



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

---

# Report to the North Carolina General Assembly

---

Repeal Personal Education  
Plans/Modify Transition Plans

*SL 2015-46 (HB 237), G.S. 115C-  
105.41*

---

**Date Due: November 15, 2016**

Report # 75

DPI Chronological Schedule, 2016-2017

## **STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION**

SBE VISION: Every public school student will graduate ready for post-secondary education and work, prepared to be a globally engaged and productive citizen.

SBE MISSION: The State Board of Education will use its constitutional authority to lead and uphold the system of public education in North Carolina.

### **WILLIAM COBEY**

Chair :: Chapel Hill – At-Large

### **BECKY TAYLOR**

Greenville – Northeast Region

### **TODD CHASTEEN**

Blowing Rock – Northwest Region

### **A.L. COLLINS**

Vice Chair :: Kernersville – Piedmont Triad Region

### **REGINALD KENAN**

Rose Hill – Southeast Region

### **WAYNE MCDEVITT**

Asheville – Western Region

### **DAN FOREST**

Lieutenant Governor :: Raleigh – Ex Officio

### **AMY WHITE**

Garner – North Central Region

### **ERIC DAVIS**

Charlotte – At-Large

### **JANET COWELL**

State Treasurer :: Raleigh – Ex Officio

### **OLIVIA OXENDINE**

Lumberton – Sandhills Region

### **PATRICIA N. WILLOUGHBY**

Raleigh – At-Large

### **JUNE ST. CLAIR ATKINSON**

Secretary to the Board :: Raleigh

### **GREG ALCORN**

Salisbury – Southwest Region

## **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, the NC Department of Public Instruction 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. Rebecca Garland, Deputy State Superintendent  
6368 Mail Service Center, Raleigh, NC 27699-6368 :: Telephone: (919) 807-3200 :: Fax: (919) 807-3388

**Visit us on the Web :: [www.ncpublicschools.org](http://www.ncpublicschools.org)**

**Students who have been placed at risk of academic failure and transitions plans.**

**SECTION 1** G.S. 115C-105.41 reads as written:

- (a) In order to implement Part 1A of Article 8 of this Chapter, local school administrative units shall identify students who are at risk for academic failure and who are not successfully progressing toward grade promotion and gradation, beginning in kindergarten. Identification shall occur as early as can reasonably be done and can be based on grades, observations, diagnostic and formative assessments, State assessments, and other factors, including reading on grade level, that impact student performance that teachers and administrators consider appropriate, without having to await the results of end-of grade or end-of course tests.
- (b) Local boards of education shall adopt policies that direct school improvement teams to develop plans to include successful transition between elementary and middle school years and between the middle school and high school years for students at risk, as defined by the State Board of Education.

**SECTION 3.5** The State Board of Education shall report to the Joint Legislative Education Oversight Committee by November 15, 2016, on how at risk students are identified and being served through interventions to prevent academic failure.

**Data gathered for this report are included on the following pages.**

**How are students in Grades K-3 identified as at-risk in Literacy? (select all that apply)**

<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Response Percent</b>	<b>Response Count</b>
mCLASS: DIBELS	76.5%	65
mCLASS: Text Reading and Comprehension	81.2%	69
Previous performance	81.2%	69
Teacher observation	89.4%	76
BOG	75.3%	64
Other (please specify) *	38.8%	33
<i>answered question</i>		<b>85</b>
<i>skipped question</i>		<b>5</b>

**\*Other Methods of Identification (recorded as noted on survey)**

Measures of Academic Progress (MAP)	3
Site word inventory	1
Spelling inventory	1
STAR	3
iReady	6
Discovery Education Reading Assessment	1
Istation	3
District Benchmark	2
Classroom data	1
Successmaker	1
Waterford	1
Fountas & Pinnell Benchmark Assessment System	2
NWEA	1
Case Assessments-TE 21	1
Student work samples	1
Quarterly Benchmark Assessments	1
Smarty Ants	1
Achieve 3000	1
Formative Assessments conducted on a routine basis	4
Standardized individual assessments	1
CORE Phonics assessments	1
PAST assessments	1
Reading Recovery- Observational surveys	1
Teacher alternate ranking of students' overall performance	1
SchoolNet Benchmark Assessments	1
ScotPad Pathways Performance	1
Screenings	1
Benchmarks	3
CORE reading assessment	1
Case Assessments	1

