



&

UNC Center for Civil Rights Leandro Advocacy Project

Special acknowledgments to N.C. NAACP, the N.C. Justice Center and NCCARE for their support of this work.

WHAT STANDS BETWEEN NORTH CAROLINA STUDENTS AND A SOUND BASIC EDUCATION?

School systems matter for children. Quality education can help level the playing field so that all students graduate ready to succeed. Years of research have shown that high quality teachers, small class sizes, a strong curriculum in each grade, modern facilities and other factors influence the quality of education students receive. Unfortunately, not all students have equal access to these essentials. Since education policy and funding decisions are largely determined at the state and local levels, school quality varies greatly across our state and school districts. Differences in school resources, academic opportunities and learning environments make it difficult to provide equal opportunity to all students. Often, our school systems seem more like obstacle courses, with the most disadvantaged students facing the most obstacles.

THE LEANDRO DECISIONS

In an attempt to ensure every child has access to a sound basic education, in 1994, parents, students and school boards from low-wealth counties filed a lawsuit against the State of North Carolina and the State Board of Education for failing to provide fair and adequate public education funding. Known as the *Leandro* decisions, the North Carolina Supreme Court twice ruled (first in 1997, then in 2004) that every child in North Carolina has a constitutional right to “an equal opportunity to receive a sound basic education.” The North Carolina Supreme Court has defined a sound basic education as one that provides every student with the following:

- ★ Sufficient ability to read, write and speak the English language, and a sufficient knowledge of fundamental mathematics and physical science to enable the student to function in a complex and rapidly changing society;
- ★ Sufficient fundamental knowledge of geography, history and basic economic and political systems to enable the student to make informed choices with regard to issues that affect the student personally or affect the student’s community, state and nation;
- ★ Sufficient academic and vocational skills to enable the student to successfully engage in post-secondary education or vocational training; and
- ★ Sufficient academic and vocational skills to enable the student to compete on an equal basis with others in further formal education or gainful employment in contemporary society.¹

1. *Leandro v. State of North Carolina*, 346 N.C. 336, 347 (1997).

The presiding judge in the *Leandro* case, the Honorable Howard E. Manning, Jr., established that, at a minimum, a sound basic education requires:

- ✦ Every student must be taught by a highly qualified teacher;
- ✦ Every school must be led by a highly competent administrator; and
- ✦ Every school must have the resources necessary to provide every student with an equal opportunity to receive a sound basic education.²

WHAT CONSTITUTES A SOUND BASIC EDUCATION?

TEN YEARS AFTER
THE *LEANDRO*
DECISIONS, MANY
STUDENTS ARE
NOT RECEIVING A
SOUND BASIC
EDUCATION

The North Carolina Supreme Court found that being at or above proficient (Level III) on the end-of-grade and end-of-course tests mandated by the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction's ABCs Plan³ demonstrates that a student has received a sound basic education.⁴

Data on end-of-grade tests clearly show that many students, especially those in low-wealth areas and high poverty schools in urban districts, are not receiving a sound basic education. Test results for all K-12 schools for the 2005-2006 school year show that in 1-out-of-6 schools, fewer than 60% of students scored at or above proficient on end-of-grade and end-of-course tests.⁵

A QUICK LOOK AT RACE, POVERTY AND HIGHLY QUALIFIED TEACHERS

The federal No Child Left Behind law mandates that every state must assign "highly qualified teachers" on an equal basis to students of color and low-income students. This is not happening in North Carolina.

Reviewing North Carolina Department of Public Instruction data, researchers determined that in any grade, a black student in North Carolina is more likely than a white student to be taught by a novice teacher. For example, a typical black 7th grader is 54% more likely to have a novice teacher in math than a white 7th grader, and is 38% more likely to have a novice teacher in English than a white student.⁶

The judge presiding over the *Leandro* litigation, Judge Manning, recently threatened to close 19 high schools because of low performance. Most of the students attending these schools are students of color and many are eligible for free or reduced price lunch. Compared to the state average, the vast majority of these schools had fewer highly qualified teachers, fewer teachers with advanced degrees and fewer fully-licensed instructors teaching core academic classes.⁷

"Data on end-of-grade tests clearly show that many students, especially those in low-wealth areas and high poverty schools in urban districts, are not receiving a sound basic education."

