

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: Parts I and II

**for
STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS
under the
ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT
As amended in 2001**

**For reporting on
School Year 2011-12**



**PART I DUE THURSDAY, DECEMBER 20, 2012
PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 2013**

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

INTRODUCTION

Sections 9302 and 9303 of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)*, as amended in 2001 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 *ESEA* Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2011-12 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 ED Facts 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 2011-12 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Thursday, December 20, 2012**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 15, 2013**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2011-12, 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 2011-12 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 2011-12 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

	OMB Number: 1810-0614
	Expiration Date: 11/30/2013
<p>Consolidated State Performance Report For State Formula Grant Programs under the Elementary And Secondary Education Act as amended in 2001</p>	
Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2011-12 <input type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2011-12	
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): Kirsten Baesler	
_____	Wednesday, April 17, 2013, 3:08:16 PM
Signature	

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART I**

For reporting on
School Year 2011-12



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 20, 2012
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

Indicate below whether your state has made or is planning to make revisions to or change the State's academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science since the State's content standards were most recently approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. If yes, indicate specifically in what school year your State implemented or will implement the revisions or changes.

State has revised or change	No revisions or changes to academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science made or planned.
	State has revised or changed its academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science or is planning to make revisions to or change its academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Indicate below the year these changes were or will be implemented or GÇ£Not ApplicableGÇ¥ to indicate that changes were not made or will not be made in the subject area.

Acceptable responses are a school year (e.g., 2011-12) or Not Applicable.

	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Academic Content Standards	2013-2014	2013-2014	2014-2015

If the responses above do not fully describe revisions or changes to your State's academic achievement standards, describe the revisions or changes below.

The response is limited to 1,000 characters

The state has adopted academic content standards in reading/language arts, mathematics, and science (<http://www.dpi.state.nd.us/standard/content.shtm>). The current academic content standards for reading/language arts and mathematics were last revised and adopted for the 2004-05 academic year and science for the 2005-06 academic year. The state's current mathematics and English language arts standards will remain effective until June 30, 2013, after which they will be replaced with the state's next generation of standards based on the CCSS. On June 11, 2011, the State Superintendent formally approved the adoption of the state's next generation of content standards in mathematics and English language arts. These new content standards are based on the national Common Core State Standards. The state is expecting the release of the national Next Generation Science Standards collaborative study in late 2012. The state will then proceed with a review and adoption of these standards.

1.1.1.1 Academic Achievement Standards in Mathematics, Reading/Language Arts and Science

Indicate below whether your state has changed or is planning to change the State's academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science since the State's academic achievement standards were most recently approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. If yes, indicate specifically in what school year your State implemented or will implement the changes.

As applicable, include changes to academic achievement standards based on any assessments (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.

<p>State has revised or changed</p>	<p>No revisions or changes to academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science made or planned.</p>
	<p>State has changed its academic achievement standards or is planning to change its academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Indicate below either the school year in which these changes were or will be implemented or GÇ£Not ApplicableGÇ¥ to indicate that changes were not made or will not be made in the subject area.</p>

Acceptable responses are a school year (e.g., 2011-12) or Not Applicable.

Academic Achievement Standards for	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Regular Assessments in Grades 3-8	2014-2015	2014-2015	n/a
Regular Assessments in High School	2014-2015	2014-2015	n/a
Alternate Assessments Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards (if applicable)	n/a	n/a	n/a
Alternate Assessments Based on Modified Achievement Standards (if applicable)	n/a	n/a	n/a
Alternate Assessments Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	2014-2015	2014-2015	n/a

If the responses above do not fully describe revisions or changes to your State's academic achievement standards, describe the revisions or changes below.

The response is limited to 1,000 characters

The state will adopt new assessments and achievement standards in 2014-15 as a result of its participation in national assessment consortium development activities.

1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts and Science

Indicate below whether your state has changed or is planning to change the State's academic assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts or science since the State's academic assessments were most recently approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. If yes, indicate specifically in what school year your State implemented or will implement the changes.

As applicable, include any assessments (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.

State has revised or changed	No changes to assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts or science made or planned.
	State has changed or is planning to change its assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Indicate below the year these changes were implemented or GÇ£Not ApplicableGÇ¥ to indicate that changes were not made or will not be made in the subject area.

Acceptable responses are a school year (e.g., 2011-12) or Not Applicable.

Academic Assessments	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Regular Assessments in Grades 3-8	2014-2015	2014-2015	n/a
Regular Assessments in High School	2014-2015	2014-2015	n/a
Alternate Assessments Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards (if applicable)	n/a	n/a	n/a
Alternate Assessments Based on Modified Achievement Standards (if applicable)	n/a	n/a	n/a
Alternate Assessments Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	2014-2015	2014-2015	n/a

If the responses above do not fully describe revisions or changes to your State's academic achievement standards, describe the revisions or changes below.

The response is limited to 1,000 characters

The state will not change its standard or alternate assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics until the 2014-15 school year, following the initiation of the state's selected assessment consortia tests. No revisions or changes to the state's standard or alternate 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. The state is an active participant in two Race to the Top Assessment Consortia (PARCC, SMARTER Balanced, and NCSC), with an anticipated implementation date of 2014-15.

