

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT:

Parts I and II

for

STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS

under the

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT

As amended by the

No Child Left Behind Act of 2001

For reporting on

School Year 2008-09

NORTH DAKOTA



PART I DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 18, 2009

PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 12, 2010

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202**

INTRODUCTION

Sections 9302 and 9303 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB) provide to States the option of applying for and reporting on multiple ESEA programs through a single consolidated application and report. Although a central, practical purpose of the Consolidated State Application and Report is to reduce "red tape" and burden on States, the Consolidated State Application and Report are also intended to have the important purpose of encouraging the integration of State, local, and ESEA programs in comprehensive planning and service delivery and enhancing the likelihood that the State will coordinate planning and service delivery across multiple State and local programs. The combined goal of all educational agencies—State, local, and Federal—is a more coherent, well-integrated educational plan that will result in improved teaching and learning. The Consolidated State Application and Report includes the following ESEA programs:

- Title I, Part A – Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies
- Title I, Part B, Subpart 3 – William F. Goodling Even Start Family Literacy Programs
- Title I, Part C – Education of Migratory Children (Includes the Migrant Child Count)
- Title I, Part D – Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk
- Title II, Part A – Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund)
- Title III, Part A – English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement Act
- Title IV, Part A, Subpart 1 – Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities State Grants
- Title IV, Part A, Subpart 2 – Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Activities (Community Service Grant Program)
- Title V, Part A – Innovative Programs
- Title VI, Section 6111 – Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities
- Title VI, Part B – Rural Education Achievement Program
- Title X, Part C – Education for Homeless Children and Youths

The NCLB Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2008-09 consists of two Parts, Part I and Part II.

PART I

Part I of the CSPR requests information related to the five ESEA Goals, established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application, and information required for the Annual State Report to the Secretary, as described in Section 1111(h)(4) of the ESEA. The five ESEA Goals established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application are:

- **Performance Goal 1: By SY 2013-14, all students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.**
- **Performance Goal 2: All limited English proficient students will become proficient in English and reach high academic standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.**
- **Performance Goal 3: By SY 2005-06, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.**
- **Performance Goal 4: All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free, and conducive to learning.**
- **Performance Goal 5: All students will graduate from high school.**

Beginning with the CSPR SY 2005-06 collection, the Education of Homeless Children and Youths was added. The Migrant Child count was added for the SY 2006-07 collection.

PART II

Part II of the CSPR consists of information related to State activities and outcomes of specific ESEA programs. While the information requested varies from program to program, the specific information requested for this report meets the following criteria:

1. The information is needed for Department program performance plans or for other program needs.
2. The information is not available from another source, including program evaluations pending full implementation of required EDFacts submission.
3. The information will provide valid evidence of program outcomes or results.

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 2008-09 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by Friday, December 18, 2009. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by Friday, February 12, 2010. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2008-09, unless otherwise noted.

The format states will use to submit the Consolidated State Performance Report has changed to an online submission starting with SY 2004-05. This online submission system is being developed through the Education Data Exchange Network (EDEN) and will make the submission process less burdensome. Please see the following section on transmittal instructions for more information on how to submit this year's Consolidated State Performance Report.

TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

The Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) data will be collected online from the SEAs, using the EDEN web site. The EDEN web site will be modified to include a separate area (sub-domain) for CSPR data entry. This area will utilize EDEN formatting to the extent possible and the data will be entered in the order of the current CSPR forms. The data entry screens will include or provide access to all instructions and notes on the current CSPR forms; additionally, an effort will be made to design the screens to balance efficient data collection and reduction of visual clutter.

Initially, a state user will log onto EDEN and be provided with an option that takes him or her to the "SY 2008-09 CSPR". The main CSPR screen will allow the user to select the section of the CSPR that he or she needs to either view or enter data. After selecting a section of the CSPR, the user will be presented with a screen or set of screens where the user can input the data for that section of the CSPR. A user can only select one section of the CSPR at a time. After a state has included all available data in the designated sections of a particular CSPR Part, a lead state user will certify that Part and transmit it to the Department. Once a Part has been transmitted, ED will have access to the data. States may still make changes or additions to the transmitted data, by creating an updated version of the CSPR. Detailed instructions for transmitting the SY 2008-09 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1965, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1810-0614. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 111 hours per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimates(s) contact School Support and Technology Programs, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW, Washington DC 20202-6140. Questions about the new electronic CSPR submission process, should be directed to the EDEN Partner Support Center at 1-877-HLPEDEN (1-877-457-3336).

Consolidated State Performance Report
For
State Formula Grant Programs
under the
Elementary And Secondary Education Act
as amended by the
No Child Left Behind Act of 2001

Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting:

Part I, 2008-09

Part II, 2008-09

Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report:

North Dakota Department of Public Instruction

Address:

600 East Boulevard #201
Bismarck ND 58505

Person to contact about this report:

Name: Stephanie Gullickson

Telephone: 701-328-2176

Fax: 701-328-2461

e-mail: sgullickson@nd.gov

Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type):

Wayne G. Sanstead

Tuesday, March 9, 2010, 2:31:37 PM

Signature

Date

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART I**

For reporting on
School Year 2008-09



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 18, 2009
5PM EST**

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

STANDARDS OF ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

This section requests descriptions of the State's implementation of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as amended (ESEA) academic content standards, academic achievement standards and assessments to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(1) of ESEA.

1.1.1 Academic Content Standards

In the space below, provide a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Responses should focus on actions taken or planned since the State's content standards were approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. Indicate specifically in what school year your State expects the changes to be implemented.

If the State has not made or is not planning to make revisions or changes, respond "No revisions or changes to content standards made or planned."

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

The state has adopted academic content standards in reading/language arts, mathematics, and science. These content standards can be accessed at the following website: <http://www.dpi.state.nd.us/standard/content.shtm>. The state's academic content standards are developed according to protocols administered by the North Dakota Department of Public Instruction. These development protocols can be accessed at the following website: <http://www.dpi.state.nd.us/standard/protocols.pdf>. The current academic content standards for reading/language arts and mathematics were last revised and adopted for the 2004-05 academic year and science was revised and adopted for the 2005-06 academic year. The next scheduled revision of these academic content standards is scheduled for 2011.

The state is involved in the current Common Core Standards initiative sponsored by the NGA and the CCSSO. The state cannot comment on the sufficiency of these forthcoming standards until they are evaluated following their release in early 2010. The state would anticipate an approximate 12-18 month timeframe to conduct development activities to finalize any resulting state standards.

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts

In the space below, provide a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's assessments and/or academic achievement standards in mathematics or reading/language arts required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA. Responses should focus on actions taken or planned since the State's assessment system was approved through ED's peer review process. Responses also should indicate specifically in what school year your State expects the changes to be implemented.

As applicable, include any assessment (e.g., alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards, alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards, native language assessments, or others) implemented to meet the assessment requirements under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA as well as alternate achievement standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities and modified academic achievement standards for certain students with disabilities implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)

(3) of ESEA. Indicate specifically in what year your state expects the changes to be implemented.

If the State has not made or is not planning to make revisions or changes, respond "No revisions or changes to assessments and/or academic achievement standards taken or planned."

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The state has adopted and administers annual academic assessments in reading/language arts, mathematics, and science required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA. The state's assessment system includes standard assessments, alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards, and alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards. The state's assessment system was awarded a fully compliant status by the U. S. Department of Education in 2007, based on the peer review of the state's reading and mathematics standard assessments and alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards.

Peer review activity in 2009. The state submitted for peer review in 2009 its standard assessment in science, its alternate assessment based on alternate achievement standards in science, and its alternate assessment based on modified achievement standards in reading/language arts, mathematics, and science. Certain provisions of the state's submission in science are moving toward resolutions with the U.S. Department of Education. The state expects to be fully approved by the completion of the 2009-10 school year.

Revision status of the state's standard assessments. The state will not change its standard assessments in reading/language arts, mathematics, and science until the release and any state approval of Common Core Standards, which is anticipated by 2011. No revisions or changes to the state's standard assessments in reading/language arts, mathematics, and science, outside those detailed within the state's peer review submissions, will be undertaken or planned during the next academic year.

Revision status of the state's alternate assessment based on alternate achievement standards. No revisions or changes to the state's alternate assessment based on alternate achievement standards, outside those detailed within the state's peer review submissions, will be undertaken or planned during the current academic year. The state will incorporate designed improvements into its alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards for the 2010-11 academic year, consistent with specifications within the state's peer review submissions.

Revision status of the state's alternate assessment based on modified achievement standards. The state has administered an alternate assessment based on modified achievement standards for several years, including reading/language arts, mathematics, and science. The state awaits final approval of its alternate assessment based on modified achievement standards by the U.S. Department of Education following the current peer review, as reported above. No revisions or changes to the state's alternate assessment based on modified achievement standards, outside those specified within the state's peer review submissions, will be undertaken or planned in outlying years.

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

1.1.4 Assessments in Science

If your State's assessments and academic achievement standards in science required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA have been approved through ED's peer review process, provide in the space below a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's assessments and/or academic achievement standards in science required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA. Responses should focus on actions taken or planned since the State's assessment system was approved through ED's peer review process. Responses also should indicate specifically in what school year your State expects the changes to be implemented.

As applicable, include any assessment (e.g., alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards, alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards, native language assessments, or others) implemented to meet the assessment requirements under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA as well as alternate achievement standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities and modified academic achievement standards for certain students with disabilities implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA.

If the State has not made or is not planning to make revisions or changes, respond "No revisions or changes to assessments and/or academic achievement standards taken or planned."

If the State's assessments in science required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA have not been approved through ED's peer review process, respond "State's assessments and academic achievement standards in science not yet approved."

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

The state anticipates full approval of its state science assessments and academic achievement standards following the current peer review process, within the 2009-10 school year. Following this approval, no revisions or changes to assessments and/or academic achievement standards will be taken or planned.
--

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

This section collects data on the participation of students in the State assessments.

1.2.1 Participation of all Students in Mathematics Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of students enrolled during the State's testing window for mathematics assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA (regardless of whether the students were present for a full academic year) and the number of students who participated in the mathematics assessment in accordance with ESEA. The percentage of students who were tested for mathematics will be calculated automatically.

The student group "children with disabilities (IDEA)" includes children who participated in the regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments. Do not include former students with disabilities (IDEA). Do not include students only covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

The student group "limited English proficient (LEP) students" includes recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months. Do not include former LEP students.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	49,670		>97%
American Indian or Alaska Native	4,620	4,459	96.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	518		>97%
Black, non-Hispanic	1,098		>97%
Hispanic	1,023	959	93.7
White, non-Hispanic	42,409		>97%
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	6,863		>97%
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,797	1,726	96.0
Economically disadvantaged students	16,493		>97%
Migratory students	106	73	68.9
Male	25,499		>97%
Female	24,124		>97%

Comments: Per the EdFacts Coordinator: N081 data is reported using a category called "Full Academic Year Status". Assessment data received by the state did not always have this field filled out, and as N081 required this as part of every record submitted, this caused a difference in record counts for Children with Disabilities.

