



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

---

# Report to the Joint Legislative Education Oversight Committee

---

Implementation of the ABCs  
*SL 1997-18, SEC 15 (a)*  
*G.S. 115C-12(25)*

---

**Date Due:** November 15, 2003  
Report # 4 in October 2003 – December 2004  
DPI Chronological Schedule

# State Board of Education

Howard N. Lee  
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

Robert T. Speed  
Boone

Wayne McDevitt  
Asheville

Patricia N. Willoughby  
Raleigh

John A. Tate, III  
Charlotte

Bev Perdue  
Lieutenant Governor  
New Bern

Richard Moore  
State Treasurer  
Kittrell

NC Department of Public Instruction  
Michael E. Ward, State Superintendent

6302 Mail Service Center • Raleigh, North Carolina 27699-6302 • Website:  
[www.ncpublicschools.org](http://www.ncpublicschools.org)

In compliance with federal law, including the provisions of Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, the Department of Public Instruction does not discriminate on the basis of race, sex, religion, color, national or ethnic origin, age, disability, or military service in its policies, programs, activities, admissions, or employment.

## **Preface for the 2002-03 Report to JLEOC on the Implementation of the ABCs**

This report has been substantially revised and shortened from its format in previous years. All reporting for the 2002-03 ABCs was electronically disseminated through the internet. Due to the inclusion of adequate yearly progress (AYP) as a component of the ABCs and due to the unprecedented coordination of the ABCs report, AYP results, and Supplemental Disaggregated State, School System and School Performance results for release on the same date (September 10, 2003) the reports released this year dramatically exceeded the volume of material it would have been practical to print. Consequently, there are no printed reports for the ABCs this year. All information is accessible on the website, as indicated in the Executive Summary that is incorporated into this report.

Specific sections of the report that appeared in the past, but have been deleted because of the electronic nature of the reporting include the following sections: Report of Growth and Performance of Schools; and ABCs Status of Alternative Schools. The elimination of these two sections reduces this report by approximately 66 pages over its length in previous years. The information covered by these two sections is readily available on the website.

# **Report to the Joint Legislative Education Oversight Committee on the Implementation of the ABCs**

## **Executive Summary**

G. S. 115C-12(25) requires the State Board of Education to submit annually by October 15 a report to the Joint Legislative Education Oversight Committee regarding the continued implementation of the ABCs Plan. Information in the report includes update of the seventh year ABCs results for schools, report on State Assistance Teams, response to the Excellent Schools Act requirements, schools identified as low performing and composition and activities of the Assistance Teams.

## Table of Contents

<b>I.</b>	<b>Update of the Seventh Year ABCs Results .....</b>	<b>1</b>
	• Memorandum from Howard N. Lee and Michael E. Ward to the General Assembly .....	2
	• Key to Status Abbreviations and Codes Used in the ABCs Report.....	4
	• Executive Summary of Results .....	5
	• Corrections to the ABCs of Public Education .....	11
	• Results of School Building Appeals .....	11
	• Evolution of the ABCs.....	12
	• SBE Recommendations for Distribution of Incentive Awards.....	17
	• State Board Policy on ABCs Accountability Model.....	18
<b>II.</b>	<b>Report on Assistance Teams .....</b>	<b>28</b>
	• Status of Personnel in Systems Receiving Mandatory Assistance .....	29
	• Composition of Activities of Assistance Teams .....	31
	• Mandated Assistance for 2002-2003: 9-12 Schools .....	33
	• High Priority Schools.....	37
	• ABCs Assistance Team Training.....	39
<b>III.</b>	<b>Response to Excellent Schools Act Requirements.....</b>	<b>42</b>
	• Certified Staff Testing Under the Excellent Schools Act .....	43
<b>IV.</b>	<b>ABCs Recognition and Schedule of Recognition Activities.....</b>	<b>44</b>
	• ABCs Recognition .....	45
	• Number and Percent of Public Schools Receiving Awards: 1997-2003 .....	46
	• LEA Codes.....	47
	• 2002-2003 Most Improved Schools.....	48
<b>V.</b>	<b>Testing Program Redevelopment and Issues for Further Consideration.....</b>	<b>49</b>
	• Testing Program Redevelopment and Issues for Further Consideration .....	50

## **I. Update of Seventh Year of ABCs Results**



# PUBLIC SCHOOLS OF NORTH CAROLINA

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION :: Howard N. Lee, *Chairman*

WWW.NCPUBLICSCHOOLS.ORG

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION :: Michael E. Ward, *State Superintendent*

September 10, 2003

## MEMORANDUM

TO: Members, North Carolina General Assembly

FROM: Howard N. Lee

Michael E. Ward

SUBJECT: Public School Investment Pays Off; Scores Reach Highest Level and Gaps Narrow

Today is a great day for our public schools. We will join Governor Easley this morning to announce that investments in the ABCs and focused work by students and teachers are resulting in more students who are at grade level than we've ever seen before.

Achievement gaps are closing at a rate that was likely hoped for when the State Board of Education was directed to add a gap closing component to the ABCs in 2001. Schools are making the kind of growth we all hoped for when the ABCs program was envisioned in 1995.

All in all, we are very excited by the individual school results to be approved today by the State Board. Legislators are extremely important partners in our school success story, and we want you to share in the accomplishments.

The gains are so great that we checked and re-checked the numbers to ensure their validity. We know the pressure on our schools to perform has been substantial. We've heard from teachers and principals across the state that they've made major changes in day-to-day operations since the ABCs began in grades 3-8 in 1996-97. Principals are studying the data, teachers are focused on the curriculum, students are getting extra help to reach proficiency and beyond, and more and more citizens are signing on as tutors and mentors. The state that once aspired to lead the Southeast is now ranked with the top states in the nation on several measures.

At the end of 1996-97, the first year of the ABCs, a total of 61.7 percent of grades 3-8 students were at or above grade level in reading and mathematics. That percentage increased to 80.8 percent in 2002-03. Achievement gaps narrowed significantly with Black and American Indian students gaining approximately 10 percentage points each in one year.

Nearly three-fourths of all schools, 72.9 percent, met the standards for high growth in 2002-03. Nearly every school, 94.3 percent, met expected growth. More of our schools are at the two highest performance categories on the ABCs - Schools of Excellence or Schools of Distinction. Sixty-one percent of all schools earned recognition as Schools of Excellence or Schools of Distinction. You may recall that in order to be a School of

Distinction, schools must have met at least expected growth and have 80-89 percent or more of their student test scores at grade level or above. Schools of Excellence must at least meet their growth goals and have 90 percent or more student test scores at grade level or above. Just six schools statewide met the criteria of low performing, down from 123 the first year of the ABCs.

You may be concerned about preliminary information released on the federal Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) results. If so, you will be interested to learn that schools met a total of 90.5 percent of the federal Adequate Yearly Progress targets. Close to 300 schools missed making AYP by only one target. For 47.4 percent of our schools to make AYP when so many schools met most of their targets is unfair. We will continue to advocate for Congress to change the all-or-nothing provisions of AYP. To us, schools that meet 90 percent of their goals are making good progress and should not be penalized in the same way as schools that miss many of their targets.

We are pleased to announce that a new Web site for the ABCs makes it easier than ever to look at school performance. The new site has search capabilities similar to the N.C. Report Cards, and we are sure that parents and others will find this site to be user-friendly. The complete ABCs report is only available on the Web at: <http://abcs.ncpublicschools.org/> Please review the results for schools in your area. You may wish to extend congratulations by contacting schools in your area that made improvement.

We think you will agree that sticking to the ABCs plan is making a real difference in student achievement. We sincerely appreciate your support of our schools. We look forward to continued momentum for better schools in 2003-04.

HNL: MEW:kw



## **Key to Status Abbreviations and Codes Used in the ABCs Report**

### **Status Abbreviations**

Hgh	School Making High Growth
Exp	School Making Expected Growth
MI	25 Most Improved K-8 Schools
MI	10 Most Improved High Schools
Exc	School of Excellence
Dst	School of Distinction
Pri	Priority School
NR	No Recognition
LP	Low-Performing *
EE	Excessive Exclusions
95R	Less than 95 percent tested

### **Special Codes**

1	K-2 feeder school
2	Senior high school – grades 9-12 option
3	Senior high school – grades 10-12 option
9	School did not meet data requirements
*	Confidence interval applied

**Executive Summary**  
Amended to include Corrections, October 02, 2003

**Statistical Summary of Results**

In the 2002-03 implementation of the ABCs, 2,219 public schools were assigned an ABCs status. These included traditional public schools spanning combinations of grades K-12; charter schools; alternative schools; and K-2 schools. There were 31 special education schools, vocational/career schools, and hospital schools that were not assigned an ABCs status, but they participated on the basis of the schools they served, as explained later in this document. Five schools were in the Schools Not Included category: Three schools had insufficient data; one school was in violation of the 95% rule, and one had unresolved data issues. The results for schools that were assigned an ABCs status appear in Table 1.

Table 1. **ABCs Results, 2002-03**

Category	High Growth	Expected Growth	Less than Expected Growth	K-2 Feeder	Alternative Schools	Total	Perce
Schools of Excellence	426	47				473	21.3
Schools of Distinction	752	134				886	39.9
Schools of Progress	354	196				550	24.8
No Recognition			105	0	3	108	4.9
Priority Schools	26	39	13			78	3.5
Low-Performing Schools			6		0	6	0.3
K-2 Feeder Schools	43	2				45	2.0
Alternative Schools	16	57				73	3.3
Total Schools	1,617	475	124	0	3	2,219	100.0
Percent of Schools	72.9	21.4	5.6	0.0	0.1	100.0	

Overall, 94.3% of the schools made either expected or high growth.

The 2002-03 ABCs program also reported the adequate yearly progress (AYP) of the state's schools during this first year's implementation of the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001. Table 2 shows the number and percent of the state's schools that met and did not meet AYP.

Table 2.

**Statewide AYP Results, 2002-03**

<b>AYP Status</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Schools that Met AYP	1,058	47.0
Schools that Did Not Meet AYP	1,194	53.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,252</b>	<b>100.0</b>

AYP results are presented by ABCs category in Table 3. Schools must have had both an ABCs status and an AYP status to appear in this table. This means that schools that did not receive an ABCs status, i.e., special education schools, vocational/career schools, hospital schools, schools not included in the ABCs, and schools with unresolved data issues are not reflected here.

Table 3.

