

North Carolina Education Research Data Center Technical Report #3: Student Offenses Database, 2000-01 through 2003-04.

November 14, 2005

In 2000-01, the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction (NCDPI) required schools to report individual student offenses every time a legally-reportable offense, an in-school suspension (ISS), an out-of-school suspension (OSS), a referral to an alternative program (ALP) or school, or an expulsion occurred during the school year. Subsequently, the requirement to report in-school suspensions was dropped. Each year NCDPI did not require that less serious events, such as those resulting in detentions or loss of privileges, be reported.

This database offers many possibilities for researchers. All four years can be aggregated to the district level, and 2001-02 through 2003-04 can be aggregated to the school-level. Additionally, many students can be linked to their academic records or across years of offense-consequence data. Researchers can use these files to examine differences in offense rates across schools, the percentage of students committing offenses in each school, and the numbers of offenses committed by each student. In some cases, researchers can link this information to student academic records to examine antecedents of misconduct.

Because state requirements for this information have changed over time, and schools and districts differ in their methods for collecting and reporting data, the quality of these files vary across time, school, and district. This report describes the data collected by NCDPI, the NC Education Research Data Center's process for cleaning the data and linking it to other files, and the limitations of using these data. Specific descriptions of measures in each file are included in the codebooks.

Data Collection

These data were collected by the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction through each local educational area's (LEA) Superintendent's office, or, in the case of charter schools, through the Director / Principal's office. Each year, records are generated each time a legally-reportable offense, an out-of-school suspension, a referral to an alternative school or program, or an expulsion occurs (or an in-school suspension in 2000-01). Although they are not required to do so, some schools report minor offenses, such as those resulting in detention, which are classified as 'other' offenses.

These data are first reported at the school. If a student misbehaves, some school official completes a discipline report form on that student. Reporting forms are not consistent across schools or districts, and different school staff members, such as teachers, support staff, or administrators, may enter the data. Given that different people complete these reports, offenses may not be reported consistently even within a school.

To compound some of the data consistency and quality issues during the years involved, at least two different software packages, SIMS and SSP, were used to collect data in North Carolina districts. Some districts used both packages during that time frame while others may have used different software. The Student Information Management System (SIMS) database does not link the student's offense to the school's consequences for that action. Student offenses and school consequences are kept in separate files, and the dates of the offenses and consequences differ.

The other piece of software typically used to gather discipline information is the School Safety Software (SSP). The software tool can be used collect, track, report and analyze violent and non-violent offense data at school. Unlike SIMS, the SSP system links all offense data to the consequence data. Also, multiple offenses can be listed in one incident report, unlike in SIMS where each offense is a separate record.

Information included in the data

Generally, these files contain two types of data on students: the type of offenses and the resulting consequences (sometimes referred to as disciplinary action). However, the requirements for reporting this information have changed over time.

Offenses

Methods for reporting offenses changed after 2000-01 both in the way schools were to report multiple offenses and in the categories of offenses they were to include. In the 2000-01 school year, each record includes only one offense per student. Therefore, one student may have multiple records stemming from one incident in which multiple offenses were committed. For example, if a student is caught by a teacher with alcohol and then assaults the teacher, he could have two records – one for possession of alcohol and one for assault on school personnel. From 2001-02 to 2003-04, it is possible to report two offenses in one incident record. This change in record format is notable, as it may in part explain the significant drop in the number of records from 2000-01 (385,494) to 2001-02 (325,104).

Categories of offenses (e.g., robbery, assault with weapon) changed as well. For example, in 2000-01, offenses included “substance abuse,” which is not present in subsequent years. The 2001-02 and 2002-03 data include a category for “possession of alcohol,” which was not collected in 2000-01. In 2002-03, the file included space for an open-ended description of the offense (described below). Use of this measure was discontinued in 2003-04.

In Table 1 below lists misconduct types and the years that data were reported. Due to changes in reporting requirements, some variation in offense rates may be expected above the normal year-to-year variation. Appendix Table 1 presents offense rates by district for each year. The percentages in this table represent the number of students in a district who committed at least one offense divided by the total number of students in that district in that year. An examination of changes in offense rates shows no consistent

pattern in district-level offense rates from 2000-01 to 2001-02 and 2002-03, so changes in codes for offense and consequence types do not seem to affect reporting in a consistent way.

Table 1: Types of Student Misconduct and Years Collected

Types of Misconduct	In file? 2000-01	In file? 2001-02– 2003-04
Aggressive Behavior	Yes	No
Assault on school personnel	Yes	Yes
Assault with serious injury	Yes	Yes
Assault with weapon	Yes	Yes
Bomb Threat	No	Yes
Burning a school building	No	Yes
Death by other than natural causes	No	Yes
Deemed a serious threat to self or others	Yes	No
Distribution of controlled substance	Yes	No
Health Immunization	Yes	No
Homicide	Yes	No
Indecent liberties with a minor	Yes	Yes
Kidnapping	Yes	Yes
Other reasons	Yes	Yes
Possession of a firearm	Yes	Yes
Possession of a harmful object	Yes	No
Possession of a weapon	Yes	Yes
Possession of alcohol	No	Yes
Possession of controlled substance	Yes	Yes
Property Damage	Yes	No
Rape	Yes	Yes
Robbery	Yes	Yes
Robbery with weapon	Yes	Yes
Rule Violation	Yes	No
Sexual assault	Yes	Yes
Sexual offense	Yes	Yes
Substance Abuse	Yes	No
Theft	Yes	No
Truancy	Yes	No
Undisciplined	Yes	No

Consequences

Like the offense information, the disciplinary consequences data change significantly between 2000-01 year and subsequent years. In the 2001-02 and 2002-03 school years, up to three consequences can be reported for each offense. In prior years, only one consequence could be linked to each offense. In Table 2 below, each of the consequences is listed with the years these items were collected.

