



Public Schools of North Carolina
State Board of Education
Department of Public Instruction

Report to the Joint Legislative Education Oversight Committee

2001 – 02 ABCs Pilot Program

General Statute 115C-12.25

Session Law 1999-237 Section 3(s)

October 2002

Report # 10 in 2002 DPI Chronological Schedule

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, III
Durham

Evelyn B. Monroe
West End

Maria Teresa U. Palmer
Chapel Hill

Ronald E. Deal
Hickory

Wayne McDevitt
Asheville

Patricia N. Willoughby
Raleigh

Beverly Perdue
Lieutenant Governor
Ex Officio

Richard H. Moore
State Treasurer
Ex Officio

NC Department of Public Instruction
Michael E. Ward, State Superintendent
Secretary to the Board

Website: www.ncpublicschools.org

~~~~~

Mary R. Lovin  
Assistant Secretary to the SBE  
NC Department of Public Instruction  
State Board of Education Office  
6302 Mail Service Center  
Raleigh, NC 27699-6302  
Office -- 919-807-3404  
Fax -- 919-807-3407 or 919-807-3198  
[mlovin@dpi.state.nc.us](mailto:mlovin@dpi.state.nc.us)

~~~~~

All e-mail correspondence to and from this address is subject to the North Carolina Public Records Law, which may result in monitoring and disclosure to third parties, including law enforcement.

Results of the 2001-02 ABCs Pilot Program to Test and Evaluate a Revised School Accountability Model for the ABCs Plan

Executive Summary

Section 8.36 of the special provisions in the 1999 Budget required the State Board of Education (SBE) to establish a pilot program in up to five Local Education Agencies (LEAs) "for the purpose of determining whether revisions in the present accountability model are likely to result in more students demonstrating mastery of grade level subject matter and skills." To this end, the SBE was instructed to "disaggregate student performance within designated ... groups" as a key feature of the pilot program. Section 8.36 further specified that the Board should report by October 15, 2001, and annually thereafter, "its findings and recommendations regarding the continued implementation, expansion, and modification of the pilot program."

The 2001 report to the General Assembly was rescheduled for December due to the delay in ABCs reporting as a result of the equating study in mathematics. In that report, the State Board recommended to discontinue the ABCs Pilot at the conclusion of the 2001-02 school year due to SB 1005 Section 23.30.(a) (G.S. 115C-105.35), which required the SBE to incorporate a "closing the achievement gap" component in the ABCs beginning with the 2002-03 school year.

The State Board of Education was required to establish awards for pilot schools that meet the goals of the pilot program. Section 8.36 stipulated that the SBE "shall not terminate a pilot program in a participating unit during the school year." Thus the SBE was obligated to continue the pilot through the 2001-02 school year and, consequently, to make the awards for the 2001-02 school year.

This report is presented to the Joint Legislative Education Oversight Committee in order to fulfill the SBE's responsibility to report on the conclusion of the ABCs Pilot Program. At its September meeting, the SBE did identify, approve and award those schools that merited awards on the basis of their performance during the 2001-02 ABCs Pilot Program, the last year of its implementation.

The five participating LEAs were: Bladen County Schools (090); Craven County Schools (250); Winston-Salem/Forsyth County Schools (340); Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools (600); and Elizabeth City-Pasquotank Public Schools (700). Based on analyses of the 2001-02 ABCs data for schools in these Local Education Agencies, 79 schools (36.9% of participating schools) merited awards for meeting the goals of the pilot program during its final year (31.6% met the goals in the first year).

**Results of the 2001-02 ABCs Pilot Program to Test and Evaluate a
Revised School Accountability Model for the ABCs Plan**

Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
Executive Summary	i
Background	1
Selection of Participating School Administrative Units.....	1
Implementation of the Pilot Program.....	2
Results	2
Summary	3
Appendix	

Results of the 2001-02 ABCs Pilot Program to Test and Evaluate a Revised School Accountability Model for the ABCs Plan

Background

In Section 8.36 of the special provisions in the 1999 Budget, the General Assembly required the State Board of Education (SBE) to establish a pilot program in up to five Local Education Agencies (LEAs) "for the purpose of determining whether revisions in the present accountability model are likely to result in more students demonstrating mastery of grade level subject matter and skills." Section 8.36 further specified that the Board should report by October 15, 2001, and annually thereafter, "its findings and recommendations regarding the continued implementation, expansion, and modification of the pilot program."

