

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART II

For reporting on
School Year 2003-2004



PART II DUE APRIL 15, 2005

**I. Improving Basic Programs
Operated by Local Educational Agencies (Title I, Part A)**

A. Student Achievement and High-Poverty Schools

1. Please provide the number of public schools with poverty rates of 40% or greater reporting an increase in the number of students performing at the proficient or advanced levels of student achievement in **reading/language arts** as measured by State assessments administered in the 2003-2004 school year as compared to assessments administered in the 2002-2003 school year. ____78 (48.45%)__

2. Please provide the number of public schools with poverty rates of 40% or greater reporting an increase in the number of students performing at the proficient or advanced levels of student achievement in **mathematics** as measured by State assessments administered in the 2003-2004 school year as compared to assessments administered in the 2002-2003 school year. ____89 (55.28%)__

B. Title I, Part A Schools by Type of Program

For the 2003-2004 school year, please provide the following:

- | | |
|---|-----------|
| 1. Total Number of Title I schools in the State | ____365__ |
| 2. Total Number of Title I Targeted Assistance Schools in the State | ____326__ |
| 3. Total Number of Title I Schoolwide Program Schools in the State | ____39__ |

C. Title I, Part A Student Participation**1. Student Participation in Title I, Part A by Special Services/Programs and Racial/Ethnic Groups**

In the following tables, please provide the *unduplicated* number of children participating in Title I, Part A in the State by special services/programs and racial/ethnic groups during the 2003-2004 school year. Count a child only once (*unduplicated* count) in each category even if the child participated during more than one term or in more than one school or district in the State during the reporting period. Include students in both Title I schoolwide and targeted assistance programs.

Student Participation in Title I, A by Special Services or Programs 2003-2004 School Year	
	Number of Students Served
Students with Disabilities	4,089
Limited English Proficient	1,281
Homeless	11
Migrant	100

Student Participation in Title I, A by Racial or Ethnic Group 2003-2004 School Year	
	Number of Students Served
American Indian/Alaskan Native	5,512
Asian/Pacific Islander	148
Black, non-Hispanic	444
Hispanic	529
White, non-Hispanic	13,084

Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

2. Student Participation in Title I, Part A by Grade Level

Title I, Part A student participation counts by grade and by public, private and local neglected should be reported as *unduplicated* counts. Please enter the number of participants by grade in Title I public targeted assistance programs (TAS), Title I schoolwide *programs* (SWP), private school students participating in Title I programs, and students served in Part A local neglected programs during the 2003-2004 school year.

Student Participation in Title I, Part A by Grade Level 2003-2004 School Year						
	Public TAS	Public SWP	Private	Local Neglected	Total	Percent of Total
Age 0-2						
Age 3-5		62			62	0.3
K	555	934	25		1,514	7.68
1	1,499	951	79	4	2,529	12.83
2	1,300	900	54	1	2,254	11.43
3	1,200	895	59	2	2,154	10.92
4	1,079	983	54	3	2,116	10.73
5	969	1,004	35	0	2,008	10.18
6	795	1,062	28	7	1,885	9.56
7	568	719	12	13	1,299	6.59
8	491	719	6	20	1,216	6.17
9	254	684		42	938	4.76
10	190	496		40	686	3.48
11	114	442		26	556	2.82
12	73	427		19	500	2.54
Ungraded						
TOTALS	9,087	10,278	352	177	19,717	99.99

3. Student Participation in Title I, Part A Targeted Assistance Programs by Instructional and Support Services

In the following chart, please provide the number of students receiving instructional and support services funded by Title I, A in targeted assistance (TAS) programs during the 2003-2004 school year.

Student Participation in Title I, A Targeted Assistance (TAS) Programs by Instructional and Support Services 2003-2004 School Year	
Instructional Services	
	Number of Students Served
Mathematics	4,096
Reading/Language Arts	7,148
Science	244
Social Studies	228
Vocational/Career	
Other (specify)	9
Support Services	
Health, Dental, and Eye Care	
Supporting Guidance/Advocacy	
Other (specify)	

C. Staff Information for Title I, Part A Targeted Assistance Programs

In the following chart, please provide the number of full-time equivalent (FTE) staff funded through Title I, A targeted assistance (TAS) programs during the 2003-2004 school year by job category. For administrators and supervisors who service both targeted assistance and schoolwide programs, report the FTE attributable to their TAS duties only.