Table 2: Types of Disciplinary Consequences and Years Collected

Types of Disciplinary Consequences	In file? 2000-01	In file? 2001-02 – 2003-04
Change in placement due to determination of a Hearing Officer	No	Yes
Community legal / court system action or decision pending	No	Yes
Detention	No	Yes
Expulsion	Yes	Yes
Hearing held, resulting in no change in placement	No	Yes
ISS	Yes	Yes
Long term suspension	Yes	Yes
Offender referred to a treatment program	No	Yes
OSS	Yes	Yes
Other	No	Yes
Privileges taken away	No	Yes
Student placed in alternative school	No	Yes
Student placed in an alternative learning program	Yes	Yes
Student placed in homebound instructional program	No	Yes
Unilateral change in placement	No	Yes

Demographic data

In addition to information about the offense committed and disciplinary consequences, the data file also contains demographic and identifying information about the student. These identifying measures were used to link records for students who had multiple offenses and to link these files to student academic achievement data. These identifying measures are not included in publicly available data; public files have encrypted identifiers. Table 3 below contains all these variables and the years in which they are available.

Table 3: Identifying and Demographic Variables and Years Collected

Student Identifying / Demographic Variables	In file? 2000-01	In file? 2001-02 – 2003-04
Age	Yes	Yes
Exceptional student status	Yes	Yes
Grade	Yes	Yes
LEA	Yes	Yes
Limited English Proficiency	Yes	No
Name	Yes	No
Race	Yes	Yes
School Code	No	Yes
Sex	Yes	Yes
Social Security Number	Yes	Yes

One new variable of note in 2001-02 is 'OFFENDER', which describes the identity of the individual committing the offense. While nearly all of the offenses are committed by students at the school reporting the offense, there are 103 (about one-thirtieth of a percent of the total) records of offenses committed by staff, parents, or caregivers.

Data Cleaning

The North Carolina Education Research Data Center (NCERDC) staff took several measures to clean and standardize these files.

- Data were read into SAS, formatted, and labeled. Dates were formatted to month-day-year. Because year was not always included on the incident record, the Data Center recoded years to fall within the school year -- August (2000, 2001, 2002) and July (2001, 2002, 2003).
- Beginning in 2001-02, charter schools' LEA and school codes were changed to match those in other Education Research Data Center files. (The 2000-01 file does not contain school code.)
- Also starting in 2001-02, variables were standardized so that offense variables begin with the prefix "O_" and consequence variables begin with "C_."

Linking Student Records

As noted above, in 2000-01, each record included only one offense per student. Therefore, for that year's data, a large portion of the cleaning process involved identifying multiple records for the same student within the dataset.¹ First, students were matched by LEA, name, LEA and social security number (SSN). Due to misspellings, nicknames, and inaccurate social security numbers, records for the same student did not always match. For example, records for Kate Smith and Katherine Smith, both with the same SSN and LEA, would not match. In addition, two records with the same name and LEA but different social security numbers 123-45-6789 and 123-45-6189 would not match. To address this problem, names attached to the same social security number were compared using *spedis*, a procedure in SAS which determines the likelihood of two words matching. Additionally, names attached to the same SSN were compared in reverse order, so that Kate Smith and Smith Kate would be identified as the same individual. Finally, *spedis* was also used to match students with the same or similar names and different social security numbers. If one number differed between the two (1 versus 7 in the example above) or two numbers were juxtaposed (45 versus 54) then the records were determined to belong to the same student (see Table 4).

¹ In subsequent years, student linking was limited to SSN-LEA matching. However, many student records were already linked as each record could include more than one offense and consequence.

Table 4: Example of within Dataset Matching for 2000-2001

Record 1 1 st Name	Record 1 Last Name	Record 1 SSN	Record 2 1 st Name	Record 2 Last Name	Record 2 SSN	Match?
Joe	Brown	123-45-6789	Joseph	Brown	123-45-6789	Yes
Joseph	Brown	123-45-6789	Joseph	Brown	123-54-6789	Yes
Joseph	Brown	123-45-6789	Joe	Brown	123-54-6789	Yes
Brown	Joseph	123-45-6789	Joseph	Brown	123-45-6789	Yes
Joseph	Brown	123-45-6789	Joseph	Brom	123-45-6789	Yes
Jennifer	Brown	123-45-6789	Joseph	Brown	123-45-6789	No

There may be multiple records for one student that are not identified as such. Students with inaccurate or missing identifying information would not be assigned the same encrypted identifier. Therefore, there may be fewer students committing offenses and more students with multiple offenses than appear in the data.

Each year, all students were then assigned an identifier to link records within that dataset (SUSID). This identifier links multiple records for the same student within each annual offense-consequence data file. *It does not link to other years of offense-consequence data or to other datasets, such as students' test scores.*

Matching the offense-consequence data to the NCERDC datasets

The NCERDC also matched students to an encrypted identifier (MASTID) that is used in other data files. Students who are matched to master id can be linked to other NCERDC datasets, including End of Course and End of Grade test scores, as well as across years of offense-consequence data.

As noted above, different identifying information was available in the 2000-01 school year than in subsequent years. Most notably, students' name was available in the first year but not in subsequent years.

In 2000-01, a multi-level system was used to link the data. First, students were matched to their master id by social security number, name, and LEA. Over 70 percent of the 156,944 students in the offense-consequence data were matched to master id using these criteria. Unmatched records were then matched using name and LEA. The final attempt to match students to master id used social security number and district. Approximately 14 percent of remaining students were matched using these criteria.

From 2001-02 on, only social security number and LEA were provided for the match. The NCERDC attempted to match students first to the current year's test scores. Unmatched students were then matched to previous and future years of test data, as available. For students not matched to the current year, the variable MATCHYR indicates the first year in which the students were linked to their test scores. The results of the matching are listed below.

- Eighty-six percent of students in the 2000-01 school year can be matched.
- Fifty-one percent of students in the 2001-02 school year can be matched.
- Forty percent of students in the 2002-03 school year can be matched.
- Thirty-one percent of students in the 2003-04 school year can be matched.