**AYP Results by ABCs Recognition Categories, 2002-03**

<b>Category</b>	<b>Met AYP</b>		<b>Did Not Meet AYP</b>		<b>Total</b>
	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>	
Schools of Excellence	371	78.4	102	21.6	473
Schools of Distinction	460	51.9	426	48.1	886
Schools of Progress	168	30.5	382	69.4	550
No Recognition	26	24.1	82	75.9	108
Priority Schools	2	2.6	76	97.4	78
Low-Performing Schools	0	0	6	100	6
Expected Growth	127	26.7	345	73.3	472
High Growth	893	55.2	724	44.8	1,617

**Presentation of Results**

Results of the 2002-03 ABCs are presented online at <http://abcs.ncpublicschools.org>. The web site offers users the ability to view and search for ABCs growth, performance, and AYP results by individual school and school district. A map search feature is also available to search for data by region, county, and some cities. Users can design their own search by selecting desired school characteristics. In addition to the new features, the web site reports the traditional ABCs results for all schools, including schools in the following traditional categories: Alternative Schools; Schools of Distinction; Schools of Excellence; 25 Most Improved K-8 Schools; 10 Most Improved High Schools; Schools Making High Growth; Schools Making Expected Growth; Low-Performing Schools; Schools of Progress; Priority Schools; and Charter Schools. New categories include Schools Meeting AYP and Schools Not Meeting AYP.

Schools with No ABCs Status include special education schools; vocational/career schools; hospital schools; Schools Not Included in the ABCs, and Schools with Unresolved Data Issues. State and school district AYP results, and disaggregated subgroup statistics and supplemental data are also available from the web site.

There are also links to *Special Conditions*, a document that explains the adjustments for special conditions in 2002-03, and a link to *Technical Notes*. This document includes: a summary of standard conventions used in the analyses; a history of the ABCs; a table of some specific values used in the ABCs growth formula computations (constants and parameters); an example of how the alternate assessments (NCAAP and NCAAI) results were incorporated into the performance composites; achievement levels for EOG mathematics, and the equating results for mathematics and reading.

## **Background**

The State Board of Education (SBE) developed the ABCs of Public Education in response to the School-Based Management and Accountability Program enacted by the General Assembly in June 1996. The ABCs focuses on strong accountability; teaching the basics with an emphasis on high educational standards; and maximum local control.

In 2002-03, the ABCs program was expanded to incorporate the new statutory accountability requirements of the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001. This federal legislation sets a proficiency goal of 100% by 2013-14 for all schools and requires that all schools make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) toward that goal. The SBE adopted AYP as a "closing the achievement gap component" of the ABCs in response to General Statute 115C-105.35. Thus the 2002-03 ABCs report includes the AYP status for each school. The SBE made several decisions this year to align the ABCs with the requirements of NCLB. Those include:

- a) Reinstating the North Carolina High School Comprehensive Test (NCHSCT) as a state-required test in Grade 10 to be used only for AYP purposes,
- b) changing the ABCs 91-Day Rule for growth calculations in grades 3 through 8 to the 140-Day Rule for EOG (See Technical Notes for details),
- c) changing the 98% Tested Rule in Grades 3-8 to the 95% Tested Rule, and
- d) the SBE will review the ABCs Awards and Recognition categories after this year of implementation for alignment with NCLB in the future. The ABCs categories for 2002-03 were not changed.

In addition to these modifications, this year's model reflected the equating of the reading posttest scores with the original reading scale in order to enable use of the accountability formulas.

The ABCs accountability program sets growth and performance standards for each elementary, middle, and high school in the state. End-of-Grade (EOG) and End-of-Course (EOC) test results and other selected components are used to measure the schools' growth and performance. Schools that attain the standards are eligible for incentive awards or other recognition, i.e., Schools of Excellence, Schools of Distinction, Schools of Progress, 25 Most Improved K-8 Schools or 10 Most Improved High Schools. Priority Schools may request assistance from the Division of School Improvement. Schools where growth and performance fall below specified levels are designated as low-performing, and may receive mandated assistance based on action by the SBE.

## **Participating schools**

In 2002-03, every school that contained one or more of the grades 3-12 that submitted appropriate data participated in the ABCs. Data submitted by a K-8 school may include test results in reading and mathematics; computer skills at grade 8; reading and

mathematics from the alternate assessments (NCAAP and NCAAAI), and any EOC tests for subject(s) taught in the school. High school data include

EOC test results, the percent of students completing courses of study (College University Prep/College Tech Prep), change in the ABCs dropout rates, and change in competency passing rates.

K-2 schools participated in the ABCs receiving their ABCs status, AYP status, and incentive awards (if applicable) based on the performance of the schools that received the largest percent of students from the K-2 schools.

Alternative schools are included in the ABCs per State Board of Education Policy HSP-C-013. Their ABCs status is based on achievement data (EOC, EOG, competency passing rates) and three "local options" specified in their school improvement plans and approved by their local boards of education. Their AYP status is determined using the same procedures as are used in traditional public schools. The only ABCs designations that an alternative school can receive are: High Growth, Expected Growth, No Recognition, or Low-Performing.

Special education schools, vocational/career schools, and hospital schools did not receive an ABCs status but they received prorated ABCs incentive awards, as appropriate, based on the schools they served. They also received an AYP status that was determined by the performance of the schools they served. They made AYP if at least half of the schools they served made AYP.

## **Analyses**

### ABCs Growth and Performance

A school's ABCs status is determined by three weighted composite scores: the expected growth composite, the high growth composite, and the performance composite. A school's grade span and/or courses determined the composition of these weighted measures, as explained below.

The expected growth composite may include:

- a) Growth in EOG reading and mathematics for grades 3-8,
- b) growth based on EOC tests,
- c) change over a two-year baseline in the percent of students completing certain courses of study (college university prep/college tech prep),
- d) change in the competency passing rate (from grade 8 to grade 10), and
- e) change in the ABCs Dropout rate (compared to a two-year baseline).

The high growth composite includes the same components and is approximately 10% higher than the expected growth composite for grades 3-8. For EOC tests, the high growth composite is approximately 3% above the expected growth composite. There is no high growth standard applicable to changes in the competency passing rate, the percent of course of study completers, or the ABCs dropout rate.

The performance composite is the school's percentage of scores at or above Achievement Level III in reading and mathematics (from the EOG and alternate assessments), Computer Skills Test (Grade 8), and EOC tests: Algebra I and II; Biology; Chemistry; English I; Economic, Legal, and Political Systems (ELPS); Geometry; Physical Science; Physics, and U.S. History. Algebra I scores of ninth graders who took

Algebra I prior to ninth grade are included in the high school's performance composite. (See *Technical Notes in the Appendices for more information related to senior high schools and the alternate assessments.*)

The ABCs results published here were produced on a Dell Precision Workstation 650, MiniTower, 512K, 2.00GHz XEON/533 running under Microsoft Windows XP V. 5.1.

### AYP Analyses

NCLB requires that each school be evaluated with respect to making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP). In order for a school to make AYP, each student subgroup, i.e., School as a whole; American Indian; Asian; Black; Hispanic; Multi-Racial; White; Economically Disadvantaged; Limited English Proficient, and Students with Disabilities, must have at least a 95% participation rate in the statewide assessments. Each subgroup must meet or exceed the State's annual measurable objectives, which were based on three years of performance data according to procedures prescribed by law and regulations of the U.S. Department of Education, and the school as a whole must show progress on the other academic indicator, which is either attendance or graduation rate (depending on the grade configuration of the school).

### **Definition of ABCs Awards and Recognition Categories**

Schools Making High Growth attained their high growth standard. In schools attaining the High Growth standard, certified staff members each receive up to \$1,500 and teacher assistants up to \$500.

Schools Making Expected Growth attained their expected growth standard (but not their high growth standard). In schools attaining the Expected Growth standard (but less than High Growth), certified staff members each receive up to \$750 and teacher assistants up to \$375.

25/10 Most Improved Schools are the 25 Most Improved K-8 schools and the 10 Most Improved High Schools that attained the State's highest values on the high growth composite. (Any school with a combination of grades which includes Grade 9 or higher was eligible for the high school recognition rather than the K-8 recognition.) These schools will receive banners, certificates, and financial awards.

Schools of Excellence are schools that made at least expected growth and had at least 90% of their students' scores at or above Achievement Level III. These schools will receive banners and certificates. They will receive incentive awards for expected or high growth.

Schools of Distinction are schools that made at least expected growth and had at least 80 percent of their students' scores at or above Achievement Level III (but were not Schools of Excellence). They will receive plaques and certificates. They will receive incentive awards for expected or high growth.

Schools of Progress are schools that made at least expected growth and had at least 60% of their students' scores at or above Achievement Level III (but were not Schools of Excellence or Distinction). They will receive certificates and incentive awards for expected growth or high growth.

Schools Receiving No Recognition did not make their expected growth standards but have at least 60% of their students' scores at or above Achievement Level III.

Priority Schools are schools that have less than 60% of their students' scores at or above Achievement Level III, irrespective of making their expected growth standards, and are not Low-Performing Schools.

Low-Performing Schools are those that failed to meet their expected growth standards and have significantly less than 50% of their students performing at or above Achievement Level III.

Schools that violate the testing requirements are assigned a violation status and cannot receive financial awards or any another ABCs status, except low-performing. The low-performing schools that violate testing requirements are assigned the low-performing status in addition to the violation status. The State Board of Education may designate schools that violate testing requirements for two consecutive years as low-performing.

**Corrections to The ABCs of Public Education:  
2002-2003 Growth and Performance of North Carolina Schools**

<b>LEA</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>LEASCH #</b>	<b>Correction</b>
The New Dimensions School	The New Dimensions School	12A	This school should be added to the Schools with No ABCs status list, with an AYP status. The school's AYP status is Met AYP. (This is a K-2 Charter School).
Kannapolis	Jackson Park Elementary	132328	AYP status should be changed from Not Met AYP to Met AYP.

**Results of School Building Appeals**

The deadline for filing appeals of the ABCs results was Thursday, October 9, 2003. As of that date, there were no appeals.



## Evolution of the ABCs

### 1995

- General Assembly directed the State Board of Education (SBE) to develop a restructuring plan for public education. The State Board conducted an in-depth study involving public hearings, surveys and interviews; reviewed current mandates and operating procedures; and undertook a major organizational analysis to relate all education operations to the mission. In May 1995, the New ABCs of Public Education outlined the framework for a dramatic restructuring.

### 1995-96

- One hundred eight schools in ten school districts piloted The New ABCs of Public Education. The systems were Albemarle, Alleghany, Asheville City, Elizabeth City-Pasquotank, Duplin, Halifax, Lexington, McDowell, Bladen, and Lincoln.