Superkids	1
ITBS Scores	1
Data Meetings	1
Reading Mastery CBAs	1

**How are students in Grades K-3 identified as at-risk in Math? (select all that apply)**

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Universal Screening **	36.6%	26
Previous Performance	91.5%	65
Teacher Observation	95.8%	68
Other (please specify) *	43.7%	31
<i>answered question</i>		<b>71</b>
<i>skipped question</i>		<b>19</b>

**\*Other Methods of Identification (recorded as noted on survey)**

AIMSweb assessments	1
KEA- rote counting	1
District assessments	1
STAR Math	3
iReady	2
Mobymax	2
IXL	1
Performance monitoring	1
Benchmark assessments	4
Discovery Education Math Assessment	2
Dreambox	2
District benchmark	2
Classroom data	1
Successmaker	1
Waterford	1
K-2 formative assessments	2
3-5 benchmark assessments	1
K-2 formative instructional assessment tasks	1
NWEA	1
MAP scores	2
Case assessments- TE21	1
K-5 math tasks	1
Work samples	1
K-2 math assessments	5
Formative assessments	1
Standardized individual assessments	1
SchoolNet Benchmarks	1
Grade Analysis	1

Teacher Alternate Ranking of Student Performance	1
ScootPad Pathways Performance	1
Common Assessments	3
Work samples	1
Benchmarks	1
Additional objectives to Core Content and Math Tasks	1
Common State Math assessment-locally administered and scored	1

**\*\*Name of Universal Screener for K-3 Math (recorded as noted on survey)**

Measures of Academic Progress (MAP)	2
Site-based decisions	1
STAR	3
iReady	3
Classworks	2
Houghton Mifflin Diagnostic Screener	1
AMC	1
AIMSweb	3
Moby Max	1
County created assessments	1
BOG math assessment	1
ScootPad initial placement	1
NC State K-2 Benchmark	1
Easy CBM	1
mClass	2
Skill Builder	1
AIMSweb Plus	1
Assessing Math Concepts	1
Istation	1

**How are students in Grades K-3 identified as at-risk for overall academic failure?  
(select all that apply)**

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Attendance	91.3%	73
Tardies	75.0%	60
Early dismissals	50.0%	40
Office Discipline Referrals (ODR)	82.5%	66
Out-of-School Suspension (OSS)	65.0%	52
In-School Suspension (ISS)	61.3%	49
Retentions	85.0%	68
Other (please specify) *	51.3%	41
<i>answered question</i>		<b>80</b>
<i>skipped question</i>		<b>10</b>

**\*Other Methods of Identification (recorded as noted on survey)**

Academic performance on various assessments	1
SAT team	2
Academic performance	11
Teacher observations	1
Outside agency involvement (i.e. mental health, Department of Social Services, law enforcement, etc.)	1
Teacher assessments	1
End of year grades	1
Academic benchmarks	2
Teacher observations	3
Parent input and concerns	3
Assessment	1
Health	1
NWEA	1
CMA	1
MAP Scores	3
Data review	1
Reading below grade level	2
Performing in math below grade level	2
Quarterly data discussions with district level team	1
Mental health involvement	1
Screenings	1
I think this data is collected but not reviewed and used to improve student outcomes	1
Grades	3
Universal Screenings	2
Performance in class	2

SWISS	1
Response to interventions	1
Classroom assessments	1
Benchmark assessments	1
SST referrals	1
Work portfolio	1
i-ready assessments	1
Just academics, the rest doesn't apply to our students	1
Relationships	1