Without name, typographical errors in the SSN variable eliminate a student's possibility to match. Additionally, several districts do not report true SSN's. For example, in Forsyth County all students were identified by a SSN beginning with the same five digits, suggesting a created ID. None of the students could be matched. Additionally, in 2002-03, Charlotte-Mecklenburg had a zero percent match rate, and Wake County schools matched only about three and a half percent of their student offenders to master id. The issue of generated IDs and missing values in the SSN filed was most problematic in 2003-04. In these data, only 124,134 of 327,572 records had nine-digit, non-missing values for social security number. Of those with nine-digit SSNs, over 55 percent were matched to other NCERDC datasets, however, due to the missing and invalid SSNs, only slightly more than one in five students were matched. Additionally, twenty-one districts, including the largest (Charlotte-Mecklenburg), failed to match any students in 2003-04.

Table A2 reports match rates across years for public school systems. This table also contains flags for districts with match rates over 80 percent for all three years and those with match rates between 50 percent and 80 percent for all three years. Match rates for charter schools are not presented in this table because of the low number of charter schools in existence in all four years and the prevalence of missing data among charter schools. Consequently, only two charter schools (Chatham Charter and Woods Charter) have match rates above 50 percent in all three years. Finally, note match rates among schools within a district differ greatly -- except in districts with extremely high or low match rates.

Standardizing and coding offenses

In the 2000-01 offense-consequence data, student offenses are classified as falling into one of 26 categories. Approximately 8 percent of records are classified as "other" offenses with no specific information about the offense leading to disciplinary consequence. There were several other codes that were used in the 2000-01 file that were not used in subsequent years (see Table 1 above).

In the 2001-02 and 2002-03 offense-consequence data, student offenses are classified as falling into one of 18 categories. *Nearly 97 percent of the offenses are classified as "other offenses."* In 2001-02 and 2003-04, there is no other information about this offense.

The 2002-03 data include an additional variable describing incident if the offense is classified as "other." Because of its open-ended nature, incident descriptions range from broad (such as "disrespectful") to specific (such as "told math teacher to shut up"), and the data contained nearly 22,000 different incident descriptions. The NCERDC standardized this variable (O_STDDESC). This standardization involved making several changes. First, words were corrected for spelling and typographical errors (such as

AGRESSIVE is changed to AGGRESSIVE). Second, the plurality of words was standardized (such as DRUG, DRUGS are changed to DRUG(S)). Third, verbs were standardized in tense (such as CHEAT, CHEATING are changed to CHEATED). Next, synonyms were grouped together (such as CUSSING, SWEARING are standardized to CURSED) and (SLAPPED, SMACKED, PUNCHED are changed to HIT). Finally, other minor changes were made to collapse the incident descriptions as much as possible without losing important information. As a result of standardization by the NCERDC, the 22,000 incident descriptions were reduced to just over 3,000.

The NCERDC then collapsed these incidents into conceptual codes that researchers could use for analysis. These codes are based on the open-ended variable describing the incident (O_STDDESC) and the categorical offense variables (O_OFFENSE1 and O_OFFENSE2). Values for these new coded variables (O_CAT1 and O_CAT2) were generated for “other” offenses using the descriptions provided in the open-ended comments. A list of each of the coded values, the category name and the number of offenses is found below.

Table 5: List of codes, descriptions and number of offenses

Code	Offense	N of offenses
RVFS	Fighting	19117
RULE	General rule violation	16777
RVDB	Disruptive behavior	12106
OTHR	Other offenses not defined	9752
RVTR	Attendance / Truancy / Tardy violations	8016
RVFT	General threats (not including bombs)	6716
AGGR	Aggressive behavior	6685
PROF	General Profanity	5726
ACTV	Discipline Action violation	3486
RVAS	Assault on student	3104
RVCR	Non-compliance with school rules	2905
RVTF	Theft / Property Damage / Trespassing	2160
RVSK	Tobacco possession / Smoking	2138
RVVS	Verbal abuse / aggression / fighting	1025
RVDR	Dress code violation	932
SEX	Sexual comments / profanity / actions (not included in assault and offense)	897
RVIS	Abusive / Intimidating towards students	698
RVCT	Cheating / Falsification / Lying	351
ATTU	Disrespectful / bad / erratic attitude / behavior	346
HI	Health / Immunization	226
RVIL	Indecent literature / materials / pornography	159
DANG	Dangerous acts towards self and others	81
RACE	Racial comments	75

In addition, some of the offenses that were categorized as ‘other’ were, in fact, comparable to one of the 18 coded offenses that were already categorized. For example, if O_OFFENSE1 is 18 (“Other”) and O_STDDDESC is “BOMB THREAT,” then O_CAT1 is coded 4, which is the code for bomb threats. As a result, there are 200 bomb threats in the data according to the O_OFFENSE variables, and 206 according to the O_CAT variables. See Table 6 below for more information about the coded offenses.

Table 6: Addition to original offense codes through recoding

Offense	Number coded originally through O_OFFENSE1 and O_OFFENSE2 in 2002-03 data file	Number initially coded as “other” in 2002-03 data file
Assault resulting in serious injury	302	24
Assault involving the use of a weapon	103	12
Assault on school personnel	943	86
Bomb Threat	200	6
Burning of a school building	41	3
Death by other than natural causes	0	0
Kidnapping	1	0
Possession of an alcoholic beverage	662	20
Possession of a controlled substance	3336	228
Possession of firearms / explosives	123	106
Possession of weapon	2759	96
Rape	3	0
Robbery with weapon	3	0
Robbery without weapon	77	0
Sexual assault	148	317
Sexual offense	91	7
Taking indecent liberties with a minor	12	0

No Child Left Behind and Persistently Dangerous Schools

Under the federal No Child Left Behind act, states must allow parents to transfer children from schools designated as “persistently dangerous.” Each state develops its own criteria for what constitutes a persistently dangerous school, and this definition may influence the way crimes are reported.