Staff Information for Title I, A Targeted Assistance Programs 2003-2004 School Year	
	Number of Title I Targeted Assistance Program FTE Staff
Administrators (non-clerical)	27
Teachers	428
Teacher Aides	159
Support Staff (clerical and non-clerical)	10
Other (specify)	15

**II. William F. Goodling Even Start Family Literacy Programs
(Title I, Part B, Subpart 3)****A. Subgrants and Even Start Program Participants**

For the 2003-2004 school year, please provide the following information:

1. Federally Funded Even Start Subgrants in the State

a. Number of federally funded Even Start subgrants in the State
_____9_____

2. Even Start Families Participating

("Participating" means participating in all applicable core services.)

a. Total number of families served
_____233_____

b. Total number of adults participating
("Adults" includes teen parents.)
_____290_____

c. Total number of adults who are English language learners
_____53_____

d. Total number of children participating
_____379_____

3. Characteristics of newly enrolled families at the time of enrollment

(A newly enrolled family means a family who is enrolled for the first time in Even Start at any time during the year.)

a. Number of newly enrolled families
_____151_____

b. Number of newly enrolled adult participants
_____163_____

c. Percent of newly enrolled families at or below the
Federal Poverty level
_____70%_____

d. Percent of newly enrolled adult participants without a

high school diploma or GED
____74%_____

e. Percent of newly enrolled adult participants who have
not gone beyond the 9th grade
____32%_____

4. Percent of families that have remained in the program

(Include families that are newly enrolled and those that are continuing.)

a. From 0 to 3 months
____22%_____

b. From 4 to 6 months
____17%_____

c. From 7 to 12 months
____18%_____

d. More than 12 months
____33%_____

B. State Even Start Performance Indicators

Using the format of the table below, describe the State's progress in meeting its performance indicators developed under section 1240 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). Include all State indicators, as developed under section 1240, including both required and optional indicators. Provide any targets set, measures used and results for each indicator, as well as an assessment and explanation of progress. For targets with no set targets or standards, provide a descriptive assessment of progress. For indicators with more than one year of available data, please note the data in the results column and include trend information in the assessment of progress. Please indicate where data are not yet available.

Indicator <i>Name of required or optional indicator</i>	Target or Standards <i>Description of target or standard set by State of desired performance on indicator</i>	Measure <i>Measurement tool used to assess progress for indicator</i>	Result <i>Data for the current reporting year and trend data where available</i>	Assessment of Progress <i>Status of progress on indicator (1) Target met (2) Target not met</i>	Explanation of Progress <i>Description of why results were obtained</i>
EXAMPLE: Adult achievement in reading, writing, English language acquisition, problem solving and numeracy	EXAMPLE: 75% of adult learners will make a grade-level gain over a program year	EXAMPLE: Tests of Adult Basic Education (TABE)	EXAMPLE: 2001-2002: 45% of adult participants met target 2002-2003: 50% of adult participants met target	EXAMPLE: Target was not met in 2002-2003, but positive movement toward target was seen between 2001-2002 and 2002-2003.	EXAMPLE: Information on participation showed that only 50% of adult participants stayed in the program for 12 months. Participants who remained in the program for at least one full year were more likely to meet target. Of participants who remained in program for one full year, 70% met target as compared to only 40% of participants who remained in program for less than 12 months.
Objective 1: Participating adults will improve their	1.1 After a program year, 25% of Even Start participants	Even Start sites will ensure that Even Start participants	2000-2001: N/A 2001-2002: N/A 2002-2003: 17 students enrolled	1	50% of enrolled participants advanced one level in the Adult Education Performance Levels

literacy skills and life skills	enrolled in the adult education component for three months or more will advance one level in the Adult Education Performance Levels.	enrolled in the adult education component are identified on the Student Information Management System (SIMS)	and were identified on the SIMS 2003-2004: 72 students were identified on the SIMS		
	1.2 After a program year, 25% of Even Start participants enrolled in high school for three months or more will complete a minimum of two units with a GPA of 2.0 or more on a 4-point scale.	School records	2000-2001: 97.5% 2001-2002: 95% 2002-2003: 93% 2003-2004: 81%	1	See Below
	1.3 After a program year, 24% of Even Start participants enrolled in postsecondary education for a semester will complete a minimum of 6 semester credits with a GPT of 2.0	School records	2000-2001: 66.5% 2001-2002: 89% 2002-2003: 80% 2003-2004: 100%	1	See Below

