



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: October 15, 2005
Report # 3 in 2005 – 2006
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

SHIRLEY E. HARRIS

Troy

MELISSA E. BARTLETT

Mooreville

ROBERT "TOM" SPEED

Boone

WAYNE MCDEVITT

Asheville

JOHN TATE III

Charlotte

PATRICIA N. WILLOUGHBY

Raleigh

BEVERLY PERDUE

Lieutenant Governor :: New Bern

RICHARD MOORE

State Treasurer :: Kittrell

NC DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

June St. Clair Atkinson, Ed.D., State Superintendent

301 N. Wilmington Street :: Raleigh, North Carolina 27601-2825

In compliance with federal law, NC Public Schools administers all state-operated educational programs, employment activities and admissions without discrimination because of race, religion, national or ethnic origin, color, age, military service, disability, or gender, except where exemption is appropriate and allowed by law.

Inquiries or complaints regarding discrimination issues should be directed to:

Dr. Elsie C. Leak, Associate Superintendent :: Office of Curriculum and School Reform Services

6307 Mail Service Center :: Raleigh, NC 27699-6307 :: Telephone 919-807-3761 :: Fax 919-807-3767

Visit us on the Web :: www.ncpublicschools.org

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 a report to the Joint Legislative Education Oversight Committee annually by October 15 regarding the continued implementation of the ABCs Plan. Information in the report includes an update of the ninth year ABCs results for schools, report on State Assistance Teams, response to NCLB, response to the Excellent Schools Act requirements, schools identified as low performing, and composition and activities of the Assistance Teams and issues for further consideration.

Consistent with last year's release, the ABCs/AYP report for the 2004-05 accountability year was released electronically through the internet. The ABCs/AYP Report and Supplemental Disaggregated State, School System and School Performance results were made available on August 4, 2005, and are accessible at <http://abcs.ncpublicschools.org/abcs/>.

Table of Contents

I.	Update of the Ninth Year ABCs Results.....	1
	• Executive Summary of ABCs/AYP Results	2
	• Results of School Building Appeals	9
	• Evolution of the ABCs.....	10
II.	Report on Assistance Teams	16
	• Status of Personnel in Systems Receiving Mandatory Assistance	17
	• Composition and Activities of Assistance Teams	18
	• Major Activities in Low-Performing Schools.....	21
	• Schools Receiving Assistance for 2004-05.....	22
	• Results for Schools Receiving Mandated Assistance	23
	• Additional Activities for Schools Receiving Mandated Assistance and LEAAP.....	24
	• LEA Assistance Program.....	25
	• Summary Remarks.....	29
III.	Response to NCLB.....	30
	• Title I Schools in School Improvement	31
	• Non-Title I Schools Required to Amend Their School Improvement Plans.....	38
	• LEAs in LEA Improvement.....	44
IV.	Response to Excellent Schools Act Requirements.....	49
	• Certified Staff Testing Under the Excellent Schools Act	50
V.	ABCs Recognition and Schedule of Recognition Activities.....	51
	• ABCs Recognition	52
	• ABCs Results – Nine – Year Chart.....	53
	• LEA Codes.....	54
VI.	Issues for Further Consideration	55
	• Issues for Further Consideration	56

I. Update of Ninth Year of ABCs Results

**The ABCs of Public Education:
2004-05 Growth and Performance of North Carolina Schools**

(Updated with September 1, 2005 SBE Action)

Executive Summary

Statistical Summary of Results

There were 2,242 public schools in North Carolina that were assigned an ABCs status in the 2004-05 implementation of the ABCs. These included regular public schools spanning combinations of grades K-12, charter schools, alternative schools, and charter schools evaluated as alternative schools. The results for the schools that were assigned an ABCs status appear in Table 1. Thirty-four schools were not assigned an ABCs status because they were special education schools, vocational/career schools, or hospital schools that participated in the ABCs on the basis of the schools they served; 14 schools had unresolved data issues, and two schools were in violation of the participation rule (although one of these schools received the low-performing status).