The North Carolina State Board of Education Policy manual defines a persistently dangerous school as “a public school in which the conditions during the past two school years continually exposed its students to injury from violent criminal offenses and it is an elementary, middle or secondary public school in which a total of five or more violent criminal offenses were committed per 1000 students in two consecutive school years.” To date, no North Carolina school has been designated persistently dangerous.

Ten offenses count towards this definition of persistently dangerous schools:

1. Assault resulting in serious injury
2. Assault involving use of a weapon
3. Death by other than natural causes
4. Kidnapping
5. Rape (statutory or forcible)
6. Robbery with a dangerous weapon
7. Robbery without a dangerous weapon
8. Sexual assault not involving rape or sexual offense
9. Sexual offense
10. Taking indecent liberties with a minor

For more details about the definitions of these crimes, see

<http://www.ncpublicschools.org/docs/schoolimprovement/alternative/safeschools/dangerous/definitions.pdf>

Conclusions

These files provide a rich database of offenses and consequences at the individual student level. These records can be aggregated to the school and district level, and linked to other school and district datasets. Some student records can be linked to other student datasets.

Due to the variability in the data collection and entry, these files have data discrepancies within each year. This was especially evident in the 2002-03 descriptions of the other offenses.

There were also significant changes in this file from the 2000-01 year to subsequent years. Most notably, the name identifier was dropped from the file. This omission had significant impact on the match rate – from a match rate of 86 percent in 2000-01 to 51 percent and 40 percent for 2001-02 and 2002-03, respectively. The match rate reached its lowest point at 31 percent in 2003-04.

There were also significant changes made to the offense and consequence categories between 2000-01 and 2001-02. Offense was collapsed from 26 categories to 18 categories. “Other” categorical offenses increased from eight percent in 2000-01 to 97 percent in 2001-02, 2002-03, and 2003-04.

Schools differ in the way they report offenses and consequences. In general, more serious offenses and consequences will be reported more consistently than less serious ones.

These differences result from the following policies:

- The number of incidents brought to a principal’s attention can vary between schools based on the climate of the school (strictness in reporting standards).

- The principal determines the punishment for less-serious offenses. Such consequences can include detention, alternative placement, or short-term suspension. Minor offenses are only required to be reported if they result in suspension or expulsion, therefore a school where the principal favors detention over short-term suspension will report fewer incidents than a school where short-term suspension is the preferred consequence for minor offenses.
- Some schools consider placing students in alternative learning programs as being suspensions and report these offenses and consequences. Others claim that because these students are still being educated they are not suspended, and these schools do not report incidents that result in alternative placement.

Across all LEAs and years, legally-reportable crimes are the most consistently reported offenses. By law, police must be notified if these offenses occur, and principals do not have much leeway in deciding whether to report such incidents.

Within LEAs, more serious consequences, such as long-term suspensions and expulsions, will be more consistently reported than less serious consequences, such as short-term suspension. Decisions regarding long-term suspensions and expulsions are made at the district level. However, districts differ in their likelihood of imposing a long-term suspension or expulsion. *Therefore, the most reliable interpretations of these data are longitudinal studies within districts.*

Example: Durham County

To illustrate some of the capacities and limitations of these data, the following example summarizes data for Durham County.

	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04
Number of offenses	7,341	8,194	8,507	9,215
Number of students committing offenses	3,511	4,244	3,969	4,220
Percent of students committing offenses	12.0	12.5	10.8	13.7
Percent of students matching education records	84.6	64.7	93.0	91.8

The number of offenses rose each year from 7,341 in 2000-01 to 9,215 in 2003-04. However, the number of students committing offenses was did not increase steadily along with the number of offenses, indicating changes in the number of offenses per student offender per year.

One could use the data to examine differences in offense rates across schools, the percentage of students committing offenses in each school, and the number of offenses associated with each student. All but two Durham schools reported incidents in 2002-03,

and all but one of them did so in 2001-02.² In 2002-03, in the school with the lowest offense rate, only 2 out of 831 students (0.24 percent) committed any offenses in that year. In contrast, one middle school reported that 1 in 3 students committed offenses in this year. Across all Durham schools in 2002-03, 14 percent of students committed at least one offense over the course of the year, and student offenders averaged about 2 offenses per year.

According to the requirements provided by the NC Department of Public Instruction, certain offenses need not be reported. Reporting guidelines for 2001-02 through 2003-04 state that offenses that must be reported involve a “legally reportable offense, an out-of-school suspension, a referral to an alternative school or ALP, or an expulsion.” Minor offenses resulting in detention, loss of privileges, or in-school suspensions need not be reported. In Durham in 2001-02, 1.1 percent of reported offenses were “other” offenses with minor consequences (detention, loss of privileges, in-school suspension). In 2002-03, approximately 3.8 percent of reported incidents involved only such minor offenses before dropping to less than one half of a percent in 2003-04. It is likely that some non-reportable offenses are included in the 2000-01 data as well. However, in this year, schools were required to report in-school suspensions as well as out-of-school suspensions; and “detention” and “loss of privileges” were not included as options in the consequence variables. Reporting patterns vary among Durham schools, with many schools reporting no minor offenses. In some schools, minor offenses make up a notable percentage (15 to 20 percent) of the overall number of reports.

² School code was not included in the dataset in 2000-01. Where student offense records match student academic records, school code can be attached to the file.