Source – The table above is produced through ED Facts. The SEA submits the data in file N/X081 that includes data group 588, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F, and subtotal 1. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Mathematics Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of children with disabilities (IDEA) participating during the State's testing window in mathematics assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA (regardless of whether the children were present for a full academic year) by the type of assessment. The percentage of children with disabilities (IDEA) who participated in the mathematics assessment for each assessment option will be calculated automatically. The total number of children with disabilities (IDEA) participating will also be calculated automatically.

The data provided below should include mathematics participation data from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act(IDEA). Do not include former students with disabilities (IDEA). Do not include students only covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	1,293	19.2
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	3,581	53.2
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	1,244	18.5
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	620	9.2
Total	6,738	
Comments: Per the EdFacts Coordinator: N081 data is reported using a category called "Full Academic Year Status". Assessment data received by the state did not always have this field filled out, and as N081 required this as part of every record submitted, this caused a difference in record counts for Children with Disabilities.		

1.2.3 Participation of All Students in the Reading/Language Arts Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.1 and collects data on the State's reading/language arts assessment.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	49,670		>97%
American Indian or Alaska Native	4,620	4,472	96.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	518	483	93.2
Black, non-Hispanic	1,098	1,048	95.4
Hispanic	1,023	966	94.4
White, non-Hispanic	42,409		>97%
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	6,863		>97%
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,797	1,718	95.6
Economically disadvantaged students	16,493		>97%
Migratory students	106	81	76.4
Male	25,499		>97%
Female	24,124		>97%
Comments: Per the EdFacts Coordinator: N081 data is reported using a category called "Full Academic Year Status". Assessment data received by the state did not always have this field filled out, and as N081 required this as part of every record submitted, this caused a difference in record counts for Children with Disabilities.			

Source – The same file specification as 1.2.1 is used, but with data group 589 instead of 588.

1.2.4 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Reading/Language Arts Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.2 and collects data on the State's reading/language arts assessment.

The data provided should include reading/language arts participation data from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). Do not include former students with disabilities (IDEA). Do not include students only covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	1,290	19.2
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	3,314	49.4
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	1,476	22.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	624	9.3
Total	6,704	

Comments: Per the EdFacts Coordinator: N081 data is reported using a category called "Full Academic Year Status". Assessment data received by the state did not always have this field filled out, and as N081 required this as part of every record submitted, this caused a difference in record counts for Children with Disabilities.

1.2.5 Participation of All Students in the Science Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.1 and collects data on the State's science assessment.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	21,747		>97%
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,960	1,868	95.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	218		>97%
Black, non-Hispanic	407	383	94.1
Hispanic	402	375	93.3
White, non-Hispanic	18,759		>97%
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	2,870		>97%
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	722	684	94.7
Economically disadvantaged students	6,770		>97%
Migratory students	43	33	76.7
Male	11,171		>97%
Female	10,555		>97%

Comments: Per the EdFacts Coordinator: N081 data is reported using a category called "Full Academic Year Status". Assessment data received by the state did not always have this field filled out, and as N081 required this as part of every record submitted, this caused a difference in record counts for Children with Disabilities.

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

1.2.6 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Science Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.2 and collects data on the State's science assessment.

The data provided should include science participation results from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). Do not include former students with disabilities (IDEA). Do not include students only covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	514	18.4
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	1,607	57.5
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	399	14.3
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	277	9.9
Total	2,797	
Comments: Per the EdFacts Coordinator: N081 data is reported using a category called "Full Academic Year Status". Assessment data received by the state did not always have this field filled out, and as N081 required this as part of every record submitted, this caused a difference in record counts for Children with Disabilities.		

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

This section collects data on student academic achievement on the State assessments.

1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics

In the format of the table below, provide the number of students who received a valid score on the State assessment(s) in mathematics implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA (regardless of whether the students were present for a full academic year) and for whom a proficiency level was assigned, and the number of these students who scored at or above proficient, in grades 3 through 8 and high school. The percentage of students who scored at or above proficient is calculated automatically.

The student group "children with disabilities (IDEA)" includes children who participated, and for whom a proficiency level was assigned in the regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments. Do not include former students with disabilities (IDEA). The student group "limited English proficient (LEP) students" does include recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months. Do not include former LEP students.

1.3.1.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	6,536	5,757	88.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	640	462	72.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	67	56	83.6
Black, non-Hispanic	189	133	70.4
Hispanic	169	126	74.6
White, non-Hispanic	5,471	4,980	91.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	993	746	75.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	300	194	64.7
Economically disadvantaged students	2,401	1,956	81.5
Migratory students	11	N<10	
Male	3,330	2,970	89.2
Female	3,197	2,778	86.9
Comments: North Dakota has no comment and stands by its data.			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.2.1 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts -Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	6,532	5,387	82.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	642	428	66.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	65	52	80.0
Black, non-Hispanic	186	126	67.7
Hispanic	171	115	67.2
White, non-Hispanic	5,468	4,666	85.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	992	678	68.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	294	152	51.7
Economically disadvantaged students	2,396	1,773	74.0
Migratory students	13	N<10	
Male	3,322	2,658	80.0
Female	3,200	2,722	85.1
Comments: North Dakota has no comment and stands by its data.			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities (IDEA)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: North Dakota assessment in Science is administered at grades 4,8, and II only.			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

1.3.1.2 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	6,797	5,516	81.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	651	409	62.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	73	57	78.1
Black, non-Hispanic	168	100	59.5
Hispanic	148	95	64.2
White, non-Hispanic	5,757	4,855	84.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,038	725	69.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	237	116	49.0
Economically disadvantaged students	2,461	1,787	72.6
Migratory students	20	11	55.0
Male	3,481	2,845	81.7
Female	3,302	2,660	80.6
Comments:			

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: C SPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.2.2 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts -Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	6,783	5,428	80.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	651	405	62.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	69	53	76.8
Black, non-Hispanic	165	104	63.0
Hispanic	148	95	64.2
White, non-Hispanic	5,750	4,771	83.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,027	680	66.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	231	112	48.5
Economically disadvantaged students	2,449	1,765	72.1
Migratory students	21	N<10	
Male	3,475	2,708	77.9
Female	3,294	2,712	82.3
Comments: North Dakota has no comment and stands by its data.			

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: C SPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	6,782	4,740	69.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	651	271	41.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	71	46	64.8
Black, non-Hispanic	165	80	48.5
Hispanic	147	77	52.4
White, non-Hispanic	5,748	4,266	74.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,034	603	58.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	232	72	31.0
Economically disadvantaged students	2,451	1,455	59.4
Migratory students	20	N<10	
Male	3,475	2,489	71.6
Female	3,293	2,242	68.1
Comments: North Dakota has no comment and stands by its data.			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online C SPR collection tool.

1.3.1.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	6,926	5,652	81.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	670	382	57.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	82	65	79.3
Black, non-Hispanic	166	90	54.2
Hispanic	145	102	70.3
White, non-Hispanic	5,863	5,013	85.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,001	687	68.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	231	98	42.4
Economically disadvantaged students	2,490	1,807	72.6
Migratory students	12	N<10	
Male	3,575	2,929	81.9
Female	3,346	2,718	81.2
Comments: North Dakota has no comment and stands by its data.			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.2.3 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts -Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	6,920	5,154	74.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	670	311	46.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	76	62	81.6
Black, non-Hispanic	164	77	47.0
Hispanic	147	91	61.9
White, non-Hispanic	5,863	4,613	78.7
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	998	585	58.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	231	72	31.2
Economically disadvantaged students	2,484	1,569	63.2
Migratory students	13	N<10	
Male	3,572	2,538	71.0
Female	3,343	2,612	78.1
Comments: North Dakota has no comment and stands by its data.			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities (IDEA)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: North Dakota assessment in Science is administered at grades 4,8, and II only.			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

1.3.1.4 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	7,018	5,850	83.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	666	391	58.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	69	55	79.7
Black, non-Hispanic	175	104	59.4
Hispanic	150	103	68.7
White, non-Hispanic	5,958	5,197	87.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	961	623	64.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	278	138	49.6
Economically disadvantaged students	2,384	1,755	73.6
Migratory students	13	N<10	
Male	3,616	2,977	82.3
Female	3,397	2,871	84.5
Comments: North Dakota has no comment and stands by its data.			

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.2.4 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts -Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	7,002	5,226	74.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	669	312	46.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	62	45	72.6
Black, non-Hispanic	169	94	55.6
Hispanic	150	96	64.0
White, non-Hispanic	5,952	4,679	78.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	955	558	58.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	279	107	38.4
Economically disadvantaged students	2,374	1,492	62.8
Migratory students	14	N<10	
Male	3,608	2,546	70.6
Female	3,392	2,678	79.0
Comments: North Dakota has no comment and stands by its data.			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities (IDEA)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: North Dakota assessment in Science is administered at grades 4,8, and II only.			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

1.3.1.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	7,145	5,595	78.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	625	333	53.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	81	72	88.9
Black, non-Hispanic	156	92	59.0
Hispanic	125	79	63.2
White, non-Hispanic	6,158	5,019	81.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	975	569	58.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	226	107	47.4
Economically disadvantaged students	2,299	1,553	67.6
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	
Male	3,634	2,840	78.2
Female	3,505	2,752	78.5
Comments: North Dakota has no comment and stands by its data.			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.2.5 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts -Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	7,139	5,824	81.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	628	370	58.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	80	68	85.0
Black, non-Hispanic	151	103	68.2
Hispanic	126	89	70.6
White, non-Hispanic	6,154	5,194	84.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	969	615	63.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	228	97	42.5
Economically disadvantaged students	2,293	1,638	71.4
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	
Male	3,630	2,855	78.6
Female	3,503	2,964	84.6
Comments: North Dakota has no comment and stands by its data.			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities (IDEA)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: North Dakota assessment in Science is administered at grades 4,8, and 11 only.			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

1.3.1.6 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	7,261	5,143	70.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	632	303	47.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	64	49	76.6
Black, non-Hispanic	122	50	41.0
Hispanic	137	67	48.9
White, non-Hispanic	6,306	4,674	74.1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	933	473	50.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	232	76	32.8
Economically disadvantaged students	2,227	1,309	58.8
Migratory students	11	N<10	
Male	3,726	2,633	70.7
Female	3,530	2,507	71.0
Comments: North Dakota has no comment and stands by its data.			