### 1996

- General Assembly approved the State Board's plan and put into law the School-Based Management and Accountability Program (the ABCs).

### 1996-97

- ABCs implementation began for schools with grades K-8.
- DPI communicated ABCs Procedures to principals and teachers.
- Assistance teams were formed and trained; assistance was offered to schools that asked for it.
- Steering Committee for Assessment and Accountability was established by the SBE to develop the High School Model.
- Compliance Commission for Accountability was established by the SBE to advise on testing and other issues related to school accountability and improvement. The commission was to be composed of two members from each of eight educational districts and four at-large members to represent parents, business, and the community.
- The first ABCs Report submitted to the State Board of Education in August.
- All schools achieving exemplary growth standards received incentive awards (\$1,000 for certified staff; \$500 for teacher assistants).

## 1997-98

- Designated Low-Performing schools received assistance teams.
- The next phase of statewide reform was implemented with the high school accountability model. It was considered a “work in progress” with re-examination, changes and adjustments to come.
- The model included results on five mandated EOCs, a high school writing test (English II – time was extended to allow students 100 minutes); percentages completing College Prep/CollegeTech Prep (based on a year to year change); SAT scores and participation rates were reported.
- Two measures, the passing rates on the high school competency tests and dropout rates, were scheduled for implementation for the subsequent year.
- The Comprehensive Test in Reading and Mathematics was administered to determine cohort growth from grade 8 to grade 10. This was to satisfy the Senate Bill 1139 legislation that called for measuring student growth (for high schools). Initially, results were to “count” for the accountability year, but it was decided to delay inclusion of these data in the growth composite for high schools until the following year.
- Growth for K-8 schools was computed using both the “old” *unmatched* grade 3 parameters, and the “new” (1996-97) *matched* group grade 3 parameters. The higher of the two growth computations was used in the final computations for growth.
- 7<sup>th</sup> Grade Writing was included in computing growth, since this was the third year of data collection; it had previously been used only in the performance composite.
- Algebra I scores from grades prior to the ninth grade were included in the computations for performance composite for high schools.
- A confidence band for the performance composite was computed; this allowed schools a safety margin for measurement error. Schools could be slightly below 50% at or above grade level and not be penalized.
- ABCs status label *No Recognition* was changed to *Adequate Performance*.
- Charter Schools were included in the ABCs reporting for the first time.
- A Comprehensive model was defined for schools that had grades included in both the K-8 and high school configurations. The school faculty voted on whether the Comprehensive model would be used to evaluate the school for the accountability year, and the vote was to be reflected in the School Improvement Plan.
- Alternative schools were asked to submit proposals of better ways to be evaluated in subsequent accountability years.
- Reporting guidelines were developed to accommodate feeder patterns for special education schools, alternative schools and K-2 feeder schools; high schools with major demographic shifts were accommodated under special conditions; reporting accommodations were implemented for schools with insufficient data, and guidelines were developed to handle senior high schools under the ABCs.
- It was decided that during this accountability year, no alternative schools or special schools were to be identified as Low-Performing.
- EOC test scores of students in middle grades were used in the high school portion of the performance composite score but not the gain composite score.

#### 1997-98 continued...

- K-8 and high school results under the ABCs were reported in A Report Card for the ABCs of Public Education, Volume I.
- All schools making Expected or Exemplary Growth/Gain were awarded incentives per the Excellent Schools Act, enacted by the General Assembly (\$1500 for certified staff, \$500 for teacher assistants in schools making Exemplary Growth/Gain; schools making Expected growth/gain received \$750 for certified staff; \$375 for teacher assistants).
- A Report Card for the ABCs of Public Education was made available on the DPI web site.

#### 1998-99

- The SBE increased the membership of the Compliance Commission for Accountability from the original 20 members to 22 members to include an SBE member and an additional At-Large business member.
- The Comprehensive model was applied to all schools.
- Five additional EOC tests were added to the performance composite score.
- The High School Comprehensive Test growth parameters were approved; the growth component was included in the high school growth/gain computations.
- The competency passing rate was included in the high school growth/gain computations.
- Algebra I scores for middle grades counted toward gain and performance at high schools.
- Data collection guidelines and procedures were documented in an Accountability Processing Checklist to incorporate roles of LEA, regional coordinators, and the agency staff.
- Insufficient data rule was documented for high schools (less than 30 students in a given course for a given year of the three years data).
- Dual enrollment policies were documented and disseminated.
- Membership rule for Comprehensive Tests was approved (160 days).
- Revised grade 3 parameters were applied to the grade 3 growth computations.
- A Report Card for the ABCs of Public Education, Volume 2 included ABCs dropout data.
- Alternative schools with sufficient data were included in the ABCs on the basis of their data; schools with insufficient data were awarded prorated incentives based on the feeder schools.
- The labels *Top 10/25 Schools* and *Adequate Performance* were changed to *Most Improved 10/25* and *No Recognition*, respectively.

#### 1999-00

- A rule for dropping courses in high school (10/20 Day Rule) was implemented.
- Alternative Schools were included in the ABCs under HSP-C-013. Web interface was developed for data collection for alternative schools to enter local option data online.
- Department of Health, Human Services (DHHS) and Office of Juvenile Justice (OJJ) Schools were included in the ABCs.
- Schools were given test administration options for fall English II Tests due to catastrophic weather.
- The SBE appointed a Writing Assessment Task Force.
- Full ABCs documentation was made available on the Accountability web site.

#### 2000-01

- EOC prediction formulas for 10 multiple-choice EOCs were implemented; this fully addressed concerns related to comparing different cohorts over time at the high school level.
- Dropout rate change was added to the growth computations in high schools.
- Computer Skills testing results at grade 8 were added to the performance composite.
- EOC prediction formulas' exemplary growth standard was adjusted from 105% to 103%.
- Weighting the ABCs growth composites was adopted by the SBE in part to eliminate concern over small groups of students having the same impact as large groups of students in the determination of whether the school met growth standards.
- Alternate Assessment Portfolio was added to the performance composite.
- Writing at grades 4 and 7 was removed from the growth composites, but remained a part of the performance composite.
- The North Carolina Alternate Assessment Academic Inventory and the Computerized Adaptive Testing System were approved by SBE to be pilot tested and included in ABCs Volume II Report.

#### 2001-02

- The State Board of Education approved revisions to the ABCs classifications for the 2001-2002 school year.
- The term **high** growth will now be used in place of *exemplary* growth.
- The term **growth** will now be used in place of *growth/gain* in all designations of meeting or exceeding growth or gain standards.
- Three tests were eliminated for the 2001-2002 school year: Iowa Tests of Basic Skills, Open-ended Assessments in grades 4 and 8, and the High School Comprehensive Tests in Reading and Mathematics at grade 10. (Only the latter had been included in the ABCs.)
- English II was suspended and will not be included in the ABCs until new tests are developed.
- Revised format for reporting data in ABCs Volume II, and changed the name to *Reports of Supplemental Disaggregated State, District and School Performance Data for 2000-2001*.
- SBE approved the revised achievement levels determined from the Summer of 2001 equating study for student reporting, student accountability standards gateways, student competency standard, and ABCs reporting (performance composites).
- SBE approved the growth formulas that were used for grades 3-8 with the 2000-2001 ABCs for growth calculations for the 2001-2002 ABCs.

### 2002-03

- ABCs 91-Day Rule for Growth Calculations changed to 140-Day Rule to align with NCLB full academic year (FAY) requirement.
- The 98% Rule in Grades 3-8 Under the ABCs was changed to 95% to conform with NCLB 95% tested requirement.
- No exclusions allowed.
- Added Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) as a “closing the gap component” of the ABCs.
- North Carolina Alternate Assessment Portfolio (NCAAP) scoring revised to yield Reading and Mathematics scores.
- The ABCs Report, The ABCs of Public Education 2002-2003 Growth and Performance of North Carolina Schools was made available in electronic format on DPI website. No hardcopy reports were published.

**SBE Recommendations for Distribution of Incentive Awards:  
ABCs of Public Education and No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act**

On June 6, 2002, the SBE adopted the following recommendation (which awaits North Carolina General Assembly action) for distributing incentive awards.

Retain current ABCs with less financial incentives for Expected and High Growth but with additional incentives for meeting Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP).

<b>One Third</b>
Expected Growth - \$600 High Growth - \$600 AYP - \$600 ----- Certified staff members at schools that made any or all of the above categories would receive \$600 for each component the school attained with \$1800 being the maximum a certifie staff member could receive. Teacher assistants would receive \$200 for each component with \$600 being the maximum a teacher assistant could receive.

**NORTH CAROLINA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION  
Policy Manual**

**Policy Identification**

**Priority:** High Student Performance

**Category:** ABCs Accountability Model

**Policy ID Number:** HSP-C-005

**Policy Title:** 16 NCAC 6G.0305 Policy delineating the annual performance standards for Grades K-12 under the ABCs Model

**Current Policy Date:** 02/07/2002

**Other Historical Information:** Previous board date: 01/01/1998; 05/04/2000; 09/14/2000; 02/01/2001

**Statutory Reference:**

**Administrative Procedures Act (APA) Reference Number and Category:** 16 NCAC 6G.0305

**\*\*\* Begin Policy \*\*\* (Do not tamper with this line)**

**.0305 ANNUAL PERFORMANCE STANDARDS, GRADES K-12**

- (a) For purposes of this Section, the following definitions shall apply to kindergarten through twelfth grade:
- (1) "Accountability measures" are SBE-adopted tests designed to gauge student performance and achievement.
  - (2) "b<sub>0</sub>" means the state average rate of growth used in the regression formula for the respective grades and content areas (reading and mathematics) in grades 3 through 8 and grade 10; or the state average performance used in the prediction formula for respective high school end-of-course tests. The constant values for b<sub>0</sub> shall be as follows:
    - (A) for reading:
      - (i) 6.2 for grade 3;
      - (ii) 5.2 for grade 4;
      - (iii) 4.6 for grade 5;
      - (iv) 3.0 for grade 6;
      - (v) 3.3 for grade 7;
      - (vi) 2.7 for grade 8; and
      - (vii) 2.3 for grade 10.
    - (B) for mathematics:
      - (i) 12.8 for grade 3;
      - (ii) 7.3 for grade 4;