Table A1: Public school district average size and percent of students committing reportable offenses each year: sorted by district

lea	District Name	Average District Size, 2000-01 to 2003-04	% students reported, 2000-01	% students reported, 2001-02	% students reported, 2002-03	% students reported, 2003-04
010	ALAMANCE-BURLINGTON SCHOOLS	21502	5.81	9.84	11.84	13.24
020	ALEXANDER COUNTY SCHOOLS	5484	7.25	7.50	8.23	7.92
030	ALLEGHANY COUNTY SCHOOLS	1487	5.11	2.42	.	2.34
040	ANSON COUNTY SCHOOLS	4500	1.77	14.63	16.62	16.02
050	ASHE COUNTY SCHOOLS	3272	12.34	4.43	3.26	2.53
060	AVERY COUNTY SCHOOLS	2458	12.07	3.94	3.17	5.04
070	BEAUFORT COUNTY SCHOOLS	7467	0.78	12.28	.	14.34
080	BERTIE COUNTY SCHOOLS	3574	7.41	9.32	8.41	6.47
090	BLADEN COUNTY SCHOOLS	5809	7.72	6.10	2.51	2.15
100	BRUNSWICK COUNTY SCHOOLS	10699	9.65	12.35	12.02	12.19
110	BUNCOMBE COUNTY SCHOOLS	24677	15.87	7.83	8.11	8.48
111	ASHEVILLE CITY SCHOOLS	3934	9.36	12.92	18.67	15.03
120	BURKE COUNTY SCHOOLS	14732	13.09	7.49	7.57	8.49
130	CABARRUS COUNTY SCHOOLS	20724	11.87	9.11	9.64	9.59
132	KANNAPOLIS CITY SCHOOLS	4386	17.44	11.82	12.65	13.08
140	CALDWELL COUNTY SCHOOLS	12740	8.58	5.16	6.79	8.15
150	CAMDEN COUNTY SCHOOLS	1391	8.50	8.48	8.68	9.32
160	CARTERET COUNTY SCHOOLS	8256	13.74	8.34	9.81	9.51
170	CASWELL COUNTY SCHOOLS	3568	7.96	7.89	15.80	21.95
180	CATAWBA COUNTY SCHOOLS	16569	10.60	5.91	6.13	5.77
181	HICKORY CITY SCHOOLS	4478	11.97	15.44	16.69	13.53
182	NEWTON CONOVER CITY SCHOOLS	2839	10.64	9.03	11.31	9.06
190	CHATHAM COUNTY SCHOOLS	7218	8.74	10.43	9.50	7.85
200	CHEROKEE COUNTY SCHOOLS	3746	7.11	3.38	4.82	3.89
210	EDENTON/CHOWAN SCHOOLS	2537	16.38	11.43	11.20	11.68
220	CLAY COUNTY SCHOOLS	1273	0.32	1.74	0.94	0.94
230	CLEVELAND COUNTY SCHOOLS	9710	15.96	10.11	11.65	11.14
231	KINGS MOUNTAIN DISTRICT	4668	12.06	11.38	13.20	14.82
232	SHELBY CITY SCHOOLS	3297	15.95	11.71	13.32	15.87
240	COLUMBUS COUNTY SCHOOLS	7135	21.14	6.86	8.69	8.51

lea	District Name	Average District Size, 2000-01 to 2003-04	% students reported, 2000-01	% students reported, 2001-02	% students reported, 2002-03	% students reported, 2003-04
241	WHITEVILLE CITY SCHOOLS	2721	9.78	10.45	12.80	8.77
250	CRAVEN COUNTY SCHOOLS	14595	14.78	17.11	10.66	11.24
260	CUMBERLAND COUNTY SCHOOLS	51935	22.60	10.72	12.07	13.95
270	CURRITUCK COUNTY SCHOOLS	3397	4.33	8.63	9.34	8.17
280	DARE COUNTY SCHOOLS	4719	0.90	4.98	4.85	4.64
290	DAVIDSON COUNTY SCHOOLS	19268	8.42	9.30	9.40	8.57
291	LEXINGTON CITY SCHOOLS	3308	25.30	1.22	16.21	16.81
292	THOMASVILLE CITY SCHOOLS	2472	12.84	0.73	22.34	13.83
300	DAVIE COUNTY SCHOOLS	5926	13.15	5.16	6.64	5.04
310	DUPLIN COUNTY SCHOOLS	8765	10.77	15.43	15.13	14.35
320	DURHAM PUBLIC SCHOOLS	30687	10.78	12.51	12.04	13.70
330	EDGECOMBE COUNTY SCHOOLS	7820	22.73	15.36	16.58	19.36
340	FORSYTH COUNTY SCHOOLS	46545	28.23	28.32	11.31	12.07
350	FRANKLIN COUNTY SCHOOLS	7895	15.55	11.66	10.83	12.86
360	GASTON COUNTY SCHOOLS	31180	0.35	13.36	12.84	13.70
370	GATES COUNTY SCHOOLS	1995	20.31	7.75	12.95	11.09
380	GRAHAM COUNTY SCHOOLS	1216	1.86	0.56	0.41	6.28
390	GRANVILLE COUNTY SCHOOLS	8493	11.71	12.78	8.06	12.13
400	GREENE COUNTY SCHOOLS	3235	8.99	16.37	13.65	14.18
410	GUILFORD COUNTY SCHOOLS	65395	9.39	10.29	10.26	9.87
420	HALIFAX COUNTY SCHOOLS	5905	12.27	14.87	11.12	12.98
421	ROANOKE RAPIDS CITY SCHOOLS	3067	14.11	6.28	8.48	7.83
422	WELDON CITY SCHOOLS	1130	14.35	20.17	17.19	16.92
430	HARNETT COUNTY SCHOOLS	16681	7.33	9.32	9.32	9.35
440	HAYWOOD COUNTY SCHOOLS	7863	.	6.14	6.38	10.84
450	HENDERSON COUNTY SCHOOLS	11974	5.06	5.58	6.32	6.16
460	HERTFORD COUNTY SCHOOLS	3965	18.63	7.98	20.20	21.14
470	HOKE COUNTY SCHOOLS	6441	1.54	21.59	20.09	10.26
480	HYDE COUNTY SCHOOLS	697	7.86	14.20	16.21	13.77
490	IREDELL-STATESVILLE SCHOOLS	18395	15.69	8.81	11.27	10.03
491	MOORESVILLE CITY SCHOOLS	4188	5.43	8.41	9.22	12.24
500	JACKSON COUNTY SCHOOLS	3705	6.72	5.44	7.82	8.23
510	JOHNSTON COUNTY SCHOOLS	23235	18.10	12.09	13.02	11.79

