

## Table of Contents

<b>Birthweight</b> .....	<b>2</b>
<i>Percent of babies born weighing less than 2500 grams (5.5 pounds)</i> .....	2
<b>Oral Health</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<i>Percent of children with untreated tooth decay</i> .....	4
<b>Early Intervention</b> .....	<b>5</b>
<i>Percent of children improving with early intervention services</i> .....	5
<b>Physical Health</b> .....	<b>6</b>
<i>Percent of parents reporting their child’s health is excellent or very good</i> .....	6
<b>Social-Emotional Health</b> .....	<b>6</b>
<b>Safe at Home</b> .....	<b>7</b>
<i>Rate of investigated/assessed child abuse or neglect</i> .....	7
<b>Positive Parent/Child Interactions</b> .....	<b>8</b>
<b>Reading with Children</b> .....	<b>8</b>
<i>Average number of days per week that parents read to their children</i> .....	8
<b>Supports for Families</b> .....	<b>8</b>
<b>Percent of new mothers reporting access to sufficient social supports</b> .....	<b>8</b>
<b>Skilled &amp; Knowledgeable Parents</b> .....	<b>9</b>
<b>High Quality Birth-through-age-Eight Early Care &amp; Education</b> .....	<b>9</b>
<i>Number of Child Care Centers by County, Type, Star-Rating; and Total Enrollment</i> .....	9
<i>Children birth-to-five attending licensed child care who are in high quality centers and homes</i> .....	12
<i>Child Care Subsidy by County, Age and Waitlist</i> .....	15
<i>Children birth-to-five receiving subsidy attending licensed child care who are in high-quality centers/ homes by age</i> . 17	
<i>Children birth-to-five receiving subsidy attending licensed child care who are in high-quality centers /homes by race</i> 20	
<i>Number of at risk 4-year-olds per county</i> .....	23
<i>Number of NC Pre-K Slots by County, with expansion and total sites</i> .....	24
<b>Positive School Climate</b> .....	<b>27</b>
<b>NC Counties with at least one Positive Behavior Intervention and Support Implementing School</b> .....	<b>27</b>
<b>Promotion to Next Grade</b> .....	<b>28</b>
<i>Percent of children retained in same grade (K and 1<sup>st</sup> grade)</i> .....	28
<i>Read to Achieve Retentions</i> .....	30
<b>Regular School Attendance</b> .....	<b>32</b>
<i>Students in NC schools with K, 1st, 2nd, and/or 3rd grades, who are chronically absent</i> .....	32
<b>Summer Learning</b> .....	<b>36</b>
<b>Family Economic Security</b> .....	<b>37</b>
<i>Percent of children living in families under 200% of federal poverty level (FPL) (ages 0-5)</i> .....	37
<i>Median Income vs. Sustainable Living Wage, by county</i> .....	38
<b>Housing Stability</b> .....	<b>39</b>
<i>Number of homeless students enrolled in public schools in NC, by grade (2013-14), Ages: (K-3)</i> .....	39
<i>Percent of Population (over 1 year old) Living in Same House as One Year Ago</i> .....	39
<i>Percent of Renters with Housing Costs Greater than 30% in 2014-15</i> .....	40
<b>Safe Neighborhoods</b> .....	<b>41</b>
<i>Violent Crime Rate per 100,000 population (2014)</i> .....	41
<i>Percent of adults living on a block where it is safe for children to play outside</i> .....	42
<b>Environmental Health</b> .....	<b>43</b>
<i>Percent of children with elevated blood lead levels (% greater than 5 micrograms per deciliter), 2014</i> .....	43
<i>Percent of 1- and 2-year olds tested for lead poisoning</i> .....	44
<b>Trauma-Informed Communities</b> .....	<b>44</b>

## Birthweight

**Percent of babies born weighing less than 2500 grams (5.5 pounds).** Infants born weighing less than 2,500 grams (5.5 pounds) are at greater risk for physical and developmental problems than infants of normal weight. Children who are born at a low birth weight are at higher risk for long-term illness or disability and are more likely to be enrolled in special education classes or to repeat a grade.

Source: State Center for Health Statistics, North Carolina

### Percent of babies born weighing less than 2500 grams (5.5 pounds)

Counties 2015 Data	% WHITE	% BLACK	% OTHER	% HISPANIC
ALAMANCE	8.1%	14.8%	11.4%	8.7%
ALEXANDER	6.3%	19.0%	11.1%	0.0%
ALLEGHANY	6.3%	0.0%	0.0%	13.6%
ANSON	5.6%	14.7%	0.0%	0.0%
ASHE	6.8%	0.0%	na	9.1%
AVERY	10.6%	0.0%	na	4.3%
BEAUFORT	11.9%	19.4%	0.0%	7.7%
BERTIE	2.5%	16.9%	0.0%	33.3%
BLADEN	6.3%	14.2%	6.7%	16.0%
BRUNSWICK	8.8%	15.3%	4.2%	6.7%
BUNCOMBE	7.9%	18.3%	6.5%	5.9%
BURKE	9.0%	2.3%	7.7%	1.0%
CABARRUS	8.3%	13.0%	7.7%	6.5%
CALDWELL	9.6%	24.4%	0.0%	5.8%
CAMDEN	5.1%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%
CARTERET	6.9%	11.1%	9.1%	5.0%
CASWELL	10.0%	17.9%	0.0%	7.1%
CATAWBA	9.6%	15.4%	6.5%	5.5%
CHATHAM	7.1%	10.8%	11.8%	9.2%
CHEROKEE	9.9%	25.0%	11.8%	22.2%
CHOWAN	10.0%	7.8%	0.0%	0.0%
CLAY	7.9%	100.0%	0.0%	33.3%
CLEVELAND	8.8%	21.1%	5.9%	8.2%
COLUMBUS	9.7%	13.9%	6.3%	9.1%
CRAVEN	8.0%	11.9%	6.7%	5.6%
CUMBERLAND	8.0%	16.9%	6.9%	8.0%
CURRITUCK	9.8%	21.4%	0.0%	0.0%
DARE	8.7%	12.5%	0.0%	4.8%
DAVIDSON	9.2%	9.9%	2.6%	7.0%
DAVIE	7.3%	10.7%	0.0%	9.4%
DUPLIN	8.6%	19.4%	0.0%	7.0%
DURHAM	7.1%	13.8%	7.2%	5.7%
EDGECOMBE	8.7%	15.5%	16.7%	5.6%
FORSYTH	7.5%	18.2%	11.3%	8.9%

Counties 2015 Data	% WHITE	% BLACK	% OTHER	% HISPANIC
FRANKLIN	7.2%	18.1%	16.7%	4.3%
GASTON	9.1%	14.3%	11.9%	6.3%
GATES	4.8%	26.1%	na	33.3%
GRAHAM	6.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
GRANVILLE	7.3%	14.3%	10.0%	4.3%
GREENE	5.1%	14.8%	0.0%	5.1%
GUILFORD	7.1%	13.4%	11.7%	8.5%
HALIFAX	9.9%	13.9%	18.2%	4.2%
HARNETT	7.2%	10.8%	10.9%	3.5%
HAYWOOD	9.5%	16.7%	20.0%	6.3%
HENDERSON	5.7%	11.1%	0.0%	11.9%
HERTFORD	12.3%	17.7%	20.0%	0.0%
HOKE	5.5%	20.6%	17.8%	6.1%
HYDE	3.1%	9.1%	na	16.7%
IREDELL	6.7%	14.6%	5.9%	9.1%
JACKSON	6.5%	0.0%	11.8%	9.1%
JOHNSTON	7.1%	17.3%	15.0%	7.9%
JONES	1.5%	15.8%	100.0%	20.0%
LEE	7.7%	13.9%	14.3%	7.2%
LENOIR	7.8%	15.4%	22.2%	4.3%
LINCOLN	8.5%	18.8%	0.0%	9.9%
MACON	10.5%	0.0%	11.1%	1.6%
MADISON	9.2%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%
MARTIN	10.1%	12.0%	0.0%	0.0%
MCDOWELL	9.1%	0.0%	0.0%	1.9%
MECKLENBURG	6.2%	14.4%	10.0%	6.7%
MITCHELL	9.1%	na	0.0%	5.6%
MONTGOMERY	8.9%	19.3%	14.3%	6.3%
MOORE	7.5%	13.3%	11.8%	5.9%
NASH	6.8%	13.9%	0.0%	5.8%
NEW HANOVER	7.0%	14.1%	4.0%	6.1%
NORTHAMPTON	3.5%	12.6%	0.0%	0.0%
ONslow	5.7%	13.3%	6.8%	7.2%
ORANGE	6.0%	9.1%	10.8%	6.3%

Counties 2015 Data	% WHITE	% BLACK	% OTHER	% HISPANIC
PAMLICO	12.9%	13.3%	0.0%	0.0%
PASQUOTANK	5.6%	14.9%	0.0%	6.5%
PENDER	6.9%	12.4%	16.7%	7.6%
PERQUIMANS	7.2%	4.3%	na	0.0%
PERSON	6.1%	20.3%	0.0%	10.0%
PITT	7.3%	14.2%	10.3%	4.2%
POLK	7.8%	12.5%	0.0%	0.0%
RANDOLPH	9.3%	8.6%	12.8%	4.3%
RICHMOND	9.5%	15.3%	18.2%	5.1%
ROBESON	11.1%	17.9%	11.2%	6.4%
ROCKINGHAM	7.8%	13.4%	0.0%	6.1%
ROWAN	9.5%	16.0%	12.2%	7.0%
RUTHERFORD	6.6%	8.6%	0.0%	2.2%
SAMPSON	8.4%	14.1%	12.9%	5.1%
SCOTLAND	14.5%	17.2%	10.6%	11.1%
STANLY	9.9%	13.7%	5.0%	4.3%
STOKES	9.9%	29.4%	25.0%	12.5%

Counties 2015 Data	% WHITE	% BLACK	% OTHER	% HISPANIC
SURRY	10.6%	12.9%	27.3%	7.4%
SWAIN	8.7%	na	8.3%	0.0%
TRANSYLVANIA	7.7%	8.3%	37.5%	25.0%
TYRRELL	10.0%	0.0%	na	0.0%
UNION	6.0%	16.6%	6.7%	8.2%
VANCE	9.8%	12.1%	44.4%	9.8%
WAKE	6.0%	12.1%	7.2%	6.9%
WARREN	9.8%	7.9%	11.1%	16.7%
WASHINGTON	15.8%	16.9%	0.0%	0.0%
WATAUGA	8.8%	0.0%	10.0%	21.7%
WAYNE	7.5%	12.0%	3.3%	6.4%
WILKES	9.4%	16.7%	0.0%	11.3%
WILSON	7.8%	15.3%	0.0%	8.9%
YADKIN	8.4%	14.3%	50.0%	6.3%
YANCEY	10.9%	0.0%	na	12.0%
<b>Total</b>	7.5%	14.5%	9.3%	7.0%

## Oral Health

**Percent of children with untreated tooth decay.** Tooth decay is the most common chronic childhood disease. Untreated dental problems can lead to secondary physical illness, delay overall development, compromise school attendance and performance, and interfere with psycho-social functioning.

Sources: *Counties in regular font: County Level Oral Health Status, 2013-14. 70 counties surveyed.*

*Counties in italics: County Level Oral Health Status, 2015-16. 55 counties surveyed.*

*Most recent data used when available, including for State Total.*

### Percent of children with untreated tooth decay

<i>Alamance</i>	19%
Alexander	10%
Alleghany	26%
Anson	29%
Ashe	27%
Avery	26%
<i>Bertie</i>	19%
<i>Beaufort</i>	21%
Bladen	31%
<i>Buncombe</i>	14%
<i>Burke</i>	27%
<i>Cabarrus</i>	15%
Caldwell	13%
Camden	16%
Caswell	22%
Catawba	12%
Cherokee	25%
Chowan	16%
Clay	20%
<i>Cleveland</i>	16%
Columbus	31%
Craven	13%
<i>Cumberland</i>	18%
<i>Currituck</i>	10%
<i>Dare</i>	9%
<i>Davidson</i>	5%
Davie	15%
<i>Duplin</i>	8%
<i>Durham</i>	21%
Edgecombe	15%
<i>Forsyth</i>	13%
<i>Franklin</i>	12%
<i>Gaston</i>	17%
Gates	10%
<i>Graham</i>	16%
Granville	19%
<i>Guilford</i>	17%
Halifax	15%

<i>Harnett</i>	16%
<i>Haywood</i>	16%
<i>Henderson</i>	6%
Hoke	11%
Hyde	18%
<i>Iredell</i>	16%
<i>Jackson</i>	20%
<i>Johnston</i>	13%
Jones	6%
<i>Lenoir</i>	20%
Lincoln	10%
<i>Macon</i>	16%
<i>Madison</i>	15%
<i>Martin</i>	8%
<i>McDowell</i>	23%
<i>Mecklenburg</i>	7%
Mitchell	21%
Montgomery	21%
<i>Moore</i>	25%
<i>New Hanover</i>	12%
Northampton	15%
<i>Onslow</i>	12%
<i>Orange</i>	7%
Pamlico	11%
<i>Pasquotank</i>	16%
<i>Pender</i>	9%
<i>Perquimans</i>	20%
Person	17%
<i>Pitt</i>	21%
<i>Polk</i>	23%
Randolph	12%
Richmond	23%
<i>Robeson</i>	25%
<i>Rockingham</i>	18%
<i>Rowan</i>	25%
Rutherford	20%
<i>Sampson</i>	16%
<i>Scotland</i>	22%

<i>Stanly</i>	5%
Stokes	22%
<i>Surry</i>	31%
<i>Swain</i>	22%
<i>Transylvania</i>	21%
<i>Tyrrell</i>	27%
<i>Union</i>	9%
Vance	22%
<i>Wake</i>	5%
<i>Warren</i>	3%
Washington	23%
<i>Wayne</i>	18%
<i>Wilkes</i>	24%
<i>Wilson</i>	17%
Yancey	14%
<i>State Total</i>	15%

## Early Intervention

**Percent of children improving with early intervention services.** Without appropriate supports and services in the early years, children with special educational needs are less likely to be ready for school and are at higher risk for poor educational outcomes.