2. *Leandro v. State of North Carolina*, 95 CVS 1158 (Apr. 2002).

3. More information on the N.C. Department of Education's ABC Plan is available online at: <http://www.ncpublicschools.org/accountability/reporting/abc/2005-06/>.

4. *Leandro v. State of North Carolina*. 358 N.C. 605, 625 (2004).

5. North Carolina Department of Public Instruction. "Complete ABCs Results Released; Rigorous Standards Reflected in Results." November 8, 2006. Available online at: <http://abcs.ncpublicschools.org/abcs/>.

6. Ladd, H.F., Clotfelter, C. and Vigdor, J. "Who Teaches Whom? Race and the Distribution of Novice Teachers." *Economics of Education Review*. 2005; vi 24(n4).

7. Analysis by the UNC Center for Civil Rights, UNC School of Law, <http://www.law.unc.edu/Centers>.

Highly qualified teachers are critical for students to succeed; a good teacher inspires students to do their best and works to ensure that all students are learning the subject matter. Numerous research studies show that high quality teachers are necessary for student success.⁸ Teacher quality has been shown to have significant positive effects on reading and math achievement.⁹ Highly qualified teachers have good verbal skills, academic ability, knowledge and professional experience as well as enthusiasm, perseverance and concern for students.¹⁰

Unfortunately, research on teacher quality in North Carolina schools shows that not all of our students have access to high quality teachers. A recent study on the distribution of experienced and novice teachers in North Carolina shows that high poverty schools have the greatest percentages of inexperienced teachers, who graduated from less competitive undergraduate institutions and have “non-regular” licenses (a lateral entry or “other” license¹¹).¹² Additionally, high poverty schools are more likely to experience high teacher turnover rates and have a greater percentage of teachers with no previous teaching experience.¹³

Highly competent school administrators are critical to school success; a great leader has a positive effect on school climate, staff morale and student achievement.¹⁴ Well-qualified principals foster effective learning environments by attracting and retaining high quality teachers, reducing staff turnover and having high expectations for all staff and students.¹⁵ *Leandro* recognizes what research and practical experience have shown: motivated, experienced administrators are required if schools are to be successful.

Research examining the distribution of highly competent principals found results similar to the distribution of highly qualified teachers: high poverty schools are least likely to have well qualified principals. Principals in high poverty schools have low leadership ratings, attended less competitive colleges, have the highest turnover rates and are most likely to be novice principals.¹⁶ If North Carolina is serious about improving the quality of education provided to our most disadvantaged students, policies and resources must assure that our neediest schools can attract and retain highly competent administrators.

EVERY STUDENT
MUST BE TAUGHT
BY A HIGHLY-
QUALIFIED
TEACHER

EVERY SCHOOL
MUST BE LED BY A
HIGHLY
COMPETENT
ADMINISTRATOR

“If North Carolina is serious about improving the quality of education provided to our most disadvantaged students, policies and resources must assure that our neediest schools can attract and retain highly competent administrators.”

8. Ladd, H.F., Clotfelter, C., Vigdor, J. and Wheeler, J. “High Poverty Schools and the Distribution of Teachers and Principals.” October 1, 2006. Paper prepared for the UNC Conference on High Poverty Schooling in America.

9. Rivkin, S.G., Hanushek, E.A., and Kain, J.F. “Teachers, Schools, and Academic Achievement.” *Econometrica*. March 2005. 73 (2), 417–458.

10. Darling-Hammond, L. and Sykes, G. (2003, September 17). “Wanted: A national teacher supply policy for education: The right way to meet the ‘Highly Qualified Teacher’ challenge?” *Education Policy Analysis Archives*. September 17, 2003. 11(33). Available online at: <http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v11n33/>.