Table 1. 2004-05 ABCs Results

Category	High Growth	Expected Growth	Less than Expected Growth	K-2 Feeder	Alternative Schools	Row Total	Row Percent
Honor Schools of Excellence	246	250				496	22.0
Schools of Excellence	19	24				43	1.9
Schools of Distinction	223	385				608	27.0
Schools of Progress	70	201				271	12.0
No Recognition			655	10	10	675	29.9
Priority Schools	9	31	15			55	2.4
Low-Performing Schools			4			4	0.2
Total (Regular Schools)	567	891	674				
K-2 Feeder Schools	8	21	10			39	1.7
Alternative Schools	10	62	11			83	3.7
Total	585	974	695			2,254	
Percent	26.0	43.2	30.8				
<hr/>							
Percent Meeting Expected or High Growth Standards	69.2						

Overall, 69.2% of the schools met either their expected or high growth standards.

The 2004-05 ABCs program also reported the adequate yearly progress (AYP) of 2,300 of the state's schools during the third year's implementation of No Child Left Behind (NCLB). Table 2 shows the number and percent of the state's schools that met and did not meet AYP.

Table 2. 2004-05 Statewide AYP Results

AYP Status	Number	Percent
Schools that Met AYP	1,307	56.8
Schools that Did Not Meet AYP	964	41.9
Under Review*	27	1.2
Unresolved	2	0.1
Total	2,300	100.0

**Schools with two or fewer full academic year students; AYP status will be determined by a qualitative review. In addition there are several schools whose data require further clarification.*

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

Table 3. 2004-05 AYP Results by ABCs Recognition Categories

Category	Met AYP		Did Not Meet AYP		Total
	#	%	#	%	
Honor Schools of Excellence	496	100			496
Schools of Excellence			43	100	43
Schools of Distinction	395	65.1	212	34.9	607
Schools of Progress	84	31.1	186	68.9	270
No Recognition	279	41.5	394	58.5	673
Priority Schools	5	9.3	49	90.7	54
Low-Performing Schools	0	0	4	100	4
Expected Growth	573	59.7	386	40.3	959
High Growth	435	74.6	148	25.4	583

Presentation of Results

Results of the 2004-05 ABCs are presented online at <http://abcs.ncpublicschools.org>. The Web site offers users the ability to view and/or print PDF and Excel files showing ABCs growth, performance, and AYP results by individual school and school district. The site features map and custom search capabilities.

The Web site report includes menu selections that allow the user to access results for *Alternative Schools*, *Performance of All Schools*, *Schools of Distinction*, *Honor Schools of Excellence*, *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*, *Charter Schools*, *Schools Meeting AYP*, and *Schools Not Meeting AYP*. There are links to *State and School District AYP Results*, and *Disaggregations*. A link to *Schools with No ABCs Status* shows results for schools that receive ABCs incentive awards based on the schools they serve (special education schools; vocational/career schools; hospital schools), schools not included due to insufficient data, and schools with unresolved data issues.

Links to *Special Conditions* and *Technical Notes* access documents that explain ABCs adjustments and ABCs technical information. *Technical Notes* includes a summary of standard conventions used in the analyses, a history of the ABCs, a table of constants and parameters used in the ABCs computations and the End-of-Course prediction formulas.

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 program 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 No Child Left Behind (NCLB). This federal legislation sets a proficiency goal of 100% for all schools by 2013-14. The SBE adopted AYP as a “closing the achievement gap component” of the ABCs in response to General Statute 115C-105.35.

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 a school’s growth and performance. Schools that attain the standards are eligible for incentive awards or other recognition, i.e., Honor Schools of Excellence, 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 Department of Public Instruction. 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.

The SBE, in anticipation of new growth formulas for the 2005-06 school year, made few changes for the 2004-05 accountability year that affected the ABCs. These include:

1. Writing results were not included in the ABCs in 2004-05.
2. Increased the weight for the dropout component to 1/4th ADM.
3. High School (10th Grade) AYP was determined primarily using Algebra I and English I EOC tests and Grade 10 Writing instead of the HS Comprehensive Test. This change also involved changing the Annual Measurable Objectives (AMO) targets for 10th grade.
4. Growth results for 6th grade reading were omitted from the ABCs results for the 2004-05 school year due to continued issues with accurate representation of growth.