*Source: Data from NC Infant and Toddler Program (Early Intervention), 2015-16. Data show: Of those children who entered the program below age expectations in this outcome area, the percent of children who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exit the program.*

### Percent of children improving with early intervention services

CDSA Region	Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication)	Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs
Blue Ridge	51.9%	64.3%	63.2%
Cape Fear	57.1%	63.3%	69.6%
Charlotte	80.2%	83.0%	86.8%
Concord	71.3%	86.1%	77.1%
Durham	60.7%	65.1%	71.7%
Elizabeth City	78.9%	72.3%	81.0%
Greensboro	80.9%	90.3%	86.1%
Greenville	48.5%	48.1%	54.4%
Morganton	68.3%	67.8%	71.1%
New Bern	62.3%	66.1%	57.7%
Raleigh	74.1%	80.3%	81.1%
Rocky Mount	64.1%	72.5%	80.0%
Sandhills	61.1%	70.2%	56.6%
Shelby	87.3%	88.2%	91.2%
Western NC	69.2%	76.8%	74.5%
Winston Salem	86.0%	89.4%	87.2%

**Blue Ridge:** Alleghany, Ashe, Avery, Mitchell, Watauga, Wilkes, Yancey

**Cape Fear:** Bladen, Brunswick, Columbus, Cumberland, Duplin, New Hanover, Pender, Robeson, Sampson

**Charlotte:** Mecklenburg

**Concord:** Cabarrus, Iredell, Rowan, Stanly, Union

**Durham:** Chatham, Durham, Franklin, Granville, Orange, Person, Vance, Warren

**Elizabeth City:** Camden, Chowan, Currituck, Dare, Gates, Hertford, Pasquotank, Perquimans, Tyrrell, Washington

**Greensboro:** Alamance, Caswell, Guilford, Randolph, Rockingham

**Greenville:** Beaufort, Bertie, Greene, Hyde, Martin, Pitt, Wayne

**Morganton:** Alexander, Burke, Caldwell, Catawba, McDowell

**New Bern:** Carteret, Craven, Jones, Lenoir, Onslow, Pamlico

**Raleigh:** Wake

**Rocky Mount:** Edgecombe, Halifax, Johnston, Nash, Northampton, Wilson

**Sandhills:** Anson, Harnett, Hoke, Lee, Montgomery, Moore, Richmond, Scotland

**Shelby:** Cleveland, Gaston, Lincoln, Polk, Rutherford

**Western NC:** Buncombe, Cherokee, Clay, Graham, Haywood, Henderson, Jackson, Macon, Madison, Swain, Transylvania

**Winston Salem:** Davidson, Davie, Forsyth, Stokes, Surry, Yadkin

## Physical Health

**Percent of parents reporting their child's health is excellent or very good.** Parents' self-reported health status of their children strongly correlates to their children's actual health, particularly at young ages. Healthy children are better able to engage in experiences crucial to the learning process.

*Source: Data Resource Center for Child & Adolescent Health. National Survey of Children's Health. Indicator 1.1: Children's overall health status. Parents responded to the question, "In general, how would you describe [child name's] health?" Data show percent of parents who replied "Excellent" or "Very Good." Other choices were "Good," "Fair," or "Poor."*

### Percent of parents reporting their child's health is excellent or very good

	NC	US
2003	86%	84%
2007	87%	84%
2011/12	85%	84%
2016	90%	90%

### Data by Race/Ethnicity for 2016:

	NC	US
Black	85%	86%
Hispanic	88%	85%
Other	85%	90%
White	93%	93%

## Social-Emotional Health

**Percent of children exhibiting self-regulation, good interpersonal skills, and no behavior problems.** Emotional health and social competence enable children to participate in learning and form good relationships with teachers and peers. Research is increasingly finding that self-regulation and social-emotional health are among the most critical building blocks for children's learning.

**NO COUNTY OR STATE DATA AVAILABLE**

## Safe at Home

**Rate of investigated/assessed child abuse or neglect.** Child abuse and neglect are linked to language deficits, reduced cognitive functioning, social and behavioral difficulties, and attention deficit disorders. The incidence of child abuse and neglect is reduced when protective factors (such as social support, high quality reliable out-of-home child care, access to treatment of depression, and decent housing) are strengthened, and risk factors (such as poverty, social isolation, absence of supportive adults, and violence in the home or neighborhood) are mitigated.

*Source: Data provided and analyzed by UNC Jordan Institute for Families, July 2015. Data show number of investigated/assessed child abuse or neglect cases per 1000 population under age 18.*

### Rate of investigated/assessed child abuse or neglect

COUNTY	Rate per 1000
Alamance	43
Alexander	95
Alleghany	80
Anson	53
Ashe	95
Avery	79
Beaufort	75
Bertie	37
Bladen	50
Brunswick	54
Buncombe	74
Burke	90
Cabarrus	42
Caldwell	93
Camden	16
Carteret	64
Caswell	54
Catawba	80
Chatham	28
Cherokee	118
Chowan	48
Clay	105
Cleveland	79
Columbus	48
Craven	55
Cumberland	80
Currituck	54
Dare	55
Davidson	56
Davie	38
Duplin	58
Durham	36
Edgecombe	68
Forsyth	49

COUNTY	Rate per 1000
Franklin	57
Gaston	83
Gates	36
Graham	138
Granville	35
Greene	43
Guilford	50
Halifax	71
Harnett	47
Haywood	83
Henderson	74
Hertford	47
Hoke	48
Hyde	43
Iredell	52
Jackson	87
Johnston	40
Jones	30
Lee	40
Lenoir	72
Lincoln	65
Macon	82
Madison	81
Martin	37
McDowell	96
Mecklenburg	58
Mitchell	106
Montgomery	65
Moore	59
Nash	61
New Hanover	72
Northampton	41
Onslow	70
Orange	40

COUNTY	Rate per 1000
Pamlico	45
Pasquotank	50
Pender	38
Perquimans	34
Person	68
Pitt	49
Polk	68
Randolph	61
Richmond	47
Robeson	93
Rockingham	61
Rowan	82
Rutherford	82
Sampson	50
Scotland	82
Stanly	59
Stokes	49
Surry	57
Swain	105
Transylvania	101
Tyrrell	69
Union	35
Vance	77
Wake	26
Warren	51
Washington	38
Watauga	39
Wayne	41
Wilkes	83
Wilson	45
Yadkin	38
Yancey	78
North Carolina	55

## Positive Parent/Child Interactions

**Average number of minutes per day that parents talk or play with their children.** The opportunity to form secure attachments with sensitive, nurturing caregivers is critical to children’s cognitive and social-emotional growth. The lack of a warm, positive relationship with parents/caregivers increases the risk that children develop major behavioral and emotional problems, including substance abuse, antisocial behavior, and juvenile delinquency. Talking to children plays a direct role in building their vocabularies and strengthening their early literacy skills. A “word gap” between children from low-income and middle-income families predicts gaps in academic achievement.

*Source: American Time Use Survey (2011-2015), Bureau of Labor Statistics. www.bls.gov/tus. Data are weighted estimates for the US non-institutional population age 15 and older for the combined years 2011-2015.*

### Average number of minutes per day that parents talk or play with their children

	NC Average Hours Per Day	US Average Hours Per Day
Playing with household children, not sports	1.85	1.84
Talking with household children	0.58	0.62

## Reading with Children

**Average number of days per week that parents read to their children.** Reading to children promotes a child’s cognitive and emotional growth and strengthens parent-child bonding. A positive correlation exists between regular parental book reading and young children’s language development, early reading achievement, and school readiness.

*Source: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Health Resources and Services Administration, Maternal and Child Health Bureau, National Survey of Children’s Health.*

### Average number of days per week that parents read to their children

	U.S.			N.C.		
	2003	2007	2011/12	2003	2007	2011/12
No days	7.4	7.6	7.4	6.4	7.4	7.5
1 or 2 days	13.3	11.8	10.7	12.7	8.3	12.6
3 or 4 days	19.9	18.9	18.2	21.4	16.7	18.7
5 or 6 days	11.6	13.9	15.8	9.8	12.9	16.9
Everyday	47.8	47.8	47.9	49.7	54.6	44.3

## Supports for Families

**Percent of new mothers reporting access to sufficient social supports.** Both formal and informal services and supports that help families obtain basic necessities and that enhance protective factors all contribute to children’s overall well-being and increase families’ abilities to deal with a range of issues.

*Source: North Carolina Pregnancy Risk Assessment Monitoring System (PRAMS) Survey. Respondents answered, “During your most recent pregnancy, would you have had the kinds of help listed below if you needed them? (a) Someone to loan me \$50, (b) Someone to help me if I were sick, (c) Someone to take me to the clinic/drs office, (d) Someone to talk with about my problems.” Based on aggregate of all prenatal social support questions asked, (i) No support was classified as a NO response to all social support questions, (ii) Adequate support classified as YES response to 1 to 3 social support questions, and (iii) Excellent support classified as YES response to 4 social support questions.*

### Percent of new mothers reporting access to sufficient social supports

	2012
No Social Support	5.6%
Adequate Social Support	25.4%
Excellent Social Support	69%



## Skilled & Knowledgeable Parents

**Percent of parents reporting sufficient knowledge of child development and parenting skills.** Parents with greater knowledge of child development and parenting skills better support their children’s early learning and development. Skilled and knowledgeable parents are better able to expose their children to activities and educational opportunities that can help them succeed.

**NO COUNTY OR STATE DATA AVAILABLE**

## High Quality Birth-through-age-Eight Early Care & Education

**Percent of children birth-through-age-eight receiving high quality early care and education (centers, family homes and schools).** Children who attend high quality early education programs and elementary schools are better prepared for success in school— academically, socially and emotionally. Economically disadvantaged three- and four-year-old children who participate in high-quality preschool programs have better school achievement, social skills and behavior than children who do not participate in a preschool experience or who are enrolled in a low-quality program. Children in higher quality programs have more advanced language and math skills, more advanced social skills, and warmer relationships with their teachers.

### Number of Child Care Centers and Family Care Homes by County, Type, Star-Rating; and Total Enrollment

*Source: Data provided by the Division of Child Development, NC Department of Health and Human Services (January 2018)*

County	Total (Centers & Family Child Care Homes)	Total Child Care Centers	Total Family Child Care Home	5-Star	4-Star	3-Star	2-Star	1-Star	Total Enrollment 0-5 years	Total Enrollment Child Care Centers 0-5 years	Total Enrollment Family Child Care Home- 0-5 years
Alamance	87	71	16	32	22	22	0	3	2,953	2,887	66
Alexander	25	22	3	8	4	11	0	1	577	564	13
Alleghany	7	7	0	5	0	1	1	0	183	183	0
Anson	31	17	14	8	15	5	0	0	502	459	43
Ashe	13	11	2	9	2	1	0	1	471	466	5
Avery	14	14	0	7	7	0	0	0	230	230	0
Beaufort	32	19	13	14	10	3	3	0	890	838	52
Bertie	17	12	5	8	5	0	2	0	333	310	23
Bladen	34	24	10	10	12	7	1	0	742	711	31
Brunswick	31	22	9	12	6	10	0	0	1,401	1,364	37
Buncombe	126	105	21	50	25	28	3	14	4,217	4,110	107
Burke	57	46	11	30	13	10	0	3	1,387	1,334	53
Cabarrus	85	68	17	39	13	10	2	6	3,549	3,470	79
Caldwell	67	56	11	37	14	9	3	0	1,264	1,217	47
Camden	6	4	2	2	2	1	0	1	83	73	10
Carteret	30	22	8	9	10	2	3	3	926	891	35
Caswell	8	8	0	4	1	1	0	0	207	207	0
Catawba	95	85	10	34	39	11	1	0	2,786	2,744	42
Chatham	47	26	21	19	10	9	0	8	1,244	1,148	96
Cherokee	18	18	0	10	2	4	0	0	407	407	0
Chowan	12	10	2	3	4	2	0	0	314	306	8
Clay	6	6	0	3	1	2	0	0	196	196	0
Cleveland	70	55	15	33	17	12	0	3	1,666	1,601	65
Columbus	39	30	9	16	12	9	0	0	1,126	1,095	31
Craven	64	32	32	31	22	8	0	1	1,631	1,504	127
Cumberland	318	221	97	76	100	95	16	10	7,353	7,014	339