1.1.3 Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities**1.1.3.1 Percentages of Funds Used for Standards and Assessment Development and Other Purposes**

For funds your State had available under *ESEA* section 6111 (Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities) during SY 2011-12, estimate what percentage of the funds your State used for the following (round to the nearest ten percent).

Purpose	Percentage (rounded to the nearest ten percent)
To pay the costs of the development of the State assessments and standards required by section 1111(b)	10.00
To administer assessments required by section 1111(b) or to carry out other activities described in section 6111 and other activities related to ensuring that the State's schools and local educational agencies are held accountable for the results	90.00
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.1.3.2 Uses of Funds for Purposes Other than Standards and Assessment Development

For funds your State had available under *ESEA* section 6111 (Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities) during SY 2011-12 that were used for purposes other than the costs of the development of the State assessments and standards required by section 1111(b), for what purposes did your State use the funds? (Enter "yes" for all that apply and "no" for all that do not apply).

Purpose	Used for Purpose (yes/no)
Administering assessments required by section 1111(b)	Yes
Developing challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards and aligned assessments in academic subjects for which standards and assessments are not required by section 1111 (b)	Yes
Developing or improving assessments of English language proficiency necessary to comply with section 1111(b)(7)	Yes
Ensuring the continued validity and reliability of State assessments, and/or refining State assessments to ensure their continued alignment with the State's academic content standards and to improve the alignment of curricula and instructional materials	Yes
Developing multiple measures to increase the reliability and validity of State assessment systems	Yes
Strengthening the capacity of local educational agencies and schools to provide all students the opportunity to increase educational achievement, including carrying out professional development activities aligned with State student academic achievement standards and assessments	Yes
Expanding the range of accommodations available to students with limited English proficiency and students with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) to improve the rates of inclusion of such students, including professional development activities aligned with State academic achievement standards and assessments	Yes
Improving the dissemination of information on student achievement and school performance to parents and the community, including the development of information and reporting systems designed to identify best educational practices based on scientifically based research or to assist in linking records of student achievement, length of enrollment, and graduation over time	Yes
Other	No
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

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

Note: States are not required to report these data by the seven (7) racial/ethnic groups; instead, they are required to report these data by the major racial and ethnic groups that are identified in their Accountability Workbooks. The charts below display racial/ethnic data that has been mapped back from the major racial and ethnic groups identified in their workbooks, to the 7 racial/ethnic groups to allow for the examination of data across states.

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	S	49,652	>=99
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	4,584	>=99
Asian	S	728	>=99
Black or African American	S	1,361	>=99
Hispanic or Latino	S	1,270	>=99
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	S	41,709	>=99
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	S	6,364	>=99
Limited English proficient (<i>LEP</i>) students	S	1,360	>=99
Economically disadvantaged students	S	17,324	>=99
Migratory students	S	75	>=95
Male	S	25,431	>=99
Female	S	24,221	>=99
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. 4/15/2013 per ND ED Facts Coordinator Data resubmitted for C175, 178, 179, 185, 188 & 189. Changes to student counts should now be corrected.			

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 (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	712	11.19
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	3,998	62.82
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.00
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	1,099	17.27
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	555	8.72
Total	6,364	////////////////////////////////////
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. 4/15/2013 per ND EDFacts Coordinator Data resubmitted for C175, 178, 179, 185, 188 & 189. Changes to student counts should now be corrected.		

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	S	49,611	>=99
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	4,593	>=99
Asian	S	689	>=99
Black or African American	S	1,352	>=99
Hispanic or Latino	S	1,272	>=99
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	S	41,705	>=99
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	S	6,349	>=99
Limited English proficient (LEP) Students	S	1,309	>=99
Economically disadvantaged students	S	17,274	>=99
Migratory students	S	77	>=95
Male	S	25,410	>=99
Female	S	24,201	>=99
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. 4/15/2013 per ND EDFacts Coordinator Data resubmitted for C175, 178, 179, 185, 188 & 189. Changes to student counts should now be corrected.			

1.2.3.1 Recently Arrived LEP Students Taking ELP Assessments in Lieu of Reading/Language Arts Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of recently arrived LEP students (as defined in 34 C.F.R. Part 200.6(b)(4)) included in the participation counts in 1.2.3 and 1.3.2.1 who took an assessment of English language proficiency in lieu of the State's reading/language arts assessment, as permitted under 34 C.F.R. Part 200.20.

Recently arrived LEP students who took an assessment of English language proficiency in lieu of the State's reading/language arts assessment	
--	--

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.

Note: For this question only, report on students with disabilities (*IDEA*) who are also LEP students in the U.S. less than 12 months who took the ELP in lieu of the statewide reading/language arts assessment.

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	713	11.23
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	3,729	58.73
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.00
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	1,340	21.11
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	567	8.93
LEP < 12 months, took ELP		
Total	6,349	////////////////////

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. 4/15/2013 per ND ED Facts Coordinator Data resubmitted for C175, 178, 179, 185, 188 & 189. Changes to student counts should now be corrected.

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	S	21,276	>=99
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	1,890	>=99
Asian	S	321	>=99
Black or African American	S	543	>=99
Hispanic or Latino	S	483	>=99
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	S	18,039	>=99
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	S	2,576	>=99
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	559	>=99
Economically disadvantaged students	S	6,927	>=99
Migratory students	S	34	>=90
Male	S	10,874	>=99
Female	S	10,402	>=99
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. 4/15/2013 per ND EDFacts Coordinator Data resubmitted for C175, 178, 179, 185, 188 & 189. Changes to student counts should now be corrected.			

