

2016–17 Performance and Growth of North Carolina Public Schools

Executive Summary (September 7, 2017)

Statistical Summary of Results

This report provides growth and performance data for the 2016–17 school year based on analysis of all end-of-grade (EOG) tests and end-of-course (EOC) tests, which are aligned to the North Carolina Standard Course of Study in English Language Arts/Reading and Mathematics and the Essential Standards in Science, for all district schools and charter schools. The following data are presented:

1. Growth: Reporting if schools exceeded, met, or did not meet growth expectations as defined and calculated in EVAAS.
2. Performance: Reporting how schools performed on assessments, high school indicators, and School Performance Grades.
3. Participation: Reporting if schools met or did not meet assessment participation requirements.

Schools not included in the report may not have any tested grades or may have a transient or very small student population. Typically, these schools are K–2 schools, special education schools, vocational/career schools, and hospital schools.

Accountability performance results for district and charter schools included in this report are available in a variety of spreadsheets and reports. Please go to <http://www.ncpublicschools.org/accountability/reporting/> to view more detailed information on the schools, districts and the state. The data will also be presented in the North Carolina School Report Cards later this fall.

Section I. Growth Results

For the 2016–17 school year, school accountability growth results are presented for 2,531 of the 2,566 public schools that participated in the statewide testing program. Using all EOG and EOC test scores, school accountability growth is calculated using EVAAS, a value-added growth modeling tool. Each school with the required data is designated as having exceeded expected growth, met expected growth, or did not meet growth. The results for school accountability growth are shown in Table 1.

Table 1. *School Accountability Growth*

Growth Category	2015–16 Number	2015–16 Percent	2016–17 Number	2016–17 Percent
Exceeded Expected Growth	691	27.5	666	26.3
Met Expected Growth	1,158	46.1	1,200	47.4
Did Not Meet Growth	663	26.4	665	26.3
Total	2,512		2,531	

Section II. Performance Results

The 2016–17 school year is the fifth year of the implementation of assessments aligned to college- and career-readiness (CCR) content standards, and it is the fourth year that the academic achievement standards have been reported as (1) Level 4 and above: on track for being prepared for college and career at the conclusion of high school and (2) Level 3 and above: demonstrating preparedness to be successful at the next grade level. To report student performance since 2012–13, the first year the tests were implemented, CCR in 2012–13 (Level 3 and above) may be compared to CCR in 2013–14 and beyond (Level 4 and above). As shown in Figure 1, there continues to be a consistent increase each year in the percent of students demonstrating CCR on the mathematics tests for grades 3–8. For the first time in four years, CCR in reading decreased slightly. However, students demonstrating CCR on both the reading and the mathematics in the same year have continued an upward trend.




Figure 1. End-of-Grade State-Level Performance Results in Both Reading and Mathematics, Mathematics only, and Reading only (Level 4 and above—College and Career Readiness (CCR) Standard)

With Grade Level Proficiency (GLP) (Level 3 and above) being implemented for the first time in 2013–14, there are now four years to compare. As presented in Figure 2, results are trending upward on all assessments.




Figure 2. End-of-Grade State-Level Performance Results in Both Reading and Mathematics, Mathematics only, and Reading only (Level 3 and above—Grade Level Proficiency (GLP) Standard)

Figures 3 through 8 show current year data and previous years' data for CCR (Level 4 and above) and for GLP (Level 3 and above) for each grade and subject. The 2016–17 data show increases and decreases across grade levels (CCR or GLP) for reading and mathematics. Grade 8 science continues a trend of improvement while Grade 5 science decreased for the first time in two years. All three of the EOC tests (Figure 8), Biology, English II and NC Math 1 had a higher percent of students proficient than the previous year for CCR and GLP.