- (iii) 7.4 for grade 5;
  - (iv) 7.1 for grade 6;
  - (v) 6.5 for grade 7;
  - (vi) 4.9 for grade 8; and
  - (vii) 2.3 for grade 10.
- (C) for EOC courses:
- (i) 60.4 for Algebra I;
  - (ii) 55.2 for Biology;
  - (iii) 54.0 for ELPS (Economic, Legal, and Political Systems);
  - (iv) 53.3 for English I;
  - (v) 56.0 for U.S. History;
  - (vi) 59.3 for Algebra II;
  - (vii) 56.9 for Chemistry;
  - (viii) 58.5 for Geometry;
  - (ix) 53.8 for Physical Science; and
  - (x) 56.1 for Physics.
- (3) " $b_1$ " means the value used to estimate true proficiency in the regression formulas for grades 3 through 8 and grade 10. The values for  $b_1$  shall be as follows:
- (A) for reading:
    - (i) 0.46 for grade 3;
    - (ii) 0.22 for grades 4 through 8; and
    - (iii) 0.24 for grade 8 to 10.
  - (B) for mathematics:
    - (i) 0.30 for grade 3;
    - (ii) 0.26 for grades 4 through 8; and
    - (iii) 0.28 for grade 8 to 10.
- (4) " $b_2$ " means the value used to estimate regression to the mean in the regression formula for grades 3 through 8. The values for  $b_2$  shall be as follows:
- (A) for reading:
    - (i) -0.91 for grade 3;
    - (ii) -0.60 for grades 4 through 8.
  - (B) for mathematics:
    - (i) -0.47 for grade 3;
    - (ii) -0.58 for grades 4 through 8.
- (5) " $b_{IRP}$ " means the value used to estimate the effect of the school's average reading proficiency on the predicted average EOC test score. The values for  $b_{IRP}$  shall be as follows:
- (A) 0.71 for Biology;
  - (B) 0.88 for ELPS;
  - (C) 1.01 for English I;
  - (D) 0.68 for U.S. History;
  - (E) 0.43 for Algebra II;
  - (F) 0.42 for Geometry; and
  - (G) 0.58 for Physical Science.
- (6) " $b_{IMP}$ " means the value used to estimate the effect, as determined by



analysis of empirical data, of the school's average math proficiency on the predicted average EOC test score. The values for  $b_{IMP}$  shall be as follows:

- (A) 0.88 for Algebra I;
  - (B) 0.318 for Biology;
  - (C) 0.88 for ELPS;
  - (D) 0.15 for U.S. History;
  - (E) 0.39 for Geometry;
  - (F) 0.34 for Physical Science; and
  - (G) 0.58 for Physics.
- (7) " $b_{IAP}$ " means the value used to estimate the effect of the school's average Algebra I proficiency on the predicted average EOC test score. The values for  $b_{IAP}$  shall be as follows:
- (A) 0.89 for Algebra II;
  - (B) 0.18 for Chemistry; and
  - (C) 0.43 for Geometry.
- (8) " $b_{IBP}$ " means the value used to estimate the effect of the school's average Biology proficiency on the predicted average EOC test score. The values for  $b_{IBP}$  shall be 0.51 for Chemistry and 0.66 for Physics.
- (9) " $b_{IEP}$ " means the value used to estimate the effect of the school's average English I proficiency on the predicted average EOC test score. The values for  $b_{IEP}$  shall be 0.27 for Chemistry and 0.32 for Physics.
- (10) "Compliance commission" means that group of persons selected by the SBE to advise the SBE on testing and other issues related to school accountability and improvement. The commission shall be composed of teachers, principals, central office staff representatives, local school board representatives, charter schools, and at-large members who represent parents, business, and the community.
- (11) "Composite score means a summary of student performance in a school. A composite score shall include reading, writing, and mathematics in grades 3 through 8 and in Algebra I & II, Biology, ELPS, English I, Geometry, Chemistry, Physics, Physical Science, and U.S. History in a school where one or more of these EOC tests are administered, as well as student performance on the NC Computer Skills Test, competency passing rate, dropout rates, and percent diploma recipients who satisfy the requirements for College Prep/College Tech Prep courses of study in grades 9 through 12 to the extent that any apply in a given school.
- (12) "Eligible students" means the total number of students in membership minus the number of students excluded from participation in a statewide assessment.
- (13) "Expected growth" means the amount of growth in student performance that is projected through use of the regression formula in grades 3 through 8 and grade 10 in reading and mathematics.
- (14) "Exemplary growth" means the amount of growth in student performance in grades 3 through 8 and grade 10 in reading and mathematics that is projected through use of the regression formula that includes the state average rate of growth adjusted by an additional ten percent (10%).
- (15) "Growth standards" means and includes collectively all the factors defined

in this paragraph that are used in the calculations described in paragraph (j) of this Rule to determine a school's growth/gain composite.

- (16) "IRM" is the index for regression to the mean used in the regression formula. The SBE shall compute the IRM for reading by subtracting the North Carolina average reading scale score from the local school average reading scale score. The SBE shall compute the IRM for mathematics by subtracting the North Carolina average mathematics scale score from the local school average mathematics scale score. The SBE shall base the state average (the baseline) on data from the 1994-95 school year.
- (17) "ITP" is the index for true proficiency used in the regression formula. The SBE shall compute the ITP by adding the North Carolina average scale scores in reading and mathematics and subtracting that sum from the addition of the local school average scale scores in reading and mathematics. The SBE shall base the state average (the baseline) on data from the 1994-95 school year.
- (18) "IRP" is the index of reading proficiency used in the prediction formula. The SBE shall compute the "IRP" by calculating the average reading scale score for students in the school and subtracting the average reading scale score for North Carolina schools. The SBE shall base the state average for North Carolina schools (the baseline) on data from the 1998-99 school year.
- (19) "IMP" is the index of mathematics proficiency used in the prediction formula. The SBE shall compute the "IMP" by calculating the average mathematics scale score for students in the school and subtracting the average mathematics scale score for North Carolina schools. The SBE shall base the state average for North Carolina schools (the baseline) on data from the 1998-99 school year.
- (20) "IAP" is the index of Algebra I proficiency used in the prediction formula. The SBE shall compute the "IAP" by calculating the average Algebra I scale score for students in the school and subtracting the average Algebra I scale score for North Carolina schools. The SBE shall base the state average for North Carolina schools (the baseline) on data from the 1998-99 school year.
- (21) "IBP" is the index of Biology proficiency used in the prediction formula. The SBE shall compute the "IBP" by calculating the average Biology scale score for students in the school and subtracting the average Biology scale score for North Carolina schools. The SBE shall base the state average for North Carolina schools (the baseline) on data from the 1998-99 school year.
- (22) "IEP" is the index of English I proficiency used in the prediction formula. The SBE shall compute the "IEP" by calculating the average English I scale score for students in the school and subtracting the average English I scale score for North Carolina schools. The SBE shall base the state average for North Carolina schools (the baseline) on data from the 1998-99 school year.
- (23) "Performance Composite" is the percent of scores of students in a school that are at or above Level III, are at a passing level on the Computer Skills

Test (students in eighth grade only) as specified by 16 NCAC 6D .0503(c), and at proficiency level or above on the Alternate Assessment Portfolio to the extent that any apply in a given school. The SBE shall:

- (A) determine the number of scores that are at Level III or IV in reading, mathematics, or writing across grades 3 through 8, or on all EOC tests administered as a part of the statewide testing program; add the number of scores that are at a passing level on the NC Computer Skills Test (students in eighth grade only); add the number of scores that are proficient or above on the Alternate Assessment Portfolio; and use the total of these numbers as the numerator;
  - (B) determine the number of student scores in reading, mathematics, or writing, across grades 3 through 8; or on all EOC tests administered as part of the statewide testing program; add the number of student scores on the N.C. Computer Skills Test (students in eighth grade only); add the number of student scores on the Alternate Assessment Portfolio; and use the total of these numbers as the denominator; and
  - (C) total the numerators for each content area and subject, total the denominators for each content area and subject, and divide the denominator into the numerator to compute the performance composite.
- (24) "Predicted EOC mean" is the average student performance in a school on an EOC test that is projected through the use of the prediction formula.
  - (25) "Predicted EOC exemplary mean" is the average student performance in a school on an EOC test that is projected through the use of the prediction formula that includes the state average adjusted by an additional five percent (5%).
  - (26) "Prediction formula" means a regression formula used in predicting a school's EOC test mean for one school year.
  - (27) "Regression formula" means a formula that defines one variable in terms of one or more other variables for the purpose of making a prediction or constructing a model.
  - (28) "Standard deviation" is a statistic that indicates how much a set of scores vary. Standard deviation baseline values used for the growth standards are as follow:
    - (A) for reading in grades K-8:
      - (i) 1.7 for grade 3;
      - (ii) 1.3 for grade 4;
      - (iii) 1.2 for grade 5;
      - (iv) 1.3 for grade 6;
      - (v) 1.1 for grade 7;
      - (vi) 1.2 for grade 8; and
      - (vii) 1.6 for grade 10.
    - (B) for mathematics in grades K-8:
      - (i) 2.6 for grade 3;
      - (ii) 2.1 for grade 4;