Participating schools

In 2004-05, every school that contained one or more of the grades 3 through 12 that submitted appropriate data participated in the ABCs. Data submitted by a K-8 school may include test results in reading and mathematics (including alternate assessments), computer skills at grade 8, and any EOC tests for subject(s) taught in the school. High school data include EOC test results, change in the percent of students completing courses of study (College University Prep/College Tech Prep), change in the ABCs dropout rate, and change in competency passing rates.

K-2 schools participating in the ABCs received 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-022. Their ABCs status is based on achievement data (EOC, EOG, competency passing rates) and three "local options" specified in their school improvement plans (from a list available based on HSP-C-013) and approved by their local board of education. The only ABCs designations that an alternative school can receive are: High Growth, Expected Growth, No Recognition, or Low-Performing. The procedures used in determining AYP for regular schools apply to alternative schools as well.

Special education schools, vocational/career schools, and hospital schools did not receive an ABCs status, but they received prorated ABCs incentive awards, 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 a weighted growth composite and a performance composite. A school's grade span and/or courses determined the composition of these measures, as described below.

The weighted 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 the college/university prep and college tech prep courses of study.
- d) Change in the competency passing rate (from grade 8 to grade 10).
- e) Change in the ABCs dropout rate (compared to a two-year baseline).

The schools meeting the expected growth expectation are said to have met expected growth. Schools who meet a higher standard (10% for grades 3-8 or approximately 3% for high schools) are said to have met the high growth standard. In determining the high growth standard, no increased expectations are calculated for components other than tests.

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, Geometry, Physical Science, and Physics. Algebra I scores of students in grade 9 who took Algebra I prior to ninth grade are included in the high school's performance composite.

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 (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 percent proficient targets in reading and in mathematics (annual measurable objectives). In addition, 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). For additional information, see *Determining AYP Status* (linked from the blue sidebar at <http://abcs.ncpublicschools.org/>).

Definition of ABCs Awards and Recognition Categories

Schools Making High Growth attained their 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). 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 growth composite scores. (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 receive banners, certificates, and financial awards.

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

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 receive banners, certificates, and 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 Honor Schools of Excellence or Schools of Excellence). They receive plaques, certificates, and 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 Honor Schools of Excellence or Schools of Excellence or Distinction). They receive certificates and incentive awards for expected 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' scores at or above Achievement Level III.

Schools that violate the testing requirements are assigned a violation status and cannot receive financial awards or any ABCs status, except low-performing. 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.

Results of School Building Appeals

The Compliance Commission for Accountability received no appeals of ABCs growth standards for 2004-05.

Evolution of the ABCs

1995

1. 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

2. 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

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

1996-97

4. ABCs implementation began for schools with grades K-8. The model included growth and performance composites and included EOG Reading and Mathematics and Writing at Grade 4. The new Grade 7 writing was used only in the performance composite.
5. DPI communicated ABCs Procedures to principals and teachers.
6. Assistance teams were formed and trained; assistance was offered to schools that asked for it.
7. Steering Committee for Assessment and Accountability was established by the SBE to develop the High School Model.
8. 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.
9. The first ABCs Report submitted to the State Board of Education in August.
10. All schools achieving exemplary growth standards received incentive awards (\$1,000 for certified staff; \$500 for teacher assistants).

1997-98

11. Designated Low-Performing schools received assistance teams.
12. 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.
13. 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/College Tech Prep (based on a year-to-year change); SAT scores and participation rates were reported.
14. 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.
15. 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.
16. 7th 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.
17. Algebra I scores from grades prior to the ninth grade were included in the computations for performance composites for high schools.
18. A confidence band for the performance composite was computed for identifying low-performing schools; this allowed schools a safety margin for sampling error. Schools could be slightly below 50% at or above grade level and not be penalized.
19. ABCs status label *No Recognition* was changed to *Adequate Performance*.
20. Charter Schools were included in the ABCs reporting for the first time.
21. 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.
22. Alternative schools were asked to submit proposals of better ways to be evaluated in subsequent accountability years.
23. 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.
24. It was decided that during this accountability year, no alternative schools or special schools were to be identified as Low-Performing.
25. EOC test scores, e.g., Algebra I 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)