Figure 3. End-of-Grade Reading Performance by Grade (Level 4 and above—CCR Standard)




Figure 4. End-of-Grade Reading Performance by Grade (Level 3 and above—GLP Standard)




Figure 5. End-of-Grade Mathematics Performance by Grade (Level 4 and above—CCR Standard)




Figure 6. End-of-Grade Mathematics Performance by Grade (Level 3 and above—GLP Standard)





Figure 7. End-of-Grade Science Performance by Grade (Level 4 and above—CCR Standard and Level 3 and above—GLP Standard)





Figure 8. End-of-Course Performance by Subject (Level 4 and above—CCR Standard and Level 3 and above—GLP Standard)

The following tables (2–5) provide student performance data by cohort over time. For example, previous grade level performance (grades 3–7) is provided for the 2016–17 Grade 8 cohort. However, student cohorts are not absolute as changes due to student mobility or other factors are not considered.

Table 2. *End-of-Grade Reading Performance Cohort Trend (Level 4 and above—CCR Standard)*

	2012–13	2013–14	2014–15	2015–16	2016–17
Grade 3	45.2	47.7	46.5	47.8	46.1
Grade 4	43.7	44.5	47.1	45.7	43.7
Grade 5		40.3	42.2	43.1	42.5
Grade 6			46.6	49.5	50.4
Grade 7				47.1	48.9
Grade 8					41.7

Table 3. *End-of-Grade Reading Performance Cohort Trend (Level 3 and above – Grade Level Proficiency (GLP) Standard)*

	2013–14	2014–15	2015–16	2016–17
Grade 3	60.2	59.0	57.7	57.8
Grade 4	55.6	58.8	58.0	57.7
Grade 5	53.8	53.0	55.4	56.7
Grade 6		57.2	58.7	61.0
Grade 7			58.5	58.2
Grade 8				53.7

Table 4. *End-of-Grade Mathematics Performance Cohort Trend (Level 4 and above—CCR Standard)*

	2012–13	2013–14	2014–15	2015–16	2016–17
Grade 3	46.8	48.3	48.8	51.7	52.1
Grade 4	47.6	47.1	48.5	51.1	50.9
Grade 5		50.3	51.3	54.0	53.9
Grade 6			41.0	44.3	45.3
Grade 7				42.0	43.0
Grade 8					39.6

Table 5. *End-of-Grade Mathematics Performance Cohort Trend (Level 3 and above – Grade Level Proficiency (GLP) Standard)*

	2013–14	2014–15	2015–16	2016–17
Grade 3	60.9	61.7	64.6	63.6
Grade 4	54.3	56.1	57.2	58.6
Grade 5	56.4	57.5	60.4	60.3
Grade 6		48.5	52.0	53.1
Grade 7			48.9	49.8
Grade 8				45.8

State-level results for other high school indicators: ACT, ACT WorkKeys, Students Passing NC Math 3, and the Graduation Project are presented in Table 6. For the fourth consecutive year the percent of schools implementing and completing a Graduation Project has decreased.

Table 6. *State-Level Performance for the High School Indicators*

Indicator	Benchmark Definition	2014–15 Percent Meeting Benchmark	2015–16 Percent Meeting Benchmark	2016–17 Percent Meeting Benchmark
ACT	Percent of grade 11 participating students who meet the UNC System minimum admission requirement of a composite score of 17	59.7	59.9	58.8
ACT WorkKeys	Percent of graduates who are Career and Technical Education (CTE) concentrators who earn a Silver Certificate or higher	72.1	73.5	73.3
Students Passing NC Math 3	Percent of graduates who complete NC Math 3 or Math III with a passing grade.	>95	>95	>95
Graduation Project	Percent of high schools that implemented and completed a graduation project	36.2	32.7	29.7

Section III. Participation Requirements

Effective with the passage of the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) in December 2015, North Carolina is no longer required to report Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) targets based on proficiency targets. However, participation is still required to be reported. Participation requirements apply to all state assessments administered by the state including EOG/EOC assessments in English language arts/reading, mathematics, and science, the ACT, and ACT WorkKeys.

In order to meet participation requirements, schools must have assessed at least 95% of eligible students. Participation requirements are reported for the following student groups: School as a whole (All Students); American Indian; Asian; Black; Hispanic; Two or More Races; White; Economically Disadvantaged; Limited English Proficient; Students with Disabilities; and Academically or Intellectually Gifted.