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	259	10.05
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	1,782	69.18
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.00
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	298	11.57
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	237	9.20
Total	2,576	////////////////////
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. 4/15/2013 per ND EDFacts Coordinator Data resubmitted for C175, 178, 179, 185, 188 & 189. Changes to student counts should now be corrected.		

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

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

Note: States are not required to report these data by the seven (7) racial/ethnic groups; instead, they are required to report these data by the major racial and ethnic groups that are identified in their Accountability Workbooks. The charts below display racial/ethnic data that has been mapped back from the major racial and ethnic groups identified in their workbooks, to the 7 racial/ethnic groups to allow for the examination of data across states.

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	7,202	S	88
American Indian or Alaska Native	668	S	68
Asian	129	S	85
Black or African American	220	S	76
Hispanic or Latino	214	S	78
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	5,971	S	91
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	914	S	72
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	258	S	55
Economically disadvantaged students	2,725	S	79
Migratory students	S	S	N<
Male	3,696	S	88
Female	3,506	S	87
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Data has been checked where warnings occur-no resolution required The State does not collect data on the race/ethnicity "Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander" The State does not collect data on the race/ethnicity "Two or more races" 4/15/2013 - per ND EDFacts Coordinator Data resubmitted for C175, 178, 179, 185, 188 & 189. Changes to student counts should now be corrected.			

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	7,198	S	79
American Indian or Alaska Native	670	S	58
Asian	126	S	71
Black or African American	218	S	66
Hispanic or Latino	214	S	66
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	5,970	S	83
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	911	S	64
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	253	S	38
Economically disadvantaged students	2,720	S	70
Migratory students	S	S	N<
Male	3,695	S	77
Female	3,503	S	82
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Data has been checked where warnings occur-no resolution required The State does not collect data on the race/ethnicity "Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander" The State does not collect data on the race/ethnicity "Two or more races" 4/15/2013 - per ND EDFacts Coordinator Data resubmitted for C175, 178, 179, 185, 188 & 189. Changes to student counts should now be corrected.			

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			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. North Dakota assessment in science is administered at grades 4, 8, and 11 only.

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	6,972	S	84
American Indian or Alaska Native	679	S	63
Asian	112	S	81
Black or African American	218	S	72
Hispanic or Latino	203	S	73
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	5,760	S	87
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	892	S	72
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	207	S	46
Economically disadvantaged students	2,627	S	76
Migratory students	20	S	65
Male	3,544	S	85
Female	3,428	S	83
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Data has been checked where warnings occur-no resolution required The State does not collect data on the race/ethnicity "Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander" The State does not collect data on the race/ethnicity "Two or more races" 4/15/2013 - per ND EDFacts Coordinator Data resubmitted for C175, 178, 179, 185, 188 & 189. Changes to student counts should now be corrected.			

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	6,959	S	77
American Indian or Alaska Native	681	S	53
Asian	100	S	78
Black or African American	216	S	65
Hispanic or Latino	203	S	63
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	5,759	S	81
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	888	S	63
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	189	S	33
Economically disadvantaged students	2,614	S	67
Migratory students	18	S	50
Male	3,537	S	74
Female	3,422	S	80
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Data has been checked where warnings occur-no resolution required The State does not collect data on the race/ethnicity "Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander" The State does not collect data on the race/ethnicity "Two or more races" 4/15/2013 - per ND EDFacts Coordinator Data resubmitted for C175, 178, 179, 185, 188 & 189. Changes to student counts should now be corrected.			

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	6,961	S	65
American Indian or Alaska Native	678	S	38
Asian	109	S	61
Black or African American	217	S	44
Hispanic or Latino	202	S	46
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	5,755	S	69
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	888	S	50
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	203	S	22
Economically disadvantaged students	2,619	S	53
Migratory students	19	S	42
Male	3,539	S	66
Female	3,422	S	63
<p>Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Data has been checked where warnings occur--no resolution required</p> <p>The State does not collect data on the race/ethnicity "Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander"</p> <p>The State does not collect data on the race/ethnicity "Two or more races"</p> <p>4/15/2013 - per ND EDFacts Coordinator</p> <p>Data resubmitted for C175, 178, 179, 185, 188 & 189. Changes to student counts should now be corrected.</p>			

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	7,000	S	81
American Indian or Alaska Native	691	S	58
Asian	96	S	81
Black or African American	197	S	64
Hispanic or Latino	201	S	69
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	5,815	S	84
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	966	S	68
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	187	S	42
Economically disadvantaged students	2,641	S	71
Migratory students	11	S	>=80
Male	3,585	S	80
Female	3,415	S	81
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Data has been checked where warnings occur-no resolution required The State does not collect data on the race/ethnicity "Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander" The State does not collect data on the race/ethnicity "Two or more races" 4/15/2013 - per ND EDFacts Coordinator Data resubmitted for C175, 178, 179, 185, 188 & 189. Changes to student counts should now be corrected.			