	<p>or more on a 4-point scale.</p> <p>1.4 In each program year, 20% of adult Even start participants will be employed, enter postsecondary education, or enter job training.</p> <p>1.5 In each program year, 50% of Even Start participants who take the GED test will achieve a score to earn a high school equivalency diploma.</p> <p>1.6 In each program year, 15% of Even Start participants who are enrolled in high school will receive a high school diploma.</p>	<p>As shown by follow-up or by participant's self report.</p> <p>Testing Scores</p> <p>School records</p>	<p>2000-2001: 47.57%</p> <p>2001-2002: 58.38%</p> <p>2002-2003: 50%</p> <p>2003-2004: 100%</p> <p>2000-2001: 64.6%</p> <p>2001-2002: 90.13%</p> <p>2002-2003: 78%</p> <p>2003-2004: 67%</p> <p>2000-201: 55.33%</p> <p>2001-2002: 56%</p> <p>2002-2003: 65%</p> <p>2003-2004: N/A</p> <p>2000-2001: 94.83%</p> <p>2001-2002:</p>	<p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p>	<p>See Below</p> <p>See Below</p> <p>See Below</p> <p>See Below</p>
Participating	2.1 In each	As measured and		1	See Below

children will improve in reading readiness or reading skills.	program year, 90% of Even Start children will improve in literacy readiness or literacy level, consistent with or greater than developmental expectations, as measured by assessment and/or observations	documented by assessment tools used at each program site. Assessment may include (but is not limited to) parent survey, time parent spends reading to the child, checklist of readiness skills, etc.	93.5% 2002-2003: 83% 2003-2004: 89%		
	2.2 In each program year, 90% of Even Start school age children will have an attendance record with 10 or fewer days absent.	School records	2000-2001: 87.83% 2001-2002: 68.38% 2002-2003: 74% 2003-2004: 71%	2	See Below
	2.3 At the end of the program year, 90% of even Start school age children will be promoted to the next grade.	School records	2000-2001: 94.36% 2001-2001: 98% 2002-2003: 98% 2003-2004: 78%	2	See Below

According to the reports submitted, North Dakota Even Start sites were able to meet all of the performance indicators set, except for 2.2, and 2.3. Several sites did not collect some of the data required for Performance Indicator #1, specifically for items 1.1, 1.3, and 1.6.

Regarding 2.2 and 2.3, several of the sites are located on reservations where absenteeism is chronic. Lower numbers for those sites significantly affects the average for the state in an adverse manner.

C. Federal Even Start Performance Indicators

Using the format of the table below, describe the State's progress in meeting the federal performance indicators listed for Even Start participants in your State. States should report data if local projects are using the indicated measures and the state collects the data.

Indicator	Target <i>Baseline data will be set with the 2002-2003 data</i>	Measure <i>Measurement tool used to assess progress for indicator</i>	Cohort Number of participants to whom the indicator applies	Result <i>Number of participants who met the achievement goal</i>	Assessment of Progress <i>Status of progress on indicator: "Target met" or "Target not met"</i>	Explanation of Progress <i>Description of why results were obtained or not</i>
A. Percentage if adults showing significant learning gains on measures of reading		TABE:	TABE: 342	TABE: 116	TABE: Target not met	TABE:
B. Percentage of adults showing significant learning gains on measures of mathematics		TABE:	TABE: 279	TABE: 40	TABE: Target not met	TABE:
C. Percentage of LEP adults showing significant learning gains on measures of English language acquisition		Best	263	109		
D. Percentage of school age adults who earn		GED	269	219	Target met	

Indicator	Target <i>Baseline data will be set with the 2002-2003 data</i>	Measure <i>Measurement tool used to assess progress for indicator</i>	Cohort Number of participants to whom the indicator applies	Result <i>Number of participants who met the achievement goal</i>	Assessment of Progress <i>Status of progress on indicator: "Target met" or "Target not met"</i>	Explanation of Progress <i>Description of why results were obtained or not</i>
a high school diploma or GED						
E. Percentage of non- school age adults who earn a high school diploma or GED		GED	582	400	Target met	
F. Percentage of children entering kindergarten who are achieving significant learning gains on measures of language development		Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT) receptive: No data available Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT) expressive: No data available	Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT) receptive: No data available Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT) expressive: No data available	Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT) receptive: No data available Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT) expressive: No data available	Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT) receptive: No data available Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT) expressive: No data available	Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT) receptive: No data available Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT) expressive: No data available
G. Percentage of children entering kindergarten who are achieving significant learning gains on measures of reading readiness		Individual Growth Development Indicator (IGDI): No data available Head Start FACES Letter	Individual Growth Development Indicator (IGDI): No data available Head Start FACES Letter	Individual Growth Development Indicator (IGDI): No data available Head Start FACES Letter	Individual Growth Development Indicator (IGDI): No data available Head Start FACES Letter	Individual Growth Development Indicator (IGDI): No data available Head Start FACES Letter Naming Task: No data available