Table 7 shows the number and percent of schools who did or did not meet all of the participation requirements.

Table 7. *Participation Requirements*

	Number of Schools	Percent of Schools
Met All Participation Requirements	2,253	88.6
Did Not Meet All Participation Requirements	289	11.4
Total	2,542	

Table 8. *The Number and Percentage of School-Level Participation Requirements Met By Student Group*

Student Groups	Participation Expectations		
	Number Met	Total Number	Percent Met
All Students	9,090	9,303	97.7
American Indian	171	176	97.2
Asian	577	583	99.0
Black	4,919	5,085	96.7
Hispanic	3,944	4,073	96.8
Two or More Races	648	664	97.6
White	7,150	7,237	98.8
Economically Disadvantaged	7,505	7,717	97.3
Limited English Proficient	1,085	1,183	91.7
Students with Disabilities	3,718	3,924	94.8
Academically/Intellectually Gifted	3,666	3,676	99.7

North Carolina is committed to ensuring that all students participate in required assessments and applies consequences to schools that do not meet the targets by student group. Schools are labeled “Consistently Low Participating” if they miss a participation target for a second consecutive year. These schools must create and submit a plan for ensuring that the missed subgroup(s) will meet participation expectations in the coming year. Schools are identified as “Focus Schools” if they fail to meet participation target(s) for three or more consecutive years. Schools with the Focus School designation must send a letter to notify parents of the inadequate participation. The letter must include information on a plan to ensure full participation for subsequent administrations.

This year 90 schools are labeled Consistently Low Participating which is an increase of 17 schools from the 2015–16 school year. Also, 57 schools are identified as Focus Schools for missing participation requirements, 15 fewer schools than the previous year.

Section IV. School Performance Grades (A–F)

Beginning with the 2013–14 school year data, per legislation (G.S. §115C-83.15) passed during the 2013 long session of the North Carolina General Assembly, School Performance Grades (A–F) based on test scores, and high schools’ additional indicators that measure college- and career-readiness, are reported for schools in North Carolina.

The School Performance Grades are based on student achievement (80%) and growth (20%). The indicators and the proficiency standard or benchmark used for achievement include:

1. Annual EOG mathematics and reading assessments in grades 3–8 and science assessments in grades 5 and 8 (Level 3 and above)
2. Annual EOC assessments in NC Math 1, Biology, and English II (Level 3 and above)
3. The percentage of graduates who complete NC Math 3 or Math III with a passing grade
4. The percentage of grade 11 students who achieve the minimum score required for admission into a constituent institution of The University of North Carolina on the ACT (composite score of 17)
5. The percentage of graduates identified as Career and Technical Education concentrators who meet the Silver Certificate or higher on the ACT WorkKeys assessment

6. The percentage of students who graduate within four years of entering high school (Standard [4-Year] Cohort Graduation Rate)

The EVAAS model, which provides the growth measure, uses current and previous student test data to determine whether schools are maintaining or increasing student achievement from one year to the next. In the event that a school does not have a Growth Score, only the School Achievement Score is used to calculate the Performance Score. For the final Performance Score and Grade, if a school's growth designation is Meets or Exceeds Expected Growth, but the inclusion of the school's Growth Score reduces the school's Performance Score and Grade, only the School Achievement Score may be used for the Performance Score and Grade. For 2016–17, there are fifteen (15) schools that meet this exception, and growth is not included in their final grade calculation.

For 2016–17, the grade designations are set on a 15-point scale as follows:

A = 85–100	B = 70–84	C = 55–69	D = 40–54	F = 39 or Less
-------------------	------------------	------------------	------------------	-----------------------

Schools that earn an A designation and do not have significant achievement and/or graduation gaps are designated as an A^{+NG} school. Significant achievement and graduation gaps are defined as in-school gaps that are above the three-year state average when averaging gaps in the previous year and at least one of the two prior years between the highest-achieving subgroup and lowest-achieving subgroup.