Source – Initially populated from EDData. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDData Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.2.6 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts -Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	7,248	5,525	76.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	632	338	53.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	62	52	83.9
Black, non-Hispanic	116	64	55.2
Hispanic	137	82	59.8
White, non-Hispanic	6,301	4,989	79.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	927	535	57.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	230	76	33.0
Economically disadvantaged students	2,219	1,442	65.0
Migratory students	12	N<10	
Male	3,718	2,668	71.8
Female	3,526	2,855	81.0
Comments: North Dakota has no comment and stands by its data.			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.3.6 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	7,243	4,570	63.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	629	201	32.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	63	45	71.4
Black, non-Hispanic	116	46	39.7
Hispanic	135	60	44.4
White, non-Hispanic	6,300	4,218	67.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	932	391	42.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	229	42	18.3
Economically disadvantaged students	2,217	1,079	48.7
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	
Male	3,717	2,454	66.0
Female	3,522	2,115	60.0
Comments: North Dakota has no comment and stands by its data.			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

1.3.1.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -High School

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	7,341	4,183	57.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	595	156	26.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	71	52	73.2
Black, non-Hispanic	108	34	31.5
Hispanic	95	45	47.4
White, non-Hispanic	6,472	3,896	60.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	811	308	38.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	220	42	19.1
Economically disadvantaged students	1,902	778	40.9
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	
Male	3,789	2,207	58.2
Female	3,550	1,976	55.7
Comments: North Dakota has no comment and stands by its data.			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.2.7 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts -High School

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	7,357	5,042	68.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	601	268	44.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	70	50	71.4
Black, non-Hispanic	108	45	41.7
Hispanic	96	59	61.5
White, non-Hispanic	6,482	4,620	71.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	813	397	48.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	223	53	23.8
Economically disadvantaged students	1,915	1,067	55.7
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	
Male	3,797	2,474	65.2
Female	3,558	2,566	72.1
Comments: North Dakota has no comment and stands by its data.			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Science -High School

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	7,336	4,478	61.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	594	183	30.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	71	48	67.6
Black, non-Hispanic	108	36	33.3
Hispanic	95	45	47.4
White, non-Hispanic	6,468	4,166	64.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	815	318	39.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	220	28	12.7
Economically disadvantaged students	1,902	877	46.1
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	
Male	3,785	2,511	66.3
Female	3,549	1,967	55.4
Comments: North Dakota has no comment and stands by its data.			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY

This section collects data on the Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) status of schools and districts.

1.4.1 All Schools and Districts Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public elementary and secondary schools and districts in the State, including charters, and the total number of those schools and districts that made AYP based on data for the SY 2008-09. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2008-09	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2008-09
Schools	468	350	74.8
Districts	183	141	77.0
Comments: To the best of our knowledge, the data is accurate.			

Source – The table above is produced through EDFacts. The SEA submits the data in N/X103 for data group 32.

1.4.2 Title I School Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public Title I schools by type and the total number of those schools that made AYP based on data for the SY 2008-09 school year. Include only public Title I schools. Do not include Title I programs operated by local educational agencies in private schools. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2008-09	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2008-09
All Title I schools	305	230	75.4
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	77	50	64.9
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	228	180	79.0
Comments: To the best of our knowledge, the data is accurate.			

Source – The table above is produced through EDFacts. The SEA submits the data in N/X129 for data group 22 and N/X103 for data group 32.

1.4.3 Accountability of Districts That Received Title I Funds

In the table below, provide the total number of districts that received Title I funds and the total number of those districts that made AYP based on data for SY 2008-09. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2008-09	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2008-09
155	112	72.3
Comments:		

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

Note: DG 582 is not collected from the SEA, rather it comes from the Title I funding data.

1.4.4 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

1.4.4.1 List of Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

In the following table, provide a list of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 for the SY 2009-10 based on the data from SY 2008-09. For each school on the list, provide the following:

- District Name
- District NCES ID Code
- School Name
- School NCES ID Code
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the school met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan

- Whether the school met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY <> (Use one of the following improvement status designations: School Improvement ¹ Year 1, School Improvement ¹ Year 2, Corrective Action, Restructuring Year 1 (planning), or Restructuring Year 2 (implementing))
- Whether (yes or no) the school is or is not a Title I school (This column must be completed by States that choose to list all schools in improvement. Column is optional for States that list only Title I schools.)
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003(a).
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003 (g).

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter school data.

Download template: [Question 1.4.4.1 \(Get MS Excel Viewer\)](#)

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

¹ The school improvement statuses are defined in LEA and School Improvement Non-Regulatory Guidance. This document may be found on the Department's Web page at <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/schoolimprovementguid.doc>.

1.4.4.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for schools in corrective action, provide the number of schools for which the listed corrective actions under ESEA were implemented in SY 2008-09 (based on SY 2007-08 assessments under Section 1111 of ESEA).

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2008-09
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	9
Extension of the school year or school day	10
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	
Replacement of the principal	3
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	2
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	
Comments:	

1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2

In the table below, for schools in restructuring – year 2 (implementation year), provide the number of schools for which the listed restructuring actions under ESEA were implemented in SY 2008-09 (based on SY 2007-08 assessments under Section 1111 of ESEA).

Restructuring Action	# of Title I Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	
Reopening the school as a public charter school	
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	
Take over the school by the State	
Other major restructuring of the school governance	13
Comments:	

In the space below, list specifically the "other major restructuring of the school governance" action(s) that were implemented.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.4.5 Districts That Received Title I Funds Identified for Improvement

1.4.5.1 List of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Were Identified for Improvement

In the following table, provide a list of districts that received Title I funds and were identified for improvement or corrective action under Section 1116 for the SY 2009-10 based on the data from SY 2008-09. For each district on the list, provide the following:

- District Name
- District NCES ID Code
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the district met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan

- Whether the district met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2009-10 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: Improvement or Corrective Action²)
- Whether the district is a district that received Title I funds. Indicate "Yes" if the district received Title I funds and "No" if the district did not receive Title I funds. (This column **must be completed by States that choose to list all districts or all districts in improvement. This column is optional for States that list only** districts in improvement that receive Title I funds.)

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter district data.

Download template: [Question 1.4.5.1 \(Get MS Excel Viewer\)](#)

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

² The district improvement statuses are defined in LEA and School Improvement Non-Regulatory Guidance. This document may be found on the Department's Web page at <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/schoolimprovementguid.doc>.

1.4.5.2 Actions Taken for Districts That Received Title I Funds and Were Identified for Improvement

In the space below, briefly describe the measures being taken to address the achievement problems of districts identified for improvement or corrective action. Include a discussion of the technical assistance provided by the State (e.g., the number of districts served, the nature and duration of assistance provided, etc.).

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Schools and districts that have been identified for program improvement receive detailed technical assistance and frequent communication from the state Title I office.

An annual workshop is held each spring and a follow-up training session in the fall to provide detailed information as to those provisions that apply when schools or districts are identified for improvement. Schools and districts receive regular communication from the state Title I office providing updated information on the program improvement provisions.

The state Title I office has an extensive program improvement website developed. This site contains a variety of resources including a link to all district and school Adequate Yearly Progress reports, information on reports due throughout the year, information and application forms on additional funds available for program improvement schools, sample letters and sample reports, and resources and handouts from prior workshops. Log on to <http://www.dpi.state.nd.us/title1/progress/index.shtm> to access this information.

The application for additional funds for program improvement is available on the web and is due in the state Title I office, along with the program improvement plan, three months after the release of the official Adequate Yearly Progress data.

Those schools and districts that are in corrective action receive increased state oversight on all Title I and program improvement activities and provisions.

The North Dakota Department of Public Instruction has a strong Title I School Support Team (SST). The team's main purpose is to provide technical assistance to North Dakota schools and districts that have been identified for program improvement and to assist Title I practitioners on the implementation of Title I program improvement requirements at the local level. The Title I School Support Team consists of members from across the state of North Dakota who are known for their knowledge of program improvement issues and distinguished efforts within education.

In addition, the state Title I office recently established a list of consultants who can assist districts and schools with planning and implementing school improvement activities. These consultants are known as the Statewide System of Support (SSOS) Consultant Team. Team members must have expertise in a variety of program improvement areas to provide individualized assistance to schools.

The North Dakota Department of Public Instruction has created a statewide system of support, as required under Section 1117, to ensure that all schools and districts meet North Dakota's academic content and student achievement standards. Our statewide system of support consists of a wealth of resources to meet the needs of school personnel. Sustained support for LEAs and schools in improvement is provided by several entities, some of which include the state Title I staff, School Support Team, North Dakota Parental Involvement Resource Center, and a Statewide System of Support Consultant Team.

1.4.5.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for districts in corrective action, provide the number of districts in corrective action in which the listed corrective actions under ESEA were implemented in SY 2008-09 (based on SY 2007-08 assessments under Section 1111 of ESEA).

Corrective Action	# of Districts receiving Title I funds in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2008-09
Implementing a new curriculum based on State standards	9
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	0
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	0
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	0
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	0
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	0
Restructured the district	2
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2007-08 and beginning of SY 2008-09 as a corrective action)	0
Comments:	

1.4.7 Appeal of AYP and Identification Determinations

In the table below, provide the number of districts and schools that appealed their AYP designations based on SY 2008-09 data and the results of those appeals.

	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts	16	2
Schools	27	5
Comments:		

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2008-09 data was complete	05/12/09
---	----------

1.4.8 School Improvement Status

In the section below, "Schools in Improvement" means Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of ESEA for SY 2008-09.

1.4.8.1 Student Proficiency for Schools Receiving Assistance Through Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Funds

The table below pertains only to schools that received assistance through section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2008-09.

Instructions for States that during SY 2008-09 administered assessments required under section 1116 of ESEA after fall 2008 (i.e., non fall-testing states):

- In the SY 2008-09 column, provide the total number and percentage of students in schools receiving School Improvement funds in SY 2008-09 who were:
 - Proficient in mathematics as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA that were administered in SY 2008-09.
 - Proficient in reading/language arts as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA in SY 2008-09.
 - In SY 2007-08 column, provide the requested data for the same schools whose student proficiency data are reported for SY 2008-09.

States that in SY 2008-09 administered assessments required under section 1116 of ESEA during fall 2008 (i.e., fall-testing states):

- In the SY 2008-09 column, provide the total number and percentage of students in schools receiving School Improvement funds in SY 2008-09 who were:
 - Proficient in mathematics as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA that were administered in fall 2009.
 - Proficient in reading/language arts as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA that were administered in fall 2009.
 - In the SY 2007-08 column, provide the requested data for the same schools whose student proficiency data are reported in the SY 2008-09 column.