11. Lateral entry licenses are issued to individuals who have not qualified for a regular license but have completed a B.A. degree in the area they are assigned to teach. The “other” license category includes provisional, temporary and emergency licenses. More information available online at: <http://www.dpi.state.nc.us/licensure/lifaq.htm>.

12. Ladd, H.F., Clotfelter, C., Vigdor, J. and Wheeler, J. (2006).

13. Darling-Hammond, L. and Sykes, G. (2003).

14. Teske, P., Schneider, Mark. “The Importance of Leadership: The Role of School Principals.” Grant Report, September 1999. Available online at: http://www.businessofgovernment.org/pdfs/Import_of_Leadership.pdf.

15. Ladd, H.F., Clotfelter, C., Vigdor, J. and Wheeler, J. (2006); and Kelley R, Thornton B, Daugherty R. “Relationships between Measures of Leadership and School Climate.” *Education* [serial online]. 2005; v126 (n1). Available from: ERIC, Ipswich, MA. Accessed February 8, 2007.

16. Ladd, H.F., Clotfelter, C., Vigdor, J. and Wheeler, J. (2006).

EVERY SCHOOL
MUST HAVE THE
RESOURCES
NECESSARY TO
PROVIDE EVERY
STUDENT WITH
AN EQUAL
OPPORTUNITY TO
RECEIVE A SOUND
BASIC EDUCATION

Adequate funding is as basic to education as skilled teachers, effective leaders and eager-to-learn students. Although high quality teachers and administrators can be effective with limited resources, the promise of *Leandro* requires adequate funding. With adequate funding must come transparency in school spending so that parents, community members, school boards and state leaders can know how money is being spent and how resources are allocated in order to evaluate the effectiveness of programs. Accountability and evaluation are essential to ensuring improved outcomes and to sharing best practices.

Low-Wealth Supplemental Funding: One way to look at whether school districts have adequate resources is to assess whether they have the funds to build and maintain needed school buildings, offer competitive salaries to attract good teachers and provide students with books, science labs and other learning materials. Eighty of North Carolina's 115 local school districts are in counties that struggle to raise enough local property tax revenue to meet the needs of the local school district. These "low-wealth" districts depend on the state legislature for extra funding to meet the needs of their students through the low-wealth supplemental funding formula.

Personal Education Plans: Another way to look at whether schools have the resources they need is whether or not they provide every student who is performing below grade level with a Personal Education Plan (PEP), as required under North Carolina law (General Statute § 115C-105.41). A PEP must include effective strategies to bring the student to grade level. Examples of these strategies include smaller class sizes, individual tutoring, or extra time to learn in after-school, Saturday school or summer school with free transportation provided. Data suggest that too few students are receiving the services required by effective PEPs. Last year, 4-of-10 elementary students and 3-of-10 high school students failed to perform at grade level on state mandated tests, and failure rates were much higher for disadvantaged students.¹⁷

Disadvantaged Student Supplemental Fund: The needs of disadvantaged students should be addressed by funding from sources such as the Disadvantaged Student Supplemental Fund (DSSF), which supports local efforts to serve students who are at the most risk for academic failure. Originally, DSSF funding was targeted to 16 low-wealth school districts. Starting in 2006-2007, DSSF funding was provided to all school districts based on a formula that takes each district's relative need into account. Unfortunately, the DSSF is significantly underfunded. The State of North Carolina has committed a total of \$94 million in DSSF funding since the North Carolina Supreme Court decision in 2004, however, the State Board of Education estimated that year that at least \$220 million per year was needed to address the needs of disadvantaged students.¹⁸

POLICY OPTIONS

★ **Provide adequate funding for disadvantaged students and school systems.** The state should increase its support for students at risk of falling below proficiency due to their own or their school system's disadvantages by fully funding the Disadvantaged Student Supplemental Fund (DSSF). The state should also continue to evaluate and publicly report on the effectiveness of DSSF-funded programs.

Continued on Page 5

17. Analysis by UNC Center for Civil Rights, UNC School of Law, <http://www.law.unc.edu/Centers>.

18. Letter from Howard N. Lee, Chairman, N.C. State Board of Education, and Michael E. Ward, Superintendent of Public Instruction, to Howard Manning, Jr., Superior Court Judge (June 7, 2004).