County	Total (Centers & Family Child Care Homes)	Total Child Care Centers	Total Family Child Care Home	5-Star	4-Star	3-Star	2-Star	1-Star	Total Enrollment 0-5 years	Total Enrollment Child Care Centers 0-5 years	Total Enrollment Family Child Care Home- 0-5 years
Currituck	14	9	5	2	4	4	2	0	249	226	23
Dare	28	20	8	11	6	7	1	0	537	496	41
Davidson	83	69	14	37	20	13	2	3	2,634	2,576	58
Davie	19	17	2	14	2	3	0	0	550	542	8
Duplin	44	33	11	8	20	6	1	1	1,102	1,078	24
Durham	292	160	132	100	96	63	6	12	6,588	6,058	530
Edgecombe	49	29	20	19	20	5	2	0	981	899	82
Forsyth	193	104	89	66	58	37	6	7	5,663	5,300	363
Franklin	28	25	3	14	9	4	0	0	844	833	11
Gaston	102	80	22	45	24	14	1	3	3,715	3,612	103
Gates	9	4	5	2	4	3	0	0	133	112	21
Graham	10	8	2	6	3	1	0	0	165	155	10
Granville	46	36	10	9	12	17	1	3	968	911	57
Greene	16	10	6	4	2	6	1	0	448	425	23
Guilford	416	310	106	112	140	120	8	11	10,427	10,023	404
Halifax	43	32	11	15	10	12	1	1	918	878	40
Harnett	86	51	35	21	30	19	4	8	2,058	1,928	130
Haywood	39	35	4	16	9	10	0	1	1,056	1,035	21
Henderson	63	51	12	29	14	8	0	0	1,452	1,399	53
Hertford	24	13	11	6	8	5	2	1	543	513	30
Hoke	47	32	15	11	11	19	2	1	1,103	1,054	49
Hyde	5	3	2	3	0	2	0	0	53	42	11
Iredell	97	79	18	42	22	21	2	2	2,430	2,344	86
Jackson	24	20	4	9	6	4	0	1	504	485	19
Johnston	120	87	33	36	34	30	7	5	3,926	3,803	123
Jones	6	6	0	4	2	0	0	0	117	117	0
Lee	42	33	9	12	14	8	3	0	1,391	1,350	41
Lenoir	40	31	9	16	8	13	0	1	1,082	1,056	26
Lincoln	36	26	10	17	11	3	1	2	1,197	1,159	38
Macon	18	17	1	9	3	3	1	1	637	632	5
Madison	13	12	1	7	4	1	0	0	243	238	5
Martin	23	15	8	6	5	9	0	2	552	533	19
McDowell	34	28	6	38	6	5	0	0	622	595	27
Mecklenburg	633	458	175	221	203	87	24	32	19,144	18,459	685
Mitchell	9	8	1	2	2	2	1	0	269	264	5
Montgomery	19	15	4	7	4	4	2	0	469	457	12
Moore	74	50	24	18	14	30	1	2	1,681	1,592	89
Nash	60	43	17	20	18	13	1	2	1,690	1,627	63
New Hanover	99	66	33	26	20	30	2	13	4,398	4,247	151
Northampton	13	11	2	5	3	3	1	1	307	301	6
Onslow	78	43	35	32	8	21	3	12	2,795	2,639	156
Orange	93	76	17	52	15	16	0	6	2,806	2,737	69

County	Total (Centers & Family Child Care Homes)	Total Child Care Centers	Total Family Child Care Home	5-Star	4-Star	3-Star	2-Star	1-Star	Total Enrollment 0-5 years	Total Enrollment Child Care Centers 0-5 years	Total Enrollment Family Child Care Home- 0-5 years
Pamlico	9	8	1	4	4	0	0	0	235	229	6
Pasquotank	40	30	10	8	10	14	2	0	986	944	42
Pender	35	19	16	9	9	8	1	3	884	826	58
Perquimans	8	5	3	2	5	1	0	0	174	164	10
Person	36	19	17	15	15	4	1	3	522	450	72
Pitt	122	86	36	39	24	23	3	9	3,660	3,511	149
Polk	6	6	0	5	0	1	0	0	136	136	0
Randolph	53	40	13	22	8	12	1	3	2,004	1,955	49
Richmond	31	24	7	10	7	9	0	1	890	862	28
Robeson	112	100	12	32	34	39	0	1	3,287	3,258	29
Rockingham	60	54	6	29	7	19	0	1	1,406	1,382	24
Rowan	54	41	13	27	11	6	1	3	2,067	2,011	56
Rutherford	33	25	8	14	11	4	1	0	930	897	33
Sampson	50	35	15	17	9	17	2	1	1,377	1,323	54
Scotland	34	25	9	15	11	3	0	1	775	727	48
Stanly	36	26	10	14	10	8	0	4	1,303	1,264	39
Stokes	19	16	3	7	6	3	2	0	586	572	14
Surry	48	33	15	19	3	16	7	1	1,379	1,311	68
Swain	12	11	1	4	3	2	1	1	364	359	5
Transylvania	11	10	1	7	2	2	0	0	336	331	5
Tyrrell	3	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	89	89	0
Union	102	83	19	53	18	9	4	6	3,672	3,585	87
Vance	52	32	20	27	21	12	0	1	1,021	937	84
Wake	510	330	180	165	122	102	14	56	22,088	21,350	738
Warren	19	9	10	6	2	6	0	3	245	206	39
Washington	12	10	2	3	2	6	1	0	262	255	7
Watauga	33	25	8	19	3	6	0	1	596	557	39
Wayne	81	65	16	27	16	26	1	3	2,766	2,693	73
Wilkes	44	32	12	18	7	10	4	2	1,025	978	47
Wilson	28	24	4	12	6	6	0	1	1,796	1,783	13
Yadkin	28	24	4	19	2	4	0	2	401	384	17
Yancey	7	6	1	3	2	1	0	0	197	192	5
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>6,254</b>	<b>4,522</b>	<b>1,732</b>	<b>2,291</b>	<b>1,662</b>	<b>1,333</b>	<b>170</b>	<b>295</b>	<b>182,544</b>	<b>175,580</b>	<b>6,964</b>

**Children birth-to-five attending licensed child care who are in high quality centers and homes (4- and 5-star), 2014-15**

Source: NC Partnership for Children, Inc. PBIS. Data show: Of those children attending licensed child care, what percentage of each age level are in high-quality centers and homes.

County	Total	Infant	Age 1	Age 2	Age 3	Age 4	Age 5
Alamance	72%	73%	66%	66%	70%	72%	85%
Alexander	67%	34%	47%	56%	68%	75%	95%
Alleghany	59%	10%	42%	26%	50%	81%	88%
Anson	75%	62%	54%	58%	59%	82%	92%
Ashe	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Avery	99%	100%	93%	100%	100%	99%	100%
Beaufort	83%	89%	83%	81%	74%	88%	81%
Bertie	86%	82%	82%	71%	84%	89%	98%
Bladen	62%	28%	32%	36%	57%	78%	82%
Brunswick	83%	68%	87%	82%	83%	87%	76%
Buncombe	71%	71%	75%	67%	70%	72%	71%
Burke	92%	86%	89%	91%	92%	95%	91%
Cabarrus	69%	67%	63%	64%	67%	71%	82%
Caldwell	71%	70%	61%	65%	67%	74%	81%
Camden	62%	67%	75%	29%	16%	84%	100%
Carteret	76%	72%	73%	66%	73%	83%	81%
Caswell	63%	18%	32%	34%	75%	69%	85%
Catawba	76%	69%	69%	75%	70%	79%	84%
Chatham	91%	81%	86%	82%	89%	94%	98%
Cherokee	87%	100%	100%	93%	78%	93%	75%
Chowan	54%	32%	35%	26%	49%	74%	65%
Clay	72%	60%	53%	55%	62%	84%	85%
Cleveland	80%	72%	74%	65%	74%	84%	92%
Columbus	81%	62%	62%	62%	76%	92%	94%
Craven	90%	94%	82%	84%	91%	93%	91%
Cumberland	68%	62%	60%	61%	64%	72%	81%
Currituck	72%	65%	45%	60%	73%	83%	75%
Dare	82%	81%	71%	76%	84%	86%	89%
Davidson	74%	69%	66%	73%	67%	76%	84%
Davie	96%	100%	93%	91%	96%	96%	98%
Duplin	63%	51%	52%	51%	46%	75%	83%
Durham	72%	72%	71%	71%	70%	72%	77%
Edgecombe	92%	77%	85%	86%	90%	95%	97%
Forsyth	73%	77%	75%	68%	71%	72%	78%
Franklin	81%	62%	66%	82%	84%	83%	94%
Gaston	75%	63%	70%	67%	70%	80%	85%
Gates	67%	25%	33%	33%	59%	84%	87%
Graham	89%	100%	44%	67%	82%	98%	100%

County	Total	Infant	Age 1	Age 2	Age 3	Age 4	Age 5
Granville	69%	66%	62%	65%	63%	71%	81%
Greene	70%	29%	25%	17%	51%	82%	97%
Guilford	67%	60%	58%	60%	59%	76%	80%
Halifax	73%	40%	39%	41%	72%	87%	89%
Harnett	76%	75%	73%	78%	72%	78%	77%
Haywood	84%	91%	81%	83%	79%	88%	83%
Henderson	92%	89%	91%	92%	88%	94%	97%
Hertford	59%	47%	37%	38%	38%	71%	80%
Hoke	66%	48%	43%	47%	61%	74%	86%
Hyde	97%	100%	100%	83%	91%	100%	100%
Iredell	77%	73%	69%	64%	74%	83%	87%
Jackson	84%	82%	98%	81%	83%	82%	86%
Johnston	67%	54%	59%	60%	64%	74%	76%
Jones	76%	44%	43%	14%	57%	91%	98%
Lee	69%	66%	56%	55%	69%	74%	89%
Lenoir	71%	63%	56%	42%	64%	82%	82%
Lincoln	85%	80%	79%	79%	82%	90%	92%
Macon	72%	72%	63%	67%	75%	81%	63%
Madison	83%	100%	100%	100%	93%	75%	57%
Martin	48%	59%	45%	32%	37%	55%	64%
McDowell	90%	81%	91%	82%	87%	91%	96%
Mecklenburg	79%	78%	78%	77%	77%	80%	86%
Mitchell	41%	53%	18%	30%	49%	50%	19%
Montgomery	77%	70%	79%	83%	71%	76%	82%
Moore	56%	54%	50%	51%	62%	56%	57%
Nash	68%	46%	53%	52%	69%	82%	75%
New Hanover	71%	71%	70%	63%	65%	75%	81%
Northampton	67%	57%	25%	33%	62%	74%	99%
Onslow	74%	71%	72%	69%	64%	78%	84%
Orange	81%	74%	83%	78%	77%	82%	92%
Pamlico	70%	50%	48%	52%	70%	73%	88%
Pasquotank	54%	46%	36%	39%	49%	67%	71%
Pender	67%	54%	55%	47%	47%	80%	85%
Perquimans	92%	93%	46%	90%	100%	97%	92%
Person	83%	72%	77%	79%	75%	89%	90%
Pitt	63%	53%	58%	55%	55%	75%	69%
Polk	73%	30%	32%	29%	50%	90%	97%
Randolph	85%	79%	82%	84%	86%	85%	89%
Richmond	65%	48%	56%	55%	59%	75%	73%
Robeson	73%	51%	47%	46%	62%	88%	95%
Rockingham	61%	25%	45%	40%	52%	76%	86%

County	Total	Infant	Age 1	Age 2	Age 3	Age 4	Age 5
Rowan	87%	85%	92%	78%	86%	88%	90%
Rutherford	77%	73%	67%	78%	66%	83%	86%
Sampson	62%	44%	37%	39%	64%	75%	69%
Scotland	78%	54%	80%	73%	72%	81%	88%
Stanly	85%	78%	82%	77%	89%	89%	89%
Stokes	67%	56%	56%	44%	60%	77%	86%
Surry	41%	17%	11%	13%	34%	60%	61%
Swain	74%	67%	40%	53%	76%	86%	95%
Transylvania	81%	33%	63%	80%	77%	89%	94%
Tyrrell	55%	0%	0%	0%	74%	77%	50%
Union	76%	68%	72%	74%	72%	80%	86%
Vance	79%	65%	65%	49%	72%	89%	93%
Wake	74%	73%	73%	74%	73%	75%	78%
Warren	79%	22%	60%	45%	52%	88%	98%
Washington	55%	12%	25%	12%	51%	71%	89%
Watauga	83%	93%	81%	81%	81%	83%	87%
Wayne	62%	35%	44%	50%	58%	74%	79%
Wilkes	66%	36%	35%	39%	50%	80%	86%
Wilson	65%	65%	63%	58%	63%	68%	72%
Yadkin	68%	0%	39%	26%	52%	80%	92%
Yancey	84%	100%	100%	68%	87%	88%	81%
State Totals	74%	67%	68%	67%	70%	78%	83%

### Child Care Subsidy by County, Age and Waitlist

Source: Data provided by the Division of Child Development, NC Department of Health and Human Services (January 2018)

