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|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1995 | Concept of Assessment and Accountability begins development/implementation after General Assembly directs the State Board of Education (SBOE) to develop a restructuring plan |
| 1995-96 | 108 schools in 10 districts given pilot assessments for development of new model |
| 1996 | General Assembly approves SBOE plan and enacts as law School Based Management and Accountability Program (ABCs) |
| 1996-97 | Administered assessments K-8; **Assistance teams formed and trained to assist low-performing schools to be deployed if requested** |
| 1997-98 | **Low-performing schools officially are designated by SBOE. Statutory definition of a low-performing school is school below 50% proficient that fails to make expected growth. A low-performing district is a district with over 50% of its schools low-performing. Assistance teams deployed to intervene. Assume specific responsibilities as outlined in statute such as teacher evaluation**. |
| 1998-2005 | **Low-performing schools continue to be identified and assistance teams are deployed**. Typically these are 4-5 person teams, spending a year in a school. Not all schools identified as low-performing receive a team. Districts with low-performing schools must submit a plan to the state for school improvement and follow statute regarding continued employment of the principal. **In 2001-03 under statute developed in response to No Child Left Behind, the state began to collect data to report Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) with a goal of 100% proficiency by 2013-2014.** |
| 2005-06 | Under state definition 51 schools were designated as low performing (2.2% of schools in NC). AYP continued. At this time there were 52 full time staff deployed as assistance team members. **Under the direction of the governor’s office and the court, high schools with performance composites under 60% proficient for 2 consecutive years became part of the NC High School Turnaround initiative in response to both executive and judicial concern that a number of schools with very low proficiency are not identified under statutory definition as low performing and consistently have low performance. AYP for state showed 1,044 schools (45.2) met goals and 1,268 (54.8) did not.** |
| 2006-07 | Forty five schools (1.9%) identified as low-performing and assistance teams in model developed in 1996-97 continue to be deployed for final year**.** AYP continues. **The court and executive branch direct SBOE/NCDPI to expand NC Turnaround Initiative to include middle schools (37) that feed the identified high schools in NC High School Turnaround if the middle school has a two consecutive year performance of under 60% proficient. A second cohort of high schools with performance composites below 60% proficient for two consecutive years is identified for the NC High School Turnaround initiative. Work with the original cohort of NC High School Turnaround continues. The North Carolina Department of Public Instruction (DPI) through the resources of a Gates Foundation grant engages Boston Consulting Group to assist DPI in a re-design of the state assistance model. The newly developed model focused on districts with clusters of low-performing schools. A pilot of this model was implemented by the newly created District and School Transformation Division in Columbus and Lexington City school districts as agency resources are redeployed to begin to staff new division.** |
| 2007-08 | One hundred and one schools identified as low-performing (4.2%). AYP continues. **The new model for assistance redesign is continued in Columbus and Lexington City and implementation begins in Richmond, Bertie, Hertford and Halifax.** The NC High School and Middle School Turnaround initiatives continue with the original cohorts of schools. Low performing elementary schools become a 4th cohort under the NC Turnaround initiative. |
| 2008-09 | Seventy five schools identified as low-performing (3%). AYP continues.NC Turnaround continues as does the new district assistance redesign model. The Halifax County Schools enters into a consent agreement with the State Board of Education (SBOE). The Halifax agreement gives SBOE and its designee the opportunity for providing advice to the Halifax Board on matters such as personnel and finance. |
| 2009-10 | Seventy five schools designated as low performing (3.5% of NC schools). AYP continues. NC Turnaround, district assistance and Halifax consent order continue. |
| 2010-11 | **NC receives Race to the Top (RTTT) grant. Goals of the grant related to Turning Around Lowest Achieving Schools (TALAS) are 1. Improve student achievement in the bottom 5% of NC schools (118 schools), 2. Increase graduation rates of all high schools in NC to above 60% (9 schools), 3. Improve achievement in lowest 10% of NC schools districts (12 districts). Grant is received after school year has begun so there is not a full year of implementation in year one.** NC Turnaround initiative is phased out and replaced by Race to the Top initiative. Sixteen schools identified as low performing. AYP continues. District and School Transformation Division blends federal and state resources to serve much larger number of schools and districts. |
| 2011-12 | Year Two of TALAS. **In May of 2012 USED approves NC’s request for flexibility under NCLB and NC no longer designates AYP. Instead NC reports Annual Measurable Objectives (number of targets met and % of targets met).** Fifteen schools identified as low-performing. One hundred and eighteen individual schools (bottom 5%) and 12 districts (bottom 10%) are served. |
| 2012-13 | Year Three of TALAS. **NC begins new accountability system (READY), replacing ABCs. Using all EOG and EOC, school accountability growth is calculated using EVAAS with 3 designations, exceeded growth, met growth and did not meet growth. For high schools, multiple factors are reported**. No designation of low performing schools. Bottom 5% of schools and bottom 10% of districts are served. |
| 2013-14 | Year Four of TALAS. Bottom 5% of schools and bottom 10% of districts are served. |
| 2014-15 | Fifth Year extension of TALAS. Bottom 5% of schools and bottom 10% of districts are served. **A-F designations are added to school accountability model**. |
| 2015-16 | **Revisions made to NC statutes regarding low-performing schools and districts. Definition based on A-F letter grades. Low-performing school redefined as a D or F school not exceeding growth. Low performing district defined as a district with over 50% of its schools identified as low performing. 581 schools and 16 districts are identified as low-performing.**  New model for support is developed-North Carolina Transformation. This model will support NC schools through four Service Support Teams. Seventy- five of the 581 schools will receive in-school support.  |