Following is the state-level distribution of School Performance Grades, including the reading and mathematics grades for the K–8 schools and secondary analyses on growth, school type, poverty, and State Board of Education districts.

Section V. Overall School Performance Grades

Of all district schools and charter schools, 2,478 received School Performance Grades (SPG) for the 2016–17 school year. Of the schools not included in the SPG report, 96 are schools approved to use the Alternative School Accountability Model, which is highlighted in Section X. The remaining 48 may not have any tested grades or may have a transient or very small student population. Typically, these schools are K–2 schools and special education schools. Table 9 and Figure 9 provide the number and percent of the 2,478 schools that received each letter grade (A–F). The majority of all schools received a letter grade of C or better. Compared to 2015–16, there were an additional 11 schools that earned an A/A^{+NG}.

To be eligible for the A^{+NG} designation, a school must have at least 30 students in two subgroups. In 2016–17, there were 76 schools that achieved an A but did not have enough data for the achievement gap calculation (6 more than in 2015–16). Of the 105 schools with sufficient data for the analysis, 87 schools did not have significant gaps and were identified as an A^{+NG} school.

Table 9. Performance Grade (District Schools and Charter Schools) *

Overall Grade	Number of Schools 2013–14	Percent of Schools 2013–14	Number of Schools 2014–15	Percent of Schools 2014–15	Number of Schools 2015–16	Percent of Schools 2015–16	Number of Schools 2016–17	Percent of Schools 2016–17
A ^{+NG}	NA	NA	69	2.8	84	3.4	87	3.5
A	132	5.4	89	3.6	86	3.5	94	3.8
B	582	24.0	586	24.0	634	25.8	706	28.5
C	1,003	41.4	1,020	41.7	1,085	44.1	1,030	41.6
D	561	23.1	536	21.9	468	19.0	463	18.7
F	146	6.0	146	6.0	102	4.1	98	4.0
Total	2,424		2,446		2,459		2,478	

*Due to rounding, the percent of schools may not total 100%.




Figure 9. Performance grades by all schools

Table 10 and Figure 10 show letter grades broken out by district schools and by charter schools. District schools had a lower percent of schools with D and F grades (22.5%) than charter schools (25.2%). Charters had a higher percent of A/A^{+NG} and B grades (43.9%) than District schools (35.2%). In all cases, the percent of D and F grades decreased and the percent of A/A^{+NG} and B grades increased.

Table 10. Performance Grades by District Schools and by Charter Schools*

Overall Grade	District Schools		Charter Schools	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
A ^{+NG}	76	3.3	11	6.7
A	89	3.8	5	3.1
B	651	28.1	55	33.7
C	979	42.3	51	31.3
D	435	18.8	28	17.2
F	85	3.7	13	8.0
Total	2,315		163	

*Due to rounding, the percent of schools may not total 100%.




Figure 10. Performance grades for district schools and charter schools

Table 11 and Figure 11 show the distribution of school grades by school type. School type is defined as follows: elementary (any school with a grade configuration up to grade 5), middle (any school with a grade configuration up to grade 8), and high (any school with a grade configuration up to grade 12 or ungraded). The elementary and middle schools’ achievement scores are based only on test scores. In 2016–17, 73.2% of the elementary and middle schools earned a grade of C or better which represents a 0.1% decrease compared to the previous year, 29.4% earned a B or better which is a 2% increase from last year, and 3.8% earned an A/A^{+NG}.

Table 11. Performance Grade by School Type (District Schools and Charter Schools)*

Grade	Elementary and Middle		Elementary		Middle		High	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
A ^{+NG}	53	2.8	43	3.5	10	1.5	34	5.8
A	19	1.0	8	0.7	11	1.6	75	12.8
B	485	25.6	344	28.1	141	21.0	221	37.8
C	830	43.8	541	44.2	289	43.1	200	34.2
D	416	22.0	233	19.1	183	27.3	47	8.0
F	91	4.8	54	4.4	37	5.5	7	1.2
Total	1,894		1,223		671		584	

*Due to rounding the percent of schools may not total 100%.