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	6,997	S	77
American Indian or Alaska Native	693	S	53
Asian	94	S	71
Black or African American	194	S	63
Hispanic or Latino	203	S	64
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	5,813	S	81
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	967	S	65
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	186	S	31
Economically disadvantaged students	2,638	S	67
Migratory students	14	S	50
Male	3,580	S	74
Female	3,417	S	81
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Data has been checked where warnings occur-no resolution required The State does not collect data on the race/ethnicity "Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander" The State does not collect data on the race/ethnicity "Two or more races" 4/15/2013 - per ND EDFacts Coordinator Data resubmitted for C175, 178, 179, 185, 188 & 189. Changes to student counts should now be corrected.			

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			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. North Dakota assessment in science is administered at grades 4, 8, and 11 only.

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	6,859	S	81
American Indian or Alaska Native	654	S	54
Asian	78	S	79
Black or African American	208	S	59
Hispanic or Latino	193	S	63
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	5,726	S	85
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	935	S	61
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	161	S	28
Economically disadvantaged students	2,436	S	69
Migratory students	S	S	N<
Male	3,530	S	81
Female	3,329	S	80
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Data has been checked where warnings occur-no resolution required The State does not collect data on the race/ethnicity "Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander" The State does not collect data on the race/ethnicity "Two or more races" 4/15/2013 - per ND EDFacts Coordinator Data resubmitted for C175, 178, 179, 185, 188 & 189. Changes to student counts should now be corrected.			

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	6,849	S	72
American Indian or Alaska Native	654	S	45
Asian	76	S	72
Black or African American	206	S	54
Hispanic or Latino	195	S	55
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	5,718	S	76
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	929	S	54
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	156	S	22
Economically disadvantaged students	2,427	S	59
Migratory students	S	S	N<
Male	3,526	S	68
Female	3,323	S	76
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Data has been checked where warnings occur-no resolution required The State does not collect data on the race/ethnicity "Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander" The State does not collect data on the race/ethnicity "Two or more races" 4/15/2013 - per ND EDFacts Coordinator Data resubmitted for C175, 178, 179, 185, 188 & 189. Changes to student counts should now be corrected.			

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			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. North Dakota assessment in science is administered at grades 4, 8, and 11 only.

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	7,288	S	79
American Indian or Alaska Native	676	S	47
Asian	101	S	73
Black or African American	192	S	61
Hispanic or Latino	177	S	68
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	6,142	S	83
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	967	S	53
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	187	S	22
Economically disadvantaged students	2,576	S	67
Migratory students	12	S	58
Male	3,731	S	78
Female	3,557	S	79
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Data has been checked where warnings occur-no resolution required The State does not collect data on the race/ethnicity "Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander" The State does not collect data on the race/ethnicity "Two or more races" 4/15/2013 - per ND EDFacts Coordinator Data resubmitted for C175, 178, 179, 185, 188 & 189. Changes to student counts should now be corrected.			

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	7,277	S	76
American Indian or Alaska Native	676	S	51
Asian	92	S	67
Black or African American	190	S	62
Hispanic or Latino	176	S	64
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	6,143	S	80
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	966	S	58
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	176	S	19
Economically disadvantaged students	2,567	S	66
Migratory students	12	S	58
Male	3,726	S	73
Female	3,551	S	81
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Data has been checked where warnings occur-no resolution required The State does not collect data on the race/ethnicity "Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander" The State does not collect data on the race/ethnicity "Two or more races" 4/15/2013 - per ND EDFacts Coordinator Data resubmitted for C175, 178, 179, 185, 188 & 189. Changes to student counts should now be corrected.			

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			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. North Dakota assessment in science is administered at grades 4, 8, and 11 only.

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	7,333	S	72
American Indian or Alaska Native	711	S	41
Asian	104	S	63
Black or African American	187	S	45
Hispanic or Latino	163	S	57
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	6,168	S	77
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	956	S	47
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	199	S	15
Economically disadvantaged students	2,497	S	57
Migratory students	S	S	N<
Male	3,743	S	72
Female	3,590	S	72
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Data has been checked where warnings occur-no resolution required The State does not collect data on the race/ethnicity "Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander" The State does not collect data on the race/ethnicity "Two or more races" 4/15/2013 - per ND EDFacts Coordinator Data resubmitted for C175, 178, 179, 185, 188 & 189. Changes to student counts should now be corrected.			

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	7,327	S	72
American Indian or Alaska Native	712	S	48
Asian	98	S	69
Black or African American	188	S	53
Hispanic or Latino	162	S	64
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	6,167	S	75
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	953	S	51
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	192	S	20
Economically disadvantaged students	2,487	S	59
Migratory students	S	S	N<
Male	3,741	S	68
Female	3,586	S	76
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Data has been checked where warnings occur-no resolution required The State does not collect data on the race/ethnicity "Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander" The State does not collect data on the race/ethnicity "Two or more races" 4/15/2013 - per ND EDFacts Coordinator Data resubmitted for C175, 178, 179, 185, 188 & 189. Changes to student counts should now be corrected.			