Category	SY 2008-09	SY 2007-08
Total number of students who completed the mathematics assessment and for whom proficiency level was assigned and were enrolled in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09	2,668	2,485
Total number of students who were proficient or above in mathematics in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09	1,606	1,371
Percentage of students who were proficient or above in mathematics in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09	60.2	55.2
Total number of students who completed the reading/language arts assessment and for whom proficiency level was assigned and were enrolled in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09	2,677	2,482
Total number of students who were proficient or above in reading/language arts in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09	1,552	1,266
Percentage of students who were proficient in reading/language arts in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09	58.0	51.0
Comments:		

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

1.4.8.2 School Improvement Status and School Improvement Assistance

In the table below, indicate the number of schools receiving assistance through section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2008-09 that:

- Made adequate yearly progress
- Exited improvement status
- Did not make adequate yearly progress

Category	# of Schools
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2008-09 that made adequate yearly progress based on testing in SY 2008-09	8
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2008-09 that exited improvement status based on testing in SY 2008-09	0
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2008-09 that did not make adequate yearly progress based on testing in SY 2008-09	16
Comments:	

1.4.8.3 Effective School Improvement Strategies

In the table below, indicate the effective school improvement strategies used that were supported through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds.

For fall-testing States, responses for this item would be based on assessments administered in fall 2009. For all other States the responses would be based on assessments administered during SY 2008-09.

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4	Column 5	Column 6	Column 7
Effective Strategy or Combination of Strategies Used (See response options in "Column 1 Response Options Box" below.) If your State's response includes a "5" (other strategies), identify the specific strategy(s) in Column 2.	Description of "Other Strategies" This response is limited to 500 characters.	Number of schools in which the strategy(s) was used	Number of schools that used the strategy(s), made AYP, and exited improvement status based on testing after the schools received this assistance	Number of schools that used the strategy(s), made AYP based on testing after the schools received this assistance, but did not exit improvement status	Most common other Positive Outcome from the Strategy (See response options in "Column 6 Response Options Box" below)	Description of "Other Positive Outcome" if Response for Column 6 is "D" This response is limited to 500 characters.
1		16	0	4	B	
2		17	0	7	C	
3		3	0	1	B	
Comments:						

Column 1 Response Options Box

1 = Provide customized technical assistance and/or professional development that is designed to build the capacity of LEA and school staff to improve schools and is informed by student achievement and other outcome-related measures.

2 = Utilize research-based strategies or practices to change instructional practice to address the academic achievement problems that caused the school to be identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.

3 = Create partnerships among the SEA, LEAs and other entities for the purpose of delivering technical assistance, professional development, and management advice.

4 = Provide professional development to enhance the capacity of school support team members and other technical assistance providers who are part of the Statewide system of support and that is informed by student achievement and other outcome-related measures.

5 = Implement other strategies determined by the SEA or LEA, as appropriate, for which data indicate the strategy is likely to result in improved teaching and learning in schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.

6 = Combination 1: Schools using a combination of strategies from above. Please use Column 2 to indicate which of the above strategies comprise this combination.

7 = Combination 2: Schools using a combination of strategies from above. Please use Column 2 to indicate which of the above strategies comprise this combination.

8 = Combination 3: Schools Using a combination of strategies from above. Please use Column 2 to indicate which of the above strategies comprise this combination.

Column 6 Response Options Box

A = Improvement by at least five percentage points in two or more AYP reporting cells

B = Increased teacher retention

C = Improved parental involvement

D = Other

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

1.4.8.4 Sharing of Effective Strategies

In the space below, describe how your State shared the effective strategies identified in item 1.4.8.3 with its LEAs and schools. Please exclude newsletters and handouts in your description.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The North Dakota Department of Public Instruction has multiple ways that we share effective strategies for schools and districts identified for improvement. The following summarizes our key methods of communication:

Extensive Website

The state Title I office has an extensive program improvement website developed. This site contains a variety of resources including a link to all district and school Adequate Yearly Progress reports, information on reports due throughout the year, information and application forms on additional funds available for program improvement schools, sample letters and sample reports, and resources and handouts from prior workshops. Log on to <http://www.dpi.state.nd.us/title1/progress/index.shtm> to access this information.

Assigned Liaison

Every school and district identified for improvement is assigned a Title I program staff member to answer questions and provide technical assistance. These liaisons keep close contact with their assigned schools by gathering information, answering questions on program improvement issues, acting as a guidance coach, and tracking needs and efforts in a very comprehensive manner.

Monthly Research Report

The state Title I office generates and distributes a monthly report which summarizes newly released research/resources on educational issues relevant to North Dakota schools. The monthly Research/Resource Report (RRR) is disseminated electronically to all principals, administrators, and Title I teachers and staff in schools identified for improvement.

Sharing of Effective Strategies

The department frequently contracts with exemplary educators within the state or educational entities to create resources for North Dakota schools and districts. We believe it is critical to highlight what has been proven to be effective in other schools and districts.

- o The North Dakota Department of Public Instruction requested assistance from the North Central Comprehensive Center (NCCC) in highlighting and documenting seven schools in the state of North Dakota that have made substantial improvement in their student achievement scores. Interviews of seven school administrators were conducted by the NCCC to gather information on the specific strategies each school employed to improve student achievement. A summary capturing the most important processes and initiatives was created for each school. All seven summaries were compiled into one document and shared statewide to disseminate effective practices.

- o The state Title I office created a "What Works" resource guide for schools and districts to provide educators with strategies, interventions, and components used in effective educational programs. This document contains 22 one-page profiles. Each of these profiles provides an overview, research summary, and resource section on educational topics being used across the nation to improve education and raise academic achievement. The resources within this document are provided to assist schools and districts in their school improvement efforts.

- o The North Dakota State Parental Information Resource Center (NDPIRC) and state Title I office contracted with state educators to create a Parent Involvement Master Literacy Bag, as well as a Parental Involvement Toolkit, for all North Dakota schools.

• Department Sponsored Conferences

The department sponsors two extensive conferences each year. Each spring, a conference for schools and districts in improvement is held to disseminate key information regarding the school improvement requirements and to share effective strategies for making AYP. In the fall, a statewide conference is held for educators to promote effective research-based strategies designed to raise achievement. Numerous other trainings, via conference call or Interactive Video Network, are offered each year to share and disseminate information statewide.

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

1.4.8.5 Use of Section 1003(a) and (g) School Improvement Funds

1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2008 (SY 2008-09) Title I, Part A allocation that the SEA reserved in accordance with Section 1003(a) of ESEA and §200.100(a) of ED's regulations governing the reservation of funds for school improvement under Section 1003(a) of ESEA: 4.0 %

Comments:

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

1.4.8.5.2 Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Allocations to LEAs and Schools

For SY 2008-09 there is no need to upload a spreadsheet to answer this question in the CSPR.

1.4.8.5.2 will be answered automatically using data submitted to EDFacts in Data Group 694, School improvement funds allocation table, from File Specification N/X132. You may review data submitted to EDFacts using the report named "Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Allocations to LEAs and Schools -CSPR 1.4.8.5.2 (EDEN012)" from the EDFacts Reporting System.

1.4.8.5.3 Use of Section 1003(g)(8) Funds for Evaluation and Technical Assistance

Section 1003(g)(8) of ESEA allows States to reserve up to five percent of Section 1003(g) funds for administration and to meet the evaluation and technical assistance requirements for this program. In the space below, identify and describe the specific Section 1003(g) evaluation and technical assistance activities that your State conducted during SY 2008-09.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

North Dakota used the funds available to the SEA under Section 1003(g) to build capacity at the LEA and school levels to improve student achievement, mainly through expanded use of our North Dakota School Support Team. We are limited in our capacity to provide training and technical assistance to our School Support Team due to the limited amount of funds we are allowed to retain at the SEA level from our 1003(a) dollars. The additional 1003(g) funds enabled us to expand our work with the North Central Comprehensive Center to provide further training to our North Dakota School Support Team so that they can continue their work with schools in improvement. The School Support Team members were then better able to build capacity at the LEA and school level to employ effective instructional strategies targeted to the areas that led to the identification for improvement.

North Dakota has chosen to create partnerships among SEA, LEAs, and other entities for the purpose of delivering technical assistance, professional development, and management advice. We chose the strategy pertaining to partnerships so we can continue to work with the North Central Comprehensive Center (NCCC) to provide additional training to our School Support Team, and provide professional development to enhance the capacity of School Support Team members and other technical assistance providers who are part of the statewide system of support and that is informed by student achievement and other outcome related measures. By providing additional professional development to School Support Team members, they can then provide customized technical assistance to schools in improvement and share research-based strategies and practices to address their academic achievement problems.

North Dakota assesses the effectiveness of the school improvement activities through the reporting process that has been established. Schools are required to submit a follow-up report annually, which assesses whether the funds were spent according to how they were approved. In addition, all schools in improvement must complete an annual report which requires that they report progress made toward reaching their goals, evaluates their school improvement plan, discusses the success of their restructuring efforts, and describes how they will make changes for the subsequent school year. These reports are reviewed each summer to evaluate the effectiveness of their school improvement activities.

The North Dakota Department of Public Instruction, in collaboration with the NCCC, engaged in a self-evaluation of its Statewide System of Support for the purpose of reflecting upon and subsequently strengthening the services and support offered to districts and schools. The efforts were intended to increase state capacity to build and sustain systemic support to close the achievement gap. The NCCC drafted an analysis report reflecting the current state of the SSOS in North Dakota. The SEA team convened a wider group of personnel, in collaboration with NCCC, to review the draft document and offer suggestions for changes. The team explored what school improvement options might be available for strengthening the SSOS and unanimously agreed to implement the electronic tool available through the COII called the Support for School Improvement and consider how it might be utilized by the School Support Team members as they provide support to schools in program improvement.

North Dakota's process for disseminating information on what works to other LEAs within the state is mainly accomplished through our in-service trainings and our extensive website. We sponsor several trainings and workshops annually, which always highlights available resources. In addition, we are constantly adding new resources and information to our Title I website. A few examples include the creation of a "What Works" document disseminated at our annual program improvement workshop last year, and subsequently made available to others on our website, and the recent establishment of a monthly Research/Resources Report which highlights new resources and research, and is electronically shared each month with all Title I schools in the state.

In addition, we monitored schools in improvement to ensure all of the required school improvement provisions are being met. We created a self-monitoring tool that schools in improvement completed and submitted to the state Title I office for review.

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

1.4.8.6 Actions Taken for Title I Schools Identified for Improvement Supported by Funds Other than Those of Section 1003(a) and 1003(g).

In the space below, describe actions (if any) taken by your State in SY 2008-09 that were supported by funds other than Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) funds to address the achievement problems of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of ESEA.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The state of North Dakota has no other funds besides 1003(a) and 1003(g) to address schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of ESEA.

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

1.4.9 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on public school choice and supplemental educational services.

1.4.9.1 Public School Choice

This section collects data on public school choice. FAQs related to the public school choice provisions are at the end of this section.

1.4.9.1.2 Public School Choice – Students

In the table below, provide the number of students who were eligible for public school choice, the number of eligible students who applied to transfer, and the number who transferred under the provisions for public school choice under Section 1116 of ESEA. The number of students who were eligible for public school choice should include:

1. All students currently enrolled in a school Title I identified for improvement, corrective action or restructuring.
2. All students who transferred in the current school year under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116, and
3. All students who previously transferred under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116 and are continuing to transfer for the current school year under Section 1116.