**How are students in Grades K-3 served through interventions to prevent academic failure? (select all that apply)**

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Differentiated instruction	92.4%	73
Small group intervention	96.2%	76
Explicit instruction	74.7%	59
Research-based interventions	89.9%	71
Intervention block built into the master schedule	70.9%	56
None	0.0%	0
Other (please specify) *	30.4%	24
<i>answered question</i>		<b>79</b>
<i>skipped question</i>		<b>11</b>

**\*Other Methods Utilized to Prevent Academic Failure (recorded as noted on survey)**

Volunteer tutors	1
Afterschool programs	1
Grant-funded extended school day and intersession programs	1
BURST intervention program	1
School specific	1
Istation	1
Dreambox	1
Data Boards	1
Computer Assisted Instruction	1
After/Before School Tutoring	1
Saturday Academy Tutoring	1
Afterschool (required)	1
Friday grouping for interventions	1
Referral to reading specialist	1
Computer-based programs at the student's level at home and school	1



Good teaching	1
Personalized playlist and contract work	1
Guided instruction	1
RTI process	1
Individualized instruction	1
Additional Tier II student support through Title I staff focusing on deficiencies	1

**How are students in Grades 4-5 identified as at-risk in Literacy?  
(check all that apply)**

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Universal Screener **	39.7%	31
Previous performance	96.2%	75
Summative assessment	85.9%	67
Formative assessment	91.0%	71
Teacher observation	96.2%	75
Other (please specify) *	34.6%	27
<i>answered question</i>		<b>78</b>
<i>skipped question</i>		<b>12</b>

**\*Other Methods of Identification (recorded as noted on survey)**

AIMSweb Assessments	1
Academic performance	1
NWEA Map	4
Discovery Education Reading Assessment	1
Istation	1
Dreambox	1
M-Class	2
Achieve 3000	2
NWEA	1
CMA	1
Case Assesssmnets-TE21	1
iReady	1
MAP comparison to EOG scores and grouping for one day per week direct instruction	1
Ongoing work samples	2
Quarterly review data with district team	1
Discovery Education Benchmark Assessment	1
Exile review	1
Previous year's teacher's alternate ranking of student performance	1
Working on using Easy CBM to screen for 2016-2017	1

Benchmark	1
mClass for bottom 25%	1
Scholastic Reading Inventory (Lexile Scores)	1
EOGs	2
Teacher's college	1
Benchmarks	1
Istation	2
Report card grades	1
DIBELS	1
CORE reading assessment	1
ITBS	1
Reading mastery CBAs	1
Data Meetings	1

**\*\*Name of Universal Screener for 4-5 Literacy (recorded as noted on survey)**

MAP	4
DIBELS	4
STAR	2
Classworks	3
Houghton Mifflin Diagnostic	1
STAR Reading	2
Fountas & Pinnell Benchmark Assessment System	3
PLA	1
i-ready	4
mClass	3
SchoolNet	1
mCLASS Reading 3D 4 <sup>th</sup> grade only	1
TRC	1
AIMSweb Plus	1
Teacher's College	1
Fontis and Pinnell	1
Istation	1

**How are students in Grades 4-5 identified as at-risk in Math? (check all that apply)?**

<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Response Percent</b>	<b>Response Count</b>
Universal Screener**	30.8%	24
Previous performance	94.9%	74
Summative assessment	88.5%	69
Formative assessment	92.3%	72
Teacher observation	96.2%	75
Other (please specify)*	32.1%	25
<i>answered question</i>		<b>78</b>
<i>skipped question</i>		<b>12</b>