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	7,321	S	63
American Indian or Alaska Native	708	S	30
Asian	104	S	54
Black or African American	186	S	31
Hispanic or Latino	162	S	45
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	6,161	S	68
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	953	S	40
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	196	S	8
Economically disadvantaged students	2,487	S	46
Migratory students	S	S	N<
Male	3,736	S	65
Female	3,585	S	60
<p>Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Data has been checked where warnings occur--no resolution required</p> <p>The State does not collect data on the race/ethnicity "Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander"</p> <p>The State does not collect data on the race/ethnicity "Two or more races"</p> <p>4/15/2013 - per ND EDFacts Coordinator</p> <p>Data resubmitted for C175, 178, 179, 185, 188 & 189. Changes to student counts should now be corrected.</p>			

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	6,998	S	58
American Indian or Alaska Native	505	S	31
Asian	108	S	61
Black or African American	139	S	26
Hispanic or Latino	119	S	39
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	6,127	S	61
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	734	S	28
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	161	S	9
Economically disadvantaged students	1,822	S	39
Migratory students	S	S	N<
Male	3,602	S	59
Female	3,396	S	56
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Data has been checked where warnings occur-no resolution required The State does not collect data on the race/ethnicity "Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander" The State does not collect data on the race/ethnicity "Two or more races" 4/15/2013 - per ND EDFacts Coordinator Data resubmitted for C175, 178, 179, 185, 188 & 189. Changes to student counts should now be corrected.			

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	7,004	S	66
American Indian or Alaska Native	507	S	38
Asian	103	S	66
Black or African American	140	S	37
Hispanic or Latino	119	S	50
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	6,135	S	70
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	735	S	35
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	157	S	8
Economically disadvantaged students	1,821	S	51
Migratory students	S	S	N<
Male	3,605	S	62
Female	3,399	S	71
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Data has been checked where warnings occur-no resolution required The State does not collect data on the race/ethnicity "Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander" The State does not collect data on the race/ethnicity "Two or more races" 4/15/2013 - per ND EDFacts Coordinator Data resubmitted for C175, 178, 179, 185, 188 & 189. Changes to student counts should now be corrected.			

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	6,994	S	62
American Indian or Alaska Native	504	S	31
Asian	108	S	58
Black or African American	140	S	31
Hispanic or Latino	119	S	40
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White	6,123	S	66
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	735	S	32
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	160	S	6
Economically disadvantaged students	1,821	S	45
Migratory students	S	S	N<
Male	3,599	S	65
Female	3,395	S	58
<p>Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Data has been checked where warnings occur--no resolution required</p> <p>The State does not collect data on the race/ethnicity "Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander"</p> <p>The State does not collect data on the race/ethnicity "Two or more races"</p> <p>4/15/2013 - per ND EDFacts Coordinator</p> <p>Data resubmitted for C175, 178, 179, 185, 188 & 189. Changes to student counts should now be corrected.</p>			

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 SY 2011-12. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2011-12	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2011-12
Schools	453	204	45.03
Districts	178	67	37.64

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

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 SY 2011-12. 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 2011-12	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2011-12
All Title I schools	297	147	49.49
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	112	40	35.71
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	185	107	57.84

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

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 2011-12. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds in SY 2011-12	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2011-12	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2011-12
160	53	33.12

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

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 2011-12 (based on SY 2010-11 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2011-12
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	17
Extension of the school year or school day	15
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	5
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	
Replacement of the principal	3
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	8
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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 2011-12 (based on SY 2010-11 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	13
Takeover the school by the State	
Other major restructuring of the school governance	9
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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.

Contract with an outside expert, NDMILE, and School Improvement Grants.

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 2011-12 (based on SY 2010-11 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 2011-12
Implemented a new curriculum based on State standards	17
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	8
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2010-11 and beginning of SY 2011-12 as a corrective action)	0
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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 2011-12 data and the results of those appeals.

//////////	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts	5	0
Schools	10	1
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2011-12 data was complete	05/21/12
---	----------

1.4.8 Sections 1003(a) and (g) School Improvement Funds

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 2011-12.

1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2011 (SY 2011-12) 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*: 4.00%

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

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

For SY 2011-12 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 ED Facts in Data Group 694, School improvement funds allocation table, from File Specification N/X132. You may review data submitted to ED Facts using the report named "Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Allocations to LEAs and Schools- CSPR 1.4.8.5.2 (EDEN012)" from the ED Facts 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 2011-12.

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.

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 2011-12 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.

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.

Public School Choice	# Students
Eligible for public school choice	4,179
Applied to transfer	38
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	20
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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*.

Transportation for Public School Choice	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$ 13,894

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.

Unable to Provide Public School Choice	# LEAs
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	38

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.

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

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*.

Supplemental Educational Services	# Students
Eligible for supplemental educational services	8,676
Applied for supplemental educational services	1,489
Received supplemental educational services	1,153
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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*.

Spending on Supplemental Educational Services	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$ 1,268,838
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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.

	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 <u>NOT</u> Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are <u>NOT</u> Highly Qualified
All classes	35,624	35,601	99.94	23	0.06
All elementary classes	15,315	15,315	100.00		
All secondary classes	20,309	20,286	99.89	23	0.11

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.

<p>The number of core academic classes taught by teachers who are not highly qualified is 0. This data was supplied by EDFacts.</p> <p>2-28-13</p> <p>The number of core academic classes taught by teachers who are not highly qualified is 23.</p> <p>The number of core academic classes taught by teachers who are not highly qualified is 0. ND does not have any teachers reported as not HQT for Elementary level, and the file specs do NOT require Zero counts.</p> <p>The number of core academic classes taught by teachers who are not highly qualified is 23. $35,624 - 35,601 = 23$.</p>

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.

