		Hispanic	*	*	*								
		White	50	50	100.0								

			Standard Met, Promoted		Standard Met, Retained		Standard Not Met, Promoted		Standard Not Met, Retained		LEP, Transfer, Alternate Assessment		
			Total	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
			N	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
92E	Sterling Montessori	All Students	20	15	75.0					*	*	*	*
		Asian	*	*	*								
		Black	*	*	*					*	*		
		Hispanic	*									*	*
		Multi-Racial	*	*	*								
		White	14	11	78.6					*	*	*	*
92F	Franklin Acad	All Students	42	40	95.2			*	*	*	*		
		Asian	*	*	*								
		Black	*	*	*			*	*				
		Hispanic	*	*	*								
		Multi-Racial	*	*	*								
		White	34	33	97.1					*	*		
92G	East Wake Acad	All Students	29	27	93.1			*	*	*	*		
		Black	11	11	100.0								
		White	18	16	88.9			*	*	*	*		
92I	SPARC Acad	All Students	33	23	69.7			*	*	*	*	*	*
		Black	29	20	69.0			*	*	*	*	*	*
		Hispanic	*							*	*		
		Other	*	*	*								
92L	NE Raleigh Chtr Acad	All Students	9	7	77.8	*	*			*	*		
		Black	7	5	71.4	*	*			*	*		
		White	*	*	*								
92N	Quest Acad	All Students	6	6	100.0								
		Black	*	*	*								
		White	5	5	100.0								
930	Warren County	All Students	277	245	88.4			21	7.6	*	*	7	2.5
		Black	207	182	87.9			19	9.2	*	*	*	*
		Hispanic	*	*	*								
		American Indian	8	7	87.5							*	*
		Multi-Racial	*	*	*								
		White	56	50	89.3			*	*	*	*	*	*
93A	Haliwa-Saponi Tribal	All Students	12	10	83.3			*	*	*	*		
		Black	*	*	*								
		American Indian	10	8	80.0			*	*	*	*		

		Total	Standard Met, Promoted		Standard Met, Retained		Standard Not Met, Promoted		Standard Not Met, Retained		LEP, Transfer, Alternate Assessment		
			N	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
940	Washington County	All Students	219	166	75.8			33	15.1			20	9.1
		Black	158	116	73.4			29	18.4			13	8.2
		Hispanic	*	*	*								
		Multi-Racial	*	*	*								
		White	59	48	81.4			*	*			7	11.9
950	Watauga County	All Students	374	343	91.7			11	2.9	5	1.3	15	4.0
		Asian	*	*	*								
		Black	5	*	*			*	*				
		Hispanic	*	*	*							*	*
		American Indian	*									*	*
		Multi-Racial	*	*	*								
		White	358	330	92.2			10	2.8	5	1.4	13	3.6
960	Wayne County	All Students	1,591	1,372	86.2	*	*	102	6.4	32	2.0	83	5.2
		Asian	18	10	55.6							8	44.4
		Black	677	548	80.9	*	*	76	11.2	16	2.4	36	5.3
		Hispanic	74	52	70.3			*	*	5	6.8	13	17.6
		Multi-Racial	26	24	92.3							*	*
		White	796	738	92.7	*	*	22	2.8	11	1.4	24	3.0
		Other											
970	Wilkes County	All Students	818	702	85.8	*	*	37	4.5	32	3.9	44	5.4
		Asian	6	5	83.3							*	*
		Black	30	26	86.7			*	*	*	*	*	*
		Hispanic	27	17	63.0			*	*	*	*	6	22.2
		American Indian	*	*	*								
		Multi-Racial	6	6	100.0								
		White	748	647	86.5	*	*	33	4.4	30	4.0	35	4.7
980	Wilson County	All Students	951	858	90.2	*	*	37	3.9	14	1.5	40	4.2
		Asian	*	*	*								
		Black	526	457	86.9	*	*	33	6.3	9	1.7	25	4.8
		Hispanic	46	38	82.6			*	*	*	*	5	10.9
		American Indian	*	*	*								
		Multi-Racial	8	7	87.5					*	*		
		White	368	353	95.9			*	*	*	*	10	2.7
		Other	*	*	*								

		Total	Standard Met, Promoted		Standard Met, Retained		Standard Not Met, Promoted		Standard Not Met, Retained		LEP, Transfer, Alternate Assessment		
			N	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
98A	Sallie B. Howard	All Students	28	20	71.4			*	*	*	*	5	17.9
		Black	19	14	73.7					*	*	*	*
		Hispanic	8	5	62.5			*	*			*	*
		White	*	*	*								
990	Yadkin County	All Students	497	403	81.1			25	5.0	*	*	67	13.5
		Asian	*	*	*								
		Black	24	19	79.2							5	20.8
		Hispanic	52	28	53.8			10	19.2			14	26.9
		American Indian	*	*	*								
		White	419	354	84.5			15	3.6	*	*	48	11.5
995	Yancey County	All Students	194	175	90.2			7	3.6	*	*	10	5.2
		Black	*									*	*
		Hispanic	7	*	*					*	*	*	*
		White	186	171	91.9			7	3.8			8	4.3