lea	District Name	Average District Size, 2000-01 to 2003-04	% students reported, 2000-01	% students reported, 2001-02	% students reported, 2002-03	% students reported, 2003-04
520	JONES COUNTY SCHOOLS	1514	13.63	8.95	5.30	10.00
530	LEE COUNTY SCHOOLS	9041	24.74	8.60	9.45	9.88
540	LENOIR COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	10246	12.33	14.16	14.16	12.17
550	LINCOLN COUNTY SCHOOLS	11061	8.33	11.19	8.63	11.22
560	MACON COUNTY SCHOOLS	4120	4.18	5.12	4.19	6.14
570	MADISON COUNTY SCHOOLS	2559	6.56	5.43	7.53	7.38
580	MARTIN COUNTY SCHOOLS	4650	16.24	15.20	13.98	14.11
590	MCDOWELL COUNTY SCHOOLS	6504	3.45	5.45	6.15	5.05
600	CHARLOTTE-MECKLENBURG SCHOOLS	108943	10.24	11.74	13.19	14.74
610	MITCHELL COUNTY SCHOOLS	2361	3.28	4.56	26.91	3.23
620	MONTGOMERY COUNTY SCHOOLS	4560	6.55	8.01	12.13	9.84
630	MOORE COUNTY SCHOOLS	11368	11.62	9.37	8.15	17.55
640	NASH-ROCKY MOUNT SCHOOLS	18441	9.29	9.95	10.72	12.04
650	NEW HANOVER COUNTY SCHOOLS	21834	12.16	10.14	12.16	11.27
660	NORTHAMPTON COUNTY SCHOOLS	3568	0.66	15.09	13.94	13.38
670	ONslow COUNTY SCHOOLS	21497	14.07	7.10	6.93	7.45
680	ORANGE COUNTY SCHOOLS	6335	1.60	8.23	10.52	7.55
681	CHAPEL HILL-CARRBORO SCHOOLS	10266	3.18	2.79	3.00	3.52
690	PAMLICO COUNTY SCHOOLS	1787	19.50	13.15	15.66	13.93
700	PASQUOTANK COUNTY SCHOOLS	6036	20.61	13.59	16.17	17.02
710	PENDER COUNTY SCHOOLS	6802	14.83	13.13	15.08	14.92
720	PERQUIMANS COUNTY SCHOOLS	1824	9.14	11.20	10.09	13.32
730	PERSON COUNTY SCHOOLS	5790	4.37	17.18	13.73	11.44
740	PITT COUNTY SCHOOLS	20822	15.62	17.17	17.21	17.72
750	POLK COUNTY SCHOOLS	2484	3.31	8.10	5.90	5.86
760	RANDOLPH COUNTY SCHOOLS	18038	4.81	5.16	4.75	4.01
761	ASHEBORO CITY SCHOOLS	4372	13.03	7.21	7.29	7.59
770	RICHMOND COUNTY SCHOOLS	8370	11.27	10.26	10.56	11.71
780	ROBESON COUNTY SCHOOLS	24152	10.16	12.83	14.63	15.43
790	ROCKINGHAM COUNTY SCHOOLS	14846	17.86	11.52	10.07	11.46
800	ROWAN-SALISBURY SCHOOLS	20811	11.71	12.00	12.74	12.27
810	RUTHERFORD COUNTY SCHOOLS	10194	7.41	9.83	8.62	10.04
820	SAMPSON COUNTY SCHOOLS	8062	20.31	9.23	9.70	9.62

lea	District Name	Average District Size, 2000-01 to 2003-04	% students reported, 2000-01	% students reported, 2001-02	% students reported, 2002-03	% students reported, 2003-04
821	CLINTON CITY SCHOOLS	2720	13.58	14.66	2.64	15.67
830	SCOTLAND COUNTY SCHOOLS	7106	16.11	14.25	16.93	19.60
840	STANLY COUNTY SCHOOLS	10100	11.65	11.91	12.98	13.56
850	STOKES COUNTY SCHOOLS	7517	17.02	4.86	5.55	5.02
860	SURRY COUNTY SCHOOLS	8502	10.05	6.49	7.09	6.76
861	ELKIN CITY SCHOOLS	1141	2.22	0.62	2.36	1.66
862	MOUNT AIRY CITY SCHOOLS	1923	9.07	1.74	1.71	3.16
870	SWAIN COUNTY SCHOOLS	1794	8.41	7.35	8.36	8.03
880	TRANSYLVANIA COUNTY SCHOOLS	3803	5.58	4.72	3.64	4.40
890	TYRRELL COUNTY SCHOOLS	708	17.99	14.27	16.03	13.90
900	UNION COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	25281	16.53	9.59	9.20	10.48
910	VANCE COUNTY SCHOOLS	8572	0.85	19.15	17.57	20.63
920	WAKE COUNTY SCHOOLS	104089	7.98	8.11	7.89	9.51
930	WARREN COUNTY SCHOOLS	3176	12.67	12.59	13.70	8.89
940	WASHINGTON COUNTY SCHOOLS	2364	20.41	15.51	16.36	14.88
950	WATAUGA COUNTY SCHOOLS	4755	6.56	1.70	4.04	3.99
960	WAYNE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	19175	1.50	13.58	14.87	17.35
970	WILKES COUNTY SCHOOLS	10356	7.32	5.61	4.38	5.44
980	WILSON COUNTY SCHOOLS	12284	9.31	14.53	12.60	13.79
990	YADKIN COUNTY SCHOOLS	5899	5.83	2.49	3.73	3.68
995	YANCEY COUNTY SCHOOLS	2509	11.75	4.93	5.22	5.78

Table A2: Match Rates across Years, by Public School District

Match:

- ** = Minimum 80% match rate across all four years
- * = Minimum 50% match rate across all four years
- = Match rates of below 50% in at least one of the four years

lea	District Name	Average Number of Offenders	Pct_2001	Pct_2002	Pct_2003	Pct_2004	Match
010	ALAMANCE-BURLINGTON SCHOOLS	2179	91.03	26.90	14.59	0.04	
020	ALEXANDER COUNTY SCHOOLS	424	87.56	16.55	0.22	0.00	
030	ALLEGHANY COUNTY SCHOOLS	36	83.78	94.29		80.00	
040	ANSON COUNTY SCHOOLS	553	88.75	95.34	97.99	50.83	*
050	ASHE COUNTY SCHOOLS	184	89.03	10.49	17.76	18.82	
060	AVERY COUNTY SCHOOLS	148	91.50	21.88	0.00	2.42	
070	BEAUFORT COUNTY SCHOOLS	511	81.03	6.34		5.51	
080	BERTIE COUNTY SCHOOLS	286	54.18	85.21	43.48	0.87	
090	BLADEN COUNTY SCHOOLS	268	90.00	42.05	76.71	23.20	
100	BRUNSWICK COUNTY SCHOOLS	1228	85.94	93.54	90.94	88.31	**
110	BUNCOMBE COUNTY SCHOOLS	2488	85.34	1.08	13.84	12.39	
111	ASHEVILLE CITY SCHOOLS	553	92.04	93.97	91.39	91.51	**
120	BURKE COUNTY SCHOOLS	1344	86.64	10.20	1.52	1.28	
130	CABARRUS COUNTY SCHOOLS	2033	88.49	90.00	86.88	0.40	
132	KANNAPOLIS CITY SCHOOLS	599	85.14	91.31	89.57	82.26	*
140	CALDWELL COUNTY SCHOOLS	913	83.17	62.97	29.36	22.62	
150	CAMDEN COUNTY SCHOOLS	119	82.57	39.47	41.80	43.51	
160	CARTERET COUNTY SCHOOLS	856	93.54	73.91	77.50	62.68	*
170	CASWELL COUNTY SCHOOLS	479	89.66	28.21	0.53	0.51	
180	CATAWBA COUNTY SCHOOLS	1167	89.84	23.45	0.00	0.00	
181	HICKORY CITY SCHOOLS	650	92.04	80.86	78.76	85.74	*
182	NEWTON CONOVER CITY SCHOOLS	282	86.91	0.00	0.00	15.50	
190	CHATHAM COUNTY SCHOOLS	652	89.09	66.49	68.51	60.81	*
200	CHEROKEE COUNTY SCHOOLS	179	83.97	28.80	69.61	41.78	
210	EDENTON/CHOWAN SCHOOLS	320	89.78	22.46	16.49	19.87	
220	CLAY COUNTY SCHOOLS	13	25.00	86.36	66.67	83.33	
230	CLEVELAND COUNTY SCHOOLS	1183	88.07	0.00	0.00	0.09	
231	KINGS MOUNTAIN DISTRICT	594	86.75	50.58	0.00	0.00	

lea	District Name	Average Number of Offenders	Pct_2001	Pct_2002	Pct_2003	Pct_2004	Match
232	SHELBY CITY SCHOOLS	469	82.82	0.00	0.00	0.00	
240	COLUMBUS COUNTY SCHOOLS	819	87.64	33.54	18.80	30.96	
241	WHITEVILLE CITY SCHOOLS	288	90.15	82.99	13.87	17.30	
250	CRAVEN COUNTY SCHOOLS	1973	86.86	56.65	14.18	17.10	
260	CUMBERLAND COUNTY SCHOOLS	7640	91.18	94.51	86.99	34.75	
270	CURRITUCK COUNTY SCHOOLS	256	89.93	0.71	1.56	2.50	
280	DARE COUNTY SCHOOLS	181	61.91	4.70	9.17	9.13	
290	DAVIDSON COUNTY SCHOOLS	1716	86.28	0.00	0.00	0.00	
291	LEXINGTON CITY SCHOOLS	492	86.19	72.50	0.00	0.00	
292	THOMASVILLE CITY SCHOOLS	306	87.38	50.00	44.40	0.00	
300	DAVIE COUNTY SCHOOLS	438	95.75	93.12	55.70	75.33	*
310	DUPLIN COUNTY SCHOOLS	1215	93.10	34.52	3.46	13.07	
320	DURHAM PUBLIC SCHOOLS	3739	84.61	64.65	93.01	91.77	*
330	EDGECOMBE COUNTY SCHOOLS	1445	93.38	1.92	2.78	0.00	
340	FORSYTH COUNTY SCHOOLS	9131	91.46	0.02	0.02	0.02	
350	FRANKLIN COUNTY SCHOOLS	999	90.24	92.11	84.71	87.43	**
360	GASTON COUNTY SCHOOLS	3135	34.26	1.40	1.02	0.65	
370	GATES COUNTY SCHOOLS	262	88.49	84.87	79.46	65.61	*
380	GRAHAM COUNTY SCHOOLS	28	91.30	85.71	0.00	92.11	
390	GRANVILLE COUNTY SCHOOLS	935	87.17	64.31	48.19	50.05	
400	GREENE COUNTY SCHOOLS	425	94.93	0.00	7.42	9.09	
410	GUILFORD COUNTY SCHOOLS	6455	93.57	91.76	90.03	93.15	**
420	HALIFAX COUNTY SCHOOLS	767	88.80	91.19	88.96	88.96	**
421	ROANOKE RAPIDS CITY SCHOOLS	282	85.88	4.64	0.00	0.00	
422	WELDON CITY SCHOOLS	196	88.62	58.55	47.67	55.26	
430	HARNETT COUNTY SCHOOLS	1467	82.55	39.94	7.83	1.22	
440	HAYWOOD COUNTY SCHOOLS	459	.	0.00	0.00	0.23	
450	HENDERSON COUNTY SCHOOLS	688	87.27	86.75	68.38	22.03	
460	HERTFORD COUNTY SCHOOLS	678	92.90	86.52	86.84	81.44	**
470	HOKE COUNTY SCHOOLS	858	72.17	59.04	23.02	33.64	
480	HYDE COUNTY SCHOOLS	91	90.91	94.90	84.96	79.17	*
490	IREDELL-STATESVILLE SCHOOLS	2058	93.42	0.00	0.00	0.00	
491	MOORESVILLE CITY SCHOOLS	368	95.87	50.29	22.68	44.66	