Elementary School Classes	Percentage
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	
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	
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	
Other (please explain in comment box below)	
Total	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

In 2011-2012 all elementary teacher assignments met the provisions of HQT statewide.
--

Secondary School Classes	Percentage
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)	0.00
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	0.00
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	100.00
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.00
Total	100.00

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

In 2011-2012 the state identified twenty three secondary core classes that were not taught by HQT. 2-28-13 The 100% listed under "Other" should have been listed under "Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)". Please note this correction.

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.

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).

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 a different category in 1.5.3 than it would be in 1.5.1.

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	3,242	3,242	100.00
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	4,324	4,324	100.00
Secondary Schools			
High Poverty secondary Schools	2,942	2,937	99.83
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	6,360	6,355	99.92

1.5.3.1 Poverty Quartile Breaks

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	47.80	25.50
Poverty metric used	percentage of students on free and reduced lunch	
Secondary schools	45.20	23.90
Poverty metric used	percentage of students on free and reduced lunch	

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

- a. *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.
- b. *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.
- c. *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.
- d. *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/rcd/BE021775/Glossary_of_Terms.pdf.
2. **Other Language** = Name of the language of instruction, other than English, used in the programs.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Schools also offer ELL Push-in/ELL Co-teaching and ELL Newcomer Programs

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	3,562
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Number of ALL LEP students in the State	

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 Receiving Services	#
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	3,361
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. # LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	

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
Spanish; Castilian	837
Ojibwa	471
Nepali	303
Somali	302
North American Indian	246

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

North American Indian language is not an acceptable response. Please specify which North American Indian language is the fifth most commonly spoken language in the State.

2-19-13

The State has discussed this code with the program office and no change is needed.

1.6.3 Student Performance Data

This section collects data on LEP students' 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 and not tested on annual State English language proficiency (ELP) assessment (as defined in 1.6.2.1).

All LEP Testing	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	3,109
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	144
Total	3,253
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. North Dakota has a large ELL migrant population. These student are here during the school year, but are not enrolled during the test window. In order to compare the number tested to the total number of ELLs, it would be more accurate to compare the number tested and the total from 1.6.3.1.1. This calculation would reflect the same student group and would allow a comparison between the number of ELL students tested and the number of ELL students enrolled.	

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

All LEP Results	#
Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	534
Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	17.18
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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

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

Title III LEP Testing	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	2,946
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	119
Total	3,065
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. North Dakota has a large ELL migrant population. These student are here during the school year, but are not enrolled during the test window. In order to compare the number tested to the total number of Title III ELLs, it would be more accurate to compare the number tested and the total from 1.6.3.2.1. This calculation would reflect the same student group and would allow a comparison between the number of Title III ELL students tested and the number of Title III ELL students enrolled.	

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 and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO 1. Report this number ONLY if the State did not include these students in establishing AMAO 1/ making progress target and did not include them in the calculations for AMAO 1/ making progress (# and % making progress).

Title III First Time Tested	#
Number of Title III students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time whose progress cannot be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO 1.	691

1.6.3.2.2 Title III LEP English Language Proficiency Results

This section collects information on Title III LEP students' development of English and attainment of English proficiency.

Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:

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

Title III Results	Results #	Results %	Targets #	Targets %
Making progress	1,598	70.86	0	53.00
Attained proficiency	518	17.58	0	12.00
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Making progress: Targets # is .2 Proficiency Level Growth Attained proficiency: 5.0 Overall Proficiency Level and minimum of 3.5 on subtests Reading, Writing, Listening and Speaking				

1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments

This section collects data on LEP students assessed in their native language (Section 1111(b)(6)) to be used for AYP determinations.

1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language

In the table below, check "Yes" if the specified assessment is used for AYP purposes.

State offers the State reading/language arts content tests in the students' native language(s).	<input type="checkbox"/> No
State offers the State mathematics content tests in the students' native language(s).	<input type="checkbox"/> No
State offers the State science content tests in the students' native language(s).	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.6.3.5.2 Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given

In the table below, report the language(s) in which native language assessments are given for *ESEA* accountability determinations for mathematics.

Language(s)
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

1.6.3.5.3 Native Language of Reading/Language Arts Tests Given

In the table below, report the language(s) in which native language assessments are given for *ESEA* accountability determinations for reading/language arts.

Language(s)
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

1.6.3.5.4 Native Language of Science Tests Given

In the table below, report the language(s) in which native language assessments are given for *ESEA* accountability determinations for science.

Language(s)
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

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 (MFLEP) students include:

- Students who have transitioned out of a language instruction educational program.
- 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
196	80	276
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

1.6.3.6.2 MFLEP Students Results for Mathematics

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 out of language instruction educational programs 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 who did not score proficient on the State annual mathematics assessment. This will be automatically calculated.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
276	S	71	S
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.6.3.6.3 MFLEP Students Results for Reading/Language Arts

In the table below, report results for MFLEP students who took the annual reading/language arts assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned out of language instruction educational programs 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. This will be automatically calculated.
4. **# Below proficient** = State-aggregated number MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
276	S	67	S
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.6.3.6.4 MFLEP Students Results for Science

In the table below, report results for MFLEP students who took the annual science assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned out of language instruction educational programs and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are MFLEP 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. This will be automatically calculated.
4. **# Below proficient** = State-aggregated number MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual science assessment.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
152	S	49	S
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

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.)