Indicator	Target <i>Baseline data will be set with the 2002-2003 data</i>	Measure <i>Measurement tool used to assess progress for indicator</i>	Cohort Number of participants to whom the indicator applies	Result <i>Number of participants who met the achievement goal</i>	Assessment of Progress <i>Status of progress on indicator: "Target met" or "Target not met"</i>	Explanation of Progress <i>Description of why results were obtained or not</i>
		Naming Task: No data available	Naming Task: No data available	Naming Task: No data available	Naming Task: No data available	
H. Percentage of school-aged children who are reading on grade level		Please indicate source. No data available	Please indicate source. No data available	Please indicate source. No data available	Please indicate source. No data available	Please indicate source. No data available
I. Percentage of parents who show improvement on measures of parental support for children's learning in the home, school environment, and through interactive learning activities		Parent Education Profile (PEP) No data available	Parent Education Profile (PEP) No data available	Parent Education Profile (PEP) No data available	Parent Education Profile (PEP) No data available	Parent Education Profile (PEP) No data available

**III. Education of Migratory Children
(Title I, Part C)**

Please complete the following tables for the Title I, Part C, Migrant Education Program.

General Data Reporting Information

1. The tables in this section contain annual performance report requirements for the Title I, Part C, Migrant Education Program (MEP) for reporting year 2003-2004.
2. Instructions for each table are provided just before the table.

INSTRUCTIONS: TABLE I. POPULATION DATA

Table I requires you to report the statewide *unduplicated* number of *eligible* migrant children by age/grade according to several descriptive categories. Include only *eligible* migrant children in the cells in this table. Within each row, count a child only once statewide (*unduplicated* count). Include children who changed ages (e.g., from 2 years to 3 years of age) or grades during the 2003-2004 reporting period in only the higher age/grade cell. For example, a child who turns three during the reporting year would only be counted in the Ages 3 – 5 cell. In all cases, the Total is the sum of the cells in a row.

TABLE I. POPULATION DATA		Ages 0-2	Ages 3-5	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Un-grad-ed	Out-of-school	Total
A. ELIGIBLE MIGRANT CHILDREN																			
1.	All Migrant Children Eligible for the MEP	133	119	61	50	42	44	39	31	38	27	26	18	12	10	7	4	0	661
B. PRIORITY FOR SERVICES																			
1.	All Migrant Children Eligible for MEP classified as having "Priority for Services"			58	49	38	42	35	31	37	25	25	17	12	10	7	4		390

TABLE I. POPULATION DATA		Ages 0-2	Ages 3-5	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Un- grad- ed	Out-of- school	Total
C. LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT (LEP)																			
1.	Migrant Children that are LEP		0	0	27	28	6	9	18	12	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	107
D. CHILDREN ENROLLED IN SPECIAL EDUCATION																			
1.	Migrant Children Enrolled in Special Education	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
E. MOBILITY																			
1.	Migrant Children with a Last Qualifying Move within 12 Months (Counting back from the Last Day of the Reporting Period)	120	106	58	49	38	42	35	31	37	25	25	17	12	10	7	4	0	616
2.	Migrant Children with a Last Qualifying Move within Previous 13 – 24 Months (Counting back from the Last Day of the Reporting Period)	12	11	3	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
3.	Migrant Children with a Last Qualifying Move within Previous 25 – 36 Months (Counting back from the Last Day of the Reporting Period)	2	2	0	0	3	1	3	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	15
4.	Migrant Children with any Qualifying Move within a Regular School Year (Count any Qualifying Move within the Previous 36 Months; counting back from the Last Day of the Reporting Period)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

INSTRUCTIONS: TABLE II. ACADEMIC STATUS

Table II asks for the statewide *unduplicated* number of *eligible* migrant children by age/grade according to several descriptive categories. Include only *eligible* migrant children in the cells in this table. Within each row, count a child only once statewide (*unduplicated* count).

Include children who changed grades during the 2003-2004 reporting period in only the higher age/grade cell. In all cases, the Total is the sum of the cells in a row.