- (iii) 2.0 for grade 5;
  - (iv) 2.1 for grade 6;
  - (v) 2.0 for grade 7;
  - (vi) 1.7 for grade 8; and
  - (vii) 2.0 for grade 10.
- (C) for courses with an EOC test:
- (i) 3.3 for Algebra I;
  - (ii) 2.6 for Biology;
  - (iii) 3.1 for ELPS;
  - (iv) 1.8 for English I;
  - (v) 2.2 for U.S. History;
  - (vi) 2.9 for Algebra II;
  - (vii) 2.5 for Chemistry;
  - (viii) 2.5 for Geometry;
  - (ix) 2.5 for Physical Science;
  - (x) 3.3 for Physics;
  - (xi) 10.0 for College Prep/College Tech Prep (CP/CTP);
  - (xii) 12.8 for Competency Passing Rate; and
  - (xiii) Dropout Rate will be determined based upon data from the 2000-01 school year.
- (29) "Weight" means the number of students used in the calculation of the amount of growth/gain for a subject or content area.
- (b) In carrying out its duty under G.S. 115C-105.35 to establish annual performance goals for each school, the SBE shall use both growth standards and performance standards.
- (1) The SBE shall calculate the expected growth rate for grades 3 through 8 and grade 10 in an individual school by using the regression formula "Expected Growth =  $b_0 + (b_1 \times \text{ITP}) + (b_2 \times \text{IRM})$ ."
  - (2) The SBE shall calculate the predicted EOC expected mean for courses in which end-of-course tests are administered by using the prediction formulas that follow.
    - (A) "Predicted Algebra I Mean Score =  $b_0 + (b_{\text{IMP}} \times \text{IMP})$ ," where  $(b_{\text{IMP}} \times \text{IMP})$  is the impact of Mathematics Proficiency.
    - (B) "Predicted Biology Mean Score =  $b_0 + (b_{\text{IRP}} \times \text{IRP}) + (b_{\text{IMP}} \times \text{IMP}) + (b_{\text{IMP}}^2 \times \text{IMP}^2) + (b_{\text{IMP}}^3 \times \text{IMP}^3)$ ," where  $(b_{\text{IRP}} \times \text{IRP})$  is the impact of Reading Proficiency and  $(b_{\text{IMP}} \times \text{IMP})$  is the impact of Mathematics Proficiency.
    - (C) "Predicted ELPS Mean Score =  $b_0 + (b_{\text{IRP}} \times \text{IRP})$ ," where  $(b_{\text{IRP}} \times \text{IRP})$  is the impact of Reading Proficiency.
    - (D) "Predicted English I Mean Score =  $b_0 + (b_{\text{IRP}} \times \text{IRP})$ ," where  $(b_{\text{IRP}} \times \text{IRP})$  is the impact of Reading Proficiency.
    - (E) "Predicted U.S. History Mean Score =  $b_0 + (b_{\text{IRP}} \times \text{IRP}) + (b_{\text{IMP}} \times \text{IMP}) + (b_{\text{IMP}}^2 \times \text{IMP}^2)$ ," where  $(b_{\text{IRP}} \times \text{IRP})$  is the impact of Reading Proficiency and  $(b_{\text{IMP}} \times \text{IMP})$  is the impact of Mathematics Proficiency.
    - (F) "Predicted Algebra II Mean Score =  $b_0 + (b_{\text{IRP}} \times \text{IRP}) + (b_{\text{IAP}} \times \text{IAP})$ ," where  $(b_{\text{IRP}} \times \text{IRP})$  is the impact of Reading Proficiency and

- (b<sub>IAP</sub> x IAP) is the impact of Algebra Proficiency.
- (G) "Predicted Chemistry Mean Score =  $b_0 + (b_{IAP} \times IAP) + (b_{IBP} \times IBP) + (b_{IEP} \times IEP)$ ," where (b<sub>IAP</sub> x IAP) is the impact of Algebra Proficiency, (b<sub>IBP</sub> x IBP) is the impact of Biology Proficiency, and (b<sub>IEP</sub> x IEP) is the impact of English I Proficiency.
  - (H) "Predicted Geometry Mean Score =  $b_0 + (b_{IRP} \times IRP) + (b_{IMP} \times IMP) + (b_{IAP} \times IAP)$ ," where (b<sub>IRP</sub> x IRP) is the impact of Reading Proficiency, (b<sub>IMP</sub> x IMP) is the impact of Mathematics Proficiency, and (b<sub>IAP</sub> x IAP) is the impact of Algebra I Proficiency.
  - (I) "Predicted Physical Science Mean Score =  $b_0 + (b_{IRP} \times IRP) + (b_{IMP} \times IMP)$ ," where (b<sub>IRP</sub> x IRP) is the impact of Reading Proficiency and (b<sub>IMP</sub> x IMP) is the impact of Mathematics Proficiency.
  - (J) "Predicted Physics Mean Score =  $b_0 + (b_{IMP} \times IMP) + (b_{IBP} \times IBP) + (b_{IEP} \times IEP)$ ," where (b<sub>IMP</sub> x IMP) is the impact of Mathematics Proficiency, (b<sub>IBP</sub> x IBP) is the impact of Biology Proficiency, and (b<sub>IEP</sub> x IEP) is the impact of English I Proficiency.
- (c) Schools shall be accountable for student performance and achievement. This paragraph describes the conditions under which an eligible student's scores shall be included in the accountability measures for the school that the student attended at the time of testing.
- (1) To be included in accountability measures for the growth standard, a student in grade three through grade eight must:
    - (A) have a pre-test score and a post-test score in reading and mathematics. For students in grade three the pre-test score refers to the score from the third-grade end-of-grade test administered in the Fall of the third grade and the post-test score refers to the score from the end-of-grade test administered in the Spring of the third grade. For students in grades four through eight, the pre-test score refers to the score from the previous year's end-of-grade test and the post-test score refers to the score from the current year's end-of-grade test and
    - (B) have been in membership more than one-half of the instructional period (91 of 180 days).
  - (2) To be included in accountability measures for Algebra I, Algebra II, Biology, Chemistry, Economic Legal and Political Systems, English I, Geometry, Physical Science, Physics, or U.S. History, a student must have scores for all tests used in the prediction formula.
  - (3) Students shall be included in the performance composite without reference to pretest scores or length of membership.
- (d) The SBE shall include in the accountability system on the same basis as all other public schools each alternative school with an identification number assigned by the Department. Test scores for students who attend programs or classes in a facility that does not have a separate school number shall be reported to and included in the students' home schools.
- (e) Each K-8 school shall test at least 98 percent of its eligible students. If a school

fails to test at least 98 percent of its eligible students for two consecutive school years, the SBE may designate the school as low performing and may target the school for assistance and intervention. Each school shall make public the percent of eligible students that the school tests.

- (f) High schools shall test at least 95 percent of enrolled students who are subject to EOC tests. High schools that test fewer than 95 percent of enrolled students for two consecutive years may be designated as low-performing by the SBE.
- (g) All students who are following the standard course of study and who are not eligible for exclusion as set out in paragraph (h) of this Rule shall take the SBE-adopted tests. Every student, including those students who are excluded from testing, shall complete or have completed by a school employee designated by the principal an answer document (except in writing). The answer sheet for an excluded student shall contain only student identification information and the reason the student was excluded. Both the school and the LEA shall maintain records on the exclusions of students from testing. The Department may audit these records.
- (h) Individual students may be excluded from SBE-adopted tests as follows:
  - (1) Limited English proficient students may be excluded for one year beginning with the time of enrollment in the LEA if the student's English language proficiency has been assessed as novice/low to intermediate/low in listening, reading, and writing. A student whose English language proficiency has been assessed as intermediate/high or advanced may be excluded from tests in which the student writes responses for up to two years. Twelve months after a limited English proficient student has enrolled in the LEA, the student must be reassessed on the same language proficiency test that was used as a part of the identification of the student for inclusion in the limited English proficiency program in that LEA. A student assessed as novice/low to intermediate/low after 12 months may be excluded for an additional 12 months. A student assessed as intermediate/high or above must participate in the state testing program. After two years from the time of initial enrollment in the LEA, all limited English proficiency students must participate in the state testing program. LEAs shall report results of the initial language proficiency test and the results on the same test 12 months after enrollment in the LEA to the Department. LEAs shall use other assessment methods for excluded students to demonstrate that these students are progressing in other subject areas.
  - (2) All students with disabilities including those identified under Section 504 shall be included in the statewide testing program through the use of state tests with appropriate accommodations or through the use of other state assessments designed for these students. The student's IEP team shall determine whether a testing accommodation is appropriate for that student's disability or whether the student should be assessed using another state assessment designed for that student's disability.
- (i) Students in grades 3-8 with IEPs and serious cognitive deficits and whose program of study focuses on functional/life skills shall participate in the North Carolina Alternate Assessment Portfolio as an alternative.

- (j) The SBE shall calculate a school's expected growth/gain composite in student performance using the following process:
- (1) Review expected and exemplary growth standards for all grades and subjects, and review the predicted EOC mean for expected standard gain and the exemplary standard gain for EOC courses.
  - (2) Determine the actual growth in reading and mathematics at each grade level included in the state testing program, using data on groups of students identified by paragraph (c)(1) of this Rule and determine the actual EOC mean for EOC tests using data on the groups of students identified by paragraph (c)(2) of this Rule from one point in time to another point in time.
  - (3) Subtract the expected growth from the actual growth in reading and mathematics at grades 3 through 8 and grade 10; then subtract the predicted EOC mean from the actual EOC mean for EOC tests.
  - (4) Divide the differences for reading and mathematics by the standard deviations of the respective differences in growth/gain at each grade level and for each EOC to determine the standard growth score.
  - (5) The SBE shall calculate a school's gain composite in college prep/college tech prep using the following process:
    - (A) Compute the percent of graduates who receive diplomas who completed either course of study in the current accountability year. Students shall be counted only once if they complete more than one course of study.
    - (B) Find the baseline, which is the average of the two prior school years' percent of graduates who received diplomas and who completed a course of study.
    - (C) Subtract the baseline from the current year's percentage.
    - (D) Subtract 0.1, unless the percentages are both 100. If both percentages are 100, the gain is zero.
    - (E) Divide by the associated standard deviation. The result is the standard gain for college prep/college tech prep.
  - (6) The SBE shall calculate a school's expected gain composite in the competency passing rate by comparing the grade 10 competency passing rate to the grade 8 passing rate for the group of students in grade 10 who also took the 8<sup>th</sup>-grade end-of-grade test.
    - (A) Subtract the grade 8 rate from the grade 10 rate.
    - (B) Subtract 0.1.
    - (C) Divide by the standard deviation. The result is the standard gain in competency passing rate.
  - (7) Multiply the expected standard growth scores for reading and mathematics at each grade level from grade 3 to 8, EOC prediction, gain in competency passing rate, gain in college prep/college tech prep, and change in dropout rate by the respective weight for each, as they may apply in a given school. These values shall be summed and divided by the sum of all the weights. If the resulting number is zero or above, the school has made the expected growth standard.
  - (8) The SBE shall compute exemplary growth using the exemplary growth

standard ( $b_o \times 1.10$ ) in the accountability formula for grades 3 through 8 in reading and mathematics, and ( $b_o \times 1.03$ ) for predicted EOC means. There is no exemplary standard for competency passing rate or college prep/college tech prep gain.

- (9) To determine the composite score for exemplary standards:
- (A) Subtract the exemplary growth/gain from the actual growth/gain standard in reading and mathematics at grades 3 through 8; subtract the predicted exemplary EOC mean from the actual EOC mean for each EOC test.
  - (B) Divide the difference in growth/gain by the standard deviations of the respective differences in growth/gain to determine the standard growth/gain score.
  - (C) Multiply the exemplary standard growth/gain scores for reading and mathematics at each grade level from grade 3 to 8, EOC gain, expected standard gain in Competency Passing Rate, Dropout Rate, and for College Prep/College Tech Prep by the respective weight for each, as they may apply in a given school. These values shall be summed and divided by the sum of all the weights. If the resulting number is zero or above, the school has met the exemplary growth standard.
- (k) If school officials believe that the school's growth standards were unreasonable due to specific, compelling reasons, the school may appeal its growth standards to the SBE. The SBE shall appoint an appeals committee composed of a panel selected from the compliance commission to review written appeals from schools. The school officials must clearly document the circumstances that made the goals unrealistic and must submit its appeal to the SBE within 30 days of receipt of notice from the Department of the school's performance. The appeals committee shall review all appeals and shall make recommendations to the SBE. The SBE shall make the final decision on the reasonableness of the growth goals.