★ **Ensure implementation of the Personal Education Plan (PEP) of every student who is at risk of academic failure.** All schools are required to provide a written PEP for every student at risk of academic failure. Every school system should have in place procedures to monitor whether plans are implemented and assure that parents have been involved in the planning process, as required under North Carolina law.

★ **Salary incentives should be provided to teachers and administrators working in hard-to-staff schools to help school districts attract and retain highly qualified teachers.** Additionally, teachers and administrators in all districts and curriculums must receive sufficient compensation. Governor Michael Easley's focus on increasing pay should be continued with additional incentives for staff to work in disadvantaged school systems.

★ **North Carolina must increase the supply of highly qualified new teachers.** North Carolina has one of the fastest growing child populations in the country, causing schools to need about 8,000 additional teachers per year. To help address this need, the N.C. Teaching Fellows program, which recruits outstanding students to the teaching profession, should be expanded. Additionally, college and university teacher education programs must be structured to ensure that future teachers graduate with the qualifications needed to educate a diverse population and students from disadvantaged communities.

★ **Teachers must be provided with educational and workplace supports.** Novice teachers benefit from being mentored by seasoned colleagues, while experienced teachers should have opportunities to further hone their skills and progress in their chosen profession. Teachers need planning time to prepare for classes, review materials and grade papers.

★ **Principals must receive training in school management both at the beginning and throughout their careers.** Principals often come from teaching and need the opportunity to develop the professional expertise required to administer a school. The State Board of Education recommends that principals receive training in seven areas: strategic planning, instructional leadership, creating a learning culture, human resources, managerial skills, external development and school politics.

★ **Appropriate facilities must be provided so that students, teachers and principals can focus on their jobs.** Too often, school facilities do not meet the needs of students, teachers and principals. The physical infrastructure needed to educate today's students requires buildings with advanced learning facilities such as computer classrooms and science labs. Growth planning by school boards and county commissions should be adequate to meet the needs of their schools and legislators should look for ways to help disadvantaged districts fund their infrastructure needs.

North Carolina must act to ensure that *all* children receive a sound basic education.

The three fundamentals—high quality teachers, excellent administrators and adequate resources—are interrelated. Individually, each is necessary but, standing alone, is not enough. North Carolina must find a way to ensure that *all* schools have every piece of this interlocking puzzle in place to fulfill the promise of *Leandro* to all students regardless of where they live. While important strides have been made, North Carolina must step up its efforts to address education inadequacies and guarantee that *every* child has an equal opportunity to receive a sound basic education.

POLICY OPTIONS, CONTINUED

“North Carolina must find a way to ensure that all schools have every piece of this interlocking puzzle in place to fulfill the promise of Leandro to all students regardless of what school is attended.”