TABLE II. ACADEMIC STATUS		Ages 0-2	Ages 3-5	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Un- grad- ed	Out- of- school	Total
F. HIGH SCHOOL COMPLETION -- (Note: Data on the high school completion <u>rate</u> and school dropout <u>rate</u> has been collected through Part I of the Consolidated State Performance Report.)																			
1.	<i>Dropped out of school</i>											0	0	0	0	0	0		0
2.	Obtained GED																		0
G. ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT -- (Note: The results of state assessments in mathematics and reading/language arts are collected in Part I of the Consolidated State Performance Report. However, information on the number of eligible migrant students who participated in the state assessment will be collected below.)																			
1.	Number of Migrant Students Enrolled During State Testing Window (State Assessment – Reading/Language Arts)						0	7	0	0	0	4		0	0	6	0		17
2.	Number of Migrant Students Tested in Reading/Language Arts (State Assessment)						0	6	0	0	0	3		0	0	6	0		15
3.	Number of Migrant Students Enrolled During State Testing Window (State Assessment – Mathematics)						0	7	0	0	0	4		0	0	6	0		17
4.	Number of Migrant Students Tested in Mathematics (State Assessment)						0	6	0	0	0	3		0	0	6	0		15

INSTRUCTION: TABLE III. H. MEP PARTICIPATION – REGULAR SCHOOL YEAR

Table III H. asks for the statewide, *unduplicated* number of children who were served by the MEP in the regular school year by age/grade according to several descriptive categories. Include children who changed ages, e.g., from 2 years to 3 years of age, or grades during the 2003-2004 reporting period in only the higher age/grade cell. Within each row, count a child only once statewide (*unduplicated* count). In all cases, the total is the sum of the cells in a row.

Participation information is required for children who received instructional or support services funded in whole or in part with MEP funds. DO NOT count migrant children served through a schoolwide program (SWP) where MEP funds were combined, in any row of this table.

Count only those children who were actually served; do not count unserved children. Include in this table all children who received a MEP-funded service, even those children continuing to receive services in the year after their eligibility ended, and those children previously eligible in secondary school and receiving credit-accrual services.

Served in a Regular School Year Project. Enter the number of children who participated in MEP-funded instructional or supportive service only. DO NOT include children who were served only by a “referred” service. Count a child only once statewide by age/grade in row 1 if he/she received any type of MEP-funded instructional or supportive service. Do not count the number of times an individual child received an instructional intervention.

Continuation of Services. In row 3, report only the numbers of children served under Sections 1304 (e) (2) – (3). Do not report in row 3 the children served in Sections 1304 (e) (1), children whose eligibility expired during the regular school year.

Instructional Services. For each listed instructional service, enter the number of children who participated in MEP-funded services. Count a child only once statewide by age/grade in row 4 if he/she received any type of MEP-funded instructional service (regardless whether provided by a teacher or paraprofessional). Count each child only once statewide in row 5, once in row 6, and once in row 7 if he/she received the MEP-funded instruction (and provided by a teacher) in the subject area noted. Do not count the number of times an individual child received an instructional intervention.

Support Services. For each listed support service, enter the number of children who participated in MEP-funded services. Count a child only once statewide by age/grade in row 8 if he/she received any type of MEP-funded supportive service. Count a child only once statewide in row 9 if he/she received the specific MEP supportive service noted (*i.e.*, do not count the number of service interventions per child).

Referred Services. Count a child only once statewide by age/grade in row 10 if he/she received a referred service. This is NOT a count of the referrals themselves, but instead represents the number of children who are placed in an educational or educationally-related service funded by another non-MEP program/organization that they would not have otherwise obtained without the efforts of MEP funds. (Do not count the number of service interventions per child).

TABLE III. MEP PARTICIPATION		Ages	Ages	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Un-	Out-	Total
		0-2	3-5														grad-	of-	
H. PARTICIPATION—REGULAR SCHOOL YEAR Does Not Apply, Summer Program Only																			
1.	Served in MEP (with an MEP-funded Instructional or Supportive Service Only -- do not include children served in a SWP where MEP funds are combined)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2.	Priority for Service			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
3.	Continuation of Service		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
4.	Any Instructional Service	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
5.	Reading Instruction	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
6.	Mathematics Instruction	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
7.	High School Credit Accrual													0	0	0	0		0
8.	Any Support Service	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
9.	Counseling Service	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
10.	Any Referred Service	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0

INSTRUCTIONS: TABLE III. I. MEP PARTICIPATION –SUMMER/INTERSESSION TERM

Table III I. asks for the statewide unduplicated number of children who were served by the MEP in a summer or intersession term by age/grade according to several descriptive categories. Include children who changed ages, e.g., from 2 years to 3 years of age in only in the higher age cell. Count summer/intersession students in the appropriate grade based on the promotion date definition used in your state. Within each row, count a child only once statewide (*unduplicated* count). In all cases, the Total is the sum of the cells in a row.

Participation information is required for children who received instructional or support services funded in whole or in part with MEP funds.