History Note: Authority G.S. 115C-12(9)c4.;  
Eff. January 1, 1998;  
Amended Eff. April 1, 2002; September 1, 2001; December 1, 2000;  
Temporary Amendment Eff. March 5, 2001.



## **II. Report on Assistance Teams**

## Status of Personnel in Systems Receiving Mandatory Assistance 2002 - 2003

### Status of Superintendents of School Systems Having More than Half of Their School Identified as Low Performing

The ABCs legislation in G.S. 115 C-105.32 permits the State Board to appoint an interim superintendent in a local school administrative unit when more than half of the schools have been identified as low performing schools. Low-performing schools are those that have not met the minimum growth standards defined by the State Board and a majority of students are performing below grade level.

The results of the ABCs of Public Education for 2002-03 did not show any school systems as having more than half of their schools identified as low performing. Therefore, State Board action was not required.

### 155C-333. Evaluation of Certified Employees including Certain Superintendents; Action Plans; State Board Notification Upon Dismissal of Employees.

Local Board Evaluation of Certain Superintendents: Each year the local board of education shall evaluate the superintendent employed by the local school administrative unit and report to the State Board the results of that evaluation if during that year the State Board designated as low-performing:

- (1) **One or more** schools in a local school administrative unit that has no more than *10 schools*.
- (2) **Two or more** schools in a local school administrative unit that has no more than *20 schools*
- (3) **Three or more** schools in a local school administrative unit that has more than *20 schools*.

LEA	Criteria From Above	Total Number of Schools	Number of Low-Performing Schools
Hertford County	1	5	1
Weldon City	1	4	1
Vance County	2	15	1
Halifax County	2	15	1
Northampton	1	10	1

## Status of Principals of Schools Receiving Mandatory Assistance in 2002 - 2003

The General Assembly revised the ABCs legislation to require local boards and superintendents to take the first actions regarding principals located in low-performing schools. The revision provides four options for superintendents to consider in dealing with principals who are in low-performing schools:

1. Retain in the same position, if principal was in the school two years or less before it was identified as low performing;
2. Retain with a remediation plan;
3. Transfer; or
4. Demote or dismiss according to G.S. 115C-325.

LEA	School	Retained: has less than two years at the school	Retained with remediation plan: has more than two years at the school	Transferred	Demoted or Dismissed	Resigned Or Retired
Halifax	Southeast High School		x			
Weldon City	Weldon High School	x				
Hertford	Hertford County High School					x
Northampton	Northampton High-West	x				
Vance	Northern Vance High			x		

## Composition and Activities of Assistance Teams

Background: For the sixth year (2002-2003) of the assistance teams, members were selected to replace team turnover. There were a total of 69 team members, down from 80 members last year. The teacher shortage caused a decrease in the number of applications received.

Composition: Assistance teams were composed of practicing principals, assistant principals, classroom teachers and central office supervisors on leave from local education agencies (LEAs) and retired educators.

Profile:

Average of 24 years of educational experience
77% Advanced Degrees
19% Work in advanced degree underway

Race Ethnicity:

13	White Males
8	African-American Males
26	White Females
22	African-American Females

Retention: During the 2002-03 school year, 16 team members returned to their home school systems or accepted other positions. Team members who returned to LEAs were usually placed in leadership roles where they have a positive impact on student achievement and teacher performance. Thirty mandated assistance team members served five (5) high schools. The remaining 39 members provided voluntary assistance in high priority elementary schools (as defined by the General Assembly). All 37 high priority schools were offered assistance.

## Major Activities in Low-Performing Schools

Low Performing Schools: As a minimum, assistance teams

- conducted an entry conferences with superintendents and principal or interim school leader at assigned school.
- conducted a needs assessment to identify school strengths and areas needing improvement.
- evaluated certified personnel, including principals.
- developed recommendations for improvement based on results of needs assessment.
- revised the to School Improvement Plan, as needed.
- developed and implement strategies, time lines and persons responsible for implementation of improvement strategies.
- assisted the school in implementing the revised School Improvement Plan.
- monitored and assessed progress frequently.

- prepared a formal needs assessment report, submitted monthly progress reports and developed an annual report summarizing accomplishments and continuing needs.

Continually Low-Performing Schools (CLPs) - Level I: In addition to the services above, assistance teams provided the additional services to CLPs:

- collaboratively developed a budget plan for the use of the additional funds allotted to CLPs. Collaborating group includes assistance team members, school improvement team members and central office staff members).
- monitored the implementation of the budget plan after its approval.
- met quarterly with the collaborative group (central office staff, school improvement team, school administrative team and assistance team) to trouble shoot, problem solve, and share concerns and successes.
- made recommendations for continuing progress and growth during the next school year (2003-2004).

Continually Low-Performing Schools (CLPs) – Level II: Schools that are continually low performing for the second year receive additional services and sanctions as described below.

- continued strategies adopted by the State Board of Education for Continually Low-Performing Schools- Level I.
- provided additional strategies for Level II as outlined below:
  - ✓ conducted External Review Committee on-site visits,
  - ✓ offered public school transfer option through a letter of notification to parents, and
  - ✓ reviewed district budget with special emphasis on local expenditures.
- made recommendations for the next school year (2003-2004).

**Mandated Assistance for 2002-2003**  
**Assistance Team Assignments**  
**9 – 12 Schools**

<b>LEA</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>Team Leader</b>	<b>Team Reviewers</b>	<b>Division of School Improvement</b>
Halifax	Southeast High School	Brock Ridge	Donyea Daniels Michele Halley Marylin Newkirk Brenda Parsons Betty Jo Rogers Jennifer Smith	Marilyn Palmer, Section Chief and Liaison
Hertford	Hertford County High School	Sheneel Branch	Jeraldine Brooks Allen Conway Ana Cuomo Melinda Harris Earnestine McNeil Karen Rodman	Debora Sydnor, Section Chief  Gary Miller, Liaison & Math support
Northampton	Northampton High-West School	Doyle Brinson	Shirley Allen Richard Caldwell Lisa Jefferys Kathy Lewis Linda Phillips	Marilyn Palmer, Section Chief  Carol White, Liaison
Vance	Northern Vance High School	Linda Mabe	Judy Craver Martha McLeod Kim Shropshire Joel Simpson Jane Teague Betty Jo Slozak	Charlotte Hughes, Section Chief Gladys Logan, Liaison
Weldon City	Weldon High School	Charles Johnson	Sally Arthur Carolyn Cooper Robert Kepner Joyce Williams Linda Wooten	Marilyn Palmer, Section Chief and Liaison

## Team Activities

September 23 - 27, 2002	Teams conducted entry conferences with superintendents, principals and school staffs.
September 30 – June 30, 2003	Team members are sharing information to build a greater understanding of the ABCs and the specific responsibilities of the team, working with assigned schools to conduct a needs assessment which includes observation of all certified personnel, continuing to build trust and integrate the staff into their efforts and providing professional development (demonstration lessons, team teaching, workshops and training sessions, “walkthrough visits,” building parental involvement and effective use of instructional time.

## Progress Reports and Debriefing

October 2002	Regional meetings scheduled with team members and with collaborative groups to debrief, problem-solve, share experiences and provide information.
November-Dec. 2002	Regional meetings scheduled with collaborative groups to debrief, problem-solve, share experiences and provide information
December 13, 2002	First full-team sharing session with the Division of School Improvement staff
December 5, 2002	Needs Assessment Report submitted to Director of School Improvement
February 2003	Regional meetings scheduled with collaborative groups to debrief, problem-solve, share experiences and provide information
March 14, 2003	Second full-team sharing session with School Improvement Division staff
Mid-May 2003	Regional meetings scheduled with collaborative groups to debrief, problem-solve, share experiences and provide information
June 13, 2003	Third full-team sharing session with School Improvement Division staff

## Support and Visitations

---

- September 2002-June 2003 Team liaisons and section chiefs visited with teas as often as necessary. Team leaders stayed in contact with Agency personnel through phone conversations, faxed messages and e-mail almost daily.
- September 2002-June 2003 Director of the Division of School Improvement held team leaders' meetings on a bimonthly basis. Sharing days for all members were held on a quarterly basis.
- September 2002 –June 2003 Director and assistant director made periodic visits throughout the year.



## Summary Remarks

The teams were received extremely well during 2002-03. Team members were focused and task oriented. In their full-team meetings and regional meetings, they shared experiences and concerns with members of the School Improvement Division. They received ongoing support and guidance from the School Improvement staff. The 2002-03 school year was a unique year for the assistance teams as only high schools (5) were designated as low-performing and assigned an assistance team. Team members with K-8 expertise provided assistance to high priority elementary schools. The teams also entered their assigned schools 1½ months later than usual because of the late release of the ABCs results. Therefore, service time preceding the next testing period was somewhat reduced in high schools having the block schedule. For the first time, the teams were serving a *continually low performing school - Level II*. This group was composed of schools that had received assistance in the past and were low performing three consecutive years out of the last four years or had been low-performing three out of the recent four years. Despite these hindrances, **all schools receiving assistance from assistance teams met or exceeded their growth expectations.**

### Performance Record of Schools Assigned State Mandated Assistance Teams

School Year	Exemplary Growth	Expected Growth	No Recognition	Low-Performing	Total Schools Served
1997-98	13	1	1	0	15
1998-99	7	2	0	2	11
1999-00	5	0	0	2	7
2000-01	5	4	3	2	14
2001-02	High growth - 2	7		4	13
2001-02	1	4	0	0	5
2002-03	High Growth - 10	6	0	0	16

During the past six years of service provided by the State Assistance Teams, eleven schools have required more than one year of having a team to overcome low-performing status.

### Schools Eligible for Voluntary Assistance – 2002 – 2003

Voluntary assistance was provided to the high priority elementary schools and Title I Schools in school improvement that accepted the services. High priority schools were first identified in 1999-2000 and are schools with 80% or more of their students on free or reduced lunch rates and 55% or less performing on grade level.