lea	District Name	Average Number of Offenders	Pct_2001	Pct_2002	Pct_2003	Pct_2004	Match
500	JACKSON COUNTY SCHOOLS	260	98.34	19.50	20.28	28.11	
510	JOHNSTON COUNTY SCHOOLS	3101	90.86	90.45	84.48	85.31	*
520	JONES COUNTY SCHOOLS	144	89.00	55.47	33.75	41.06	
530	LEE COUNTY SCHOOLS	1182	91.23	93.68	89.60	0.00	
540	LENOIR COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	1352	90.17	7.60	4.96	1.68	
550	LINCOLN COUNTY SCHOOLS	1081	87.58	33.42	36.95	26.73	
560	MACON COUNTY SCHOOLS	201	89.29	88.52	95.95	87.80	**
570	MADISON COUNTY SCHOOLS	172	95.21	26.81	0.00	37.57	
580	MARTIN COUNTY SCHOOLS	702	88.64	62.54	6.66	11.35	
590	MCDOWELL COUNTY SCHOOLS	326	93.72	80.80	64.09	28.27	
600	CHARLOTTE-MECKLENBURG SCHOOLS	13430	54.36	94.54	0.01	0.01	
610	MITCHELL COUNTY SCHOOLS	224	96.15	20.18	9.62	0.00	
620	MONTGOMERY COUNTY SCHOOLS	416	83.95	92.58	91.86	86.64	**
630	MOORE COUNTY SCHOOLS	1319	86.72	0.66	0.00	0.00	
640	NASH-ROCKY MOUNT SCHOOLS	1932	86.39	64.69	64.12	1.98	
650	NEW HANOVER COUNTY SCHOOLS	2490	89.34	93.58	90.11	85.75	**
660	NORTHAMPTON COUNTY SCHOOLS	383	72.00	5.22	9.50	0.00	
670	ONSLow COUNTY SCHOOLS	1889	89.19	90.35	90.37	87.18	**
680	ORANGE COUNTY SCHOOLS	440	92.00	29.86	38.42	31.04	
681	CHAPEL HILL-CARRBORO SCHOOLS	315	84.92	54.84	19.29	5.48	
690	PAMLICO COUNTY SCHOOLS	278	91.17	87.93	90.00	90.76	**
700	PASQUOTANK COUNTY SCHOOLS	1017	92.13	72.68	64.45	10.71	
710	PENDER COUNTY SCHOOLS	979	91.48	34.04	20.12	9.23	
720	PERQUIMANS COUNTY SCHOOLS	199	86.39	5.97	0.00	3.70	
730	PERSON COUNTY SCHOOLS	676	93.23	89.34	43.22	81.15	
740	PITT COUNTY SCHOOLS	3492	87.41	0.03	0.00	0.00	
750	POLK COUNTY SCHOOLS	145	79.52	87.38	84.93	27.59	
760	RANDOLPH COUNTY SCHOOLS	834	83.63	91.91	89.43	88.86	**
761	ASHEBORO CITY SCHOOLS	380	84.95	65.81	39.69	25.83	
770	RICHMOND COUNTY SCHOOLS	916	86.38	88.22	89.37	85.32	**
780	ROBESON COUNTY SCHOOLS	3196	92.10	0.03	0.00	0.00	
790	ROCKINGHAM COUNTY SCHOOLS	1881	93.35	15.74	1.14	0.12	
800	ROWAN-SALISBURY SCHOOLS	2527	89.70	93.11	91.79	94.29	**

lea	District Name	Average Number of Offenders	Pct_2001	Pct_2002	Pct_2003	Pct_2004	Match
810	RUTHERFORD COUNTY SCHOOLS	916	89.96	92.94	88.72	90.81	**
820	SAMPSON COUNTY SCHOOLS	975	92.75	79.68	45.41	28.92	
821	CLINTON CITY SCHOOLS	313	87.64	87.37	88.89	68.77	*
830	SCOTLAND COUNTY SCHOOLS	1189	87.73	15.06	2.74	7.25	
840	STANLY COUNTY SCHOOLS	1266	90.34	90.55	0.08	0.00	
850	STOKES COUNTY SCHOOLS	606	93.67	83.79	59.81	75.66	*
860	SURRY COUNTY SCHOOLS	643	78.44	93.97	59.93	23.87	
861	ELKIN CITY SCHOOLS	20	80.00	57.14	0.00	0.00	
862	MOUNT AIRY CITY SCHOOLS	75	91.33	36.36	24.24	29.51	
870	SWAIN COUNTY SCHOOLS	144	87.08	49.63	53.33	55.56	*
880	TRANSYLVANIA COUNTY SCHOOLS	176	87.56	97.22	97.83	92.73	**
890	TYRRELL COUNTY SCHOOLS	111	97.76	1.01	2.66	5.10	
900	UNION COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	2786	91.03	0.00	0.00	0.04	
910	VANCE COUNTY SCHOOLS	1251	61.97	0.06	0.13	0.06	
920	WAKE COUNTY SCHOOLS	8598	79.16	63.68	92.07	72.30	*
930	WARREN COUNTY SCHOOLS	378	88.31	66.75	62.39	0.00	
940	WASHINGTON COUNTY SCHOOLS	396	98.50	43.73	75.71	42.90	
950	WATAUGA COUNTY SCHOOLS	196	90.65	70.73	68.59	22.63	
960	WAYNE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	2270	86.85	7.68	0.00	0.00	
970	WILKES COUNTY SCHOOLS	591	93.33	54.89	8.17	8.17	
980	WILSON COUNTY SCHOOLS	1542	92.54	91.43	88.18	88.33	**
990	YADKIN COUNTY SCHOOLS	231	92.08	93.20	93.64	86.64	**
995	YANCEY COUNTY SCHOOLS	174	88.18	71.55	16.79	6.90	