CONCLUSION

SCHOOL DISTRICT DATA

	North Carolina	Bertie	Cumberland	Durham	Edgecombe	Forsyth	Franklin	Guilford	Halifax	Hertford	Hoke	Hyde
School Population												
Students in Public Schools (average daily membership)	1,347,177	3,349	52,521	30,704	7,625	48,299	7,916	67,130	5,139	3,522	6,756	647
White	57.6%	13.3%	39.6%	26.6%	36.8%	48.7%	51.8%	44.6%	5.1%	16.9%	29.7%	49.1%
Black	31.4%	85.1%	50.8%	59.2%	57.7%	37.3%	39.3%	44.4%	87.9%	80.7%	46.8%	44.2%
Hispanic	7.5%	0.8%	6.1%	11.7%	5.2%	12.4%	8.2%	6.0%	1.0%	1.2%	8.5%	6.6%
Native American	1.5%	0.5%	1.8%	0.3%	0.1%	0.2%	0.3%	0.6%	6.0%	0.9%	14.1%	0.0%
Asian	2.0%	0.2%	1.7%	2.2%	0.2%	1.4%	0.4%	4.4%	0.1%	0.3%	0.9%	0.0%
County Finances												
Average Per Capita Income ¹ (2004)	\$29,322	\$22,489	\$29,425	\$32,649	\$23,923	\$33,575	\$25,191	\$32,888	\$21,497	\$21,736	\$18,817	\$21,028
Children Living in Poverty (2004)	16.9%	25.5%	19.6%	18.4%	21.5%	16.0%	16.0%	17.4%	29.8%	24.7%	20.3%	23.1%
Property Tax Rate ¹ (SFY 05-06) per \$100 assessed valuation	varies	\$0.78	\$0.88	\$0.81	\$0.93	\$0.67	\$0.79	\$0.64	\$0.87	\$0.91	\$0.74	\$0.72
Adjusted Property Tax Base ¹ (in Billions, SFY 05-06)	\$708.3	\$1.0	\$14.6	\$21.6	\$2.7	\$26.4	\$3.2	\$39.8	\$2.9	\$1.1	\$1.6	\$0.8
County Appropriations and Supplemental Taxes for Education (in Millions)	\$1,925.5	\$2.1	\$60.9	\$77.9	\$6.1	\$87.7	\$9.0	\$130.7	\$3.3	\$3.2	\$3.2	\$1.0
School Finances												
Total Per Pupil Expenditures	\$6,922	\$8,383	\$6,622	\$8,107	\$7,348	\$7,152	\$6,749	\$7,152	\$8,113	\$8,361	\$6,882	\$14,439
Federal Per Pupil Expenditures	\$562	\$1,235	\$797	\$566	\$971	\$400	\$675	\$446	\$1,596	\$1,146	\$986	\$1,437
State Per Pupil Expenditures	\$4,724	\$6,040	\$4,580	\$4,796	\$5,268	\$4,621	\$4,708	\$4,471	\$5,695	\$6,124	\$5,122	\$10,425
Local Per Pupil Expenditures	\$1,636	\$1,108	\$1,245	\$2,745	\$1,109	\$2,132	\$1,366	\$2,235	\$821	\$1,092	\$774	\$2,577
Students Receiving Free/Reduced Lunch	47.7%	92.5%	56.6%	47.7%	72.3%	47.1%	54.8%	46.4%	86.0%	82.6%	60.9%	63.4%
School Performance												
3rd Grade Students Below Proficient on End-of-Grade Math Testing	13.9%	29.2%	17.2%	20.4%	16.2%	15.6%	21.1%	15.8%	16.4%	25.7%	27.4%	14.3%
8th Grade Students Below Proficient on End-of-Grade Math Testing	15.2%	21.1%	17.9%	24.5%	23.0%	18.9%	23.4%	17.8%	28.1%	21.5%	23.0%	11.8%
High School Students Below Grade Level in Algebra I	19.7%	33.1%	25.3%	34.5%	23.7%	26.6%	27.0%	36.2%	48.9%	52.1%	33.0%	9.8%
Graduation Rate (SY 05-06)	68.1%	63.1%	64.7%	68.8%	56.3%	73.7%	61.5%	63.5%	59.4%	48.9%	47.1%	68.1%
School Faculty (SY 05-06)												
Teachers with Graduate Certificate ²	32.5%	21.4%	28.8%	38.8%	26.6%	38.8%	21.6%	35.0%	25.5%	24.9%	27.7%	26.3%
Teachers with No Prior Experience ²	5.9%	2.8%	10.2%	8.6%	10.2%	4.5%	8.8%	8.2%	2.7%	5.4%	8.7%	15.0%
Personnel with Master's Degree ³	33.0%	22.5%	30.6%	38.9%	26.5%	36.6%	23.5%	32.7%	26.8%	24.0%	25.0%	29.1%

Note: Data are for the 2004-2005 school year (SY) unless otherwise noted.

¹Data for these indicators are county level. For districts that are parts of a county, county information is given.

²Instructional personnel includes principals, assistant principals, classroom teachers, guidance counselors and librarians/media coordinators.

³Includes all teachers, guidance counselors and librarians/media coordinators.