## High Priority Schools

	LEA	School	Grade Span	Performance Composite 2001-02	Performance Composite 2002-03
1.	Anson	Wadesboro Primary	K-3	45.2	61.3
2.	Bertie	Windsor Elementary	K-5	55.7	77.2
3.	Cumberland	Pauline Jones Elementary	PK-5	53.5	68.3
4.	Cumberland	Teresa Berrien Elementary	PK-5	55.2	66.2
5.	Forsyth	Cook Elementary	PK-5	44.7	67.9
6.	Forsyth	Forest Park Elementary	PK-5	54.9	64.3
7.	Guilford	Fairview Elementary	PK-5	54.2	72.5
8.	Hertford	Riverview Elementary	PK-5	56.7	73.3
9.	Northampton	Rich Square-Creecy	PK-5	67.5	73.8
10.	Robeson	West Lumberton Elementary	PK-4	84.0	86.1

## Title I Schools In School Improvement

	LEA	School	Grade Span	Performance Composite 2001-02	Performance Composite 2002-03
1.	Halifax	Northwest Halifax High	9-12	40.9	*
2.	Wayne	Goldsboro High School	9-12	45.1	52.8

\*Services were discontinued in February 2003.

## Activities

September 12, 2002	Superintendents and principals notified that high priority elementary schools are eligible to receive voluntary assistance
September 18, 2002	Response to the offer of voluntary assistance received
September 20, 2002	Orientation session conducted
September 2002	Voluntary services began
September 2002 –June 2003	Ongoing assistance and support provided to schools accepting assistance.

## Support and Visitation

---

September 2002-June 2003 Assistance team members, school improvement consultants and section chiefs received ongoing support and guidance from section chiefs, the assistant director and director of School Improvement.

## Summary Remarks

Voluntary assistance went well. The Division of School Improvement served high priority elementary schools, Title I Schools in school improvement and Title I Schools on Watch with the assistance of education consultants in the School improvement Division. As time permitted and staff were available, other schools were assisted as requested. In some cases, school principals thought that “voluntary” meant they could decide if they wanted to implement services recommended by the team. Through conferences with these principal and explanations to school improvement teams, the understanding of “voluntary” was clarified. The term “voluntary” simply means it was the choice of the school as to whether or not they accepted services. Once the school opted to receive services, the operations of the team were the same as in mandated assistance, with the exception of teacher evaluations. Teams in voluntary assistance did not do formal teacher evaluations but conducted “walk throughs” and informal observations to determine how to best assist individual teachers and the school as a whole. Feedback on informal observations was provided to the teachers and to the principal.

## ABCs Assistance Team Training

Topics and Subtopics: The team members work with local, state, national and international educational trainers and leaders.

### 1. The ABCs Plan

- Context Setting and Training Goals
- Local Participation, Local Flexibility, and School-Based Accountability
- Improving Low Performing Schools
- Issues, Questions and Concerns

### 2. Building a High-Performance Team

- What Comprises a Team
- High performance Teams
- Roles/Responsibilities of Assistance Teams
- Working as a Team
- Team Mission and Code of Conduct
- Issues, Questions and Concerns

### 3. Effective Schools

- How the Correlates Inform and Assist the Team's Work
- Excellence Without Excuses
- Using Effective School Correlates as a Way to Structure Intervention
- Case Studies of Effective Schools in High Poverty Areas
- Issues, Questions, and Concerns

### 4. School Improvement Plans

- Components of Plans
- Development of Plans (process)
- Developing Plans for Elementary and Middle Schools
- Implementing School Improvement Plans

### 5. Effective Curriculum and Instruction Programming

- The Non-Negotiable: The Standard Course of Study
- Aligning the Curriculum in Reading
- Aligning the Curriculum in Writing
- Reading/Writing Across the Curriculum
- Teaching Mathematics in Elementary, Middle and High Schools
- Teaching Reading and Writing in Elementary and Middle Schools
- Teaching English in High School
- Coaching, Mentoring and Conferencing
- Service Models
- Managing Classrooms
- Recognizing and Respecting Cultural Differences

6. Team-School Relations and Home-School Relations
  - Teams Entering Schools
  - Teams Working with Schools: Case Study
  - Strategies for Involving Parents/Families
  - Facilitating Positive Home-School Relations
7. Personnel Evaluations
  - Purpose and Use of the Principals Revised Evaluation Program
  - Purpose and Use of the Teacher Performance Appraisal Instrument (TPAI)
  - TPAI Use (24 hours of training)
  - Evaluating Support Personnel
  - Evaluating the Media Center Collection
8. Needs Assessment
  - Overview of Needs Assessment
  - Conducting a Needs Assessment
  - Interpreting, Using and Reporting Data
9. Student Supports and Staff Development
  - Student Support Activities
  - Student Support Programming
  - School Improvement Plans and Staff Development: Matching Needs
  - Planning and Implementation
10. Building Teams
  - Team Relationships
  - Team Relationships with Schools
  - Team Work: Case Studies
  - Team Presentations
11. Communicating with the School Community
  - Reporting Results to the Local Board and Communities
  - Group Case Study Presentation

Additional Topics Addressed in Training During July: Presenters were members of the DPI staff and staff from other organizations.

- Student Accountability Standards
- ABCs Law/
- Critical Issues for Team Members
- Conducting Entry Conferences
- Conducting a Needs Assessment
- Mediation and Facilitation Training
- Instructional Profile
- Science Update K-12
- ESL Issues
- CRISS Training
- True Colors
- Team Leader Responsibilities
- English Language Arts Update K-12
- TPAI-Revised
- Language Acquisition/ESL Strategies
- Team Responsibility
- High Expectations
- Review of Skill Packets
- Workshop Facilitation
- K- 2 Assessment
- Testing Update/Issues
- Teams in Action
- Exceptional Children's Issues
- Principal Performance Appraisal
- PPA System Revised
- Evaluation of Team Members
- Affirming Diversity
- Mentoring
- Blending Educational Strategies and Educational Technology

### **III. Response to Excellent Schools Act Requirements**

## **Response to Excellent Schools Act Requirements Certified Staff Testing Under the Excellent Schools Act**

Senate Bill 1126, ratified in May 1998, amended the teacher competency testing provisions of the Excellent Schools Act to ensure that only teachers were tested whose unsatisfactory performance was judged in whole or part due to lack of general knowledge. While no teachers were identified for testing at the end of the 1997-98 school year under this provision, the State Board of Education approved the use of the *Florida College Level Academic Skills Test* (CLAST) to assess the general knowledge of certified staff subject to testing. In the Summer of 1998, standard-setting procedures were conducted, and in the Fall of 1998 the State Board of Education set "passing" scores for the reading and writing portions of this test.

**For 2002-03, there were no teachers recommended by the assistance teams or by principals in low-performing schools that were not served by assistance teams to take the General Knowledge Test.** A variety of resources were made available to assist teachers in low-performing schools. The State Board of Education allocated funds appropriated by the General Assembly to continually low-performing schools and high priority schools. These funds were in addition to support provided by the assistance teams. The UNC Center for School Leadership Development agreed to provide remediation assistance requested for teachers in low-performing schools as the need arose. The low-performing schools were also served by assistance teams. Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration (CSRD) Grants provided financial support to about 100 schools in the State.

The State Board of Education approved contracts with seven vendors (colleges, universities, public schools, SERVE, and the Principals' Executive Program) to develop evaluation instruments aligned with the new standards for professional educators adopted in May 1998. The instruments were piloted in 1999-2000 and were available for use by school systems beginning with the 2000-2001 school year. While the focus of the individual instruments vary, each included means of rating teaching performance. In the fall of 2001-2002, all systems were required to implement the new evaluation instruments(s) they adopted.



#### **IV. ABCs Recognition and Schedule of Recognition Activities**

## ABCs Recognition

Top schools around the State receive special recognition as part of the ABCs of Public Education. There are three levels of recognition in the student growth area and two levels of recognition for student performance. Because of the significant number of schools exceeding growth and reaching *School of Distinction* or *School of Excellence* status, recognition events will be conducted at the LEA level, unless an LEA has an unusual circumstance and requests an individual school visit. All K-12 schools that make significant growth are deemed high growth and receive a certificate of achievement. Certified employees in these schools also receive an incentive bonus. All K-12 schools meeting 100% of their student growth/gains standard are considered as having met expected growth/gain and receive a certificate.

For student performance, a School of Excellence is the designation for those schools where at least 90% of the students tested performed at or above grade level and the school made expected growth/gains (as a minimum). These schools will receive a banner to hang in the school and a certificate of achievement. Schools in which 80.0-89.9 percent of student scored at or above grade level are designated as Schools of Distinction. They receive a certificate and a plaque.

In November, December and January, the Chairman of the State Board of Education and/or the State Superintendent, Senior Leadership, or a State Board member will visit the designated schools/LEAs to present recognition banners. Teachers, parents, students, administrators and community leaders proudly participate in these local celebrations.

## Number and Percent of Public Schools in North Carolina Receiving Awards and Recognition, 1997-2003<sup>1</sup>

Category	1996-97 <sup>2</sup>		1997-98 <sup>3</sup>		1998-99 <sup>4</sup>		1999-00		2000-01		2001-02		2002-03	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Schools of Excellence	12	0.7	24	1.4	0	0.0	50	2.5	73	3.5	171	7.9	300	13.7
Schools of Distinction <sup>5</sup>	158	9.7	289	16.8	1	0.2	408	20.6	509	24.1	640	29.7	647	29.5
Schools Making High Growth <sup>6</sup>	531	32.5	1137	66.0	265	63.2	1156	58.2	956	45.2	521	24.1	779	35.5
Schools Making Expected Growth	395	24.2	308	17.9	83	19.8	456	23.0	520	24.6	769	35.6	863	39.3
Schools Not Making Expected Growth <sup>7</sup>	706	43.3	276	16.0	65	15.5	371	18.7	639	30.2	865	40.1	552	25.2
Low-Performing Schools	123	7.5	15	0.9	15	3.6	13	0.7	44	2.1	31	1.4	19	0.9
Made Expected or High Growth	926	56.7	1445	83.9	348	83.1	1612	81.2	1476	69.8	1290	59.7	1642	74.8
Total ABCs Schools <sup>8</sup>	1632		1722		419		1985		2115		2158		2194	

<sup>1</sup>ABCs results for 1996-97, 1997-98, 1998-99, 1999-00, 2000-01, 2001-02, and 2002-03 reflect State Board of Education actions through October 2, 1997, October 1, 1998, October 7, 1999, October 5, 2000, November 1, 2001, October 3, 2002, and September 10, 2003, respectively.

<sup>2</sup>The first year of implementation of the ABCs was in 1996-97; only K-8 schools were included in the model.