Title III Subgrantees	#
# - Total number of subgrantees for the year	10
////////////////////////////////////	
# - Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	1
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	7
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	7
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	1
////////////////////////////////////	
# - 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 2010-11 and 2011-12)	1
# - Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2011-12 for not meeting Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years	1
# - Number of subgrantees that have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2008-09, 2009-10, 2010-11, and 2011-12)	5

Provide information on how the State counted consortia members in the total number of subgrantees and in each of the numbers in table 1.6.4.1.

The response is limited to 4,000 characters

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The AMAO subgrantee performance is reported on the LEA level. In 2011-12 North Dakota had 6 individual districts and 4 consortium subgrantees that participated in the Title III program for a total of 46 districts. Generally there are one or two districts within each consortium that are not meeting any of the AMAOs. Most often, the other districts within a consortium are meeting AMAO1 & 2 but they are not meeting AMAO3. The Title III program in North Dakota continues to grow, adding eight districts and two subgrantees since 2010-11.

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	_____ No
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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 <u>or</u> activities terminated for failure to reach program goals?	_____ N
If yes, provide the number of language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> activities for immigrant children and youth terminated.	
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students

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

Note: All immigrant students are not LEP 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 only 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
743	743	4

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.

1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development

This section collects data on teachers in Title III language instruction educational 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) v The term 'Language instruction educational program' means an instruction course v (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 as a second language.

Title III Teachers	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	70
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	60

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.

The state has recommended a caseload of 25-40 students per ELL teacher. North Dakota would need an additional 60 teachers to reach this goal.

* 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 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 and 1.6.4.)
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	9	////////////////////////////////////
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	8	////////////////////////////////////
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	8	////////////////////////////////////
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	6	////////////////////////////////////
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	4	////////////////////////////////////
Other (Explain in comment box)	2	////////////////////////////////////
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	9	218
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	10	92
PD provided to principals	9	45
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	7	62
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	5	45
PD provided to community based organization personnel	2	93
Total	42	555

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 submitted using the MM/DD/YY format.

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 2011-12 funds July 1, 2011, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2011, for SY 2011-12 programs. Then the "# of days/\$\$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
07/01/11	08/01/11	30
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

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.

Beginning in 2012-13, LEAs will submit their applications electronically on the consolidated application.

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	#
Persistently Dangerous Schools	0
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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 automatically calculated.

LEAs	#	# LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	176	176
LEAs with subgrants	5	5
Total	181	181
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

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 <u>Enrolled</u> in Public School in LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths <u>Enrolled</u> in Public School in LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	1	13
K	61	225
1	53	202
2	48	183
3	34	175
4	42	159
5	27	166
6	24	168
7	34	158
8	28	152
9	37	148
10	47	141
11	35	138
12	47	166
Ungraded		
Total	518	2,194

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Per the EDFacts Coordinator We do not use the value UG (Ungraded) as it is not collected in ND. Per the file spec, zero counts are NOT required for 118 (LEA), and therefore have been left out of the file. See ticket #184179, ND was told we DO NOT need to re-submit LEA level file with zero counts for Ungraded!

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.

Primary Nighttime Residence	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	14	175
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	103	1,058
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	77	420
Hotels/Motels	19	477
Total	213	2,130

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. One district was allowed to select an unacceptable residence as primary residence. This option was removed but somehow reappeared. The district is correcting their data as well as our MIS unit is looking into data collection issue.
3-4-13
North Dakota Department of public Instruction is in the process of implementing validation errors in our homeless data collection process ensuring complete data collection for 2012-2013.

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 Birth Through 2	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	13
K	204
1	192
2	165
3	170
4	154
5	158
6	158
7	150
8	146
9	141
10	133
11	127
12	159
Ungraded	0
Total	2,070

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Per the EDFacts Coordinator ND added zero filled category for "Ungraded", and discovered a programming error that was fixed so "Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)" now shows up.

"Age Birth Through 2" is not required for submission on the C043 (SEA level) file, see file specs. ND does not have child counts to report for that category.

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.

Subgroup	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied homeless youth	69
Migratory children/youth	0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	373
Limited English Proficient (LEP) students	56
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.9.3 Academic Achievement of Homeless Students

The following questions collect data on the academic achievement of enrolled homeless children and youths.

1.9.3.1 Reading Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of enrolled homeless children and youths 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/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient
3	129	85
4	116	81
5	106	75
6	42	22
7	50	37
8	43	21
High School	30	15

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. 4/15/2013 per ND EDFacts Coordinator Data resubmitted for C175, 178, 179, 185, 188 & 189. Changes to student counts should now be corrected.

1.9.3.2 Mathematics Assessment

This section is similar to 1.9.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State mathematics assessment.

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient
3	129	103
4	116	94
5	107	67
6	42	27
7	50	30
8	42	20
High School	29	12

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. 4/15/2013 per ND EDFacts Coordinator Data resubmitted for C175, 178, 179, 185, 188 & 189. Changes to student counts should now be corrected.

