


# Data Highlights for North Carolina

These data highlights are based on charts for your state for school years 2017-18 through 2021-22. Finding 1 examines high (20-29%) and extreme (30% +) levels of chronic absence. Findings 2-4 focus on extreme levels of chronic absence. Finding 5 offers overall demographics. After each finding we indicate where to find the data on your data chart.

1. **North Carolina Schools with High and Extreme Chronic Absence Increased from 21% to 78%.** (See school demographics, chart 2)




**Why This Matters:** When 20% of students are chronically absent, it affects all students and teachers, and schools need a systemic approach and plan for improvement.

2. **In 2021-22, 771 (52%) of elementary schools, 330 (68%) of middle schools and 360 (62%) of high schools had extreme chronic absence.** (See school demographics, charts 3a and b).



**Why This Matters:** Knowing which grade levels are affected by chronic absence is important because strategies should be tailored to student's varying realities. Efforts to improve attendance for younger students must have a strong family engagement component. At the secondary level, it is important to recognize and respect youth agency and voice.

3. **Schools with extreme chronic absence levels are found in all locales, especially cities and rural areas.** (See Chart 6a)



**Why This Matters:** Understanding the demographics will help determine how to tailor responses to different circumstances.

4. **In 2021-22, in 60% of the most economically challenged districts serving three or more schools, the vast majority of their schools had extreme levels of chronic absence.** (See District Level Analysis Tab).



**Why This Matters:** When districts have multiple schools with extreme levels of chronic absence, a district strategy is needed to support the work.

5. **In 2021-22, the largest *number* of chronically absent students were White (185,984), followed by Black (156,787) and Latino/Hispanic (111,566). Chronic absence *rates* were highest for Native (50.6%), Pacific Islander (41.7%) and Black (41.5%) students. 39.7% of students with disabilities and 40.7% of English learners were chronically absent.**



**Why This Matters:** Knowing the demographic make-up of chronically absent students, as well as which student groups are most affected, allows states and districts to develop interventions that consider student and family culture and language as well as community assets.

**Additional Data:** For more information, see the Excel data file for your state for SY 2021-22. The file has four tabs:

a) **School Demographics:** This worksheet shows the percent and number of schools with different levels of chronic absence for SY 2017-18 compared to SY 2021-22. It also analyzes this same data by grades served, type of school, concentration of poverty, locality and non-white student composition.

b) **District Level Analysis:** This worksheet shows the percent and number of districts with varying levels of schools with extreme chronic absence levels. The data compares this information for districts with >75% of students receiving FRPL (Free and Reduced Price Lunch), 50-74% FRLP, 25-49% FRPL and < 25% FRLP. Charts show data for all districts and for districts with three or more schools.

c) **Student Composition:** This worksheet shows the number and percent of students who are chronically absent by ethnicity, gender, type of educational program, locality and grade level.

d) **Data Sources:** This worksheet provides information about the federal data sources from which the data was drawn. If a chart or graph does not show the data, it is because it was not submitted.

**For national patterns,** see [this comparison data](#).