**\*Other Methods of Identification (recorded as noted on survey)**

EOG performance from previous years	1
AIMSweb Assessment	1
Academic Performance	1
NWEA Map	4
Discovery Education Math Assessment	1
Istation	2
Dreambox	3
District Benchmark	2
Classroom data	1
SuccessMaker	1
Waterford	1
CMA	1
Case Assessments-TE-21	1
iReady	1
Ongoing work samples	2
Discovery Education Benchmark Assessment	1
MobyMax	1
Digital personalized tools	1
Previous teacher's alternate ranking of student performance	1
Looking to use Easy CBM in 16-17	1
Benchmarks	1
EOGs	2
Report Card Grades	1
SMI assessments	1
Classworks assessments	1
IXL	1
Reflex Math	1
Saxon Math CBAs	1

ITBS	1
Data meetings	1

**\*\*Name of Universal Screening for 4-5 Math (recorded as noted on survey)**

Measures of Academic Progress (MA)	4
STAR	2
iReady	5
Classworks	1
Macgraw Hill Diagnostic	1
Star Math	1
PLA	1
USA Test Prep	1
Classworkds	1
Moby Max	1
SchoolNet	1
Skill Builders	1
AIMSweb Plus	1
Ten Marks	1
STAR Math	1
SMI	1
Classwork benchmark assessment (not all schools)	1
Istation	1

**How are students in Grades 4-5 identified as at-risk for overall academic failure? (check all that apply)**

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Attendance	89.7%	70
Tardies	75.6%	59
Early dismissals	55.1%	43
Office Discipline Referrals (ODR)	84.6%	66
Out-of-School Suspension (OSS)	74.4%	58
In-School Suspension (ISS)	66.7%	52
Retention	87.2%	68
Other (please specify)*	44.9%	35
<i>answered question</i>		<b>78</b>
<i>skipped question</i>		<b>12</b>

**\*Other Methods for Identification (recorded as noted on survey)**

Overall academic performance in previous years	10
SAT Team	1
Teacher observations	6
Outside agency involvement (i.e. mental health, Department of Social Services, law enforcement, etc.)	1
NWEA Map	2
End of year assessments	1
Teacher assessment	1
Istation	1
Dreambox	1
Assessment	1
Health	1
NWEA	1
CMA	1
Parent Conferences	2
EOG	1
Data	1
Teacher input	1
Academic level	2
Quarterly review through district level data meetings	1
Mental health involvement	1
Data is collected buy not analyzed to improve student outcomes	1
Grades	2
Screenings	1
Benchmarks	1
Performance on district assessments	1
Performance on state assessments	1
Classroom performance	1
Assistance team	1
Performance	2
Portfolio of work	1
Assessments	1
Academic only	1
Relationships	1

**How are students in Grades 4-5 served through interventions to prevent academic failure? (check all that apply)**

<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Response Percent</b>	<b>Response Count</b>
Differentiated instruction	91.1%	72
Small group intervention	94.9%	75
Explicit instruction	78.5%	62
Research-based interventions	89.9%	71
Intervention block built into the master schedule	75.9%	60
None	0.0%	0
Other (please specify) *	26.6%	21
<i>answered question</i>		<b>79</b>
<i>skipped question</i>		<b>11</b>

**\*Other Methods Utilized to Prevent Academic Failure (recorded as noted on survey)**

Volunteers	1
After-School Programs	1
Grant-funded extended days	1
Intersession programs	1
Study Island	1
Instructional Facilitators	1
Data Boards	1
Istation	3
Dreambox	2
Academic Achievement Data	1
Teacher observations	1
Parent input and concerns	1
Computer assisted instruction	1
Before/After school tutorials	1
Saturday Academy	1
Good teaching	1
Guided instructional model	1
Contract work (playlist)	1
Personalized learning	1
Online assessment	1
Intervention tools	1
After school tutoring	1
Title 1 support as Tier II strategies to address specific deficiencies	1
AR	1
AM	1
Mastery Content	1
Use of specialists such as AIG, reading, ESL,	1

counselors	
Guidance and social worker intervention	1
Iready personalized lessons on areas of weakness	1
Similar based grouping	1
Direct instruction methodology and curriculum	1