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

1998-99

29. 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.
30. The Comprehensive model was applied to all schools.
31. Five additional EOC tests were added to the performance composite score.
32. The High School Comprehensive Test growth parameters were approved; the growth component was included in the high school growth/gain computations.
33. The change in the competency passing rate component was implemented in the high school growth/gain computations.
34. Changes in dropout rates were approved for implementation in the 2000-01 school year for growth calculations.
35. EOC scores in middle schools counted toward the schools' growth/gain and performance.
36. Data collection guidelines and procedures were documented in an Accountability Processing Checklist to incorporate roles of LEA, regional coordinators, and the agency staff.
37. Insufficient data rule was documented for high schools (less than 30 students in a given course for a given year of the three years of data).
38. Dual enrollment policies were documented and disseminated.
39. Membership rule for Comprehensive Tests was approved (160 days).
40. Revised grade 3 parameters were applied to the grade 3 growth computations.
41. A Report Card for the ABCs of Public Education, Volume 2 included ABCs dropout data.
42. 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.
43. The labels *Top 10/25 Schools* and *Adequate Performance* were changed to *Most Improved 10/25* and *No Recognition*, respectively.

1999-00

44. A rule for dropping courses in high school (10/20 Day Rule) was implemented.
45. 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.
46. Department of Health, Human Services (DHHS) and Office of Juvenile Justice (OJJ) Schools were included in the ABCs.

1999-00 (continued)

- 47. Schools were given test administration options for fall English II Tests due to catastrophic weather.
- 48. The SBE appointed a Writing Assessment Task Force.
- 49. Full ABCs documentation was made available on the Accountability web site.

2000-01

- 50. 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.
- 51. Dropout rate change was implemented as a component to the growth computations in high schools.
- 52. Computer Skills testing results at grade 8 were added to the performance composite.
- 53. EOC prediction formulas' exemplary growth standard was set at 3% more than the expected growth standard.
- 54. 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.
- 55. The North Carolina Alternate Assessment Portfolio (NCAAP) was added to the performance composite.
- 56. Writing at grades 4 and 7 was removed from the growth composites, but remained a part of the performance composite.
- 57. The North Carolina Alternate Assessment Academic Inventory (NCAAI) and the Computerized Adaptive Testing System were approved by SBE to be pilot tested and included in ABCs Volume II Report.

2001-02

- 58. The State Board of Education approved revisions to ABCs terminology for the 2001-02 school year.
- 59. The term *high* growth replaced *exemplary* growth, and the term *growth* replaced *growth/gain* in all designations of meeting or exceeding growth or gain standards.
- 60. Schools of Distinction were required to make expected growth.
- 61. 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.)
- 62. English II was suspended and will not be included in the ABCs until new tests for grade 10 Writing are developed. Writing results at grades 4 and 7 were removed from the ABCs performance composite.
- 63. Format for reporting data in ABCs Volume II was revised, and the name was changed to *Reports of Supplemental Disaggregated State, District and School Performance Data for 2000-2001*.
- 64. SBE approved the revised achievement levels in mathematics determined from the summer of 2001 equating study for student reporting, student accountability standards gateways, student competency standard, and ABCs reporting (performance composites).
- 65. Two ABCs reporting categories were added: Schools of Progress (schools that make at least expected growth and have a performance composite of at least 60%) and Priority Schools (schools that have less than 60% performance composite and are not low-performing.)

2002-03

66. ABCs 91-Day Rule for Growth Calculations changed to 140-Day Rule to align with No Child Left Behind (NCLB) full academic year (FAY) requirement.
67. The ABCs 98% participation rule for grades 3-8 under the ABCs was changed to 95% to conform to the NCLB 95% participation rule.
68. No exclusions were allowed.
69. Added Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) as a “closing the gap component” of the ABCs to meet requirements of General Statute 115C-105.35.
70. North Carolina Alternate Assessment Portfolio (NCAAP) scoring revised to yield Reading and Mathematics scores.
71. 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.