Count only those children who were actually served; do not count unserved children. Include in this table all children who received a MEP funded service, even children continuing to receive services in the year after their eligibility ended, and those children previously eligible in secondary school and receiving credit-accrual services.

Served in a Summer or Intersession Project. Enter the number of children who participated in MEP-funded instructional or supportive service only. DO NOT include children who were served only by a “referred” service. Count a child only once statewide by age/grade in row 1 if he/she received any type of MEP-funded instructional or supportive service. Do not count the number of times an individual child received an instructional intervention.

Continuation of Services. In row 3, report only the numbers of children served under Sections 1304 (e) (2) – (3). Do not report in row 3 the children served in Sections 1304 (e) (1), children whose eligibility expired during the summer term.

Instructional Services. For each listed instructional service, enter the number of children who participated in MEP-funded services. Count a child only once statewide by age/grade in row 4 if he/she received any type of MEP-funded instructional service (regardless whether provided by a teacher or paraprofessional). Count each child only once statewide in row 5, once in row 6, and once in row 7 if he/she received the MEP-funded instruction (and provided by a teacher) in the subject area noted. Do not count the number of times an individual child received an instructional intervention.

Support Services. For each listed support service, enter the number of children who participated in MEP-funded services. Count a child only once statewide by age/grade in row 8 if he/she received any type of MEP-funded supportive service. Count a child only once statewide in row 9 if he/she received the specific MEP supportive service noted (*i.e.*, do not count the number of service interventions per child).

Referred Services. Count a child only once statewide by age/grade in row 10 if he/she received a referred service. This is NOT a count of the referrals themselves, but instead represents the number of children who are placed in an educational or educationally-related service funded by another non-MEP program/organization that they would not have otherwise obtained without the efforts of MEP funds (*i.e.*, do not count the number of service interventions per child).

TABLE III. MEP PARTICIPATION		Ages	Ages	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Un-	Out-	Total
		0-2	3-5														grad-	of-	
I. PARTICIPATION—SUMMER TERM OR INTERSESSION																			
1. Served in MEP Summer or Intersession Project (with an Instructional or Supportive Service Only)	133	119	61	50	42	44	39	31	38	27	26	18	12	10	7	4	0	661	
2. Priority for Service			38	49	38	42	35	31	37	25	25	17	12	10	7	4		390	
3. Continuation of Service		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
4. Any Instructional Service	0	119	61	50	42	44	39	31	38	27	26	18	12	10	7	4	0	528	
5. Reading Instruction	0	119	61	50	42	44	39	31	38	27	26	18	12	10	7	4	0	528	
6. Mathematics Instruction	0	119	61	50	42	44	39	31	38	27	26	18	12	10	7	4	0	528	
7. High School Credit Accrual												6	4	4	1	0	0	15	
8. Any Support Service	133	119	61	50	42	44	39	31	38	27	26	18	12	10	7	4	0	661	
9. Counseling Service	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
10. Any Referred Service	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

INSTRUCTIONS: TABLE IV. SCHOOL DATA

Table IV asks for information on the number of schools and number of *eligible* migrant children who were enrolled in those schools.

In the first column of Table IV, enter the number of schools that enroll *eligible* migrant children during the regular school year. Schools include public schools, alternative schools, and private schools (that serve school-age children, i.e., grades K-12). In the second column, enter the number of *eligible* migrant children who were enrolled in these schools. In the second column, since more than one school in a State may enroll the same migrant child, the count of eligible children enrolled will be duplicated statewide.

TABLE IV. SCHOOL DATA		
J. STUDENT ENROLLMENT	NUMBER OF SCHOOLS	NUMBER OF MIGRANT CHILDREN ENROLLED
1. Schools Enrolling Migrant Children	a. 4	b. 661
2. Schools in Which MEP Funds are Combined in SWP	a. 0	b. 0

INSTRUCTIONS: TABLE V. K. MEP PROJECT DATA – TYPE OF MEP PROJECT

Enter the number of projects that are funded in whole or in part with MEP funds. A MEP project is the entity that receives MEP funds (by a subgrant from the State or through an intermediate entity that receives the subgrant) and provides services directly to the migrant child. **DO NOT** include *schoolwide* programs in which MEP were combined in any row of this table.