Figure 11. Performance grades by school type

Section VI. Growth and School Performance Grades (District Schools and Charter Schools)

Though only counted as 20% of the overall SPG, the amount of growth a school’s students demonstrate for the year indicates the school’s success in moving student achievement forward, a key criterion for sustained improvement. For 2016–17, 73.7% of all schools, district and charter, met or exceeded growth expectations. Table 12 and Figure 12 provide the percent of schools for each growth designation by school type.

Table 12. *Growth Status of Schools with School Performance Grades by School Type (District Schools and Charter Schools)*

Growth Status	Elementary School		Middle School		High School	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Exceeds Expected Growth	289	23.6	186	27.8	190	33.3
Meets Expected Growth	693	56.7	284	42.4	207	36.3
Does Not Meet Growth	241	19.7	200	29.9	174	30.5
Total	1,223		670		571	




Figure 12. Growth status by school type

Data shows that of the 2,464 schools with both a SPG and a school accountability growth status, 1,849 (75.0%) met or exceeded growth, and of those schools: 171 (9.2%) earned an A/A^{+NG}, 632 (34.2%) earned a B, and 738 (39.9%) earned a C (see Table 13 and Figure 13).

Table 13. *Performance Grade by School Accountability Growth (District Schools and Charter Schools)*

Grade	Meets or Exceeds Expected Growth		Exceeds Expected Growth		Meets Expected Growth		Does Not Meet Expected Growth	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
A ^{+NG}	86	4.7	45	6.8	41	3.5	1	0.2
A	85	4.6	52	7.8	33	2.8	1	0.2
B	632	34.2	288	43.3	344	29.1	73	11.9
C	738	39.9	227	34.1	511	43.2	290	47.2
D	270	14.6	52	7.8	218	18.4	193	31.4
F	38	2.1	1	0.2	37	3.1	57	9.3
Total	1,849		665		1,184		615	

*Due to rounding the percent of schools may not total 100%.




Figure 13. Performance grades of schools by growth designations

Section VII. Performance Grade by School Poverty Percentage (District Schools and Charter Schools)

Data for the poverty percentages were available for 2,473 schools. Table 14 and Figure 14 show for each letter grade the percent of all schools reporting poverty at 50% or more of their students or reporting poverty at 50% or less of their students. Schools with greater poverty earned fewer letter grades of A/A^{+NG} and B and earned more C's, D's, and F's than schools with less poverty.

Table 14. Number and Percent of Schools by Letter Grade and School Poverty Percentage
(District Schools and Charter Schools) *

Grade	Total Number of Schools	Schools with 50% or More Poverty		Schools with Less than 50% Poverty	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent
A ^{+NG}	87	9	10.3	78	89.7
A	91	15	16.5	76	83.5
B	705	219	31.1	486	68.9
C	1,029	713	69.3	316	30.7
D	463	425	91.8	38	8.2
F	98	96	98.0	2	2.0
Total	2,473	1,477		996	

*Data Source: 2016–17 Eligible School Summary Report

Grades by School Poverty Percentage




Figure 14. Bar graph showing school performance grades by school poverty percentage

Section VIII: Reading and Mathematics Performance Grades for Elementary and Middle Schools

Schools with grades 3–8 report a separate letter grade for reading and for mathematics based on the EOG test scores. Like the overall SPGs, the reading and mathematics grades include achievement (80%) and growth (20%). Table 15 and Figure 15 provide this information by the number and percent of grades earned for all schools. A^{+NG} designations are not assigned to reading and mathematics performance grades.

Table 15. *Number and Percent of Schools' Reading and Mathematics Letter Grades (District Schools and Charter Schools)**

Grade	Reading		Mathematics	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
A	58	2.9	86	4.3
B	458	23.1	466	23.5
C	846	42.6	755	38.0
D	518	26.1	497	25.0
F	106	5.3	182	9.2
Total	1,986		1,986	

*Due to rounding, the percent of schools may not total 100%.