2003-04

72. No U.S. History tests were administered in 2003-04. Economic, Legal and Political Systems (ELP) tests was administered for transfer students, students who previously failed the course and students in 10th-12th grade who needed the course for graduation. U.S. History and ELP data will be excluded from the ABCs data analysis for 2003-04 and 2004-05 school years. New EOC tests in these subjects are under development for administration during the 2005-06 school year.
73. Alternative schools’ accountability policy was revised to prescribe 8 local options; these revisions were optional for the 2003-04 school year, and mandatory in 2004-05.
74. Certain charter schools became eligible to participate in the ABCs as alternative schools per SBE policy.
75. The Occupational Course of Study (OCS) graduates were subtracted from the denominator of diploma recipients in computing the College University Prep/College Tech Prep component.
76. Writing results (grades 4, 7, and 10) were not included in the ABCs in 2003-04; results at grades 4, 7, and 10 will be included in performance composite in 2004-05.
77. SBE approved a change in weighting the dropout component of the ABCs to $\frac{1}{4}$ membership, making it comparable to English I weight; this will be applied to the changes in dropout rates reported in the 2004-05 ABCs.
78. The SBE approved adding a recognition category for Schools of Excellence that meet AYP. The new category was named Honor Schools of Excellence.

2004-05

79. Writing results (grades 4, 7, and 10) were not included in the ABCs in 2003-04; results at grades 4, 7, and 10 will be included in performance composite in 2005-06.
80. Implementation of weighting the dropout component of the ABCs to $\frac{1}{4}$ of the membership used for funding was included in growth calculations.
81. SBE approves new growth formulas and standards for the 2005-06 school year and beyond. Included is the calculation of student level growth and a variety of procedural changes precipitated by a provision in general statute from the summer of 2004.

2004-05 (continued)

82. SBE approves Report of 2004-05 ABCs with sixth grade reading excluded from the growth calculations.

II. Report on Assistance Teams

Status of Personnel in Systems Receiving Mandatory Assistance

2004 - 05

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. For 2004-05, no schools systems had more than half of their schools identified as low-performing.

G. S. 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*.

Status of Principals of Schools Receiving Mandatory Assistance

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.

Composition and Activities of Assistance Teams

Background

For the eighth year (2004-2005) of the assistance teams, members were selected to replace team turnover. There were a total of 64 team members. While many highly qualified candidates were selected and joined the teams, there is still a severe lack of high school and exceptional children team members.

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.

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

Profile of Team Members

- Average of 23 years of educational experience
- 54% Advanced Degrees
- 6% Work in advanced degree underway
- 10% White Males
- 8% African-American Males
- 59% White Females
- 23% African-American Females

Retention: During the 2004-05 school year, 18 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. Nine mandated assistance team members served Phillip O. Berry Academy of Technology in Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools. The remaining 55 members provided voluntary assistance to Montlieu Elementary, Vandalia Elementary, Washington Elementary, Wiley Elementary, and Ferndale Middle (all in Guilford County). Voluntary assistance teams were also deployed to Riverview Elementary, Hertford Middle, Hertford High School (all in Hertford County), Bertie High School in Bertie County, and Phillips Middle School in Edgecombe County.

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.
- developed a strategic plan to leave with the school district to ensure progress continues during the 2004-05 school year.

**Schools Receiving Assistance for 2004-2005
Assistance Team Assignments**

Schools Receiving Mandated Assistance				
LEA	School	Team Leader	Team Reviewers	Division of School Improvement
Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools	Phillip O Berry Academy of Technology	Melissa Harrelson Levern Gurganious	Martha McLeod Heidi Coleman Lola Weikel Jennifer Smith Vicki Russell Betty Jo Slozak	School Support Services Section

Results for Schools Receiving Mandated Assistance

School Year	Exemplary Growth	Expected Growth	No Recognition	Low-Performing	Priority School	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
2003-04	High Growth - 3				1	4
2004-05		1				1

A total of 86 schools have been served in mandated assistance between 1997-2005. 70 (83%) made high or expected growth the year they had a team.