County Name	# Subsidy (0-5)	Total # Subsidy Served (0-12)	# Waitlist (All Ages)
Alamance	754	1524	696
Alexander	126	222	96
Alleghany	62	85	48
Anson	149	243	227
Ashe	141	198	46
Avery	47	73	0
Beaufort	387	714	204
Bertie	77	120	99
Bladen	123	235	223
Brunswick	423	790	501
Buncombe	1193	1971	393
Burke	348	746	475
Cabarrus	421	624	747
Caldwell	424	722	608
Camden	11	22	31
Carteret	173	241	219
Caswell	79	134	0
Catawba	753	1288	1,062
Chatham	247	406	69
Cherokee	177	239	0
Chowan	50	86	140
Clay	69	93	0
Cleveland	281	657	328
Columbus	205	460	582
Craven	474	874	477
Cumberland	1850	3863	1,760
Currituck	67	91	123
Dare	86	147	134
Davidson	797	1160	0
Davie	122	278	184
Duplin	216	399	454
Durham	1421	1974	1,191
Edgecombe	214	366	260
Forsyth	1715	2623	2,885
Franklin	295	418	408
Gaston	846	1554	1,633
Gates	45	59	0
Graham	41	49	0
Granville	191	312	148
Greene	65	134	21
Guilford	1917	3583	3,084
Halifax	267	545	300
Harnett	521	946	856

County Name	# Subsidy (0-5)	Total # Subsidy Served (0-12)	# Waitlist (All Ages)
Haywood	503	724	0
Henderson	359	482	486
Hertford	133	269	170
Hoke	373	568	0
Hyde	5	6	4
Iredell	549	1003	445
Jackson	236	339	0
Johnston	641	1226	1,383
Jones	56	89	30
Lee	247	425	209
Lenoir	254	412	164
Lincoln	228	396	470
Macon	243	345	0
Madison	54	100	110
Martin	130	246	121
McDowell	214	339	0
Mecklenburg	3644	6740	5,066
Mitchell	89	175	0
Montgomery	117	185	6
Moore	336	535	108
Nash	275	485	14
New Hanover	964	1637	781
Northampton	83	173	127
Onslow	1113	1531	0
Orange	495	665	115
Pamlico	55	120	55
Pasquotank	218	359	418
Pender	187	357	262
Perquimans	66	119	75
Person	160	259	149
Pitt	932	1530	1
Polk	64	94	37
Randolph	574	1138	388
Richmond	251	446	283
Robeson	1052	1726	1,385
Rockingham	521	909	478
Rowan	341	520	1,449
Rutherford	279	569	189
Sampson	372	499	311
Scotland	185	411	419
Stanly	219	468	310
Stokes	151	289	212
Surry	297	569	221

County Name	# Subsidy (0-5)	Total # Subsidy Served (0-12)	# Waitlist (All Ages)
Swain	87	124	0
Transylvania	115	176	41
Tyrrell	20	29	12
Union	518	1022	498
Vance	344	630	344
Wake	3380	5488	1,157
Warren	144	223	0
Washington	67	132	103

County Name	# Subsidy (0-5)	Total # Subsidy Served (0-12)	# Waitlist (All Ages)
Watauga	102	163	0
Wayne	742	1220	15
Wilkes	219	370	246
Wilson	455	702	70
Yadkin	38	91	153
Yancey	43	53	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>41409</b>	<b>71168</b>	<b>39802</b>



**Children birth-to-five receiving subsidy who are in high-quality centers and homes (4- and 5-star), by age.**

Source: NC Partnership for Children, Inc. PBIS. Data show: Of those children receiving subsidy, what percentage of each age level are in high-quality centers and homes.

COUNTY	Infant	Age 1	Age 2	Age 3	Age 4	Age 5	Total
ALAMANCE	73%	71%	64%	80%	90%	65%	80%
ALEXANDER	62%	52%	51%	63%	81%	76%	66%
ALLEGHANY	20%	47%	33%	46%	88%	53%	62%
ANSON	71%	64%	65%	79%	96%	59%	84%
ASHE	100%	96%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
AVERY	71%	89%	92%	96%	100%	63%	95%
BEAUFORT	82%	74%	81%	86%	92%	79%	85%
BERTIE	93%	81%	92%	84%	98%	67%	91%
BLADEN	59%	47%	63%	76%	92%	57%	79%
BRUNSWICK	79%	91%	90%	90%	99%	92%	93%
BUNCOMBE	78%	79%	83%	88%	94%	84%	88%
BURKE	100%	94%	88%	95%	98%	88%	95%
CABARRUS	82%	77%	83%	87%	95%	90%	89%
CALDWELL	73%	71%	76%	79%	90%	77%	81%
CAMDEN	0%	57%	40%	86%	92%	100%	79%
CARTERET	97%	98%	100%	98%	97%	92%	98%
CASWELL	50%	56%	40%	68%	83%	58%	69%
CATAWBA	80%	79%	79%	88%	91%	89%	86%
CHATHAM	89%	83%	88%	89%	96%	83%	92%
CHEROKEE	100%	100%	94%	100%	97%	73%	95%
CHOWAN	62%	48%	50%	59%	94%	65%	71%
CLAY	0%	100%	85%	69%	93%	75%	87%
CLEVELAND	77%	86%	83%	90%	95%	77%	90%
COLUMBUS	71%	69%	64%	83%	96%	72%	84%
CRAVEN	98%	85%	97%	92%	98%	92%	95%
CUMBERLAND	77%	70%	73%	81%	93%	70%	84%
CURRITUCK	100%	75%	74%	79%	90%	50%	81%
DARE	88%	85%	90%	76%	96%	80%	89%
DAVIDSON	89%	91%	87%	89%	95%	87%	91%
DAVIE	100%	100%	97%	100%	99%	97%	99%
DUPLIN	73%	64%	80%	78%	93%	60%	82%
DURHAM	74%	74%	75%	81%	87%	78%	81%
EDGEcombe	83%	83%	74%	87%	95%	89%	89%
FORSYTH	70%	68%	71%	75%	88%	78%	78%
FRANKLIN	83%	69%	81%	79%	94%	83%	84%
GASTON	83%	83%	83%	86%	96%	83%	90%
GATES	67%	40%	18%	74%	87%	40%	63%
GRAHAM	100%	88%	100%	94%	100%	na	97%
GRANVILLE	70%	71%	78%	80%	90%	62%	81%
GREENE	100%	27%	47%	79%	95%	58%	82%
GUILFORD	60%	62%	68%	77%	94%	73%	82%

COUNTY	Infant	Age 1	Age 2	Age 3	Age 4	Age 5	Total
HALIFAX	46%	47%	57%	71%	89%	65%	71%
HARNETT	77%	69%	71%	82%	91%	74%	81%
HAYWOOD	92%	88%	91%	93%	97%	81%	92%
HENDERSON	76%	81%	77%	90%	94%	92%	89%
HERTFORD	59%	64%	65%	77%	93%	67%	81%
HOKE	39%	34%	48%	63%	87%	43%	67%
HYDE	100%	100%	100%	88%	100%	0%	96%
IREDELL	58%	63%	56%	68%	91%	79%	77%
JACKSON	100%	92%	100%	98%	95%	89%	95%
JOHNSTON	75%	65%	64%	68%	86%	63%	74%
JONES	78%	88%	46%	92%	98%	89%	90%
LEE	84%	77%	82%	90%	90%	80%	86%
LENOIR	65%	51%	49%	71%	87%	43%	70%
LINCOLN	84%	80%	83%	84%	96%	85%	89%
MACON	77%	82%	78%	82%	92%	61%	83%
MADISON	100%	100%	100%	100%	98%	100%	99%
MARTIN	81%	53%	71%	82%	93%	52%	81%
MCDOWELL	82%	86%	85%	90%	96%	84%	91%
MECKLENBURG	93%	92%	92%	93%	96%	92%	94%
MITCHELL	33%	33%	33%	52%	68%	0%	46%
MONTGOMERY	71%	73%	84%	89%	96%	67%	89%
MOORE	49%	37%	33%	47%	55%	44%	44%
NASH	76%	70%	68%	73%	89%	57%	77%
NEW HANOVER	60%	62%	67%	74%	94%	73%	81%
NORTHHAMPTON	16%	24%	30%	50%	85%	12%	56%
ONslow	88%	85%	83%	89%	97%	95%	93%
ORANGE	79%	83%	75%	80%	96%	78%	86%
PAMLICO	50%	62%	47%	74%	92%	56%	77%
PASQUOTANK	84%	79%	75%	88%	94%	70%	85%
PENDER	71%	72%	73%	86%	99%	82%	89%
PERQUIMANS	80%	67%	57%	80%	95%	82%	78%
PERSON	82%	89%	76%	87%	97%	87%	90%
PITT	65%	72%	66%	74%	94%	70%	81%
POLK	8%	10%	15%	30%	87%	18%	54%
RANDOLPH	87%	86%	91%	93%	94%	85%	91%
RICHMOND	73%	70%	68%	82%	93%	73%	84%
ROBESON	61%	64%	57%	75%	92%	68%	79%
ROCKINGHAM	34%	49%	39%	51%	78%	37%	57%
ROWAN	100%	95%	98%	95%	99%	95%	97%
RUTHERFORD	81%	73%	86%	89%	95%	81%	89%
SAMPSON	56%	47%	51%	61%	94%	53%	74%
SCOTLAND	79%	79%	88%	87%	96%	87%	90%
STANLY	79%	85%	88%	90%	97%	79%	91%
STOKES	52%	61%	60%	70%	95%	78%	80%

COUNTY	Infant	Age 1	Age 2	Age 3	Age 4	Age 5	Total
<b>SURRY</b>	9%	4%	10%	25%	81%	9%	45%
<b>SWAIN</b>	100%	92%	100%	93%	98%	90%	97%
<b>TRANSYLVANIA</b>	42%	41%	60%	76%	91%	77%	75%
<b>TYRRELL</b>	0%	0%	0%	25%	80%	0%	36%
<b>UNION</b>	85%	84%	85%	93%	98%	88%	92%
<b>VANCE</b>	61%	63%	47%	71%	89%	49%	69%
<b>WAKE</b>	73%	76%	79%	79%	91%	82%	83%
<b>WARREN</b>	64%	53%	45%	53%	88%	36%	68%
<b>WASHINGTON</b>	18%	48%	25%	33%	81%	30%	56%
<b>WATAUGA</b>	88%	92%	92%	91%	82%	90%	87%
<b>WAYNE</b>	43%	51%	54%	62%	90%	65%	71%
<b>WILKES</b>	39%	43%	39%	71%	93%	50%	76%
<b>WILSON</b>	77%	78%	66%	76%	88%	78%	79%
<b>YADKIN</b>	44%	24%	38%	63%	87%	19%	70%
<b>YANCEY</b>	100%	100%	89%	100%	97%	75%	95%
<b>State Totals</b>	74%	73%	74%	81%	93%	77%	84%

**Children birth-to-five receiving subsidy who are in high-quality centers and homes (4- and 5-star), by race.**

Source: NC Partnership for Children, Inc. PBIS. Data show: Of those children receiving subsidy, what percentage of each race/ethnicity are in high-quality centers and homes.

COUNTY	White	Black	AmInd/NatAlsk	Asian	Hispanic	Other
ALAMANCE	91%	69%	100%	88%	92%	92%
ALEXANDER	63%	73%	0%	100%	100%	100%
ALLEGHANY	57%	75%	N/A	N/A	100%	100%
ANSON	81%	84%	100%	100%	100%	100%
ASHE	100%	100%	N/A	N/A	100%	100%
AVERY	95%	88%	100%	N/A	100%	100%
BEAUFORT	93%	79%	100%	N/A	100%	100%
BERTIE	94%	91%	N/A	100%	100%	100%
BLADEN	78%	78%	83%	100%	100%	100%
BRUNSWICK	94%	89%	100%	100%	100%	88%
BUNCOMBE	86%	86%	100%	100%	100%	92%
BURKE	94%	98%	N/A	100%	100%	100%
CABARRUS	86%	89%	100%	100%	100%	94%
CALDWELL	79%	78%	100%	100%	100%	100%
CAMDEN	83%	62%	N/A	100%	100%	100%
CARTERET	97%	99%	100%	100%	100%	100%
CASWELL	60%	72%	N/A	N/A	100%	100%
CATAWBA	85%	85%	N/A	96%	100%	100%
CHATHAM	90%	85%	100%	100%	100%	93%
CHEROKEE	95%	100%	75%	100%	100%	100%
CHOWAN	63%	75%	N/A	47%	100%	100%
CLAY	88%	100%	N/A	N/A	100%	100%
CLEVELAND	92%	89%	57%	100%	97%	100%
COLUMBUS	86%	82%	65%	0%	100%	100%
CRAVEN	96%	93%	100%	100%	100%	100%
CUMBERLAND	87%	81%	86%	97%	100%	95%
CURRITUCK	79%	83%	N/A	N/A	100%	100%
DARE	88%	83%	N/A	100%	100%	100%
DAVIDSON	87%	95%	100%	100%	100%	100%
DAVIE	99%	98%	N/A	100%	100%	100%
DUPLIN	73%	80%	100%	100%	100%	75%
DURHAM	80%	78%	N/A	85%	91%	97%
EDGECOMBE	90%	88%	100%	N/A	100%	92%
FORSYTH	79%	75%	75%	78%	98%	83%
FRANKLIN	81%	85%	N/A	N/A	100%	100%
GASTON	91%	85%	100%	100%	100%	100%
GATES	78%	52%	N/A	N/A	100%	100%
GRAHAM	96%	N/A	100%	N/A	100%	100%
GRANVILLE	84%	76%	100%	100%	100%	100%
GREENE	90%	66%	100%	50%	100%	100%
GUILFORD	82%	79%	92%	98%	97%	99%