The number of students who applied to transfer should include:

1. All students who applied to transfer in the current school year but did not or were unable to transfer.
2. All students who transferred in the current school year under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116; and
3. All students who previously transferred under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116 and are continuing to transfer for the current school year under Section 1116.

For any of the respective student counts, States should indicate in the Comment section if the count does not include any of the categories of students discussed above.

	# Students
Eligible for public school choice	6,613
Applied to transfer	4
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	4

1.4.9.1.3 Funds Spent on Public School Choice

In the table below, provide the total dollar amount spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice under Section 1116 of ESEA.

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$ 4,980

1.4.9.1.4 Availability of Public School Choice Options

In the table below provide the number of LEAs in your State that are unable to provide public school choice to eligible students due to any of the following reasons:

1. All schools at a grade level in the LEA are in school improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.
2. LEA only has a single school at the grade level of the school at which students are eligible for public school choice.
3. LEA's schools are so remote from one another that choice is impracticable.

	# LEAs
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	25

FAQs about public school choice:

- a. How should States report data on Title I public school choice for those LEAs that have open enrollment and other choice programs? For those LEAs that implement open enrollment or other school choice programs in addition to public school choice under Section 1116 of ESEA, the State may consider a student as having applied to transfer if the student meets the following:
- Has a "home" or "neighborhood" school (to which the student would have been assigned, in the absence of a school choice program) that receives Title I funds and has been identified, under the statute, as in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring; and
 - Has elected to enroll, at some point since July 1, 2002 (the effective date of the Title I choice provisions), and after the home school has been identified as in need of improvement, in a school that has not been so identified and is attending that school; and
 - Is using district transportation services to attend such a school.
- In addition, the State may consider costs for transporting a student meeting the above conditions towards the funds spent by an LEA on transportation for public school choice if the student is using district transportation services to attend the non-identified school.
- b. How should States report on public school choice for those LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice? In the count of LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice (for any of the reasons specified in 1.4.9.1.4), States should include those LEAs that are unable to offer public school choice at one or more grade levels. For instance, if an LEA is able to provide public school choice to eligible students at the elementary level but not at the secondary level, the State should include the LEA in the count. States should also include LEAs that are not able to provide public school choice at all (i.e., at any grade level). States should provide the reason(s) why public school choice was not possible in these LEAs at the grade level(s) in the Comment section. In addition, States may also include in the Comment section a separate count just of LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice at any grade level.

For LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice at one or more grade levels, States should count as eligible for public school choice (in 1.4.9.1.2) all students who attend identified Title I schools regardless of whether the LEA is able to offer the students public school choice.

³ Adapted from OESE/OII policy letter of August 2004. The policy letter may be found on the Department's Web page at <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/stateletters/choice/choice081804.html>.

1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

1.4.9.2.2 Supplemental Educational Services – Students

In the table below, provide the number of students who were eligible for, who applied for, and who received supplemental educational services under Section 1116 of ESEA.

	# Students
Eligible for supplemental educational services	2,983
Applied for supplemental educational services	553
Received supplemental educational services	381
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk.

1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services

In the table below, provide the total dollar amount spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services under Section 1116 of ESEA.

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$ 332,059
Comments:	

1.5 TEACHER QUALITY

This section collects data on "highly qualified" teachers as the term is defined in Section 9101(23) of ESEA.

1.5.1 Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified

In the table below, provide the number of core academic classes for the grade levels listed, the number of those core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified, and the number taught by teachers who are not highly qualified. The percentage of core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified and the percentage taught by teachers who are not highly qualified will be calculated automatically. Below the table are FAQs about these data.

School Type	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified
All classes	35,626	35,614	100.0	12	0.0
All elementary classes	15,624	15,619	100.0	5	0.0
All secondary classes	20,002	19,995	100.0	7	0.0

Do the data in Table 1.5.1 above include classes taught by special education teachers who provide direct instruction core academic subjects?

Data table includes classes taught by special education teachers who provide direct instruction core academic subjects.

Yes

If the answer above is no, please explain below. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Does the State count elementary classes so that a full-day self-contained classroom equals one class, or does the State use a departmentalized approach where a classroom is counted multiple times, once for each subject taught?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

A full-day self-contained classroom equals one class.

FAQs about highly qualified teachers and core academic subjects:

- a. *What are the core academic subjects? English, reading/language arts, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, and geography [Title IX, Section 9101(11)]. While the statute includes the arts in the core academic subjects, it does not specify which of the arts are core academic subjects; therefore, States must make this determination.*
- b. *How is a teacher defined? An individual who provides instruction in the core academic areas to kindergarten, grades 1 through 12, or ungraded classes, or individuals who teach in an environment other than a classroom setting (and who maintain daily student attendance records) [from NCES, CCD, 2001-02]*
- c. *How is a class defined? A class is a setting in which organized instruction of core academic course content is provided to one or more students (including cross-age groupings) for a given period of time. (A course may be offered to more than one class.) Instruction, provided by one or more teachers or other staff members, may be delivered in person or via a different medium. Classes that share space should be considered as separate classes if they function as separate units for more than 50% of the time [from NCES Non-fiscal Data Handbook for Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education, 2003].*
- d. *Should 6th-, 7th-, and 8th-grade classes be reported in the elementary or the secondary category? States are responsible for determining whether the content taught at the middle school level meets the competency requirements for elementary or secondary instruction. Report classes in grade 6 through 8 consistent with how teachers have been classified to determine their highly qualified status, regardless of whether their schools are configured as elementary or middle schools.*
- e. *How should States count teachers (including specialists or resource teachers) in elementary classes? States that count self-contained classrooms as one class should, to avoid over-representation, also count subject-area specialists (e.g., mathematics or music teachers) or resource teachers as teaching one class. On the other hand, States using a departmentalized approach to instruction where a self-contained classroom is counted multiple times (once for each subject taught) should also count subject-area specialists or resource teachers as teaching multiple classes.*
- f. *How should States count teachers in self-contained multiple-subject secondary classes? Each core academic subject taught for which students are receiving credit toward graduation should be counted in the numerator and the denominator. For example, if the same teacher teaches English, calculus, history, and science in a self-contained classroom, count these as four classes in the denominator. If the teacher is Highly Qualified to teach English and history, he/she would be counted as Highly Qualified in two of the four subjects in the numerator.*
- g. *What is the reporting period? The reporting period is the school year. The count of classes must include all semesters, quarters, or terms of the school year. For example, if core academic classes are held in summer sessions, those classes should be included in the count of core academic classes. A state determines into which school year classes fall.*

1.5.2 Reasons Core Academic Classes Are Taught by Teachers Who Are Not Highly Qualified

In the tables below, estimate the percentages for each of the reasons why teachers who are not highly qualified teach core academic classes. For example, if 900 elementary classes were taught by teachers who are not highly qualified, what percentage of those 900 classes falls into each of the categories listed below? If the three reasons provided at each grade level are not sufficient to explain why core academic classes at a particular grade level are taught by teachers who are not highly qualified, use the row labeled "other" and explain the additional reasons. The total of the reasons is calculated automatically for each grade level and must equal 100% at the elementary level and 100% at the secondary level.

Note: Use the numbers of core academic classes taught by teachers who are not highly qualified from 1.5.1 for both elementary school classes (1.5.2.1) and for secondary school classes (1.5.2.2) as your starting point.

	Percentage
Elementary School Classes	
Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	0.0
Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	0.0
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	0.0
Other (please explain in comment box below)	100.0
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

In 2008-2009 all teacher assignments met the provisions of HQT, except the state identified five noncompliant instances which resulted in sanctions and removal of the teacher.

	Percentage
Secondary School Classes	
Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	0.0
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	0.0
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	0.0
Other (please explain in comment box below)	100.0
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

In 2008-2009 all teacher assignments met the provisions of HQT, except the state identified seven noncompliant instances which resulted in sanctions and removal of the teacher.

1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

In the table below, provide the number of core academic classes for each of the school types listed and the number of those core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified. The percentage of core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified will be calculated automatically. The percentages used for high-and low-poverty schools and the poverty metric used to determine those percentages are reported in the second table. Below the tables are FAQs about these data.

This means that for the purpose of establishing poverty quartiles, some classes in schools where both elementary and secondary classes are taught would be counted as classes in an elementary school rather than as classes in a secondary school in 1.5.3. This also means that such a 12th grade class would be in different category in 1.5.3 than it would be in 1.5.1.

NOTE: No source of classroom-level poverty data exists, so States may look at school-level data when figuring poverty quartiles. Because not all schools have traditional grade configurations, and because a school may not be counted as both an elementary and as a secondary school, States may include as elementary schools all schools that serve children in grades K through 5 (including K through 8 or K through 12 schools).

School Type	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified
Elementary Schools			
High Poverty Elementary Schools	3,335	3,335	100.0
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	4,266	4,266	100.0
Secondary Schools			
High Poverty secondary Schools	2,792	2,792	100.0
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	7,417	7,410	99.9

1.5.4 In the table below, provide the poverty quartiles breaks used in determining high-and low-poverty schools and the poverty metric used to determine the poverty quartiles. Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

	High-Poverty Schools (more than what %)	Low-Poverty Schools (less than what %)
Elementary schools	45.9	26.2
Poverty metric used	Percent of free and reduced lunch.	
Secondary schools	40.0	24.0
Poverty metric used	Percent of free and reduced lunch. 3/2/10 explanation: This is correct.	

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

- What is a "high-poverty school"? Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "high-poverty" schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State.
- What is a "low-poverty school"? Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "low-poverty" schools as schools in the bottom quartile of poverty in the State.
- How are the poverty quartiles determined? Separately rank order elementary and secondary schools from highest to lowest on your percentage poverty measure. Divide the list into four equal groups. Schools in the first (highest group) are high-poverty schools. Schools in the last group (lowest group) are the low-poverty schools. Generally, States use the percentage of students who qualify for the free or reduced-price lunch program for this calculation.
- Since the poverty data are collected at the school and not classroom level, how do we classify schools as either elementary or secondary for this purpose? States may include as elementary schools all schools that serve children in grades K through 5 (including K through 8 or K through 12 schools) and would therefore include as secondary schools those that exclusively serve children in grades 6 and higher.

1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

This section collects annual performance and accountability data on the implementation of Title III programs.

1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs

In the table below, place a check next to each type of language instruction educational programs implemented in the State, as defined in Section 3301(8), as required by Sections 3121(a)(1), 3123(b)(1), and 3123(b)(2).

Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

1. **Types of Programs = Types of programs described in the subgrantee's local plan (as submitted to the State or as implemented) that is closest to the descriptions in http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/files/uploads/5/Language_Instruction_Educational_Programs.pdf.**
2. **Other Language = Name of the language of instruction, other than English, used in the program.**

Check Types of Programs	Type of Program	Other Language
No	Dual language	
No	Two-way immersion	
No	Transitional bilingual programs	
Yes	Developmental bilingual	
Yes	Heritage language	Lakota/Hidatsa
Yes	Sheltered English instruction	
Yes	Structured English immersion	
Yes	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)	
No	Content-based ESL	
Yes	Pull-out ESL	
Yes	Other (explain in comment box below)	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.6.2 Student Demographic Data

1.6.2.1 Number of ALL LEP Students in the State

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of ALL LEP students in the State who meet the LEP definition under Section 9101(25).

- Include newly enrolled (recent arrivals to the U.S.) and continually enrolled LEP students, whether or not they receive services in a Title III language instruction educational program
- Do not include Former LEP students (as defined in Section 200.20(f)(2) of the Title I regulation) and monitored Former LEP students (as defined under Section 3121(a)(4) of Title III) in the ALL LEP student count in this table.

Number of ALL LEP students in the State	3,901
Comments:	

1.6.2.2 Number of LEP Students Who Received Title III Language Instruction Educational Program Services

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of LEP students who received services in Title III language instructional education programs.

	#
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	3,461
Comments:	

Source – The SEA submits the data in file N/X116 that contains data group ID 648, category set A.

1.6.2.3 Most Commonly Spoken Languages in the State

In the table below, provide the five most commonly spoken languages, other than English, in the State (for all LEP students, not just LEP students who received Title III Services). The top five languages should be determined by the highest number of students speaking each of the languages listed.

Language	# LEP Students
Ojibwa	1,327
Spanish; Castilian	492
Dakota	412
Somali	216
Bosnian	174

Report additional languages with significant numbers of LEP students in the comment box below.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.6.3 Student Performance Data

This section collects data on LEP student English language proficiency, as required by Sections 1111(h)(4)(D) and 3121(a)(2).

1.6.3.1.1 All LEP Students Tested on the State Annual English Language Proficiency Assessment

In the table below, please provide the number of ALL LEP students tested on annual State English language proficiency assessment (as defined in 1.6.2.1).

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	3,050
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	1,001
Total	4,051
Comments: NDDPI has improved their identification of LEP students and appropriate exiting of LEP students.	

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

	#
Number proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	1,127
Percent proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	28.9
Comments:	

1.6.3.2.1 Title III LEP Students Tested on the State Annual English Language Proficiency (ELP) Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of Title III LEP students tested on annual State English language proficiency assessment.

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	3,530
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	991
Total	4,521
Comments:	
In the table below, provide the number of Title III Students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time and whose progress cannot be determined. Report this number ONLY if the State did not include these students in establishing AMAO1/making progress target and did not include them in the calculations for AMAO1/making progress(# and % making progress).	
	#
Number of Title III LEP with one data point whose progress can not be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO1.	311

1.6.3.2.2

Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:

1. **Annual Measureable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs) = State targets for the percent of students making progress and attaining proficiency.**
2. **Making Progress = Number of Title III LEP students that met the definition of Making Progress as defined by the State and submitted to ED in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.**
3. **ELP Attainment = Number of Title III LEP students that meet the State defined English language proficiency submitted to ED in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.**
4. **Results = Number and percent of Title III LEP students that met the State definition of Making Progress and the number and percent that met the State definition of Attainment of English language proficiency.**

In the table below, provide the State targets for the number and percentage of States making progress and attaining English proficiency for this reporting period. Additionally, provide the results from the annual State English language proficiency assessment for Title III-served LEP students who participated in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12. If your State uses cohorts, provide us with the range of targets, (i.e., indicate the lowest target among the cohorts, e.g., 10% and the highest target among a cohort, e.g., 70%).

	Results		Targets	
	#	%	#	%
Making progress	1,576	61.8	21	16.00
ELP attainment	360	14.1	24	5.60
Comments:				

1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students

This section collects data on the performance of former LEP students as required by Sections 3121(a)(4) and 3123(b)(8).

1.6.3.6.1 Title III Served MFLEP Students by Year Monitored

In the table below, report the unduplicated count of monitored former LEP students during the two consecutive years of monitoring, which includes both MFLEP students in AYP grades and in non-AYP grades.

Monitored Former LEP students include:

- Students who have transitioned out of a language instruction educational program funded by Title III into classrooms that are not tailored for LEP students.
- Students who are no longer receiving LEP services and who are being monitored for academic content achievement for 2 years after the transition.

Table 1.6.3.6.1 Definitions:

1. **# Year One = Number of former LEP students in their first year of being monitored.**
2. **# Year Two = Number of former LEP students in their second year of being monitored.**
3. **Total = Number of monitored former LEP students in year one and year two. This is automatically calculated.**

# Year One	# Year Two	Total
77	277	354
Comments:		

1.6.3.6.2 In the table below, report the number of MFLEP students who took the annual mathematics assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned into classrooms not designed for LEP students and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:

1. **# Tested = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in mathematics in all AYP grades.**
2. **# At or Above Proficient = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual mathematics assessment.**
3. **% Results = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the number tested.**
4. **# Below proficient = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school) who did not score proficient on the State NCLB mathematics assessment. This will be automatically calculated.**

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
148	118	79.7	30
Comments:			

1.6.3.6.3 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Reading/Language Arts

In the table below, report the number of MFLEP students who took the annual mathematics assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned into classrooms not designed for LEP students and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

Table 1.6.3.6.3 Definitions:

1. **# Tested = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in reading/language arts in all AYP grades.**
2. **# At or Above Proficient = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment.**
3. **% Results = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the total number tested.**
4. **# Below proficient = State-aggregated number MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment. This will be automatically calculated.**

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
149	115	77.2	34
Comments:			

1.6.3.6.4 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Science

In the table below, report results for monitored former LEP students who took the annual science assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned into classrooms not designed for LEP students and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

Table 1.6.3.6.4 Definitions:

1. **# Tested = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in science.**
2. **# At or Above Proficient = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual science assessment.**
3. **% Results = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the total number tested.**
4. **# Below proficient = State-aggregated number MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual science assessment. This will be automatically calculated.**

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
57	42	73.7	15
Comments:			

1.6.4 Title III Subgrantees

This section collects data on the performance of Title III subgrantees.

1.6.4.1 Title III Subgrantee Performance

In the table below, report the number of Title III subgrantees meeting the criteria described in the table. Do not leave items blank. If there are zero subgrantees who met the condition described, put a zero in the number (#) column. Do not double count subgrantees by category.

Note: Do not include number of subgrants made under Section 3114(d)(1) from funds reserved for education programs and activities for immigrant children and youth. (Report Section 3114(d)(1) subgrants in 1.6.5.1 ONLY.)

	#
# -Total number of subgrantees for the year	44
# -Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	3
# -Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	24
# -Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	21
# -Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	30
# -Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	3
# -Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2007-08 and 2008-09)	11
# -Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2008-09 for not meeting Title III AMAOs	0
# -Number of subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2005-06, 2006-07, 2007-08, and 2008-09)	3
Comments: Comments -ND has 44 subgrantees which are subsumed into 11 consortium grants. Also, schools are not included that have an N value of less than or equal to 10. Data is reflective of this. 3/5/10 correction / explanation NDDPI has recently hired a new Assistant Director for Bilingual and ELL programs. Prior to the hire of the Assistant Director, letters to Districts that did not meet AMAO's were sent out by the former Director. The letters, however, did not request Districts develop an improvement plan. The new Assistant Director has been working with Districts to remedy this situation and to assure that improvement plans are completed and submitted.	

1.6.4.2 State Accountability

In the table below, indicate whether the State met all three Title III AMAOs.

Note: Meeting all three Title III AMAOs means meeting each State-set target for each objective: Making Progress, Attaining Proficiency, and Making AYP for the LEP subgroup. This section collects data that will be used to determine State AYP, as required under Section 6161.

State met <u>all</u> three Title III AMAOs	<u>No</u>
Comments:	

1.6.4.3 Termination of Title III Language Instruction Educational Programs

This section collects data on the termination of Title III programs or activities as required by Section 3123(b)(7).

Were any Title III language instruction educational programs or activities terminated for failure to reach program goals?	No
If yes, provide the number of language instruction educational programs or activities for immigrant children and youth terminated.	
Comments:	

1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students

This section collects data on education programs and activities for immigrant students.

1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students

In the table below, report the unduplicated number of immigrant students enrolled in schools in the State and who participated in qualifying educational programs under Section 3114(d)(1).

Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:

1. **Immigrant Students Enrolled = Number of students who meet the definition of immigrant children and youth under Section 3301(6) and enrolled in the elementary or secondary schools in the State.**
2. **Students in 3114(d)(1) Program = Number of immigrant students who participated in programs for immigrant children and youth funded under Section 3114(d)(1), using the funds reserved for immigrant education programs/activities. This number should not include immigrant students who receive services in Title III language instructional educational programs under Sections 3114(a) and 3115(a).**
3. **3114(d)(1)Subgrants = Number of subgrants made in the State under Section 3114(d)(1), with the funds reserved for immigrant education programs/activities. Do not include Title III Language Instruction Educational Program (LIEP) subgrants made under**

Sections 3114(a) and 3115(a) that serve immigrant students enrolled in them.

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants
697	362	2

If state reports zero (0) students in programs or zero (0) subgrants, explain in comment box below. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: C SPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk.

1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development

This section collects data on teachers in Title III language instruction education programs as required under Section 3123(b)(5).

1.6.6.1 Teacher Information

This section collects information about teachers as required under Section 3123 (b)(5).

In the table below, report the number of teachers who are working in the Title III language instruction educational programs as defined under Section 3301(8) and reported in 1.6.1 (Types of language instruction educational programs) even if they are not paid with Title III funds.

Note: Section 3301(8) - The term 'Language instruction educational program' means an instruction course (A) in which a limited English proficient child is placed for the purpose of developing and attaining English proficiency, while meeting challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards, as required by Section 1111(b)(1); and (B) that may make instructional use of both English and a child's native language to enable the child to develop and attain English proficiency and may include the participation of English proficient children if such course is designed to enable all participating children to become proficient in English and a second language.

	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	48
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	46

Explain in the comment box below if there is a zero for any item in the table above. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

* This number should be the total additional teachers needed for the next 5 years, not the number needed for each year. Do not include the number of teachers currently working in Title III English language instruction educational programs.

1.6.6.2 Professional Development Activities of Subgrantees Related to the Teaching and Learning of LEP Students

In the tables below, provide information about the subgrantee professional development activities that meet the requirements of Section 3115(c)(2).

Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:

1. **Professional Development Topics = Subgrantee activities for professional development topics required under Title III.**
2. **#Subgrantees = Number of subgrantees who conducted each type of professional development activity. A subgrantee may conduct more than one professional development activity. (Use the same method of counting subgrantees, including consortia, as in 1.6.1.1 and 1.6.4.1.)**
3. Total Number of Participants = Number of teachers, administrators and other personnel who participated in each type of the professional development activities reported.
4. Total = Number of all participants in professional development (PD) activities

Type of Professional Development Activity	# Subgrantees	
Instructional strategies for LEP students	44	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	44	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	44	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	44	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	44	
Other (Explain in comment box)	0	
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	44	255
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	44	30
PD provided to principals	44	25
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	44	10
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	44	30
PD provided to community based organization personnel	44	25
Total	44	375

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities

This section collects data on State grant activities.