In spring of 2006, Judge Manning determined that 19 high schools in North Carolina had fewer than 55% of students passing end-of-course tests for four years. The districts with these high schools plus districts receiving Disadvantaged Student Supplemental Funds and the original five plaintiff districts are included in this chart. Information on all other school districts is available online at: <http://www.ncchild.org> and <http://www.law.unc.edu/Centers>.

SCHOOL DISTRICT DATA

	Lexington City	Mecklenburg	Montgomery	Northampton	Pasquotank	Robeson	Thomasville City	Vance	Warren	Washington	Wayne	Weldon City
School Population												
Students in Public Schools (average daily membership)	3,092	118,517	4,523	3,177	5,977	24,268	2,541	8,134	3,081	2,132	19,306	1,058
White	27.4%	39.7%	49.1%	17.8%	46.8%	20.1%	30.7%	27.5%	19.2%	22.1%	47.2%	2.5%
Black	46.0%	45.1%	27.3%	80.6%	50.5%	30.4%	49.6%	65.7%	73.3%	75.7%	43.3%	96.9%
Hispanic	21.0%	10.4%	20.8%	1.3%	1.9%	5.9%	18.5%	6.5%	3.0%	2.1%	8.1%	0.3%
Native American	0.2%	0.6%	0.0%	0.2%	0.2%	43.1%	0.4%	0.1%	4.5%	0.0%	0.2%	0.3%
Asian	5.4%	4.2%	2.7%	0.0%	0.6%	0.5%	0.8%	0.2%	0.0%	0.1%	1.3%	0.1%
County Finances												
Average Per Capita Income¹ (2004)	\$27,029	\$40,416	\$23,615	\$25,074	\$23,256	\$19,621	\$27,029	\$21,993	\$19,164	\$22,983	\$24,901	\$21,497
Children Living in Poverty (2004)	34.8%	18.7%	15.0%	26.1%	20.0%	28.5%	26.9%	24.9%	26.4%	26.7%	19.0%	33.1%
Property Tax Rate¹ (SFY 05-06) per \$100 assessed valuation	\$0.54	\$0.84	\$0.58	\$0.88	\$0.84	\$0.80	\$0.54	\$0.92	\$0.84	\$0.79	\$0.74	\$0.87
Adjusted Property Tax Base¹ (in Billions, SFY 05-06)	\$9.9	\$85.2	\$2.1	\$1.4	\$1.9	\$4.1	\$9.9	\$2.4	\$1.5	\$0.6	\$5.8	\$2.9
County Appropriations and Supplemental Taxes for Education (in Millions)	\$4.9	\$267.2	\$5.0	\$3.2	\$7.6	\$12.3	\$3.7	\$6.7	\$2.5	\$1.5	\$16.6	\$1.5
School Finances												
Total Per Pupil Expenditures	\$8,415	\$7,116	\$7,750	\$8,547	\$7,477	\$6,721	\$8,081	\$7,384	\$8,083	\$9,610	\$6,617	\$10,033
Federal Per Pupil Expenditures	\$941	\$483	\$998	\$1,226	\$781	\$878	\$1,184	\$1,003	\$1,090	\$1,615	\$643	\$1,852
State Per Pupil Expenditures	\$5,527	\$4,397	\$5,322	\$6,051	\$5,130	\$5,064	\$5,097	\$5,128	\$5,925	\$6,798	\$4,873	\$6,074
Local Per Pupil Expenditures	\$1,947	\$2,236	\$1,430	\$1,270	\$1,566	\$778	\$1,799	\$1,253	\$1,067	\$1,197	\$1,101	\$2,107
Students Receiving Free/Reduced Lunch	79.8%	47.6%	63.6%	82.8%	59.8%	80.5%	82.9%	80.4%	77.2%	86.4%	58.1%	88.9%
School Performance												
3rd Grade Students Below Proficient on End-of-Grade Math Testing	9.8%	14.1%	19.0%	28.8%	21.8%	19.3%	38.0%	15.1%	27.2%	29.5%	16.2%	22.8%
8th Grade Students Below Proficient on End-of-Grade Math Testing	22.6%	18.9%	19.8%	24.7%	23.3%	19.7%	18.6%	31.2%	19.3%	34.9%	16.9%	30.8%
High School Students Below Grade Level in Algebra I	47.7%	30.8%	31.8%	24.2%	31.8%	23.7%	23.7%	30.1%	43.9%	30.4%	16.1%	44.8%
Graduation Rate (SY 05-06)	43.7%	74.6%	72.0%	61.9%	48.2%	55.1%	50.0%	47.8%	68.2%	70.3%	61.5%	47.6%
School Faculty (SY 05-06)												
Teachers with Graduate Certificate²	28.8%	37.7%	26.4%	22.5%	29.7%	32.1%	30.0%	25.7%	26.9%	27.0%	26.8%	27.1%
Teachers with No Prior Experience²	7.2%	9.0%	7.1%	6.0%	5.8%	7.4%	17.7%	13.8%	9.3%	3.7%	6.0%	6.3%
Personnel with Master's Degree³	28.3%	36.4%	25.1%	25.7%	28.6%	32.1%	30.5%	27.0%	29.5%	29.4%	27.5%	29.1%