COUNTY	White	Black	AmInd/NatAlsk	Asian	Hispanic	Other
HALIFAX	54%	74%	48%	100%	100%	100%
HARNETT	82%	77%	80%	100%	100%	100%
HAYWOOD	92%	90%	100%	100%	100%	100%
HENDERSON	88%	83%	100%	N/A	100%	100%
HERTFORD	88%	79%	100%	N/A	100%	100%
HOKE	78%	54%	52%	71%	100%	84%
HYDE	95%	92%	N/A	N/A	100%	N/A
IREDELL	83%	67%	67%	83%	100%	93%
JACKSON	94%	100%	96%	N/A	100%	100%
JOHNSTON	69%	68%	50%	100%	100%	100%
JONES	91%	87%	N/A	N/A	100%	100%
LEE	74%	85%	N/A	100%	99%	100%
LENOIR	82%	62%	67%	N/A	100%	81%
LINCOLN	88%	91%	100%	100%	100%	100%
MACON	81%	83%	100%	100%	100%	100%
MADISON	99%	100%	N/A	N/A	100%	N/A
MARTIN	78%	80%	100%	100%	100%	100%
MCDOWELL	90%	100%	N/A	100%	100%	100%
MECKLENBURG	95%	93%	100%	100%	99%	100%
MITCHELL	46%	100%	N/A	0%	100%	10%
MONTGOMERY	83%	88%	100%	100%	100%	100%
MOORE	48%	34%	50%	N/A	100%	75%
NASH	72%	79%	100%	100%	100%	59%
NEW HANOVER	86%	74%	100%	95%	93%	91%
NORTHHAMPTON	80%	54%	100%	N/A	100%	100%
ONslow	92%	92%	100%	96%	100%	100%
ORANGE	91%	76%	100%	92%	100%	100%
PAMLICO	78%	82%	N/A	N/A	100%	20%
PASQUOTANK	78%	87%	100%	100%	100%	100%
PENDER	88%	85%	100%	N/A	100%	100%
PERQUIMANS	87%	71%	N/A	N/A	100%	N/A
PERSON	89%	89%	100%	N/A	100%	100%
PITT	93%	77%	100%	100%	100%	100%
POLK	55%	52%	N/A	100%	100%	60%
RANDOLPH	91%	86%	100%	89%	100%	100%
RICHMOND	78%	85%	100%	N/A	100%	100%
ROBESON	85%	85%	71%	100%	100%	91%
ROCKINGHAM	58%	52%	0%	50%	100%	79%
ROWAN	97%	98%	100%	100%	100%	100%
RUTHERFORD	88%	91%	N/A	100%	100%	100%
SAMPSON	60%	73%	48%	67%	96%	100%
SCOTLAND	92%	89%	94%	100%	100%	100%
STANLY	93%	83%	100%	87%	100%	100%
STOKES	77%	89%	N/A	N/A	100%	100%

<b>COUNTY</b>	<b>White</b>	<b>Black</b>	<b>AmInd/NatAlsk</b>	<b>Asian</b>	<b>Hispanic</b>	<b>Other</b>
<b>SURRY</b>	35%	22%	100%	100%	100%	100%
<b>SWAIN</b>	95%	100%	98%	100%	100%	100%
<b>TRANSYLVANIA</b>	72%	79%	N/A	N/A	100%	N/A
<b>TYRRELL</b>	17%	29%	N/A	100%	100%	100%
<b>UNION</b>	90%	91%	100%	100%	100%	95%
<b>VANCE</b>	59%	69%	100%	100%	100%	57%
<b>WAKE</b>	84%	80%	94%	98%	100%	100%
<b>WARREN</b>	58%	71%	25%	N/A	100%	100%
<b>WASHINGTON</b>	48%	57%	N/A	N/A	100%	100%
<b>WATAUGA</b>	88%	89%	N/A	N/A	72%	100%
<b>WAYNE</b>	70%	68%	100%	88%	100%	93%
<b>WILKES</b>	74%	67%	100%	100%	100%	76%
<b>WILSON</b>	71%	76%	100%	100%	100%	91%
<b>YADKIN</b>	65%	73%	N/A	100%	95%	57%
<b>YANCEY</b>	93%	100%	N/A	N/A	100%	100%
<b>State Totals</b>	84%	81%	74%	94%	99%	94%

### Number of at risk 4-year-olds per county

Source: Data provided by the Division of Child Development, NC Department of Health and Human Services (January 2018)

Alamance	938
Alexander	187
Alleghany	50
Anson	129
Ashe	123
Avery	69
Beaufort	237
Bertie	91
Bladen	187
Brunswick	569
Buncombe	1,371
Burke	442
Cabarrus	1,240
Caldwell	422
Camden	52
Carteret	327
Caswell	111
Catawba	902
Chatham	321
Cherokee	115
Chowan	75
Clay	46
Cleveland	548
Columbus	320
Craven	775
Cumberland	2,698
Currituck	142
Dare	182
Davidson	904
Davie	190
Duplin	384
Durham	2,281
Edgecombe	305
Forsyth	2,387

Franklin	355
Gaston	1,308
Gates	52
Graham	46
Granville	281
Greene	109
Guilford	3,189
Halifax	287
Harnett	1,019
Haywood	290
Henderson	561
Hertford	118
Hoke	492
Hyde	25
Iredell	924
Jackson	199
Johnston	1,181
Jones	53
Lee	407
Lenoir	338
Lincoln	413
Macon	175
Madison	100
Martin	123
McDowell	236
Mecklenburg	7,392
Mitchell	74
Montgomery	156
Moore	529
Nash	524
New Hanover	1,186
Northampton	87
Onslow	2,226
Orange	633

Pamlico	46
Pasquotank	266
Pender	325
Perquimans	71
Person	225
Pitt	1,094
Polk	83
Randolph	827
Richmond	261
Robeson	874
Rockingham	498
Rowan	801
Rutherford	351
Sampson	425
Scotland	221
Stanly	352
Stokes	202
Surry	384
Swain	109
Transylvania	151
Tyrrell	22
Union	1,236
Vance	288
Wake	6,630
Warren	99
Washington	66
Watauga	190
Wayne	879
Wilkes	345
Wilson	485
Yadkin	190
Yancey	86
STATE	62,287

**Number of NC Pre-K Slots by County, with expansion and total sites.**

Source: Data provided by the Division of Child Development, NC Department of Health and Human Services (January 2018)

NC Pre-K Contracting Agency	County	Initial Total # of Children SFY 17-18	Additional Slots Received	Total Children after expansion	Total NC Pre-K Sites
Alamance Partnership for Children	Alamance	426	24	450	24
Albemarle Alliance for Children and Families, Inc.	Camden	36		36	1
Alexander County Partnership for Children	Alexander	69		69	4
Alleghany County Schools	Alleghany	62		62	3
Alliance for Children	Union	375		375	12
Anson County Partnership for Children	Anson	152		152	5
Ashe County Schools	Ashe	134		134	5
Avery County Schools	Avery	109		109	6
Beaufort/Hyde Partnership for Children	Beaufort, Hyde	139	9	148	5
Bertie County Schools	Bertie	142		142	3
Bladen County Schools	Bladen	204		204	8
Buncombe County Partnership for Children	Buncombe	357	38	395	24
Burke County Smart Start, Inc.	Burke	379		379	19
Cabarrus County Partnership for Children	Cabarrus	411		411	11
Caldwell County Schools	Caldwell	156	30	186	16
Carteret County Schools	Carteret	202	26	228	11
Caswell County Partnership for Children	Caswell	71	9	80	5
Catawba County Partnership for Children	Catawba	330	26	356	20
Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools	Mecklenburg	1,206	215	1,421	34
Chatham County Partnership for Children	Chatham	250	19	269	11
Children's Council of Watauga County, Inc.	Watauga	81	10	91	20
Cleveland County Partnership for Children, Inc.	Cleveland	421		421	16
Columbus County Schools	Columbus	326	19	345	3
Community Action Opportunities	Madison	44	3	47	12
Craven County Board of Education	Craven	237	27	264	3
Currituck County Schools	Currituck	36	9	45	4
Dare County Schools	Dare	92	14	106	12
Davie County Schools	Davie	163	3	166	22
Down East Partnership for Children	Nash, Edgecombe	564		564	10
Duplin County Schools	Duplin	272	32	304	25
Durham's Partnership for Children	Durham	490	52	542	2
Edenton - Chowan Board of Education	Chowan	70		70	4
Elizabeth City - Pasquotank County Schools	Pasquotank	134	7	141	9
Franklin Granville Vance Smart Start, Inc.	Franklin, Granville, Vance	128	18	146	32
Gaston County Schools	Gaston	811	28	839	1



Gates County Schools	Gates	31		31	8
Granville County Schools	Granville	121	30	151	79
Guilford County Partnership for Children	Guilford	1,965	72	2,037	15
Halifax-Warren SmartStart Partnership for Children	Halifax, Warren	360		360	11
Harnett County Partnership for Children	Harnett	320	26	346	3
Hertford County Schools	Hertford	162		162	10
Hoke County Schools	Hoke	401		401	2
Hyde County Schools	Hyde	31		31	2
Intermountain Children's Services, Inc.	Mitchell	34		34	2
Iredell County Partnership for Children	Iredell	264	20	284	4
Jones County Partnership for Children	Jones	71	2	73	8
Lee County Partnership for Children	Lee	233	16	249	8
Lenoir/Greene County. Partnership for Children	Lenior, Greene	246		246	3
Martin County Schools	Martin	127		127	9
McDowell County Schools	McDowell	176	9	185	7
Montgomery Public Schools	Montgomery	175	9	184	6
Moore County Schools	Moore	44	6	50	15
New Hanover County Schools	New Hanover	532	20	552	4
Northampton County Schools	Northampton	120		120	19
Onslow County Partnership for Children, Inc.	Onslow	736		736	22
Orange County Partnership for Young Children	Orange	265	23	288	2
Pamlico County Schools	Pamlico	58		58	63
Partnership for Children of Cumberland County, Inc.	Cumberland	1,825		1,825	26
Partnership for Children of Johnston County, Inc.	Johnston	329	16	345	11
Partnership for Children of Lincoln/Gaston Counties, Inc.	Lincoln, Gaston	161	13	174	19
Pender County Schools	Pender	213	37	250	8
Perquimans County Schools	Perquimans	36		36	1
Person County Partnership for Children	Person	123		123	3
Pitt County Schools	Pitt	495	17	512	19
Polk County Schools	Polk	79		79	4
Randolph County Partnership for Children	Randolph	293	18	311	9
Region A Partnership for Children	Cherokee, Clay, Graham, Haywood, Jackson, Macon, Swain	560	19	579	31
Richmond County Schools	Richmond	231		231	8
Robeson County Partnership for Children, Inc.	Robeson	828		828	41
Rockingham County Partnership for Children, Inc.	Rockingham	218	4	222	19
Rutherford County Schools	Rutherford	228		228	13
Sampson County Partnership for Children	Sampson	324		324	10

Scotland County Schools	Scotland	240	8	248	9
Smart Start of Brunswick County, Inc.	Brunswick	250		250	9
Smart Start of Davidson County	Davidson	347		347	18
Smart Start of Forsyth County	Forsyth	610	67	677	24
Smart Start of Transylvania County	Transylvania	64	18	82	4
Smart Start Rowan, Inc.	Rowan	325	12	337	19
Stanly County Partnership for Children, Inc.	Stanly	300		300	11
Stokes Partnership for Children	Stokes	180		180	8
Surry County Early Childhood Partnership	Surry	261		261	17
Partnership for Children of Wayne County, Inc.	Wayne	540	15	555	6
Tyrrell County Schools	Tyrrell	18		18	1
Vance County Schools	Vance	140	5	145	7
Wake County SmartStart	Wake	1,013	527	1,540	49
Washington County Schools	Washington	72	11	83	2
Western Carolina Community Action, Inc.	Henderson	177	12	189	12
Wilkes County Schools	Wilkes	379		379	13
Wilson County Partnership for Children	Wilson	119		119	4
Yadkin County Schools	Yadkin	164		164	12
Yancey County Schools	Yancey	36	5	41	3
TOTAL		26,729	1,655	28,384	1164

## Positive School Climate

Percent of early care and education programs and schools integrating social-emotional strategies. Students show better academic and social-emotional outcomes when they learn in positive school climates, where they feel safe, connected and engaged.