1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process

In the table below, report the time between when the State receives the Title III allocation from ED, normally on July 1 of each year for the upcoming school year, and the time when the State distributes these funds to subgrantees for the intended school year. Dates must be in the format MM/DD/YY.

Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:

1. **Date State Received Allocation = Annual date the State receives the Title III allocation from US Department of Education (ED).**
2. **Date Funds Available to Subgrantees = Annual date that Title III funds are available to approved subgrantees.**
3. **# of Days/\$\$ Distribution = Average number of days for States receiving Title III funds to make subgrants to subgrantees beginning from July 1 of each year, except under conditions where funds are being withheld.**

Example: State received SY 2008-09 funds July 1, 2008, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2008, for SY 2008-09 programs. Then the "# of days/\$\$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
07/01/09	09/01/09	60
Comments:		

1.6.7.2 Steps To Shorten the Distribution of Title III Funds to Subgrantees

In the comment box below, describe how your State can shorten the process of distributing Title III funds to subgrantees. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Title III is moving to an entirely electronic process.

1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS

In the table below, provide the number of schools identified as persistently dangerous, as determined by the State, by the start of the school year. For further guidance on persistently dangerous schools, refer to Section B "Identifying Persistently Dangerous Schools" in the Unsafe School Choice Option Non-Regulatory Guidance, available at: <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/unsafeschoolchoice.pdf>.

	#
Persistently Dangerous Schools	
Comments: North Dakota has no Persistently Dangerous Schools to report.	

1.8 GRADUATION RATES AND DROPOUT RATES

This section collects graduation and dropout rates.

1.8.1 Graduation Rates

In the table below, provide the graduation rates calculated using the methodology that was approved as part of the State's accountability plan for the previous school year (SY 2007-08). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	86.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	59.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	86.6
Black, non-Hispanic	74.8
Hispanic	
White, non-Hispanic	88.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	66.6
Limited English proficient	80.4
Economically disadvantaged	74.6
Migratory students	33.3
Male	84.5
Female	87.5
Comments: North Dakota has no comment.	

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

FAQs on graduation rates:

- a. *What is the graduation rate? Section 200.19 of the Title I regulations issued under the No Child Left Behind Act on December 2, 2002, defines graduation rate to mean:*
 - The percentage of students, measured from the beginning of high school, who graduate from public high school with a regular diploma (not including a GED or any other diploma not fully aligned with the State's academic standards) in the standard number of years; or,
 - Another more accurate definition developed by the State and approved by the Secretary in the State plan that more accurately measures the rate of students who graduate from high school with a regular diploma; and
 - Avoids counting a dropout as a transfer.
- b. *What if the data collection system is not in place for the collection of graduate rates? For those States that are reporting transitional graduation rate data and are working to put into place data collection systems that will allow the State to calculate the graduation rate in accordance with Section 200.19 for all the required subgroups, please provide a detailed progress report on the status of those efforts.*

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.8.2 Dropout Rates

In the table below, provide the dropout rates calculated using the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's (NCES) Common Core of Data (CCD) for the previous school year (SY 2007-08). Below the table is a FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Dropout Rate
All Students	2.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	7.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	4.1
Black, non-Hispanic	3.9
Hispanic	4.6
White, non-Hispanic	1.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	0.0
Limited English proficient	0.0
Economically disadvantaged	0.0
Migratory students	0.0
Male	2.6
Female	2.2
Comments: Dropout data is not collected for Children with disabilities (IDEA), Limited English proficient, Economically disadvantaged or Migratory students.	

FAQ on dropout rates:

What is a dropout? A dropout is an individual who: 1) was enrolled in school at some time during the previous school year; and 2) was not enrolled at the beginning of the current school year; and 3) has not graduated from high school or completed a State-or district-approved educational program; and 4) does not meet any of the following exclusionary conditions: a) transfer to another public school district, private school, or State-or district-approved educational program (including correctional or health facility programs); b) temporary absence due to suspension or school-excused illness; or c) death.

1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS PROGRAM

This section collects data on homeless children and youths and the McKinney-Vento grant program.

In the table below, provide the following information about the number of LEAs in the State who reported data on homeless children and youths and the McKinney-Vento program. The totals will be will be automatically calculated.

	#	# LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	187	26
LEAs with subgrants	6	6
Total	193	32
Comments:		

1.9.1 All LEAs (with and without McKinney-Vento subgrants)

The following questions collect data on homeless children and youths in the State.

1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youths

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youths by grade level enrolled in public school at any time during the regular school year. The totals will be automatically calculated:

Age/Grade	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs With Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	N<10	33
K	36	56
1	39	54
2	50	41
3	50	52
4	40	52
5	32	38
6	40	45
7	37	30
8	41	32
9	48	28
10	41	25
11	42	21
12	29	99
Ungraded		15
Total	528	621

Comments: The total number of homeless children/youth enrolled in LEAs without subgrants 1.9.1.2 does not equal the total number of homeless children/youth enrolled in LEAs without subgrants 1.9.1.1 is because not all LEAs without subgrants reported the Primary Nighttime Residence of homeless children and youths.

1.9.1.2 Primary Nighttime Residence of Homeless Children and Youths

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youths by primary nighttime residence enrolled in public school at any time during the regular school year. The primary nighttime residence should be the student's nighttime residence when he/she was identified as homeless. The totals will be automatically calculated.

	# of Homeless Children/Youths -LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths -LEAs With Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	16	210
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	180	275
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	N<10	29
Hotels/Motels	26	107
Total	227	621
Comments: Not all LEA without subgrant reported night time residency.		

1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants

The following sections collect data on LEAs with McKinney-Vento subgrants.

1.9.2.1 Homeless Children and Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youths by grade level who were served by McKinney-Vento subgrants during the regular school year. The total will be automatically calculated.

Age/Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	N<10
K	41
1	40
2	29
3	37
4	35
5	29
6	28
7	21
8	19
9	16
10	12
11	14
12	32
Ungraded	
Total	356
Comments: Not all LEA with subgrant reported.	

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

1.9.2.2 Subgroups of Homeless Students Served

In the table below, please provide the following information about the homeless students served during the regular school year.

	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied youth	46
Migratory children/youth	
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	58
Limited English proficient students	24
Comments: Not all LEA with subgrant reported this section.	

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

1.9.2.3 Educational Support Services Provided by Subgrantees

In the table below, provide the number of subgrantee programs that provided the following educational support services with McKinney-Vento funds.

	# McKinney-Vento Subgrantees That Offer
Tutoring or other instructional support	5
Expedited evaluations	3
Staff professional development and awareness	5
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	6
Transportation	4
Early childhood programs	3
Assistance with participation in school programs	6
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	6
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	5
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	6
Coordination between schools and agencies	6
Counseling	4
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	6
Clothing to meet a school requirement	5
School supplies	5
Referral to other programs and services	6
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	6
Other (optional – in comment box below)	3
Other (optional – in comment box below)	0
Other (optional – in comment box below)	0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Source – Manual input by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.9.2.4 Barriers To The Education Of Homeless Children And Youth

In the table below, provide the number of subgrantees that reported the following barriers to the enrollment and success of homeless children and youths.

	# Subgrantees Reporting
Eligibility for homeless services	4
School Selection	2
Transportation	4
School records	3
Immunizations	2
Other medical records	2
Other Barriers – in comment box below	0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.9.2.5 Academic Progress of Homeless Students

The following questions collect data on the academic achievement of homeless children and youths served by McKinney-Vento subgrants.

1.9.2.5.1 Reading Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youths served who were tested on the State ESEA reading/language arts assessment and the number of those tested who scored at or above proficient. Provide data for grades 9 through 12 only for those grades tested for ESEA.

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Reading Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	32	19
4	32	13
5	22	N<10
6	26	10
7	25	11
8	14	N<10
High School	24	N<10
Comments:		

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

1.9.2.5.2 Mathematics Assessment

This section is similar to 1.9.2.5.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State ESEA mathematics assessment.

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Mathematics Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	31	21
4	31	20
5	22	11
6	25	N<10
7	24	N<10
8	14	N<10
High School	24	N<10
Comments:		

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

1.10 MIGRANT CHILD COUNTS

This section collects the Title I, Part C, Migrant Education Program (MEP) child counts which States are required to provide and may be used to determine the annual State allocations under Title I, Part C. The child counts should reflect the reporting period of September 1, 2008 through August 31, 2009. This section also collects a report on the procedures used by States to produce true, accurate, and valid child counts.

To provide the child counts, each SEA should have sufficient procedures in place to ensure that it is counting only those children who are eligible for the MEP. Such procedures are important to protecting the integrity of the State's MEP because they permit the early discovery and correction of eligibility problems and thus help to ensure that only eligible migrant children are counted for funding purposes and are served. If an SEA has reservations about the accuracy of its child counts, it must inform the Department of its concerns and explain how and when it will resolve them under Section 1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes.

Note: In submitting this information, the Authorizing State Official must certify that, to the best of his/her knowledge, the child counts and information contained in the report are true, reliable, and valid and that any false Statement provided is subject to fine or imprisonment pursuant to 18 U.S.C. 1001.

FAQs on Child Count:

How is "out-of-school" defined? Out-of-school means youth up through age 21 who are entitled to a free public education in the State but are not currently enrolled in a K-12 institution. This could include students who have dropped out of school, youth who are working on a GED outside of a K-12 institution, and youth who are "here-to-work" only. It does not include preschoolers, who are counted by age grouping.

How is "ungraded" defined? Ungraded means the children are served in an educational unit that has no separate grades. For example, some schools have primary grade groupings that are not traditionally graded, or ungraded groupings for children with learning disabilities. In some cases, ungraded students may also include special education children, transitional bilingual students, students working on a GED through a K-12 institution, or those in a correctional setting. (Students working on a GED outside of a K-12 institution are counted as out-of-school youth.)

1.10.1 Category 1 Child Count

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number by age/grade of eligible migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, resided in your State for one or more days during the reporting period of September 1, 2008 through August 31, 2009. This figure includes all eligible migrant children who may or may not have participated in MEP services. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

- Children age birth through 2 years
- Children served by the MEP (under the continuation of services authority) after their period of eligibility has expired when other services are not available to meet their needs
- Previously eligible secondary-school children who are receiving credit accrual services (under the continuation of services authority).

Age/Grade	12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	123
K	53
1	54
2	68
3	53
4	50
5	62
6	36
7	32
8	32
9	35
10	35
11	28
12	12
Ungraded	N<10
Out-of-school	
Total	675
Comments: North Dakota did not serve any Out-of-school youth.	