ABCs reporting for 2000-01 occurred in October because of the need to do an equating study in mathematics that year before ABCs results could be calculated. At the October 2001 State Board meeting the SBE also approved the results of the ABCs Pilot Program and the distribution of awards (\$2,207,146) to the pilot program participants. The first report of the pilot program results to the General Assembly was submitted in December 2001.

However, even before the first report was completed, the General Assembly enacted SB 1005 Section 23.30.(a) (G.S. 115C-105.35), which required the SBE to incorporate a "closing the achievement gap" component in the ABCs beginning with the 2002-03 school year. The Pilot Program had shown only modest impact in 2000-01 and was limited to grades 3-8. Consequently, in its December 2001 report, the State Board recommended to discontinue the ABCs Pilot Program at the conclusion of the 2001-02 school year. (Based on language in the original statute, the program could not be discontinued during the school year; so the SBE had to continue the Pilot Program through 2001-02.)

This report presents school-by-school results for those schools participating in the pilot program during the 2001-02 school year, the second and final year of the program.

Selection of Participating School Administrative Units

Under the special provision, local boards of education could volunteer to participate in the pilot. Each volunteer was required to hold a public meeting and pass a resolution specifically approving the LEA's participation in the pilot program. Participation also required a commitment of local funds (on a 25% matching basis) if the LEA did not qualify for Low-Wealth or Small School supplemental funding.

In January 2000 Superintendents of LEAs and Chief Officers of Charter Schools were formally invited to submit applications to participate in the ABCs Pilot Program required

by Section 8.36. They were advised of the legislative requirements and provided a copy of the legislation and the preliminary guidelines for the pilot program. Volunteers were required to submit their applications to the Department of Public Instruction by February 18, 2000 and to include results of their public meeting and a copy of the resolution passed by the local board approving their participation.

Six LEAs submitted applications. They were: Bladen County Schools (090); Craven County Schools (250); Winston-Salem/Forsyth County Schools (340); Roanoke Rapids City Schools (421); Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools (600); and Elizabeth City-Pasquotank Public Schools (700).

The State Board of Education met March 1-2, 2000 and approved the applications for: Bladen County Schools (090); Craven County Schools (250); Winston-Salem/Forsyth County Schools (340); Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools (600); and Elizabeth City-Pasquotank Public Schools (700). These LEAs provided good geographic, demographic, rural and urban coverage of the state as prescribed by Section 8.36. The application from Roanoke Rapids City Schools (421) was not selected because of the legislative restriction to five LEAs and because the small number of schools in the district would add the least statistical information to the pilot study.

Implementation of the Pilot Program

The ABCs Pilot Program was first implemented starting with the 2000-2001 school year. Participation continued through 2001-02. Within each selected LEA, all schools containing any of the grades 3-8 participated. (No high schools were involved in the pilot due to the additional complexity of the high school ABCs and because of the anticipated transition to a prediction model for high school accountability in 2000-2001 which precluded its use for subgroup analyses within a school.)

Schools in the pilot continue to be subject to standard ABCs requirements and the associated awards and sanctions continue to apply. Awards achieved under the pilot program are in addition to any earned under the standard ABCs program. (The SBE was authorized by statute to set a uniform level of financial awards, up to \$750 for each teacher and certified personnel and up to \$325 for each teacher assistant.) For each school, receiving the additional awards is contingent on meeting growth standards in ten subgroups of students. Subgroups are defined in terms of ethnicity, socioeconomic status, and prior achievement. Additional details are given in the Guidelines for implementation of the pilot program (see appendix).

Pilot program LEAs met with DPI staff in conjunction with the 2001 Testing and Accountability Conference. The meeting on January 29, 2001 was used to review activities to that point in time and to discuss data from prior years as they informed potential areas of concentration for pilot efforts.

Pilot participants were provided with detailed summaries of their schools' results following the 2000-01 school year. Participation in the program continued during 2001-02 using the same guidelines as had been effective during the first year of the program.