TABLE V. MEP PROJECT DATA		
K. TYPE OF MEP PROJECT	NUMBER OF MEP PROJECTS	NUMBER OF MIGRANT CHILDREN ENROLLED
1. MEP Projects: Regular School Year (All MEP Services Provided During the School Day Only)	a. 0	b. 0
2. MEP Projects: Regular School Year (Some or All MEP Services Provided During an Extended Day/Week)	a. 0	b. 0
3. MEP Projects: Summer/Intersession Only	a. 4	b. 661
4. MEP Projects: Year Round (All MEP Services Provided throughout the Regular School Year and Summer/Intersession Terms)	a. 0	b. 0

INSTRUCTIONS: TABLE V. L. MEP PROJECT DATA – KEY MEP PERSONNEL

For each school term, enter both the actual number and *full-time-equivalent* number of staff that are paid by the MEP. Report both the actual number and FTE number by job classification. For actual numbers, enter the total number of individuals who were employed in the appropriate job classification, regardless of the percentage of time the person was employed. For the FTE number, define how many full-time days constitute one *FTE* for each term in your state. (For example, one regular term FTE may equal 180 full-time (8 hour) work days, one summer term FTE may equal 30 full-time work days, and one *intersession* FTE may equal 45 full-time work days split between three 15-day non-contiguous blocks throughout the year.) Use only the percentage of an FTE paid by the MEP in calculating the total FTE numbers to be reported below for each job classification.

DO NOT include staff employed in *schoolwide* programs where MEP funds are combined with those of other programs.

TABLE V. MEP PROJECT DATA				
L. KEY MEP PERSONNEL	NUMBER OF MEP FUNDED STAFF IN REGULAR SCHOOL YEAR	FTE IN REGULAR SCHOOL YEAR 1 FTE = _____ Days	NUMBER OF MEP FUNDED STAFF IN SUMMER-TERM/ INTERSESSION	FTE IN SUMMER-TERM/ INTERSESSION 1 FTE = __36__ Days
1. State Director	a. 1	b. 0.5	c. 1	d. 0.5
2. Teachers	a. 0	b. 0	c. 44	d. 20.5
3. Counselors	a. 0	b. 0	c. 0	d. 0
4. All Paraprofessionals	a. 0	b. 0	c. 12	d. 6.5
5. "Qualified" Paraprofessionals	a. 0	b. 0	c. 1	d. 0.5
6. Recruiters	a. 0	b. 0	c. 5	d. 5.0
7. Records Transfer Staff	a. 0	b. 0	c. 3	d. 2.0

IV. Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent or At-Risk (Title I, Part D)

A. Student Participation in Title I, Part D by Racial/Ethnic Groups and Gender

In the following table, please provide the unduplicated number of children participating in Title I, Part D by racial/ethnic groups and gender during the 2003-2004 school year.

Student Participation in Title I, D by Racial or Ethnic Group 2003-2004 School Year	
	Number of Students
American Indian/Alaskan Native	
Asian/Pacific Islander	
Black, non-Hispanic	
Hispanic	
White, non-Hispanic	

Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

Student Participation in Title I, D by Gender 2003-2004 School Year	
	Number of Students
Male	
Female	

At the present time we do not collect this information in the State of North Dakota. However, please note that we have plans in place to add this information request as part of our final N & D report for the 2004-2005 school year.

B. Program Results

The first year for which States are asked to submit data on program results is the 2004-2005 school year. These data will be available for the first time for the 2004-2005 school year and will be requested for the next Consolidated State Performance Report that will cover the results of school year 2004-2005 activities.

**V. Comprehensive School Reform
(Title I, Part F)**

- A. Please provide the percentage of Comprehensive School Reform (CSR) schools that have or have had a CSR grant and made AYP in reading/language arts based on data from the 2003-2004 school year. ___100%___
- B. Please provide the percentage of CSR schools that have or have had a CSR grant and made AYP in mathematics based on data from the 2003-2004 school year. ___100%___
- C. How many schools in the State have or have been awarded a CSR grant since 1998?
___16___

Please note Four Winds Community High School made AYP in the area of Reading/Math. However, they were identified as not making AYP on their secondary indicator of graduation rates.

VI. Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Teacher and Principal and Recruiting Fund) (Title II, Part A)

Performance data needed for this program will be available from another source. The Department will implement a national evaluation and data reporting system to provide essential data needed to measure program performance. States will be notified and are requested to participate in these activities once they are implemented.

**VII. Enhancing Education through Technology
(Title II, Part D)**

Funding Year: FY 2002

School Years: 2002 – 2003 AND 2003 – 2004

FY 2002 Program Information

State (Approved) Technology Plan (YES/NO) Yes
 Year last updated: 2001 (for this report)
 Date of State Approval: September 2001
 Web Site Location/URL: no longer on our site –
 replaced by 2003-05 plan

State Program Goals, Objectives and Performance Indicators

Using the format of the table below, describe the State's progress in meeting its EETT performance indicators based on data sources that the State established for its use in assessing the effectiveness of the program in improving access to and use of educational technology by students and teachers in support of academic achievement, as submitted in the Consolidated State Application. Indicate which of the three or combination of the three Title II, Part D goals relates to your State goals.