**How are students in Grades 6-8 identified as at-risk in LITERACY?  
(check all that apply)**

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Universal Screener **	27.3%	21
Previous performance	94.8%	73
Summative assessment	89.6%	69
Formative assessment	87.0%	67
Teacher observation	92.2%	71
Early Warning System	19.5%	15
Other (please specify) *	31.2%	24
<i>answered question</i>		<b>77</b>
<i>skipped question</i>		<b>13</b>

**\*Other Methods of Identification (recorded as noted on survey)**

Previous EOG data	1
Academic Performance	1
NWEA Map	1
Data Boards	1
Dreambox	1
Istation	1
iReady	2
NWEA	1
MAP tests	1
Work Samples	2
Mastery Content	1
Discovery Education Benchmark assessment tools	1
Achieve 3000	1
Moby Max	1
Benchmarks	2
Academic benchmarking	1
Informal reading inventory	1
AIMSweb	1
Classworks assessment	1
Dreambox Math	1
Istation reading	1
EOGs	1

ITBS	1
Ready step	1

**\*\*Name of Universal Screener for 6-8 Literacy (recorded as noted on survey)**

Measures of Academic Progress (MAP)	2
STAR	1
MAP	1
iReady	4
Star Reading	2
STAR	1
USA Test Prep	1
Mastery Connect	1
AIMSweb	3
SchoolNet	1
Language LIVE!	1
MAPS (grade 6 only)	1
AIMSweb Plus	1
Istation	2
Classworks	1

**How are students in Grades 6-8 identified as at-risk in MATH? (check all that apply)**

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Universal Screener **	25.0%	19
Previous performance	94.7%	72
Summative assessment	89.5%	68
Formative assessment	88.2%	67
Early Warning System	21.1%	16
Teacher observation	89.5%	68
Other (please specify) *	27.6%	21
<i>answered question</i>		<b>76</b>
<i>skipped question</i>		<b>14</b>



**\*Other Methods for Identification (recorded as noted on survey)**

Previous EOG Scores	2
Academic performance	1
NWEA Map	3
Dreambox	1
iReady	3
Case Assessments- TE21	1
Ongoing work samples	1
Discovery Education Benchmark Assessment Tools	1
Discovery Education Math Techbooks	1
Assessment probes	1
Moby Max	1
Personalized digital tools	1
Benchmarks	1
SMI	1
IXL	1
Classwork district benchmarks	1
Dreambox Math	1
ITSBS	1
Ready Step	1

**\*\*Name of Universal Screener for 6-8 Math (recorded as noted on survey)**

MAP	1
STAR	2
Dreambox	1
iReady	2
Star Math	2
USA Test Prep	1
MAP	1
i-ready	3
Mastery Content	1
AIMsweb	1
SchoolNet	1
MAPS (grade 6 only)	1
AIMSweb Pus	1
Ten Marks	1
SMI	1
Classworks	1

**How are students in Grades 6-8 identified as at-risk for overall academic failure?  
(check all that apply)**

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Attendance	91.8%	67
Tardies	78.1%	57
Early dismissals	56.2%	41
Office Discipline Referrals (ODR)	83.6%	61
Out-of-School Suspension (OSS)	80.8%	59
In-School Suspension (ISS)	78.1%	57
Retention	84.9%	62
Other (please specify) *	43.8%	32
<i>answered question</i>		<b>73</b>
<i>skipped question</i>		<b>17</b>

**\*Other Methods of Identification (recorded as noted on survey)**

Previous academic data	1
Current academic data	1
SAT process	1
Academic performance	10
Outside agency involvement (i.e. mental health, Department of Social Services, law enforcement, etc.)	1
NWEA Map	3
End of year assessments	1
Teacher assessments	1
Data Dashboards	1
Dreambox	1
Istation	2
Academic Achievement	1
Classroom Grades	1
Assessment	2
Health	1
CMA	1
Teacher observations	5
Parent conferences	2
EOG	1
Data	1
CARES team	1
Quarterly data reviews with district level support staff	1
Data is collected but not analyzed	1
Grades	2
District Assessments	1
State Assessments	1
Referrals to assistance team	1