Results for 2001-02

The 2001-02 ABCs Pilot analyses were applied as outlined in the pilot program guidelines. Results are shown in the appendix. A list is provided showing, by LEA, each school that participated and the outcomes for each subgroup in the pilot program. An overall status is given for each school indicating whether the school met the overall pilot program requirements (i.e. whether they met growth expectations in all applicable subgroups). Table 1 shows the number and percentage of schools (by LEA, and in the total pilot program) that met the goals of the pilot program during 2001-02.

Table 1. Number and Percent of Schools Meeting ABCs Pilot Requirements in 2001-02

LEA	Name	Pilot Requirements				Total	
		Met		Not Met			
		N	%	N	%	N	%
090	Bladen County Schools	4	33.3	8	66.7	12	100.0
250	Craven County Schools	10	52.6	9	47.4	19	100.0
340	Winston-Salem/Forsyth County Schools	14	25.5	41	74.5	55	100.0
600	Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools	47	39.8	71	60.2	118	100.0
700	Elizabeth City-Pasquotank Public Schools	4	40.0	6	60.0	10	100.0
Total		79	36.9	135	63.1	214	100.0

Summary

During the 2001-02 school year 79 schools, or 36.9% of the schools participating in the pilot program, met the pilot program goals by attaining growth expectations in all applicable subgroups. This indicates improvement over the first year of the pilot program when 67 (31.6%) schools met the pilot program goals. A total amount of \$2,613,720 was spent for pilot program awards in 2001-02 compared to \$2,207,146 in 2000-01.

Appendix

Pilot Program to Test and Evaluate a Revised School Accountability Model for the ABCs Plan

Guidelines

Legislative requirements include:

1. Statewide, no more than five LEAs will be selected to participate in the pilot.
2. The LEA must hold a public hearing and the local Board of Education must approve participation in the event the LEA is selected.
3. The LEA must submit an application to the State Board of Education.
4. The LEA must contribute 25% matching funds, if not qualified for Low-Wealth or Small School supplemental funding.
5. The pilot program will be implemented starting with the 2000-2001 school year and could continue through 2004-2005.

Administrative requirements:

1. Within each selected LEA, all schools containing any of the grades 3-8 shall participate.
2. Standard ABCs requirements, awards and sanctions will continue to apply to schools in the participating LEAs.
3. The pilot will be restricted to grades 3-8. (No high schools will be involved in the pilot due to the additional complexity of the high school ABCs and because of the anticipated transition to a prediction model for high school accountability in 2000-2001. High schools may be included in the pilot in later years, if feasible.)
4. Awards achieved under the pilot program are in addition to any earned under the standard ABCs program.
5. Additional awards under the pilot will be based on growth in the following subgroups:
 - 5.1. American Indian,
 - 5.2. Asian,
 - 5.3. Black,
 - 5.4. Hispanic,
 - 5.5. White,
 - 5.6. Other (including multi-racial),
 - 5.7. Students eligible for free/reduced price lunches,
 - 5.8. Students not eligible for free/reduced price lunches,
 - 5.9. Students whose pretest scores were in Level I/II in reading or mathematics, and
 - 5.10. Students whose pretest scores were in Level III/IV in reading or mathematics
6. Pilot awards may be up to \$750 for each teacher and certified personnel and up to \$325 for each teacher assistant (to be determined by the SBE).

7. Pilot awards will be based on:
 - 7.1. Expected growth composites calculated for each subgroup,
 - 7.2. using the same formula used in the standard ABCs, including weighting the components if done for the standard ABCs,
 - 7.3. restricted to reading and mathematics only (writing will not be included),
 - 7.4. across all applicable grades 3-8 in the school.
8. To receive awards under the pilot, schools must make the growth expectation in all subgroups that meet the following conditions:
 - 8.1. There must be at least 15 students contributing to the composite (i.e., across all grades/subjects) in each subgroup for it to count,
 - 8.2. Subgroups with less than 15 students contributing to the composite will be dropped from the pilot accountability requirements for that school (i.e., if there are less than 15 Asian students, then the school must meet the remaining nine subgroup goals).
9. All of the above requirements are subject to change, pending further developments or additional information.