Source: NC Department of Public Instruction, PBIS Report, 2013-14

### NC Counties with at least one Positive Behavior Intervention and Support Implementing School

Alamance	Yes	Franklin	Yes	Pamlico	No
Alexander	Yes	Gaston	No	Pasquotank	Yes
Alleghany	No	Gates	Yes	Pender	Yes
Anson	No	Graham	No	Perquimans	Yes
Ashe	Yes	Granville	No	Person	Yes
Avery	No	Greene	No	Pitt	Yes
Beaufort	Yes	Guilford	Yes	Polk	No
Bertie	No	Halifax	No	Randolph	Yes
Bladen	No	Harnett	No	Richmond	No
Brunswick	Yes	Haywood	Yes	Robeson	Yes
Buncombe	Yes	Henderson	Yes	Rockingham	Yes
Burke	No	Hertford	No	Rowan	No
Cabarrus	Yes	Hoke	Yes	Rutherford	Yes
Caldwell	Yes	Hyde	No	Sampson	Yes
Camden	Yes	Iredell	Yes	Scotland	Yes
Carteret	Yes	Jackson	Yes	Stanly	No
Caswell	No	Johnston	No	Stokes	Yes
Catawba	Yes	Jones	Yes	Surry	Yes
Chatham	Yes	Lee	No	Swain	Yes
Cherokee	No	Lenoir	Yes	Transylvania	Yes
Chowan	Yes	Lincoln	Yes	Tyrrell	No
Clay	No	Macon	No	Union	Yes
Cleveland	Yes	Madison	Yes	Vance	Yes
Columbus	Yes	Martin	Yes	Wake	Yes
Craven	No	McDowell	No	Warren	Yes
Cumberland	Yes	Mecklenburg	No	Washington	No
Currituck	Yes	Mitchell	No	Watauga	Yes
Dare	Yes	Montgomery	No	Wayne	Yes
Davidson	Yes	Moore	No	Wilkes	Yes
Davie	Yes	Nash	Yes	Wilson	No
Duplin	No	New Hanover	Yes	Yadkin	Yes
Durham	Yes	Northampton	No	Yancey	Yes
Edgecombe	Yes	Onslow	Yes		
Forsyth	Yes	Orange	Yes		

## Promotion to Next Grade

**Percent of children promoted to next grade (K-3).** A large body of research suggests that students retained in the early years achieve at lower levels, are more likely to drop out of high school, and have worse social-emotional outcomes than similar students who are promoted.

Source: 2015 Child Care Services Association.

### Percent of children retained in same grade (K and 1<sup>st</sup> grade)

County	% Children Held Back in Kindergarten	% Children Held Back in First Grade
Alamance	3%	2%
Alexander	5%	5%
Alleghany	1%	2%
Anson	13%	8%
Ashe	1%	1%
Avery	1%	0%
Beaufort	6%	3%
Bertie	2%	2%
Bladen	6%	7%
Brunswick	5%	6%
Buncombe	1%	1%
Burke	2%	1%
Cabarrus	2%	2%
Caldwell	3%	3%
Camden	6%	5%
Carteret	2%	4%
Caswell	7%	3%
Catawba	2%	3%
Chatham	2%	1%
Cherokee	6%	4%
Chowan	11%	6%
Clay	3%	6%
Cleveland	1%	2%
Columbus	9%	14%
Craven	5%	4%
Cumberland	7%	6%
Currituck	2%	2%
Dare	1%	1%
Davidson	3%	3%
Davie	3%	3%
Duplin	12%	9%

County	% Children Held Back in Kindergarten	% Children Held Back in First Grade
Durham	5%	3%
Edgecombe	7%	11%
Forsyth	6%	4%
Franklin	11%	9%
Gaston	7%	5%
Gates	3%	1%
Graham	8%	8%
Granville	4%	5%
Greene	3%	0%
Guilford	2%	1%
Halifax	2%	5%
Harnett	2%	2%
Haywood	5%	7%
Henderson	3%	2%
Hertford	5%	7%
Hoke	4%	6%
Hyde	3%	2%
Iredell	3%	3%
Jackson	8%	5%
Johnston	2%	5%
Jones	4%	3%
Lee	2%	1%
Lenoir	5%	6%
Lincoln	5%	4%
Macon	10%	5%
Madison	5%	7%
Martin	8%	6%
McDowell	5%	3%
Mecklenburg	2%	2%
Mitchell	2%	2%
Montgomery	4%	3%

County	% Children Held Back in Kindergarten	% Children Held Back in First Grade
Moore	4%	3%
Nash	7%	6%
New Hanover	2%	1%
Northampton	7%	10%
Onslow	4%	6%
Orange	1%	1%
Pamlico	13%	13%
Pasquotank	7%	5%
Pender	3%	2%
Perquimans	7%	5%
Person	13%	4%
Pitt	4%	4%
Polk	6%	6%
Randolph	3%	2%
Richmond	1%	2%
Robeson	7%	9%
Rockingham	5%	7%
Rowan	6%	4%
Rutherford	12%	9%
Sampson	9%	7%

County	% Children Held Back in Kindergarten	% Children Held Back in First Grade
Scotland	10%	9%
Stanly	4%	5%
Stokes	8%	5%
Surry	4%	5%
Swain	5%	4%
Transylvania	3%	2%
Tyrrell	2%	2%
Union	3%	4%
Vance	5%	10%
Wake	2%	3%
Warren	5%	7%
Washington	2%	3%
Watauga	5%	2%
Wayne	7%	7%
Wilkes	4%	3%
Wilson	7%	4%
Yadkin	7%	2%
Yancey	5%	4%

## Read to Achieve Retentions

Source: County data source: Source: NC Public Schools/NC State Board of Education/NC DPI Report to the NC General Assembly Improve K-3 Literacy Accountability Measures, October 2016.

State of North Carolina District Level Report 2015-16 Read to Achieve Grade 3 End-of-Year Results	Percentage of students retained for not demonstrating reading proficiency on 3rd grade standards
District Name	%
Alamance-Burlington Schools	17.5
Alexander County Schools	6.1
Alleghany County Schools	3.6
Anson County Schools	16.7
Ashe County Schools	7.7
Asheboro City Schools	22.3
Asheville City Schools	9.5
Avery County Schools	3
Beaufort County Schools	12.3
Bertie County Schools	17.3
Bladen County Schools	14.4
Brunswick County Schools	7.6
Buncombe County Schools	14.8
Burke County Schools	8.1
Cabarrus County Schools	18.8
Caldwell County Schools	9.1
Camden County Schools	0
Carteret County Public Schools	2.7
Caswell County Schools	24.9
Catawba County Schools	7.7
Chapel Hill-Carrboro Schools	8.1
Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools	19.6
Chatham County Schools	16.2
Cherokee County Schools	5.2
Clay County Schools	3.3
Cleveland County Schools	4.6
Clinton City Schools	20.3
Columbus County Schools	12.9
Craven County Schools	8.4
Cumberland County Schools	10.5
Currituck County Schools	6.3
Dare County Schools	12.5
Davidson County Schools	15.9
Davie County Schools	9.2
Duplin County Schools	17
Durham Public Schools	26.6

State of North Carolina District Level Report 2015-16 Read to Achieve Grade 3 End-of-Year Results	Percentage of students retained for not demonstrating reading proficiency on 3rd grade standards
District Name	%
Edenton-Chowan Schools	15.2
Edgecombe County Public School	23.7
Elkin City Schools	6.1
Forsyth County Schools	20.9
Franklin County Schools	10.3
Gaston County Schools	14.9
Gates County Schools	6
Graham County Schools	1.1
Granville County Schools	25.7
Greene County Schools	17.8
Guilford County Schools	18.5
Halifax County Schools	25.1
Harnett County Schools	28.2
Haywood County Schools	5.1
Henderson County Schools	5
Hertford County Schools	15.5
Hickory City Schools	23.2
Hoke County Schools	17.2
Hyde County Schools	3.7
Iredell-Statesville Schools	13.8
Jackson County Schools	7.5
Johnston County Schools	5.9
Jones County Schools	13.1
Kannapolis City Schools	19
Lee County Schools	24
Lenoir County Public Schools	13
Lexington City Schools	16.2
Lincoln County Schools	4.4
Macon County Schools	10.1
Madison County Schools	0.6
Martin County Schools	5.7
McDowell County Schools	16.6
Mitchell County Schools	6.5
Montgomery County Schools	12.1
Moore County Schools	14.3
Mooresville City Schools	4.6

State of North Carolina District Level Report 2015-16 Read to Achieve Grade 3 End-of-Year Results	Percentage of students retained for not demonstrating reading proficiency on 3rd grade standards
District Name	%
Mount Airy City Schools	17.8
Nash-Rocky Mount Schools	11
New Hanover County Schools	14.2
Newton Conover City Schools	8.2
Northampton County Schools	39
Onslow County Schools	7.6
Orange County Schools	16.8
Pamlico County Schools	20
Pasquotank County Schools	12.1
Pender County Schools	10.2
Perquimans County Schools	2
Person County Schools	17
Pitt County Schools	14.5
Polk County Schools	5.5
Randolph County Schools	16.4
Richmond County Schools	17.9
Roanoke Rapids City Schools	17.1
Robeson County Schools	27.2
Rockingham County Schools	15.1
Rowan-Salisbury Schools	27
Rutherford County Schools	2.3
Sampson County Schools	11.3
Scotland County Schools	11.1

State of North Carolina District Level Report 2015-16 Read to Achieve Grade 3 End-of-Year Results	Percentage of students retained for not demonstrating reading proficiency on 3rd grade standards
District Name	%
Stanly County Schools	10.7
Stokes County Schools	9.1
Surry County Schools	6
Swain County Schools	18.4
Thomasville City Schools	36.5
Transylvania County Schools	3.2
Tyrrell County Schools	12
Union County Public Schools	10.7
Vance County Schools	33
Wake County Schools	11.3
Warren County Schools	13.8
Washington County Schools	30.6
Watauga County Schools	8.2
Wayne County Public Schools	11.2
Weldon City Schools	31.5
Whiteville City Schools	17.6
Wilkes County Schools	6.1
Wilson County Schools	5.9
Yadkin County Schools	5.4
Yancey County Schools	1.1
State of North Carolina	14.4

## Regular School Attendance

**Percent of children with regular attendance in early care and education programs and schools.** Children, particularly those with multiple risk factors, benefit from regular attendance in child care, where they establish good attendance and learning habits. Consistent school attendance in the early grades helps boost children’s academic learning, achievement, and motivation. Early chronic absenteeism is associated with lower academic achievement, truancy in middle school, school dropout, delinquency, and substance abuse. The educational experience of all children is impacted when teachers must divert their attention to meet the needs of chronically absent children when they are in school.

Source: US Department of Education, Office of Civil Rights Data Collection, 2013-14

### Students in NC schools with K, 1st, 2nd, and/or 3rd grades, who are chronically absent

Local Education Agency	American Indian/ Alaska Native	Asian	Black	Hispanic	Multi-Racial	Native Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander	White	Total Male	Total Female	Total Chronic Student Absenteeism
Alamance-Burlington	10%	10%	13%	11%	19%	9%	15%	14%	13%	14%
Alexander	na	5%	9%	7%	17%	**	9%	9%	8%	9%
Alleghany	**	**	<5%*	13%	18%	na	12%	12%	13%	12%
Anson	40%	8%	16%	20%	27%	na	21%	21%	16%	18%
Ashe	**	**	<5%*	5%	17%	na	10%	9%	9%	9%
Asheboro City	**	18%	5%	<5%*	12%	**	6%	5%	5%	5%
Asheville City	**	20%	17%	16%	18%	43%	10%	12%	13%	13%
Avery	**	<5%*	**	<5%*	<5%*	**	<5%*	<5%*	<5%*	<5%*
Beaufort	**	40%	15%	6%	16%	na	17%	15%	14%	15%
Bertie	**	<5%*	11%	28%	30%	na	27%	14%	13%	13%
Bladen	28%	**	14%	10%	29%	na	21%	18%	15%	16%
Brunswick	25%	5%	9%	9%	17%	<5%*	16%	14%	14%	14%
Buncombe	23%	8%	16%	8%	12%	14%	12%	12%	11%	12%
Burke	17%	<5%*	8%	<5%*	8%	17%	9%	8%	7%	7%
Cabarrus	8%	8%	9%	9%	11%	5%	9%	9%	8%	9%
Caldwell	**	20%	13%	14%	16%	**	14%	14%	14%	14%
Camden	na	20%	9%	8%	23%	**	17%	17%	16%	17%
Carteret	27%	21%	15%	12%	19%	<5%*	15%	16%	14%	15%
Caswell	**	**	14%	15%	21%	na	22%	20%	16%	18%
Catawba	17%	<5%*	11%	7%	15%	**	12%	12%	10%	11%
Chapel Hill-Carrboro	<5%*	6%	11%	7%	9%	na	7%	7%	7%	7%
Charlotte-Mecklenburg	6%	<5%*	5%	<5%*	5%	<5%*	<5%*	<5%*	<5%*	<5%*
Chatham	<5%*	22%	10%	8%	19%	**	8%	9%	9%	9%
Cherokee	42%	13%	13%	14%	19%	na	14%	15%	13%	14%
Clay	**	**	**	9%	20%	na	17%	13%	18%	16%
Cleveland	**	11%	6%	8%	14%	**	10%	9%	9%	9%
Clinton City	17%	18%	10%	7%	32%	na	9%	10%	10%	10%