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

1.10.1.1 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases

In the space below, explain any increases or decreases from last year in the number of students reported for Category 1 greater than 10 percent.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

For the category 1 child count North Dakota did experience a decrease of 10% from last year's count.

3/5/10 explanation: Resubmitted corrected numbers.

1.10.2 Category 2 Child Count

In the table below, enter by age/grade the unduplicated statewide number of eligible migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, were served for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods that occurred within the reporting period of September 1, 2008 through August 31, 2009. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. Count a child who moved to different schools within the State and who was served in both traditional summer and year-round school intersession programs only once. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

- Children age birth through 2 years
- Children served by the MEP (under the continuation of services authority) after their period of eligibility has expired when other services are not available to meet their needs
- Previously eligible secondary-school children who are receiving credit accrual services (under the continuation of services authority).

Age/Grade	Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	87
K	32
1	39
2	37
3	28
4	34
5	34
6	20
7	13
8	12
9	15
10	15
11	N<10
12	N<10
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	
Total	374
Comments: North Dakota did not serve any Ungraded. North Dakota did not serve any Out-of-school.	

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

1.10.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases

In the space below, explain any increases or decreases from last year in the number of students reported for Category 2 greater than 10 percent.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

For the category 2 child count North Dakota did experience a decrease of 10% from last year's count.

3/5/10 explanation: Resubmitted corrected numbers.

1.10.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures

The following question requests information on the State's MEP child count calculation and validation procedures.

1.10.3.1 Student Information System

In the space below, respond to the following questions: What system(s) did your State use to compile and generate the Category 1 and Category 2 child count for this reporting period (e.g., NGS, MIS 2000, COEStar, manual system)? Were child counts for the last reporting period generated using the same system(s)? If the State's category 2 count was generated using a different system from the category 1 count, please identify each system.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The State of North Dakota used the MIS 2000 system to compile and generate the 08-09 Category 1 and Category 2 child counts.

The state of North Dakota used the MIS 2000 system to compile and generate 07-08 Category 1 and Category 2 child counts also.

1.10.3.2 Data Collection and Management Procedures

In the space below, respond to the following questions: How was the child count data collected? What data were collected? What activities were conducted to collect the data? When were the data collected for use in the student information system? If the data for the State's category 2 count were collected and maintained differently from the category 1 count, please describe each set of procedures.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The state of North Dakota has two summer migrant education centers. The child and family data is collected by a Tri Valley Head Start recruiter. The Tri Valley Head Start recruiter interviews the families at the school, home or the place of employment. The Tri Valley Head Start recruiters require documentation showing a qualifying move. Without documentation of a qualifying move, the migrant family's children were not served in the summer migrant education program. This information is entered on the Certificate of Eligibility (C.O.E.) and the move documentation is also attached to the COE. This C.O.E. is completed and submitted to the state office. The data that is collected on the C.O.E. is the required MSIX data elements. The family and child information is collected during the summer migrant school and the regular school year. The State of North Dakota used the MIS 2000 system to compile and generate the Category 1 and Category 2 child counts.

In the space below, describe how the child count data are inputted, updated, and then organized by the student information system for child count purposes at the State level

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

When the C.O.E. is entered at the state office, the MIS 2000 system generates an education record. The education record is sent to the migrant centers. At the end of the summer migrant program if the migrant student attended at least one day, the clerk at the migrant center will enter an enrollment date, withdrawal date and an "S" for summer. The education record is also given to all teachers for them to enter instructional services as well as support services. The education record is then sent to the state office to be entered by the state data entry specialist into the MIS 2000 system for the child count.

If the data for the State's category 2 count were collected and maintained differently from the category 1 count, please describe each set of procedures.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

For the state to maintain the Category 1 count, the state hires a Tri Valley Head Start recruiter to complete the COE's and to obtain the

required parents signatures. The schools in North Dakota who indicate they have migrant students during the regular school year report all migrant students on the (STARS) State Automated Reporting System. The STARS is checked daily at the state office. When schools submit the names of their migrant students on STARS the migrant coordinator at the state office prints the list of students and sends that list to the recruiter. The recruiter verifies the student and family information as well as all eligibility information.

The STARS report of migrant students is also crossed checked with all of the C.O.E.s that is received in the State office during the regular school year. Once all C.O.E.s are verified for accuracy, the migrant students are entered into the MIS 2000 system for the Category 1 child count and are identified by an "R" for regular school.

All LEA's must complete on the STARS system the educational data required for the performance report and for the MIS 2000 data.

1.10.3.3 Methods Used To Count Children

In the space below, respond to the following question: How was each child count calculated? Please describe the compilation process and edit functions that are built into your student information system(s) specifically to produce an accurate child count. In particular, describe how your system includes and counts only:

- children who were between age 3 through 21;
- children who met the program eligibility criteria (e.g., were within 3 years of a last qualifying move, had a qualifying activity);
- children who were resident in your State for at least 1 day during the eligibility period (September 1 through August 31);
- children who—in the case of Category 2—received a MEP-funded service during the summer or intersession term; and
- children once per age/grade level for each child count category.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The child count is calculated when the student information is entered into the MIS 2000 information system.

MIS 2000 has edit functions to separate the category 1 and category 2 counts. For the category 1 count, a date is used to get the count example (9/1/08 -8/31/09). This report also includes an "R" for fall enrollment. After running a printout of all the students who are in this date range, our state compares results with the schools districts who reported migrant students during the regular school year to see if the LEA count and the SEA count are the same. For the Category 2, count the date that is used, for example, would be 9/1/08-8/31/09. This report also includes an "S" for summer school. After the MIS 2000 report is run on this count, a comparison is made from the MIS 2000 report to the State's student enrollment report that was run throughout the North Dakota summer program. The category 1 and category 2 counts are enrollment based reports. This means that a student's enrollment must meet the report's criteria in order to be counted. For example students who have graduated will not have enrollments in the migrant database for subsequent years; therefore, those students would not be included in the counts. MIS2000 also has a termination code for students who graduated in our database. However, this is used to indicate that a student's graduation is associated with a specific enrollment. This wouldn't be brought forward to new enrollments that were created after a student graduated.

The MIS 2000 information system is set up to include children ages 3-21 years of age. The system also automatically checks to see if a student meets the three-year eligibility requirement. The recruiters are informed at the yearly spring recruiter workshop what the eligibility years are for the upcoming summer migrant education program. For example, in 2009 if a family made a move in 2007, 2008, 2009 and any move after September 1, 2006 the family still will have made a qualifying three-year move. A recruiter is at each migrant center that completes the C.O.E. and verifies that the family has met a qualifying move and will be working at a qualifying agricultural activity.

Using the three-year eligibility rule, MIS 2000 generates a printout of our A-1 count. In addition, they run a copy of the number of students who were documented with a C.O.E who were in the State during the period 9/1/08 -8/31/09. Our data entry specialist then contacts our two migrant centers, by both faxing and phoning, to verify whether the students who represented the difference between the two counts were still residents of North Dakota.

For our category 2 count, all students received instructional services as well as support services. No students in our A-2 count receive support services only.

MIS 2000 has reports to calculate the category 1 count and the category 2 counts. Edit checks are built into MIS 2000 to determine which students qualify for category 1 and category 2. Each student record in the database has a unique number assigned to it. This number is called the studentseq in the database and represents a student. No two student records in the database will have the same studentseq. This allows North Dakota to create "unduplicated" reports by only listing or counting each student record (studentseq) once.

If your State's category 2 count was generated using a different system from the category 1 count, please describe each system separately.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The data for the State's category 2 count and category 1 count are maintained the same.

1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes

In the space below, respond to the following question: What steps are taken to ensure your State properly determines and verifies the eligibility of each child included in the child counts for the reporting period of September 1 through August 31 before that child's data are included in the student information system(s)?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

All C.O.E.'s and educational records are sent to the state office for input. The C.O.E.'s and educational records are edited by the migrant coordinators at the migrant sites. At the state office, the records are reviewed by the migrant administrator and the data entry specialist. At that time, if any questions regarding eligibility are determined, the migrant administrator will contact the migrant sites and request verification of eligibility before the child is entered into the MIS 2000 system.

In the space below, describe specifically the procedures used and the results of any re-interview processes used by the SEA during the reporting period to test the accuracy of the State's MEP eligibility determinations. In this description, please include the number of eligibility determinations sampled, the number for which a test was completed, and the number found eligible.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Below is the description the State of North Dakota used for the 2009 summer migrant program to test the accuracy of the State's eligibility determination. Because of the time frame of our seven-week summer migrant program, North Dakota has chosen to require the migrant families to show documentation of a qualifying move. The recruiter must see documentation that would prove that the migrant family did make a qualifying move and that the family will be doing agricultural work. Examples of the documentation are as follows: school records, rental agreements, Social Service documents etc. If no documentation was brought by the migrant family, the children are not enrolled in the summer migrant program.

In the space below, respond to the following question: Throughout the year, what steps are taken by staff to check that child count data are inputted and updated accurately (and—for systems that merge data—consolidated accurately)?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Throughout the year, the North Dakota migrant administrator works very closely with MIS 2000 to ensure accuracy. With the help of MIS 2000, the state of North Dakota has developed reports that keep our state apprised of the child-count data. Therefore, from these reports, we are able to verify that the child count data is being inputted and updated accurately.

In the space below, respond to the following question: What final steps are taken by State staff to verify the child counts produced by your student information system(s) are accurate counts of children in Category 1 and Category 2 prior to their submission to ED?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

At the state level, information is being gathered for the performance report in mid-October. A customer service representative from MIS 2000 downloads all the information required for the performance report. This allows our data entry specialist and the migrant administrator to check the numbers to see if the numbers are accurate; and if not, to begin working on the problem. Because of the size of our state and the small migrant centers in North Dakota, we at the state office are able to contact the migrant personnel by phone, fax, or e-mail if for any reason we would need additional information.

In the space below, describe those corrective actions or improvements that will be made by the SEA to improve the accuracy of its MEP eligibility determinations in light of the prospective re-interviewing results.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The corrective actions that the State of North Dakota has in place require documentation of a qualifying move and a qualifying agricultural activity by all migrant families. This process has greatly improved the accuracy of our State's eligibility results. As stated earlier, without documentation showing that the migrant family indeed made a qualifying move or if the families can not show documentation that they will be doing agricultural work, the students are not allowed to participate in the North Dakota summer migrant education program.

Almost 90% of the migrant families that North Dakota serves during the summer migrant education program return summer after summer. Therefore the families have been informed over and over again that without proof of a qualifying move or proof that they will indeed be doing agricultural work; their children will not be served in the summer migrant education program. The families have been very cooperative and almost all families are providing the documentation that is required so that their children are able to participate in the summer migrant education program.

In the space below, discuss any concerns about the accuracy of the reported child counts or the underlying eligibility determinations on which the counts are based.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.