Results of the 2001-02 ABCs Pilot Program

2001 - 2002 ABCs Pilot Program Results

LEA	SCHOOL	SCHOOL NAME	ASIAN	AMERICAN INDIAN	BLACK	HISPANIC	MULTI-RACIAL	WHITE	LEVEL 1-2	LEVEL 3-4	F/R LUNCH	NO F/R LUNCH	# MET	HAVE DATA	LESS 15	NO DATA	MET PILOT
090	304	B T WASHINGTON PRI	.	.	Y	~	.	N	Y	Y	N	Y	4	6	2	2	
090	312	BLADEN MID	~	~	N	~	.	Y	Y	N	N	N	2	6	3	1	
090	317	BLADENBORO PRI	.	~	Y	~	.	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	5	6	3	1	
090	318	BLADEN LAKES PRI	.	.	Y	Y	.	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	7	7	0	3	Y
090	320	CLARKTON SCH OF DISC	~	~	N	~	.	N	Y	N	N	N	1	6	4	0	
090	324	DUBLIN ELEM	.	~	Y	Y	~	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	7	7	2	1	Y
090	328	EAST ARCADIA ELEM	.	~	Y	~	.	~	Y	Y	Y	Y	5	5	3	2	Y
090	333	ELIZABETH CITY MID	.	~	N	N	.	Y	Y	N	N	Y	3	7	1	2	
090	352	PLAIN VIEW PRI	.	~	Y	~	.	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	6	6	3	1	Y
090	354	SCH OF EXTENDED HOPE	.	.	~	.	.	~	N	N	~	~	0	2	4	4	
090	364	SPAULDING-MONROE MID	.	~	N	.	~	Y	Y	N	Y	N	3	6	2	2	
090	364	TAR HEEL MIDDLE-HS	.	~	N	~	.	N	N	N	N	N	0	6	2	2	
250	304	ALBERT H BANGERT ELEM	~	.	Y	~	~	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	6	6	3	1	Y
250	306	BEN D QUINN ELEM	~	~	N	~	~	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	4	6	4	0	
250	308	BRIDGETON ELEM	.	.	Y	~	.	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	6	6	1	3	Y
250	312	BRINSON MEMORIAL ELEM	~	.	Y	~	.	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	6	6	3	1	Y
250	320	VANCEBORO-FARM LIFE	.	~	Y	~	~	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	6	6	3	1	Y
250	324	GROVER C FIELDS MID	~	~	N	Y	~	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	5	7	3	0	
250	328	GRAHAM A BARDEN ELEM	.	~	Y	Y	~	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	7	7	2	1	Y
250	332	H J MACDONALD MID	~	.	Y	Y	~	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	8	8	1	1	Y
250	336	HAVELOCK ELEM	~	~	Y	~	~	N	Y	N	N	Y	3	6	4	0	
250	344	HAVELOCK MID	~	~	Y	N	~	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	7	8	2	0	
250	348	J T BARBER ELEM	.	.	Y	~	~	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	6	6	2	2	Y
250	350	JAMES W SMITH ELEM	.	.	N	~	~	Y	Y	N	N	Y	3	6	2	2	
250	360	OAKS ROAD ELEM	~	.	Y	~	~	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	6	6	3	1	Y
250	362	ROGER R BELL ELEM	~	.	N	~	~	Y	Y	N	N	Y	3	6	3	1	
250	364	TRENT PARK ELEM	~	.	Y	~	~	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	6	6	3	1	Y
250	368	TUCKER CREEK MID	~	~	Y	~	~	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	6	6	3	1	
250	376	WEST CRAVEN MID	N	~	Y	N	~	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	2	9	1	0	
250	978	W JESSE GURGANUS ELEM	~	~	N	~	~	Y	Y	N	N	Y	7	6	4	0	
250	380	ARTHUR W EDWARDS ELEM	~	~	Y	~	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	8	8	1	1	Y
340	308	ASHLEY ELEM	.	.	Y	~	~	~	Y	Y	Y	Y	3	5	2	3	
340	312	ATKINS MID	.	.	N	~	~	~	N	N	N	N	0	5	3	2	
340	314	BOLTON ELEM	N	~	N	Y	~	~	Y	Y	Y	Y	6	9	1	0	
340	320	BRUNSON ELEM	Y	.	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	6	9	0	1	
340	334	CASH ELEM	~	~	N	~	~	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	5	6	4	0	
340	336	FORSYTH VOC HS	.	.	~	~	.	.	~	.	~	.	0	0	3	7	

LEGEND: Y = met expected growth. N = did not meet expected growth. ~ = less than 15 students in subgroup. . = no students in subgroup.