Figure 15. Performance grades for reading and mathematics

Table 16 and Figure 16 show the distribution of reading grades for district schools and charter schools.

Table 16. Number and Percent of Reading Grades by District Schools and Charter Schools*

Grade	District Schools		Charter Schools	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
A	47	2.6	11	7.0
B	388	21.2	70	44.3
C	802	43.9	44	27.8
D	497	27.2	21	13.3
F	94	5.1	12	7.6
Total	1,828		158	

*Due to rounding, the percent of schools may not total 100%.




Figure 16. Distribution of reading grades for district schools and charter schools

Table 17 and Figure 17 show the distribution of mathematics grades for district schools and charter schools.

Table 17. *Mathematics Grades by District Schools and Charter Schools*

Grade	District Schools		Charter Schools	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
A	75	4.1	11	7.0
B	434	23.7	32	20.3
C	699	38.2	56	35.4
D	464	25.4	33	20.9
F	156	8.5	26	16.5
Total	1,828		158	




Figure 17. Distribution of mathematics grades for district schools and charter schools

Table 18 and Figure 18 show for each reading letter grade the percent of all schools who are reporting poverty at 50% or more of their students and that are reporting poverty at 50% or less of their students.

Table 18. *Number and Percent of Schools by Reading Grade and School Poverty Percentage*

Grade	Total Number of Schools	Schools with 50% or More Poverty		Schools with Less than 50% Poverty	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent
A	58	3	5.2	55	94.8
B	457	109	23.9	348	76.1
C	846	597	70.6	249	29.4
D	518	478	92.3	40	7.7
F	105	105	100.0	0.0	0.0
Total	1,984	1,292		692	

Reading Grades by School Poverty Percentage




Figure 18. Reading grades by school poverty percentage

Table 19 and Figure 19 show for each mathematics letter grade the percent of all schools who are reporting poverty at 50% or more of their students and that are reporting poverty at 50% or less of their students.

Table 19. Number and Percent of Schools by Mathematics Grade and School Poverty Percentage

Grade	Total Number of Schools	Schools with 50% or More Poverty		Schools with Less than 50% Poverty	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent
A	86	9	10.5	77	89.5
B	465	194	41.7	271	58.3
C	755	489	64.8	266	35.2
D	497	430	86.5	67	13.5
F	181	170	93.9	11	6.1
Total	1,984	1,292		692	

Mathematics Grades by School Poverty Percentage




Figure 19. Mathematics grades by school poverty percentage

Section IX. Performance Grades by State Board Districts (District Schools and Charter Schools)

The distributions of SPGs, Growth Designations, Reading Grades, and Mathematics Grades by State Board of Education districts are presented in Tables 20–23.

Table 20. *Number and Percent of School Performance Grades by State School Board District**

District		Overall Performance Grade						Total Schools
		A ^{+NG}	A	B	C	D	F	
Northeast	Number	1	3	33	69	47	11	164
	Percent	0.6	1.8	20.1	42.1	28.7	6.7	
Southeast	Number	5	9	60	104	49	8	235
	Percent	2.1	3.8	25.5	44.3	20.9	3.4	
North Central	Number	22	22	154	203	105	28	534
	Percent	4.1	4.1	28.8	38.0	19.7	5.2	
Sandhills	Number	4	7	54	120	57	11	253
	Percent	1.6	2.8	21.3	47.4	22.5	4.3	
Piedmont-Triad	Number	12	18	117	176	76	24	423
	Percent	2.8	4.3	27.7	41.6	18.0	5.7	
Southwest	Number	36	23	134	186	109	15	503
	Percent	7.2	4.6	26.6	37.0	21.7	3.0	
Northwest	Number	3	5	67	99	10	1	185
	Percent	1.6	2.7	36.2	53.5	5.4	0.5	
Western	Number	4	7	87	73	8	0	179
	Percent	2.2	3.9	48.6	40.8	4.5	0.0	
Virtual**	Number	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
	Percent	0	0	0	0	100.0	0	

*Due to rounding, the percent of schools may not total 100%.