Local Education Agency	American Indian/	Asian	Black	Hispanic	Multi-Racial	Native Hawaiian/	White	Total Male	Total Female	Total Chronic Student Absenteeism
	Alaska Native					Pacific Islander				
Columbus	20%	**	14%	16%	25%	**	17%	16%	16%	16%
Craven	15%	9%	11%	11%	17%	7%	13%	13%	11%	12%
Cumberland	21%	10%	11%	14%	15%	15%	13%	13%	12%	13%
Currituck	**	<5%*	<5%*	13%	10%	na	7%	9%	6%	7%
Dare	**	12%	16%	13%	23%	**	17%	16%	18%	17%
Davidson	6%	5%	8%	8%	8%	<5%*	8%	8%	8%	8%
Davie	**	<5%*	8%	12%	13%	**	11%	11%	11%	11%
Duplin	29%	17%	14%	11%	29%	**	19%	15%	15%	15%
Durham	27%	13%	14%	10%	15%	11%	9%	12%	11%	12%
Edenton-Chowan	**	**	10%	8%	16%	na	11%	12%	9%	11%
Edgecombe	**	**	17%	10%	31%	**	26%	21%	17%	19%
Elizabeth City-Pasquotank	17%	24%	15%	12%	19%	na	20%	17%	18%	17%
Elkin City	na	**	16%	<5%*	9%	na	<5%*	<5%*	<5%*	<5%*
Franklin	13%	8%	9%	7%	18%	**	12%	10%	11%	10%
Gaston	29%	7%	8%	7%	14%	22%	13%	11%	10%	11%
Gates	**	na	13%	40%	25%	na	15%	16%	15%	16%
Graham	21%	**	**	8%	**	na	16%	17%	15%	16%
Granville	29%	5%	9%	6%	16%	**	12%	11%	9%	10%
Greene	**	**	8%	12%	10%	na	13%	9%	12%	11%
Guilford	26%	11%	14%	12%	15%	20%	12%	13%	13%	13%
Halifax	8%	**	18%	11%	24%	**	24%	18%	16%	17%
Harnett	24%	16%	12%	11%	16%	15%	15%	14%	13%	14%
Haywood	23%	<5%*	17%	<5%*	15%	**	10%	9%	11%	10%
Henderson	<5%*	7%	10%	7%	15%	18%	10%	10%	10%	10%
Hertford	58%	18%	15%	6%	42%	**	22%	18%	15%	17%
Hickory City	**	8%	10%	6%	9%	**	9%	9%	8%	8%
Hoke	25%	9%	10%	9%	13%	<5%*	15%	13%	12%	12%
Hyde	na	na	6%	6%	20%	na	16%	12%	12%	12%
Iredell-Statesville	13%	<5%*	12%	11%	19%	<5%*	10%	11%	10%	11%
Jackson	35%	5%	10%	12%	21%	**	21%	21%	19%	20%
Johnston	<5%*	<5%*	<5%*	<5%*	<5%*	<5%*	<5%*	<5%*	<5%*	<5%*
Jones	na	**	14%	12%	24%	na	19%	17%	16%	17%
Kannapolis City	14%	8%	12%	8%	16%	**	13%	11%	12%	11%

Local Education Agency	American Indian/	Asian	Black	Hispanic	Multi-Racial	Native Hawaiian/	White	Total Male	Total Female	Total Chronic Student Absenteeism
	Alaska Native					Pacific Islander				
Lee	7%	<5%*	9%	6%	13%	na	9%	7%	9%	8%
Lenoir	25%	25%	13%	14%	26%	**	17%	16%	14%	15%
Lexington City	17%	13%	8%	9%	17%	**	19%	15%	10%	12%
Lincoln	17%	12%	9%	10%	14%	**	11%	11%	11%	11%
Macon	**	<5%*	24%	6%	5%	**	12%	10%	11%	11%
Madison	na	**	**	8%	<5%*	**	9%	10%	8%	9%
Martin	na	80%	17%	16%	29%	na	19%	18%	20%	19%
McDowell	<5%*	8%	14%	9%	11%	**	13%	13%	12%	12%
Mitchell	na	**	**	7%	13%	na	14%	14%	13%	14%
Montgomery	**	22%	9%	7%	23%	**	15%	12%	12%	12%
Moore	24%	13%	14%	11%	24%	**	16%	16%	15%	15%
Mooresville	**	<5%*	8%	9%	11%	**	7%	7%	8%	7%
Mount Airy City	**	<5%*	14%	12%	35%	na	16%	14%	17%	15%
Nash-Rocky Mount	13%	7%	15%	13%	23%	<5%*	17%	17%	14%	15%
New Hanover	33%	12%	16%	10%	16%	40%	11%	13%	11%	12%
Newton Conover City	na	<5%*	9%	8%	10%	na	11%	9%	9%	9%
Northampton	na	**	19%	24%	15%	**	23%	24%	15%	20%
Onslow	23%	9%	10%	13%	13%	30%	14%	13%	13%	13%
Orange	<5%*	14%	15%	9%	17%	**	10%	11%	11%	11%
Pamlico	**	**	10%	9%	14%	na	17%	14%	15%	14%
Pender	33%	21%	14%	11%	26%	**	18%	16%	17%	17%
Perquimans	**	**	16%	28%	11%	na	16%	16%	16%	16%
Person	<5%*	**	9%	10%	18%	**	8%	9%	9%	9%
Pitt	13%	<5%*	10%	7%	13%	<5%*	8%	10%	8%	9%
Polk	na	**	6%	10%	14%	**	8%	8%	9%	9%
Randolph	12%	13%	11%	8%	19%	**	13%	12%	12%	12%
Richmond	17%	<5%*	13%	6%	22%	**	14%	13%	13%	13%
Roanoke Rapids	**	6%	15%	17%	22%	na	14%	13%	17%	15%
Robeson	22%	11%	16%	10%	22%	27%	21%	19%	18%	18%
Rockingham	**	14%	10%	10%	14%	**	12%	11%	12%	12%
Rowan-Salisbury	9%	6%	15%	11%	25%	13%	14%	15%	13%	14%
Rutherford	<5%*	<5%*	9%	8%	16%	**	14%	13%	13%	13%

Local Education Agency	American Indian/	Asian	Black	Hispanic	Multi-Racial	Native Hawaiian/	White	Total Male	Total Female	Total Chronic Student Absenteeism
	Alaska Native					Pacific Islander				
Sampson	26%	<5%*	14%	14%	21%	**	14%	15%	14%	14%
Scotland	27%	9%	12%	16%	19%	**	15%	17%	15%	16%
Stanly	25%	7%	17%	11%	17%	20%	12%	14%	12%	13%
Stokes	33%	<5%*	16%	24%	27%	**	16%	17%	17%	17%
Surry	**	13%	11%	6%	19%	na	12%	10%	11%	11%
Swain	28%	**	**	5%	19%	na	19%	19%	22%	20%
Thomasville City	**	**	10%	9%	13%	**	15%	10%	11%	11%
Transylvania	**	**	11%	13%	11%	**	13%	13%	12%	13%
Tyrrell	**	**	<5%*	9%	<5%*	**	17%	11%	7%	9%
Union	18%	5%	8%	5%	10%	25%	7%	7%	7%	7%
Vance	**	<5%*	12%	6%	19%	**	16%	13%	11%	12%
Wake	16%	8%	12%	11%	13%	10%	8%	10%	9%	10%
Warren	11%	**	24%	17%	43%	**	24%	25%	20%	23%
Washington	**	**	<5%*	6%	12%	na	<5%*	<5%*	<5%*	<5%*
Watauga	**	23%	17%	13%	19%	**	14%	15%	13%	14%
Wayne	31%	10%	19%	14%	17%	22%	18%	18%	17%	17%
Weldon City	na	na	13%	**	**	na	**	17%	11%	14%
Whiteville City	**	**	10%	15%	15%	na	15%	14%	11%	13%
Wilkes	<5%*	6%	7%	7%	8%	**	7%	8%	7%	7%
Wilson	13%	14%	8%	7%	20%	**	9%	9%	8%	9%
Winston Salem/Forsyth	37%	9%	17%	12%	17%	22%	11%	14%	13%	13%
Yadkin	14%	<5%*	6%	<5%*	12%	**	8%	7%	7%	7%
Yancey	**	na	**	8%	59%	na	22%	19%	22%	20%
NC	21%	7%	11%	9%	15%	13%	11%	11%	10%	11%

na = There are no children of this race/ethnicity reported enrolled in this school district.

\* = Per DPI policy, in any group where the percentage of individuals is less than 5%, the actual values may not be displayed because of federal privacy regulations (FERPA). In these cases, the results will be shown as <5%.

\*\* = Per DPI policy, in any group where the denominator (number of enrolled students) is less than 10, the percentage may not be displayed.

## **Summer Learning**

**Percent of children who maintain literacy gains over the summer.** While middle-income students tend to hold steady or gain in learning over the summer, low-income students lose ground, likely because students from disadvantaged families are less able to access educational resources than their more advantaged peers during the summer months. The cumulative effects of year-after-year summer learning loss contributes to the achievement gaps between higher- and lower-income students. Learning opportunities and book access during the summer months can contribute to children's short- and long-term outcomes.

**NO COUNTY OR STATE DATA AVAILABLE**

## Family Economic Security

**Percent of families with children living under 200% of Federal Poverty Level.** Child poverty is linked with a range of negative outcomes including diminished academic achievement, more health problems, lower nutrition, and lower overall well-being. Children from extremely poor families tend to have lower cognitive skills, including reading, problem solving, and concentration ability, and experience greater developmental losses during the non-academic year.

*Source: American Community Survey 5 year estimates (2009-2015)*

### Percent of children living in families under 200% of federal poverty level (FPL) (ages 0-5)

Alamance	59.9%	Franklin	58.4%	Pamlico	56.3%
Alexander	56.7%	Gaston	56.3%	Pasquotank	53.2%
Alleghany	77.7%	Gates	56.7%	Pender	43.1%
Anson	65.6%	Graham	67.6%	Perquimans	65.1%
Ashe	79.7%	Granville	55.3%	Person	60.0%
Avery	67.4%	Greene	78.0%	Pitt	50.2%
Beaufort	62.2%	Guilford	55.8%	Polk	54.1%
Bertie	79.2%	Halifax	66.7%	Randolph	63.1%
Bladen	67.9%	Harnett	55.8%	Richmond	63.2%
Brunswick	55.5%	Haywood	65.8%	Robeson	78.0%
Buncombe	52.3%	Henderson	50.8%	Rockingham	59.1%
Burke	60.3%	Hertford	72.7%	Rowan	59.8%
Cabarrus	46.7%	Hoke	57.0%	Rutherford	65.7%
Caldwell	62.4%	Hyde	65.9%	Sampson	67.1%
Camden	24.6%	Iredell	49.9%	Scotland	73.9%
Carteret	54.4%	Jackson	51.6%	Stanly	48.3%
Caswell	61.7%	Johnston	52.8%	Stokes	54.4%
Catawba	52.5%	Jones	66.3%	Surry	67.5%
Chatham	48.8%	Lee	57.1%	Swain	66.8%
Cherokee	68.3%	Lenoir	76.3%	Transylvania	49.5%
Chowan	69.8%	Lincoln	47.8%	Tyrrell	77.4%
Clay	69.2%	McDowell	66.3%	Union	40.0%
Cleveland	67.5%	Macon	68.2%	Vance	75.2%
Columbus	65.0%	Madison	45.0%	Wake	35.2%
Craven	49.6%	Martin	54.8%	Warren	67.5%
Cumberland	58.5%	Mecklenburg	44.4%	Washington	74.6%
Currituck	50.4%	Mitchell	56.4%	Watauga	49.2%
Dare	50.0%	Montgomery	69.2%	Wayne	67.9%
Davidson	52.3%	Moore	48.9%	Wilkes	65.0%
Davie	45.1%	Nash	59.5%	Wilson	67.1%
Duplin	73.3%	New Hanover	47.2%	Yadkin	65.5%
Durham	50.1%	Northampton	87.9%	Yancey	53.0%
Edgecombe	82.7%	Onslow	55.8%		
Forsyth	58.1%	Orange	36.5%	NC	53.3%

**Percent of children living in families that make a living wage.** Caregivers who do not make a living wage may work full-time and still be unable to keep their families out of poverty.

Source: Median Income: NC Office of State Budget and Management; Sustainable Living Wage: United Way of NC

**Median Income vs. Sustainable Living Wage, by county**

County	Median Income	Sustainable Living Wage
Alamance	41,296	54,845
Alexander	43,043	44,900
Alleghany	35,266	42,619
Anson	32,508	47,682
Ashe	36,488	44,505
Avery	37,131	50,075
Beaufort	40,357	48,960
Bertie	31,217	45,786
Bladen	33,521	47,560
Brunswick	47,387	54,365
Buncombe	47,296	59,796
Burke	39,275	44,547
Cabarrus	55,250	60,070
Caldwell	38,653	43,923
Camden	61,730	58,910
Carteret	48,824	54,546
Caswell	42,730	48,087
Catawba	45,080	49,478
Chatham	56,797	59,095
Cherokee	34,620	46,286
Chowan	38,887	47,404
Clay	37,072	48,240
Cleveland	39,444	45,396
Columbus	34,321	47,121
Craven	43,972	53,871
Cumberland	42,582	53,869
Currituck	58,024	56,260
Dare	54,642	62,065
Davidson	43,346	47,358
Davie	47,592	51,007
Duplin	34,109	46,446
Durham	50,745	67,526
Edgecombe	31,615	50,713
Forsyth	45,944	53,991
Franklin	48,166	52,458

County	Median Income	Sustainable Living Wage
Gaston	42,056	50,520
Gates	48,413	49,264
Graham	33,824	47,566
Granville	49,342	54,043
Greene	37,263	46,419
Guilford	44,828	55,549
Halifax	31,674	46,690
Harnett	45,380	53,061
Haywood	42,812	49,614
Henderson	47,286	54,430
Hertford	30,056	47,262
Hoke	44,175	49,986
Hyde	36,891	61,494
Iredell	54,026	58,002
Jackson	38,130	48,794
Johnston	50,055	59,174
Jones	38,928	48,808
Lee	46,073	50,399
Lenoir	35,991	45,926
Lincoln	49,676	51,393
Macon	37,884	49,009
Madison	38,445	50,960
Martin	35,930	46,106
McDowell	37,881	46,720
Mecklenburg	59,049	65,173
Mitchell	36,795	48,019
Montgomery	38,530	46,364
Moore	51,650	52,840
Nash	43,348	50,329
New Hanover	49,905	60,098
Northampton	32,063	52,499
Onslow	47,201	53,426
Orange	60,304	72,189
Pamlico	43,097	48,504
Pasquotank	44,596	50,683

County	Median Income	Sustainable Living Wage
Pender	45,453	54,342
Perquimans	41,328	48,282
Person	45,841	49,681
Pitt	41,765	55,851
Polk	45,464	53,679
Randolph	41,770	47,347
Richmond	34,665	42,505
Robeson	30,414	47,660
Rockingham	39,606	45,345
Rowan	44,973	48,454
Rutherford	35,629	44,439
Sampson	33,876	47,618
Scotland	32,782	47,010
Stanly	41,921	48,642
Stokes	45,065	49,489

County	Median Income	Sustainable Living Wage
Surry	37,915	49,790
Swain	34,788	45,709
Transylvania	44,490	51,693
Tyrrell	32,773	45,077
Union	64,381	61,558
Vance	33,609	47,414
Wake	66,950	69,403
Warren	33,869	46,100
Washington	32,867	50,197
Watauga	41,942	57,087
Wayne	36,890	47,785
Wilkes	33,398	51,044
Wilson	39,268	49,769
Yadkin	40,801	46,740
Yancey	35,974	44,634

### Housing Stability

**Percent of birth-through-age-eight children who are homeless.** Homeless children develop more slowly and may develop serious emotional problems. They are more likely to get sick, have mental health problems, have academic problems, be victims of violence, exhibit delinquent or aggressive behavior, be behind academically and have social and emotional issues that result in poor academic performance, behavior problems and depression.