<sup>3</sup>The ABCs high school model was first implemented in 1997-98. (Schools whose grades spanned K-12 were included in statistical summaries for both K-8 and high schools, so there is duplication in these counts.)

<sup>4</sup>The comprehensive ABCs model has been applied since 1998-99; there is no duplication in these counts.

<sup>5</sup>Beginning in 2002, *Schools of Distinction* were required to make at least expected growth for the first time.

<sup>6</sup>*High Growth* was referred to as *Exemplary Growth* prior to 2002.

<sup>7</sup>*Schools Not Making Expected Growth* was included in two categories prior to 2002: *Schools Receiving No Recognition* and *Low Performing Schools*.

<sup>8</sup>*Total ABCs Schools* is the total number of schools participating in the ABCs for a given year; this total does not reflect the sum of the column; *Schools of Excellence*, *Schools of Distinction*, and *Low-Performing Schools* are not exclusive categories and may include schools that appear in other categories.

**Caution:** Comparisons across years should be made with the above footnotes in mind.

## LEA Codes

Refer to the chart below to locate school systems referenced by code when reading the lists of 2002-2003 *Most Improved Schools* *Growth and Performance Results 1998-2003* and 2002-2003 *Schools of Excellence, Growth and Performance Results*.

010	Alamance-Burlington	240	Columbus	480	Hyde	760	Randolph
020	Alexander	241	Whiteville City	490	Iredell-Statesville	761	Asheboro City
030	Alleghany	250	Craven	491	Mooresville City	770	Richmond
040	Anson	260	Cumberland	500	Jackson	780	Robeson
050	Ashe	270	Currituck	510	Johnston	790	Rockingham
060	Avery	280	Dare	520	Jones	800	Rowan-Salisbury
070	Beaufort	290	Davidson	530	Lee	810	Rutherford
080	Bertie	291	Lexington City	540	Lenoir	820	Sampson
090	Bladen	292	Thomasville City	550	Lincoln	830	Scotland
100	Brunswick	300	Davie	560	Macon	840	Stanly
110	Buncombe	310	Duplin	570	Madison	850	Stokes
111	Asheville City	320	Durham	580	Martin	860	Surry
120	Burke	330	Edgecombe	590	McDowell	861	Elkin City
130	Cabarrus	340	Winston-Salem/Forsyth	600	Mecklenburg	862	Mount Airy City
132	Kannapolis City	350	Franklin	610	Mitchell	870	Swain
140	Caldwell	360	Gaston	620	Montgomery	880	Transylvania
150	Camden	370	Gates	630	Moore	890	Tyrrell
160	Carteret	380	Graham	640	Nash-Rocky Mount	900	Union
170	Caswell	390	Granville	650	New Hanover	910	Vance
180	Catawba	400	Greene	660	Northampton	920	Wake
181	Hickory City	410	Guilford	670	Onslow	930	Warren
182	Newton Conover City	420	Halifax	680	Orange	940	Washington
190	Chatham	421	Roanoke Rapids City	690	Pamlico	950	Watauga
200	Cherokee	422	Weldon City	700	Elizabeth City/ Pasquotank	960	Wayne
210	Edenton-Chowan	430	Harnett	710	Pender	970	Wilkes
220	Clay	440	Haywood	720	Perquimans	980	Wilson
230	Cleveland	450	Henderson	730	Person	990	Yadkin
231	Kings Mountain City	460	Hertford	740	Pitt	995	Yancey
232	Shelby City	470	Hoke	750	Polk	679	Camp Lejeune (Federal)
						209	Cherokee Central (Federal)
						269	Fort Bragg (Federal)

**2002-2003 Most Improved Schools  
Growth and Performance 1998-99 through 2002-03**

School Code	Name	Grade Span	1998-99		1999-00		2000-01		2001-02		2002-03	
			Status	PC	Status	PC	Status	PC	Status	PC	Status	PC
020	308 ELLENDALE ELEM	OK-5	Exm Dst	80.8	Exm Dst	83.8	Exm Dst	87.8	Exc Hgh	92.0	Exc Hgh MI	93.0
040	308 ANSONVILLE ELEM	PK-6	Exm	75.0	NR	72.8	NR	73.2	NR	75.4	Dst Hgh MI	89.1
090	352 PLAIN VIEW PRI	PK-5	Exm MI	67.6	NR	58.0	NR	65.5	Pro Hgh	77.5	Dst Hgh MI	88.6
110	388 PISGAH ELEM	OK-5	Exm	74.7	Exm Dst	81.2	Exm Exc	90.0	Dst Hgh	87.5	Exc Hgh MI	92.6
120	356 MOUNTAIN VIEW EL	PK-5	NR	59.6	Exm MI	78.6	Exp Dst	86.8	Dst Hgh	86.1	Exc Hgh MI	90.7
16A	000 CAPE LOOKOUT HS	9 -12			Exm	41.5	Exp	46.0	Pri Exp	53.8	Pri Hgh MI	44.7
180	312 BANOAK ELEM	OK-6	Exm	72.7	NR	69.9	NR	76.4	NR	67.9	Dst Hgh MI	87.4
20A	000 THE LEARNING CT	OK-5	Exp	68.6	NR	57.8	NR	77.1	NR	71.8	Pro Hgh MI	72.2
231	304 BETHWARE ELEM	PK-4	Exm	77.8	Exm Dst	80.5	Exp Dst	83.3	Dst Hgh	85.7	Exc Hgh MI	93.0
231	316 EAST ELEM	OK-4	Exm Dst MI	85.6	Exm Exc MI	91.8	Exm Exc	94.5	Exc Hgh	91.6	Exc Hgh MI	93.9
32H	000 RESEARCH TRI CH	OK-7			LP	31.4	NR	49.1	Pro Hgh	72.4	Dst Hgh MI	80.6
330	328 N EDGEcombe MAG	9 -12	Exm	49.7	Exm	50.8	Exp	48.7	Pri Hgh MI	56.5	Pri Hgh MI	55.8
330	358 TARBORO HS	9 -12	Exm	57.3	Exm	57.6	Exm	59.4	Pro Hgh MI	66.5	Pro Hgh MI	68.5
34D	000 WOODSON SCH	OK-12	LP	38.6	Exp	44.8	NR	42.6	LP	39.3	Pro Hgh MI	64.3
34E	000 EAST WINSTON PR	OK-4	LP	3.30	Exp	20.8			Pro Hgh MI	76.8	Pro Hgh MI	76.6
360	308 ARLINGTON ELEM	PK-5	Exp	52.4	Exm	60.1	Exm Dst	81.2	Dst Hgh	89.4	Exc Hgh MI	93.7
360	484 RHYNE ELEM	PK-5	LP	44.2	NR	48.8	NR	59.5	Exc Hgh	96.0	Pro Hgh MI	79.3
360	520 WOODHILL ELEM	PK-5	Exp	45.1	LP	39.2	Exp	53.0	Pri	52.1	Pro Hgh MI	72.4
420	348 PITTMAN ELEM	PK-5	Exm Dst MI	84.3	Exm	77.0	Exm	79.4	NR		Exc Hgh MI	94.6
54A	000 CHILDREN'S ACAD	OK-6	Exm	55.1	NR	54.9	NR	47.0	Pri	48.6	Pro Hgh MI	60.2
550	342 NORTH BROOK EL	OK-5	Exm	73.4	Exm	77.3	Exm Dst	83.4	Exc Hgh	90.1	Dst Hgh MI	88.0
560	332 NANTAHALA SCH	OK-12	NR	73.6	Exm	79.9	NR	77.9	Pro Exp	78.8	Dst Hgh MI	84.5
560	332 NANTAHALA SCH	OK-12	NR	73.6	Exm	79.9	NR	77.9	Pro Exp	78.8	Dst Hgh MI	84.5
570	316 LAUREL ELEM	OK-5	Exm Dst MI	80.6	Exp	69.1	Exm Exc MI	92.0	NR	87.0	Exc Hgh MI	97.8
620	316 EAST MONTGOMERY	9 -12	Exm	43.6	Exp	47.2	Exp	50.3	Pri Exp	54.4	Pro Hgh MI	73.5
66A	000 GASTON COLLEGE	5 -6							Exc Hgh MI	91.8	Exc Hgh MI	99.6
770	318 FAIRVIEW HEIGHTS	OK-3	Exm	67.9	Exm	60.8	Exm	64.9	Dst Hgh MI	80.3	Dst Hgh MI	86.9
770	366 ROHANEN PRI	PK-3	Exm Dst	89.2	Exp	71.8	NR	51.1	Pro Hgh	78.5	Dst Hgh MI	87.0
780	325 FAIRMONT HS	9 -12	Exm	37.4	LP	40.6	Exp	47.3	Pro Hgh MI	62.9	Pro Hgh MI	71.1
780	328 GREEN GROVE EL	PK-3	Exm	76.1	Exm	66.0	Exm MI	72.6	Pro Hgh	68.2	Pro Hgh MI	79.5
780	344 MAGNOLIA ELEM	PK-8	NR	57.5	NR	60.2	NR	60.3	Pro Exp	64.2	Dst Hgh MI	86.5
780	356 OXENDINE ELEM	PK-6	Exm	71.7	Exm	66.3	NR	68.6	Pri	58.3	Dst Hgh MI	87.4
78A	000 CIS ACAD	6 -8	Exp	29.0	LP	26.0	Exm	39.0	Pri Exp	50.7	Pro Hgh MI	79.2
820	349 LAKEWOOD HS	9 -12	Exm MI	50.2	Exm MI	57.1	Exm	60.5	Pro Hgh MI	68.5	Pro Hgh MI	72.0
830	345 SCOTLAND ACCEL	PK-3									Dst Hgh MI	82.5
83B	000 LAURINBURG HOM	8 -12			LP	33.3	LP	15.4	LP	37.5	Pri Hgh MI	52.9

## **V. Testing Program Redevelopment and Issues for Further Consideration**

## **Testing Program Redevelopment and Issues for Further Consideration**

The enactment of the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act in 2002 caused DPI and the SBE to develop an accountability plan that would meet the requirements of the legislation and ultimately be approved by the US Department of Education (USED). Several aspects of that plan are being reconsidered based on the first year's AYP results. The SBE will finalize its recommendations in January and then DPI must seek approval from the USED.

Another issue is the decision on the part of the NC General Assembly to restructure the ABCs incentive system to incorporate AYP status as part of the system.

Finally, with the ultimate goal of NCLB that 100% of students score proficient on state tests by the end of the school year 2013-14, it provides challenges to the state in terms of developing newer editions of the state tests based on revisions to the state curriculum and whether the achievement standards (levels) should be raised during this time period.