**The two virtual charter schools serve students across the state and are not assigned to a specific district.

Table 21. *Number and Percent of Schools With School Performance Grades by Growth Designations by State School Board District**

District		Growth Status			Total Schools
		Exceeds	Meets	Does Not Meet	
Northeast	Number	45	66	51	162
	Percent	27.8	40.7	31.5	
Southeast	Number	74	99	62	235
	Percent	31.5	42.1	26.4	
North Central	Number	126	246	160	532
	Percent	23.7	46.2	30.1	
Sandhills	Number	63	133	57	253
	Percent	24.9	52.6	22.5	
Piedmont-Triad	Number	127	216	77	420
	Percent	30.2	51.4	18.3	
Southwest	Number	134	236	129	499
	Percent	26.9	47.3	25.9	
Northwest	Number	59	94	30	183
	Percent	32.2	51.4	16.4	
Western	Number	37	94	47	178
	Percent	20.8	52.8	26.4	
Virtual**	Number	0	0	2	2
	Percent	0	0	100.0	

*Due to rounding, the percent of schools may not total 100%.

**The two virtual charter schools serve students across the state and are not assigned to a specific district.

Table 22. *Number and Percent of Reading Grades by State School Board District**

District		Reading Grade					Total Schools
		A	B	C	D	F	
Northeast	Number	0	16	49	50	9	124
	Percent	0.0	12.9	39.5	40.3	7.3	
Southeast	Number	5	40	84	48	10	187
	Percent	2.7	21.4	44.9	25.7	5.3	
North Central	Number	18	116	167	110	28	439
	Percent	4.1	26.4	38.0	25.1	6.4	
Sandhills	Number	3	34	88	70	11	206
	Percent	1.5	16.5	42.7	34.0	5.3	
Piedmont-Triad	Number	3	66	138	101	28	336
	Percent	0.9	19.6	41.1	30.1	8.3	
Southwest	Number	26	99	144	120	18	407
	Percent	6.4	24.3	35.4	29.5	4.4	
Northwest	Number	1	33	100	11	1	146
	Percent	0.7	22.6	68.5	7.5	0.7	
Western	Number	2	53	75	8	1	139
	Percent	1.4	38.1	54.0	5.8	0.7	
Virtual**	Number	0	1	1	0	0	2
	Percent	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	

*Due to rounding, the percent of schools may not total 100%.

**The two virtual charter schools serve students across the state and are not assigned to a specific district.

Table 23. *Number and Percent of Mathematics Grades by State School Board District**

District		Mathematics Grade					Total Schools
		A	B	C	D	F	
Northeast	Number	0	16	39	49	20	124
	Percent	0.0	12.9	31.5	39.5	16.1	
Southeast	Number	7	33	77	52	18	187
	Percent	3.7	17.6	41.2	27.8	9.6	
North Central	Number	23	102	160	107	47	439
	Percent	5.2	23.2	36.4	24.4	10.7	
Sandhills	Number	2	41	70	70	23	206
	Percent	1.0	19.9	34.0	34.0	11.2	
Piedmont-Triad	Number	9	78	130	86	33	336
	Percent	2.7	23.2	38.7	25.6	9.8	
Southwest	Number	36	98	148	87	38	407
	Percent	8.8	24.1	36.4	21.4	9.3	
Northwest	Number	4	42	76	23	1	146
	Percent	2.7	28.8	52.1	15.8	0.7	
Western	Number	5	56	55	22	1	139
	Percent	3.6	40.3	39.6	15.8	0.7	
Virtual**	Number	0	0	0	1	1	2
	Percent	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	

*Due to rounding, the percent of schools may not total 100%.

**The two virtual charter schools serve students across the state and are not assigned to a specific district.

Section X. Alternative Schools

In consideration of the limited data available for alternative schools, State Board of Education policy provides an alternative accountability model for alternative schools to report their overall achievement and growth performance, in lieu of required participation in School Performance Grades. Schools in this model include alternative schools, North Carolina Department of Public Instruction (NCDPI)-approved special education schools, and schools identified as Developmental Day Centers. Table 24 provides information on the options selected by the alternative schools.