*Source: National Center for Homeless Education, Consolidated State Performance Report and North Carolina Factsheet (2013-14). DPI Statistical Profile (2013-14).*

### Number of homeless students enrolled in public schools in NC, by grade (2013-14), Ages: (K-3)

	# homeless	# enrolled - districts	% homeless
<b>K</b>	2493	122,129	2.04%
<b>1</b>	2481	122,441	2.03%
<b>2</b>	2301	117,695	1.96%
<b>3</b>	2118	114,343	1.85%

**Percent of children with housing stability (family has not moved more than once in past 12 months).** When children move frequently, it impacts their social capital and ability to learn because of disruptive absences from school, discontinuity of teaching styles, and insecure social relationships. Families that move frequently may be less successful at developing social ties and may be unfamiliar with available resources to help their children.

*Source: US Census Bureau, Quick Facts: North Carolina (2012-2016)*

### Percent of Population (over 1 year old) Living in Same House as One Year Ago

North Carolina	84%
United States	85%

**Percent of families who spend less than 30% of income on housing.** Families with high housing costs are more likely to go without other basic necessities in order to pay for rent and utilities. High housing costs can increase the likelihood of frequent moves and doubling up with family members or friends.

*Source: BTC Brief: County Economic Snapshots, 2017, NC Budget and Tax Center*

**Percent of Renters with Housing Costs Greater than 30% in 2014-15**

Alamance	51.6	Franklin	52.3	Pamlico	52.3
Alexander	49.6	Gaston	54.4	Pasquotank	53.7
Alleghany	52.7	Gates	52.9	Pender	52.4
Anson	53	Graham	39.4	Perquimans	56.3
Ashe	58.7	Granville	44.5	Person	55.1
Avery	57	Greene	44	Pitt	54.3
Beaufort	52.4	Guilford	51.4	Polk	40.3
Bertie	67.7	Halifax	60.8	Randolph	49.9
Bladen	56.5	Harnett	48.7	Richmond	53.7
Brunswick	56.7	Haywood	50.6	Robeson	53.3
Buncombe	49.8	Henderson	55.4	Rockingham	52.2
Burke	51.9	Hertford	50.4	Rowan	50.5
Cabarrus	47.3	Hoke	54.7	Rutherford	48.5
Caldwell	57.1	Hyde	46	Sampson	49.6
Camden	58.4	Iredell	48.3	Scotland	59.1
Carteret	46.2	Jackson	56.7	Stanly	54.3
Caswell	54.9	Johnston	54.8	Stokes	50.9
Catawba	46.6	Jones	53.8	Surry	46.7
Chatham	49.2	Lee	44.7	Swain	44.8
Cherokee	54.4	Lenoir	52.4	Transylvania	52
Chowan	61.4	Lincoln	47.3	Tyrrell	47.7
Clay	53.7	Macon	57.6	Union	54
Cleveland	57.9	Madison	45.1	Vance	57.8
Columbus	53.9	Martin	42.1	Wake	46.4
Craven	49.8	McDowell	45.1	Warren	55.6
Cumberland	49.7	Mecklenburg	48.7	Washington	70.1
Currituck	57.5	Mitchell	61.2	Watauga	74.1
Dare	43.2	Montgomery	52.3	Wayne	51.1
Davidson	45.5	Moore	48.1	Wilkes	55.5
Davie	45.5	Nash	54.8	Wilson	53.8
Duplin	52.5	New Hanover	54.5	Yadkin	45
Durham	51	Northampton	63.9	Yancey	50.7
Edgecombe	55	Onslow	53		
Forsyth	52.3	Orange	52.8		



## Safe Neighborhoods

Rate of reported violent crimes. Exposure to community violence is associated with negative outcomes for children, including reduced behavioral and social competence. Repeated exposure to violence threatens children’s physical, intellectual, and emotional development.

Source: NC State Bureau of Investigation, Annual Summary Report

### Violent Crime Rate per 100,000 population (2014)

Alamance	381.2	Franklin	145.8	Pamlico	304
Alexander	154.9	Gaston	369.1	Pasquotank	351.9
Alleghany		Gates		Pender	194.7
Anson	348	Graham		Perquimans	159.6
Ashe	61.3	Granville	297.4	Person	186.3
Avery	130	Greene		Pitt	419.7
Beaufort	302.5	Guilford	392.2	Polk	40.2
Bertie	134.6	Halifax	484.5	Randolph	154.5
Bladen	232.9	Harnett	261.8	Richmond	425.7
Brunswick	143.7	Haywood	243	Robeson	859
Buncombe	247.4	Henderson	132.7	Rockingham	183.1
Burke	149.2	Hertford	322.5	Rowan	376.6
Cabarrus	110.4	Hoke	128.3	Rutherford	132.3
Caldwell	136.6	Hyde		Sampson	211.6
Camden	30.1	Iredell	254.5	Scotland	642.2
Carteret	331	Jackson	277.1	Stanly	262.9
Caswell	184.5	Johnston	195.4	Stokes	283
Catawba	253.4	Jones		Surry	174.3
Chatham	182.9	Lee	181.8	Swain	276.7
Cherokee	223.9	Lenoir	838.1	Transylvania	141.5
Chowan	310.5	Lincoln	160.5	Tyrrell	217.2
Clay	240.9	Macon	125.9	Union	176
Cleveland	212.8	Madison	35.1	Vance	648.1
Columbus	479.2	Martin	551.6	Wake	240.5
Craven	245.7	McDowell	151.1	Warren	210.2
Cumberland	524.5	Mecklenburg	534	Washington	269.8
Currituck	200	Mitchell			
Dare	238.1	Montgomery	534	Watauga	114.7
Davidson	176.1	Moore	172.3	Wayne	373.3
Davie	155.4	Nash	419.8	Wilkes	205.2
Duplin	247.2	New Hanover	471.4	Wilson	404.1
Durham	675.5	Northampton	266.4	Yadkin	281
Edgecombe	551.5	Onslow	175.7	Yancey	28.1
Forsyth	561	Orange	151.1		

Note: Data was not collected for all counties.

**Percent of adults living on block where it is safe for children to play outside.** Perceived neighborhood safety impacts child development because it affects parents' willingness to use available resources such as parks, libraries, and children's programs. When parents feel connected to their neighborhood, their children benefit from community resources and collective socialization opportunities.

*Source: National Survey of Children's Health, Indicator 7.2 - Children live in safe communities*

**Percent of adults living on a block where it is safe for children to play outside**

	US			NC		
	2003	2007	2011/12	2003	2007	2011/12
<b>Never/Sometimes Safe</b>	16.2	14	13.4	13.2	11.4	10.5
<b>Usually/Always Safe</b>	83.8	86.1	86.6	86.8	88.6	89.5

RANK: NC ranks 20th nationally for "usually/always safe"

## Environmental Health

**Percent of children with elevated blood lead levels.** Children with elevated blood lead levels are more likely to have a lowered IQ and behavioral problems, academic failure, need for special education services and increased risk of juvenile delinquency. Elevated blood lead levels in the early years are associated with intellectual impairments, attention and behavioral problems, and lower achievement in school.

*Source: Data prepared by Children's Environmental Health division of the NC Department of Public Health*

### Percent of children with elevated blood lead levels (% greater than 5 micrograms per deciliter), 2014

Alamance	1.6
Alexander	0.8
Alleghany	2.9
Anson	2.3
Ashe	0.6
Avery	no data reported
Beaufort	1.3
Bertie	2
Bladen	2.2
Brunswick	0.8
Buncombe	1.3
Burke	1
Cabarrus	0.9
Caldwell	1
Camden	3.3
Carteret	1.7
Caswell	2
Catawba	0.9
Chatham	0.9
Cherokee	1.9
Chowan	4.8
Clay	0.7
Cleveland	1.1
Columbus	1.6
Craven	0.9
Cumberland	1.7
Currituck	1.8
Dare	2.5
Davidson	1.7
Davie	2.8
Duplin	1.5
Durham	0.6
Edgecombe	4
Forsyth	1.2

Franklin	1.5
Gaston	1.1
Gates	2
Graham	0.8
Granville	0.9
Greene	3.3
Guilford	1.3
Halifax	3.8
Harnett	1
Haywood	0.9
Henderson	1.1
Hertford	1.7
Hoke	1
Hyde	3.2
Iredell	2
Jackson	2.2
Johnston	0.7
Jones	2.4
Lee	1.8
Lenoir	1.6
Lincoln	1
Macon	2.2
Madison	1
Martin	no data reported
McDowell	4.7
Mecklenburg	1.3
Mitchell	3.6
Montgomery	1.7
Moore	1.4
Nash	2.9
NC	<b>1.3</b>
New Hanover	0.7
Northampton	3.9
Onslow	0.6

Orange	1
Pamlico	no data reported
Pasquotank	2.8
Pender	1.3
Perquimans	1
Person	1.5
Pitt	0.5
Polk	1.1
Randolph	1.7
Richmond	2.1
Robeson	1.7
Rockingham	2.5
Rowan	2.2
Rutherford	2.2
Sampson	1.5
Scotland	2.6
Stanly	2.6
Stokes	1.7
Surry	2.9
Swain	1.9
Transylvania	no data reported
Tyrrell	no data reported
Union	1
Vance	0.7
Wake	0.8
Warren	2
Washington	2.4
Watauga	1.1
Wayne	0.4
Wilkes	1.3
Wilson	1.1
Yadkin	1.2
Yancey	2

**Percent of children screened for elevated blood lead levels.** Early detection of lead exposure, when followed by intervention, can prevent long-term damage. Children living in poverty have higher blood lead levels than other children and are more likely to experience adverse effects, due to the interaction of blood lead with other risk factors, especially poor nutrition.

*Source: Data prepared by Children's Environmental Health division of the NC Department of Public Health*

**Percent of 1- and 2-year olds tested for lead poisoning**

Alamance	56
Alexander	67
Alleghany	75
Anson	44
Ashe	64
Avery	84
Beaufort	68
Bertie	69
Bladen	62
Brunswick	44
Buncombe	56
Burke	79
Cabarrus	46
Caldwell	79
Camden	51
Carteret	68
Caswell	48
Catawba	67
Chatham	48
Cherokee	63
Chowan	60
Clay	79
Cleveland	64
Columbus	54
Craven	62
Cumberland	37
Currituck	36
Dare	44
Davidson	66
Davie	56
Duplin	64
Durham	47
Edgecombe	73
Forsyth	65

Franklin	58
Gaston	38
Gates	46
Graham	68
Granville	51
Greene	57
Guilford	71
Halifax	86
Harnett	51
Haywood	64
Henderson	49
Hertford	73
Hoke	44
Hyde	59
Iredell	51
Jackson	63
Johnston	41
Jones	67
Lee	60
Lenoir	68
Lincoln	42
Macon	72
Madison	53
Martin	59
McDowell	61
Mecklenburg	29
Mitchell	58
Montgomery	75
Moore	54
Nash	77
<b>NC</b>	<b>51</b>
New Hanover	66
Northampton	79
Onslow	38

Orange	44
Pamlico	80
Pasquotank	57
Pender	64
Perquimans	72
Person	26
Pitt	47
Polk	33
Randolph	64
Richmond	59
Robeson	72
Rockingham	51
Rowan	51
Rutherford	31
Sampson	76
Scotland	69
Stanly	84
Stokes	68
Surry	63
Swain	77
Transylvania	31
Tyrrell	61
Union	33
Vance	53
Wake	43
Warren	57
Washington	63
Watauga	81
Wayne	61
Wilkes	58
Wilson	76
Yadkin	53
Yancey	61

**Trauma-Informed Communities**

No data indicator as yet defined.