2001 - 2002 ABCs of Program Results

LEA	SCHOOL	SCHOOL NAME	ASIAN	AMERICAN INDIAN	BLACK	HISPANIC	MULTI-RACIAL	WHITE	LEVEL 1-2	LEVEL 3-4	F/R LUNCH	NO F/R LUNCH	# MET	HAVE DATA	LESS 15	NO DATA	MET PILOT
340	348	CLEMMONS ELEM	-	-	N	-	-	Y	N	Y	N	Y	3	6	3	1	
340	350	CLEMMONS MIDDLE	Y	-	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	4	9	1	0	
340	351	COOK ELEM	-	-	N	-	-	-	N	N	N	-	0	4	5	1	
340	354	THE DOWNTOWN SCH	-	-	Y	-	-	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	5	6	2	2	
340	360	DIGGS ELEM	-	-	Y	-	-	-	Y	Y	Y	-	4	4	2	4	Y
340	368	EASTON ELEM	-	-	Y	Y	-	N	Y	N	N	N	3	7	1	2	
340	376	FOREST PARK ELEM	-	-	N	N	-	-	Y	Y	N	Y	1	6	2	2	
340	380	GIBSON ELEM	-	-	Y	-	-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	6	6	2	2	Y
340	384	GRIFFITH ELEM	-	-	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	2	8	2	0	
340	390	HALL-WOODWARD ELEM	-	-	Y	N	-	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	5	7	1	2	
340	392	HANES MID	Y	-	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	3	9	1	0	
340	396	HILL MID	-	-	N	N	-	N	N	N	N	N	0	7	1	2	
340	400	IBRAHAM ELEM	-	-	N	N	-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	3	7	1	2	
340	403	JEFFERSON ELEM	Y	-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	9	9	1	0	Y
340	406	JEFFERSON MIDDLE	Y	-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	9	9	1	0	Y
340	416	KERNERSVILLE ELEM	-	-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	8	8	1	1	Y
340	420	KERNERSVILLE MIDDLE	Y	-	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	1	9	1	0	
340	424	KIMBERLEY PARK ELEM	-	-	Y	-	-	-	Y	N	Y	Y	4	5	1	4	
340	428	KONNOAK ELEM	-	-	Y	Y	-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	6	7	3	0	
340	430	LATHAM ELEM	-	-	Y	Y	-	Y	Y	Y	Y	-	6	6	4	0	Y
340	432	LEWISVILLE ELEM	-	-	Y	Y	-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	6	6	3	1	Y
340	440	MEADOWLARK ELEM	-	-	Y	-	-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	6	7	3	0	
340	442	MEADOWLARK MIDDLE	Y	-	Y	-	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	7	8	1	1	
340	448	MINERAL SPRINGS ELEM	-	-	Y	Y	-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	7	7	2	1	Y
340	452	MINERAL SPRINGS MIDDLE	-	-	N	N	-	N	Y	N	N	Y	3	8	1	1	
340	453	MOORE ELEM	-	-	Y	-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	7	7	2	1	Y
340	462	NORTH HILLS ELEM	-	-	Y	-	-	-	Y	N	Y	-	3	4	3	3	
340	464	NORTHWEST HS	-	-	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	4	8	2	0	
340	472	OLD RICHMOND ELEM	-	-	N	Y	-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	6	7	1	2	
340	476	OLD TOWN ELEM	-	-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	7	8	2	0	
340	480	PAISLEY MID	-	-	Y	-	-	Y	N	Y	N	Y	4	6	2	2	
340	488	LEAP AT KENNEDY	-	-	N	N	-	Y	N	Y	N	Y	1	7	1	2	
340	490	PETREE ELEM	-	-	Y	-	-	-	Y	Y	N	Y	5	5	2	3	Y
340	492	PHILO MID	-	-	Y	-	-	-	N	N	N	N	1	7	3	0	
340	494	PINEY GROVE ELEM	-	-	N	Y	-	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	6	6	3	1	Y
340	504	RURAL HALL ELEM	-	-	Y	-	-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	6	7	3	0	
340	508	SEDGE GARDEN ELEM	-	-	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	4	8	1	1	

LEGEND: Y = met expected growth. N = did not meet expected growth. ~ = less than 15 students in subgroup. . = no students in subgroup.