Note: Data are for the 2004-2005 school year (SY) unless otherwise noted.

¹Data for these indicators are county level. For districts that are parts of a county, county information is given.

²Instructional personnel includes principals, assistant principals, classroom teachers, guidance counselors and librarians/media coordinators.

³Includes all teachers, guidance counselors and librarians/media coordinators.

Data Sources: Unless otherwise noted, all data are from the North Carolina Public Schools Statistical Profile, 2005 and 2006, tables 10, 17, 18, 19, 21, 25, 30. Available online at: <http://www.ncpublicschools.org/fbs/resources/data/>. Poverty data from the U.S. Census, Small Area Income and Poverty Data. Available online at: <http://www.census.gov/hhes/www/saipo/index.html>. Property Tax data from North Carolina Department of Revenue, "Property Tax Rates and Latest Year of Revaluation for North Carolina Counties and Municipalities" Fiscal Year 2005-2006. Available online at: <http://www.dor.state.nc.us/publications/propertyrates.html>. Adjusted Property Tax Base data from North Carolina Department of Public Instruction (N.C. DPI), Financial Support Documentation "Low-Wealth Funding Allotment, Formula Sample Calculation." Available online at: <http://www.ncpublicschools.org/fbs/allotments/support/>. Free and Reduced Price Lunch data from a special request to N.C. DPI Claims Department, October 2005. Graduation Rate data from N.C. DPI, "2006 4-Year Cohort Graduation Rates by LEA." Available online at: <http://www.ncpublicschools.org/newsroom/news/2006-07/20070228-01>. End-of-grade testing data from a special request to N.C. DPI, Division of Accountability Services, October 2005.

© Copyright 2007.

Any or all portions of this report may be reproduced without prior permission, provided the source is cited as "What Stands Between North Carolina Students and A Sound Basic Education?," Action for Children North Carolina and the UNC Center for Civil Rights Leandro Advocacy Project, March 2007, Raleigh, NC.

This publication is a joint project between Action for Children North Carolina and the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill's Center for Civil Rights.

This publication was funded by the Annie E. Casey Foundation and the Jessie Ball duPont Fund. We thank them for their support but acknowledge that the findings and conclusions presented in this report are those of the authors alone, and do not necessarily reflect the opinions of these organizations.

Special acknowledgments to N.C. NAACP, the N.C. Justice Center and NCCARE for their support of this work.



UNC Center for Civil Rights Leandro Advocacy Project

www.law.unc.edu/Centers
VOICE 919.962.5106



1300 Saint Mary's Street, Suite 500
Raleigh, NC 27605-1276

VOICE 919.834.6623 x 229
FAX 919.829.7299

Visit us online at
www.ncchild.org

*Working to make North Carolina
the best place to be and raise a child*

Nonprofit Org.
US Postage
PAID
Raleigh, NC
Permit No. 2156