IXL	1
Classworks	1
MTSS documentation over time	1
Portfolio of work	1
Dreambox Math	1
Poverty count	1

**How are students in Grades 6-8 served through interventions to prevent academic failure? (check all that apply)**

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Differentiated instruction	83.6%	61
Small group intervention	89.0%	65
Explicit instruction	63.0%	46
Research-based interventions	82.2%	60
Intervention period built into the master schedule	74.0%	54
None	0.0%	0
Other (please specify) *	20.5%	15
<i>answered question</i>		<b>73</b>
<i>skipped question</i>		<b>17</b>

**\*Other Methods for Providing Interventions (recorded as noted on survey)**

Volunteer Tutors	1
After School Programs	1
Grant-funded after-school academic tutoring	1
School Specific	1
Istation	2
Data Boards	1
Computer Assisted Instruction	1
Dreambox	1
Before/After School Tutorials	1
Sunday Academy	1
Good Teaching	1
Summer Enrichment Program	1
Guided instructional model	1
Contract work (personalized playlist)	1
Not applicable	1
Benchmarks	1
Ten Marks	1
Use of specialists such as AIG, ESL, Counselors, etc	1
i-ready lessons on areas of weakness	1
Dreambox Math	1

Istation Reading & Math	1
Double dose of math or reading too	1

**How are students in Grades 9-12 identified as at-risk for overall academic failure?  
(check all that apply)**

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Universal Screener **	4.3%	3
Previous performance	85.5%	59
Summative assessment	81.2%	56
Formative assessment	78.3%	54
Early Warning System	26.1%	18
Retention	72.5%	50
Teacher observation	84.1%	58
Attendance data	84.1%	58
Tardies	63.8%	44
Early dismissals	46.4%	32
Office Discipline Referrals (ODR)	73.9%	51
Out-of-School Suspension (OSS)	71.0%	49
In-School Suspension (ISS)	68.1%	47
Credits obtained	79.7%	55
Other (please specify) *	27.5%	19
<i>answered question</i>		<b>69</b>
<i>skipped question</i>		<b>21</b>

**\*Other Methods of Identification (recorded as noted on survey)**

SAT Process	1
Academic Performance	1
Age	1
Teacher observations	1
Discovery Education Benchmark Assessment	1
DE Textbook probes and assessments	1
Achieve 3000	1
Lexile	1
Data	1
Academic Progress	1
Mental Health issues	1
Physical health issues	1
Data gathered but not reviewed/analyzed to improve student outcomes	1

Overall academic performance	1
Report cards	1
Seat time	1
Past	1

**\*\*Name of Universal Screener for Grades 9-12 (recorded as noted on survey)**

USA Test Prep	1
Achieve 3000	1
Ten Marks	1

**How are students in Grades 9-12 served through interventions to prevent academic failure? (check all that apply)**

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Differentiated instruction	70.0%	49
Small group intervention	55.7%	39
Explicit instruction	58.6%	41
Research-based interventions	55.7%	39
Intervention period built into the master schedule	51.4%	36
None	1.4%	1
Other (please specify) *	37.1%	26
<i>answered question</i>		<b>70</b>
<i>skipped question</i>		<b>20</b>

**\*Other Methods for Providing Interventions in 9-12 (recorded as noted on survey)**

Credit recovery	3
Intervention Support teams	1
Istation	1
Data Boards	1
Dreambox	1
Brigance	1
Foundations class in 9 <sup>th</sup> grade is used for intervention	1
One on one tutorials	1
Course Recovery	1
Good teaching	1

Fusion	1
RAVEO	1
Summer enrichment and review	1
Virtual courses	1
Blended learning model	1
Guided instruction	1
Personalized playlist	1
Online credit recovery	1
Intervention periods	1
After school program	1
SMART lunch	1
Benchmarks	1
Use of staff	1
Evening academies	1
Tutoring	1
Modified block schedule with flex period for remediation	1