2001 - 2002 ABCs Pilot Program Results

LEA	SCHOOL	SCHOOL NAME	ASIAN	AMERICAN INDIAN	BLACK	HISPANIC	MULTI-RACIAL	WHITE	LEVEL 1-2	LEVEL 3-4	F/R LUNCH	NO F/R LUNCH	# MET	HAVE DATA	LESS 15	NO DATA	MEI PILOT
600	449	MCALPINE ELEM	Y	-	Y	Y	-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	8	8	2	0	Y
600	450	MCCLINTOCK MID	Y	-	Y	Y	-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	8	8	2	0	Y
600	451	MCKEE ROAD ELEM	Y	-	Y	-	-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	7	7	3	0	Y
600	453	MERRY OAKS ELEM	-	-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	8	8	1	1	Y
600	458	MANAGEMENT SCH	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	0	5	5	Y
600	459	MONTCLAIRE ELEM	Y	-	Y	Y	-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	8	8	1	1	Y
600	461	MORGAN SCH	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	0	4	6	Y
600	464	MYERS PARK TRAD ELEM	-	-	Y	-	-	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	5	6	2	2	Y
600	468	NATHANIEL ALEXANDER	Y	-	Y	Y	-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	8	8	2	0	Y
600	471	NATIONS FORD ELEM	-	-	Y	-	-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	6	6	2	2	Y
600	474	NEWELL ELEM	Y	-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	9	9	1	0	Y
600	478	J H GUNN ELEM	N	-	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	2	9	1	0	Y
600	479	NORTHEAST MID	Y	-	Y	Y	-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	8	8	2	0	Y
600	481	NORTHBRIDGE MID	Y	-	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	7	9	1	0	Y
600	482	NORTHWEST HS	-	-	N	-	-	N	N	N	N	N	0	6	4	0	Y
600	485	OAKDALE ELEM	-	-	N	-	-	N	Y	N	N	N	1	6	4	0	Y
600	487	OAKHURST ELEM	-	-	N	Y	-	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	7	7	2	1	Y
600	489	OAKLAWN ELEM	Y	-	Y	Y	-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	6	7	1	2	Y
600	491	OLDE PROVIDENCE ELEM	-	-	Y	-	-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	6	6	1	3	Y
600	492	PARK ROAD ELEM	-	-	Y	-	-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	6	7	2	1	Y
600	494	PAW CREEK ELEM	-	-	Y	Y	-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	7	8	2	0	Y
600	495	PAWTUCKETT ELEM	Y	-	Y	N	-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	8	8	1	1	Y
600	497	PIEDMONT OPEN MID	Y	-	Y	Y	-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	4	8	1	1	Y
600	500	PINEVILLE ELEM	Y	-	N	N	-	Y	N	Y	N	Y	8	8	1	1	Y
600	501	PINEWOOD ELEM	Y	-	Y	Y	-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	8	8	1	1	Y
600	503	PINEY GROVE ELEM	Y	-	Y	Y	-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	8	9	0	1	Y
600	509	QUAIL HOLLOW MID	Y	-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	9	9	1	0	Y
600	512	RAMA ROAD ELEM	N	-	N	N	-	Y	Y	N	N	Y	3	8	2	0	Y
600	513	RANDOLPH MID	Y	-	N	Y	-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	7	8	2	0	Y
600	514	RANSON MID	Y	-	N	Y	-	Y	N	N	N	Y	4	8	2	0	Y
600	516	REEDY CREEK ELEM	Y	-	N	Y	-	Y	Y	N	N	Y	5	9	1	0	Y
600	517	REID PARK ELEM	-	-	N	-	-	Y	Y	N	N	Y	3	6	4	0	Y
600	519	SEDFIELD ELEM	-	-	N	-	-	Y	Y	N	N	Y	3	7	2	1	Y
600	520	SEDFIELD MID	Y	-	Y	Y	-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	8	8	2	0	Y
600	522	SELWYN ELEM	-	-	Y	-	-	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	4	6	2	2	Y
600	527	SHAMROCK GARDENS ELEM	-	-	Y	-	-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	7	7	3	0	Y
600	530	SHARON ELEM	-	-	N	-	-	Y	N	Y	N	Y	3	6	2	2	Y

LEGEND: Y = met expected growth. N = did not meet expected growth. ~ = less than 15 students in subgroup. . = no students in subgroup.