1.9.3.3 Science Assessment

This section is similar to 1.9.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State science assessment.

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient
3		
4	115	71
5		
6		
7		
8	42	14
High School	29	15

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. 4/15/2013 per ND EDFacts Coordinator Data resubmitted for C175, 178, 179, 185, 188 & 189. Changes to student counts should now be corrected.

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, 2011 through August 31, 2012. 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:

- a. *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.
- b. *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, 2011 through August 31, 2012. 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)	51
K	43
1	46
2	45
3	37
4	42
5	39
6	31
7	43
8	42
9	39
10	16
11	14
12	15
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	503
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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.

Once again the decrease is due to many families during the 11-12 school year were not making a qualifying move due to the economy. More migrant families are settling out; therefore, North Dakota is finding that many of the families three year eligibility expired and no longer qualifying the families as migrant status. Also some of our migrant families are ending their many years of migratory work and are going to work in the North Dakota oil fields.

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, 2011 through August 31, 2012. 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)	43
K	25
1	25
2	21
3	17
4	27
5	22
6	17
7	21
8	20
9	14
10	3
11	3
12	3
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	261
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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.

The North Dakota summer migrant education program has found that once again our migrant families are ending their many years of migratory work and are finding work in the North Dakota oil fields.

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 11-12 Category 1 and Category 2 child counts.

The state of North Dakota used the MIS 2000 system to compile and generate 11-12 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.

2-27-13

North Dakota uses the National C.O.E.

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.

2-27-13

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 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 program administrator 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
- 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 (9/1/11 - 8/31/12). 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 9/1/11- 8/31/12. 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 2012 if a family made a move in 2010, 2011, 2012 and any move after September 1, 2009 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 9/1/11 - 8/31/12. 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 project coordinators at the migrant sites. At the state office, the records are reviewed by the migrant program administrator and the data entry specialist. At that time, if any questions regarding eligibility are determined, the migrant program administrator will contact the migrant sites and request verification of eligibility before the child is entered into the MIS 2000 system.

All student eligibility is based on a personal interview with a parent or guardian. North Dakota also conducts an annual recruiter training in April. This training consists of eligibility requirements which include eligibility definition, economic necessity, temporary vs. seasonal and processing etc. At this meeting the recruiters are also provided a written eligibility handbook. The SEA periodically evaluates the effectiveness of recruitment efforts and revised procedures.

Data entry personnel are provided training once a year on how to review summer/inter-session site records, input data, and run reports used for child count purposes.

2-27-13

Yes the state of North Dakota uses the National C.O.E. statewide.

Yes the SEA yearly evaluates the effectiveness of recruitment efforts and revises procedures accordingly.

Yes the SEA reviews eligibility documentation as part of the regular monitoring.

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.

All migrant families and all summer migrant students that attended the 2012 North Dakota summer migrant education program are included in the eligibility determination sampling. All of our families qualified for migrant services.

The corrective action that the state of North Dakota has in place requires documentation of a qualifying move and a qualifying agricultural activity by all summer migrant families. This process has greatly improved the accuracy of our states' eligibility results. As stated earlier, without documentation showing that the migrant family indeed made a qualifying move or if the families cannot 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 95% 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 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.

Examples of the documentation are as follows: school records, rental agreements, social service documents etc. If no documentation was brought by the migrant families, or if no move is found on MSIX the children will not be enrolled in the summer migrant program.

2-27-13

As I stated our re-interviewing is done at the time of interviewing because this is also when documentation must be provided to the recruiter showing that the family has made a qualifying move. This process is always conducted face-to-face.

The standard instrument used requires documentation of a qualifying move and a qualifying agricultural activity by all summer migrant families.

This protocol has greatly improved the accuracy of our states' eligibility results. As stated earlier, without documentation showing that the migrant family indeed made a qualifying move or if the families cannot show documentation the migrant students are not allowed to participate in the North Dakota summer migrant education program.

The guidance provided is each family must provide documentation that the family made a move. For example the documentation must be school records, rental agreements social service documents, utility bill etc.

Almost 95% 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 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. North Dakota does not receive a huge grant for the migrant program. The state continues to look at ways to save money so that more funds can be geared toward education for the summer migrant program. By using this process North Dakota has more funds to provide a strong education program for our migrant students.

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.

2-27-13

The procedure the state has in place is the state migrant program administrator reviews every C.O.E. that is inputted and updated. The state migrant program administrator also reviews all documentation showing that the migrant families did make a qualifying move. Please keep in mind the state of North Dakota has only around three hundred migrant students and 95% of these students leave and return every year. North Dakota has only two migrant centers therefore it is very easy to contact the centers by phone fax or email to ensure any questions that may occur.

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.

2-27-13

North Dakota is a very small state; therefore, we have a unit director. The unit director oversees Title I part A, ELL, 21st Century and Migrant Education. The unit director therefore assigns program administrators to oversee these federal programs. I work very closely with the unit director regarding child count, comparing counts to previous years, expectations for the current year and all other data tables in the performance report to assess accurate count for the North Dakota migrant education program.

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 requires 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 families 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 95% 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.

Because of operating only two seven week summer migrant program and the size of the North Dakota summer migrant programs our state feels very confident about the accuracy of the 2012 reported child counts and the eligibility of the migrant families.