Table 24. *Alternative Accountability Model Options*

SBE Policy Selection	Number of Schools	Description of Option and Outcomes
Option A	0	Participate in School Performance Grades
Option B	4	All data sent back to base schools within the district
Option C	81	Alternative Progress Model
Option D	11	Schools submitted individual reports to NCDPI
Total	96	

Alternative schools who select Option C under the alternative model are evaluated based on their performance in the current year compared to the previous year. Schools are considered “Maintaining” if results stay within +/-3 points of the previous year. If more or less than 3 points are earned, the schools are “Progressing” or “Declining” respectively. Table 25 shows the results for the schools selecting Option C.

Table 25. *Alternative Accountability Model Option C results**

Option C Results	Number of Schools	Percent of Schools
Progressing	18	22.2
Maintaining	41	50.6
Declining	22	27.2
Total	81	

*Due to rounding, the percent of schools may not total 100%.

Under Option D, alternative schools are able to develop an alternative accountability model and present their proposal to the State Board of Education for approval. After approval, schools are required to submit a report, which is posted with the accountability reports.

The results of the schools that chose Option C or Option D are located at <http://www.ncpublicschools.org/accountability/reporting/>.

Section XI. State Board of Education Goals

The State Board of Education (SBE) implemented a strategic plan with the vision that “every public school student will graduate ready for post-secondary education and work, prepared to be globally engaged and productive citizens.” Table 26 provides information showing results based on the goals set for assessment and accountability measures. Unless specified, results include data in all district schools and charter schools.

Table 26. *State Board of Education Goals*

Objective	Measure	2015–16 Target	2015–16 Actual	2016–17 Target	2016–17 Actual
1.2	1.2.1 The ACT (Minimum 17 Composite)	71.1	59.9	75.3	58.8
1.3	1.3.1 ACT WorkKeys (Silver or Better)	73.6	73.5	75.1	73.3
1.5	1.5.1a Percent Proficient (EOG/EOC)*	47.3	48.8	47.7	49.2
1.5	1.5.1b Percent Proficient (EOG/EOC)**	56.9	58.3	57.2	59.2
1.5	1.5.2 School Growth (Meet/Exceed)	75.0	73.6	75.0	73.7
2.4	2.4.1a Charter Schools 60% or higher Performance Composite*	43.0	37.8	45.0	33.7
2.4	2.4.1b Charter Schools 60% or higher Performance Composite**	58.0	59.0	60.0	58.4
2.4	2.4.2 Charter Schools’ Growth (Meet/Exceed)	75.0	70.4	75.0	70.1
2.5	2.5.1 Percent of Low-Performing Schools	23.6	20.0	22.6	20.3

Objective	Measure	2015–16 Target	2015–16 Actual	2016–17 Target	2016–17 Actual
2.5	2.5.2 Percent of Low-Performing Districts	9.6	8.7	5.2	9.6

*Based on Level 4 and above (CCR standard)

**Based on Level 3 and above (GLP standard)

Section XII. Low-Performing Schools and Districts

The North Carolina General Assembly has enacted requirements to identify low-performing schools, low-performing districts, and recurring low-performing schools based on legislative requirements. The identification of these schools and districts requires them to develop plans for improvement.

The overall number of low performing schools and districts has increased with the 2016–17 Accountability results. The recurring Low Performing Schools number has also increased by 53 from the previous year. Though the overall numbers for the state have increased, districts have schools previously identified as low performing that are no longer low performing and schools identified as low performing in 2016–17 that were not low performing last year. Table 27 displays the overall changes from 2015–16 to 2016–17.

Table 27. *Number of Low-Performing Schools and Districts*

	2015–16	2016–17	Difference
Low-Performing Schools	489	505	+16
Low-Performing Districts	10	11	+1
Recurring Low-Performing Schools	415	468	+53

The lists of low-performing schools and districts can be found on the Accountability Services website at <http://www.ncpublicschools.org/accountability/reporting/>.