2001 - 2002 ABCs Pilot Program Results

LEA	SCHOOL	SCHOOL NAME	ASIAN	AMERICAN INDIAN	BLACK	HISPANIC	MULTI-RACIAL	WHITE	LEVEL 1-2	LEVEL 3-4	F/R LUNCH	NO F/R LUNCH	# MET	HAVE DATA	LESS 15	NO DATA	MET PILOT
600	532	SMITH MID	Y	~	Y	Y	~	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	8	8	2	0	Y
600	534	SMITHFIELD ELEM	Y	~	N	Y	~	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	7	8	1	1	Y
600	537	SOUTH CHARLOTTE MID	Y	~	Y	Y	~	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	8	8	2	0	Y
600	541	SPAUGH MID	Y	~	N	Y	~	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	7	8	2	0	Y
600	544	STARMOUNT ELEM	~	~	Y	Y	~	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	7	7	3	0	Y
600	546	STATESVILLE ROAD ELEM	Y	~	Y	Y	~	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	8	8	2	0	Y
600	549	STEELE CREEK ELEM	Y	~	Y	Y	~	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	7	8	2	0	Y
600	550	STERLING ELEM	~	~	Y	Y	~	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	7	7	2	1	Y
600	553	THOMASBORO ELEM	N	~	Y	~	~	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	5	7	3	0	Y
600	562	TUCKASEEGEE ELEM	Y	~	Y	Y	~	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	8	8	1	1	Y
600	565	UNIV PARK CREAT ARTS	~	~	Y	Y	~	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	6	7	2	1	Y
600	566	UNIV MEADOWS ELEM	Y	~	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	8	9	1	0	Y
600	571	VILLA HEIGHTS ELEM	Y	~	Y	~	~	Y	~	Y	Y	Y	6	6	2	2	Y
600	577	WESTERLY HILLS ELEM	N	~	N	Y	~	N	N	N	N	Y	2	8	2	0	Y
600	581	J T WILLIAMS MID	Y	~	Y	N	~	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	7	8	2	0	Y
600	585	WILSON MID	Y	~	N	Y	~	Y	Y	N	N	Y	5	8	2	0	Y
600	586	WINDING SPRINGS ELEM	N	~	N	Y	~	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	5	8	1	1	Y
600	587	WINDSOR PARK ELEM	~	~	N	Y	~	Y	Y	N	N	N	3	7	3	0	Y
600	589	WINTERFIELD ELEM	Y	~	Y	Y	~	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	8	8	1	1	Y
700	306	CENTRAL ELEM	~	~	Y	~	~	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	6	6	4	0	Y
700	308	ELIZABETH CITY MID	~	~	N	~	~	N	N	N	N	N	0	6	4	0	Y
700	310	H L TRIGG COMM	~	~	~	~	~	~	N	~	~	~	0	1	5	4	Y
700	314	NORTHSIDE ELEM	~	~	N	~	~	N	N	N	N	N	0	6	3	1	Y
700	316	J C SAWYER ELEM	~	~	Y	~	~	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	6	6	4	0	Y
700	318	PASQUOTANK ELEM	~	~	Y	~	~	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	6	6	1	3	Y
700	320	P W MOORE ELEM	~	~	Y	~	~	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	5	6	3	1	Y
700	322	RIVER ROAD MID	~	~	N	~	~	N	N	N	N	N	0	6	4	0	Y
700	324	SHEEP-HARNEY ELEM	~	~	Y	~	~	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	5	6	1	3	Y
700	328	WEEKSVILLE ELEM	~	~	Y	~	~	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	6	6	2	2	Y

LEGEND: Y = met expected growth. N = did not meet expected growth. ~ = less than 15 students in subgroup. . = no students in subgroup.