Success is due to the commitment and skills team members bring to the teams and the attitudes and cooperation of the school faculties and support from the central offices. Teams also receive strong support to carry out their work from the Department of Public Instruction and Division of School Improvement.

Assistance teams have been able to build strong rapport with teachers/administrators to accomplish the task of improving student achievement. Expertise, caring and humanism foster the strong rapport. Teams demonstrate that there are no excuses for under-achievement and that all students can learn when taught appropriately.

Additional Activities for Schools Receiving Mandated Assistance and LEAAP

1. At four different times throughout the year, regional meetings were held with team members and with collaborative groups to debrief, problem-solve, share experiences and provide information.
2. Three full-day sharing sessions were conducted for all team members by the Division of School Improvement staff to share ideas and continue the professional development of team members.
3. Needs Assessment Reports, Monthly Reports and the Annual Report (including Strategic Plan) are submitted to Director of School Improvement. If any problem areas are noticed, the director/assistant director followed up immediately with the team leader.
4. Team liaisons and section chiefs visited with team as often as necessary. Most visits are unannounced. Team leaders stayed in contact with Agency personnel through phone conversations, faxed messages and e-mail almost daily.
5. The director of the Division of School Improvement held team leaders' meetings on a bimonthly basis.
6. The director and assistant director made periodic (unannounced) visits throughout the year.

LEA Assistance Program

Office of Curriculum and School Reform Services
Elsie C. Leak, Associate Superintendent

LEA Assistance

The LEA Assistance Program (LEAAP) for 2004-05 focused on the LEAs receiving additional funding. They began the first year of a two-year pilot.

LEAs designated to receive Disadvantaged Student Supplemental Funding (DSSF)

- Sixteen (16) designated LEAs
- Received funding for a partial year
- Assisted by contracted part-time LEAAP team members for part of the school year

Progress Report on the Implementation of the LEA Assistance Program (LEAAP)

2004-05

Leandro Districts						
	ABCs Composite		AYP			
System	2003-04	2004-05	Total # Targets	Targets Met	% Targets Met	Made AYP
Edgecombe County Schools	69.07%	70.73%	49	34	69.4	No
Franklin County Schools	73.46%	71.63%	49	41	83.7	No
Halifax County Schools	60.89%	53.57%	41	24	58.5	No
Hertford County Schools	51.03%	56.83%	35	21	60	No
Hoke County Schools	63.36%	61.85%	61	39	63.9	No
Hyde County Schools	77.30%	77.15%	25	23	92	No
Lexington City Schools	66.86%	65.59%	49	42	85.7	No
Montgomery County Schools	70.13%	67.11%	53	39	73.6	No
Northampton County Schools	61.42%	59.81%	36	26	72.2	No
Pasquotank County Schools	68.79%	67.28%	47	32	68.1	No
Robeson County Schools	68.59%	68.76%	65	35	53.8	No
Thomasville City Schools	70.83%	66.96%	47	34	72.3	No
Vance County Schools	63.58%	65.20%	49	34	69.4	No
Warren County Schools	65.09%	61.56%	39	28	71.8	No
Washington County Schools	57.71%	55.54%	33	23	69.7	No
Weldon City Schools	53.00%	54.97%	25	16	64	No
Report created on September 15, 2005 5:00 PM						

Assistance Plan for LEAs Identified to Receive Additional Funding

Introduction

Each of the identified LEAs will complete and submit to the State Board of Education an Action Plan and an accompanying Budget Plan no later than September 15, 2004. These documents should reflect the strategies to be implemented and how the additional funds received will support the designated strategies. Plans should be reviewed by the local board of education prior to submission to the State Board. Upon approval at the State Board meeting in October 2004, funds will be released to the LEAs. The three areas of focus that LEAs should address in their plans are

- recruiting and retaining teachers (using the Teacher Working Conditions survey as a tool),
- class size reduction, and
- PEP development and implementation.

Menu of Recommended Strategies

Recruiting and Retaining Teachers

- Signing bonuses
- Performance-based bonuses
- Targeted salary supplements/retention bonuses (for example: additional pay to teachers with National Board Certification)

Personnel

- Class size reduction
- Support for lateral entry teachers
- Support for special instructional programs (i.e., Project Achieve, EVAAS, Learning Bridges, Positive Behavior Support, Schools Attuned, etc.)
- Classroom support for Limited English Proficient (LEP) students

Professional Development Activities

- Best Practices training
- Refining PEPs

Extending instructional time

- Tutorial services
- Transportation and other related costs for after-school programs and/or Saturday academies

Instructional materials, supplies, and equipment

General Overview of the Assistance Process

State

- Conduct an orientation session for the selected LEAs
- Assign a LEAAP Team to work with the LEA
 - Provide support and guidance
 - Assist with the development and review of action and budget plans
 - Spend time onsite to assist with monitoring the implementation of the action plan
 - Provide coaches and mentoring as needed
 - Broker services when necessary

LEA

- Attend the orientation session (superintendent and the instructional leader)
- Superintendent assigns a local team (superintendent, instructional leader, finance officer, personnel director, etc.) to work along with the LEAAP team to
 - thoroughly examine the LEA's data,
 - develop the action and budget plans for the system,
 - submit plan to the State Board,
 - monitor the implementation of the action plan, and
 - submit quarterly reports to the State Board on the implementation process

Summary Remarks

The LEAAP teams were received with mixed reactions during 2004-05. Some LEAS worked collaboratively with the Teams and others showed more reluctance. Team members were focused and task oriented. In their quarterly meetings, they shared experiences and concerns. They received ongoing support and guidance from Office of Curriculum and School Reform. The teams entered their assigned schools in either October or January depending on when the funds were available and when approval of their action and budget plans was given by the State Board of education. Therefore, service time last year was for less than an entire school year.

III. Response to NCLB

Title I Schools in School Improvement

A Title I school is a school that receives Title I money, the largest single federal funding source for education. About half of North Carolina's traditional and charter public schools are Title I schools and all 115 of the state's school districts receive Title I funding. Title I began with the passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. It is intended to help ensure that all children have the opportunity to obtain a high quality education and reach grade-level proficiency. Title I funds help students who are behind academically or at risk of falling behind. Services can include: hiring teachers to reduce class size, tutoring, computer labs, parental involvement activities, professional development, purchase of materials and supplies, pre-kindergarten programs, and hiring teacher assistants or others. Many of the major requirements in NCLB are outlined in Title I - Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP), teacher and paraprofessional (teacher assistant) requirements, accountability, sanctions for schools designated for improvement, standards and assessments, annual state report cards, professional development, and parent involvement.

Title I School Improvement Timetable

SCHOOL'S STATUS	SANCTIONS/IMPROVEMENT STRATEGIES
After Year 1 of not making AYP	None
After Year 2 of not making AYP in the same subject	Public School Choice Improvement Plan/Technical Assistance
After Year 3 of not making AYP in the same subject	Public School Choice Improvement Plan/Technical Assistance Supplemental Educational Services
After Year 4 of not making AYP in the same subject	Public School Choice Improvement Plan/Technical Assistance Supplemental Educational Services Corrective Action
After Year 5 of not making AYP in the same subject	Public School Choice Improvement Plan/Technical Assistance Supplemental Educational Services Corrective Action Plan for Restructuring
After Year 6 of not making AYP in the same subject	Public School Choice Improvement Plan/Technical Assistance Supplemental Educational Services Corrective Action Implement Restructuring Plan

Title I Schools and School Improvement							
#	LEA	Code	School	Grades	School Improvement (SI) Status		
					2003-04	2004-05	2005-06
1	Alamance-Burlington Schools	010326	Eastlawn Elementary	PK-5	.	1	1R
2	Alexander County Schools	020306	East Alexander Middle	6-8	.	1	1M
3	Anson County Schoos	040311	Wadesboro Primary	K-3	.	.	1RM
4		040316	Lilesville Elementary	K-6	.	.	1RM
5		040324	Morven Elementary	PK-6	.	.	1R
6		040330	Wadesboro Elementary	4-6	.	1	2 RM
7	Ashe County Schools	050330	Mountain View Elementary	PK-6	.	.	1R

ERROR: syntaxerror
OFFENDING COMMAND:)

STACK:

147
2115