Title II, Part D -- Enhanced Education Through Technology Goals:

1. Improve student academic achievement through the use of technology in elementary schools and secondary schools.
2. To assist every student in crossing the digital divide by ensuring that every student is technologically literate by the time the student finishes the eighth grade, regardless of the student's race, ethnicity, gender, family income, geographic location, or disability.
3. To encourage the effective integration of technology resources and systems with teacher training and curriculum development to establish research-based instructional methods that can be widely implemented as best practices by State educational agencies and local educational agencies.

Provide results for each indicator, as well as an assessment and explanation of progress. For targets with no set targets, provide a descriptive assessment of progress. Please indicate where data are not yet available.

For the purpose of completing the table below, please explain how you define the following:

1. Curriculum Integration

The Professional Competency Continuum (PCC) defines curriculum integration using the following competencies and the levels at which educators achieve these competencies. North Dakota uses the PCC to measure levels of integration and skill in the use of technology (technology literacy) of educators.

Curriculum Design

Educator is skilled at identifying opportunities within the curriculum for improving student learning through the use of technology and is capable of designing technology-enriched learning activities that are aligned with curriculum standards.

Teaching/Learning Strategies

Educator uses a variety of instructional strategies for teaching and learning with technology (authentic problem, project, and inquiry-based) and is able to match specific strategies with the learning needs of individual students.

New Roles for Educators

Educator understands the possibilities for new roles for educators (facilitator, co-investigator, coach, guide,) that better support learning in a technology-rich classroom and has mastered specific strategies for adopting these roles such as modeling, mediating, explaining and providing options without controlling.

New Roles for Students

Educator understands the possibilities for new roles for students (teacher, independent learner, collaborator, investigator, problem solver and producer of knowledge and products valued by stakeholders outside the classroom) that better support learning in the technology-rich classroom and has explicit strategies for supporting students as they adopt these roles.

Assessment

Educator is skilled in the design and implementation of a variety of ongoing, seamless assessment strategies, including portfolio, performance and product-based assessments that are viewed by students as a valuable part of learning, and are more relevant in the technology-rich classroom than paper and pencil assessments that primarily involve recall and seatwork.

Additional Information on the North Dakota PCC is available at:

<http://www.edutech.nodak.edu/ndpcc/pdf/index.htm>

2. Technology literacy

See above for teacher technology literacy definition.

North Dakota defines technology literacy for students in its Library/Technology Literacy Standards. We have 4th, 8th and 12th grade benchmarks. The 8th grade benchmarks are the levels of technological literacy that LEAs are encouraged to achieve with their 8th grade students.

<http://www.dpi.state.nd.us/standard/content/tech.pdf>

Goals, Objectives, Targets	Narrative
<p>Program Goal</p> <p>The Nine Essential Conditions and Indicators for Technology Integration</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Shared Vision - Technology Access and Use - Leadership Capacity and Proficiency - Educator Capacity and Proficiency - Professional Development Program - Designs for Effective Teaching and Learning - Technical Support - Student Experiences and Application - On-going Evaluation and Continuous Improvement (Accountability) 	<p>The 2001-03 North Dakota State Educational Technology Plan is made up of nine Essential Conditions – The essential conditions and indicators for technology integration make up the North Dakota Guide for Effective Use of Technology (ND GEUT). The essential conditions are conditions that “should be used as a road map to evaluate each district’s progress toward integrating technology into its curriculum.” They are in no specific order, as the writers believed that there is no single one of them that is more important than any other. They are the goals that the SEA was working toward during the reporting period, and continue to be important goals of this department and educators throughout our state.</p>
<p>Statutory Goal Indicate Statutory Goal number 1, 2, and/or 3. This Statutory Goal(s) relates to the Goal(s) submitted in your State Consolidated Application.</p>	<p>Everything in the use of the PCC, the state education technology plan and its use as an evaluation tool for schools that received competitive grants was intended to address the goals of EETT.</p>
<p>Program Objective</p> <p>All information on pages 69-71 of Consolidated Application</p>	<p>The objective of the program is to achieve the level of “Transformation” as described in each of the indicators of each of the nine essential conditions in the ND GEUT.</p> <p>State content standards in the area of Library/Technology Literacy were completed in January 2003. These standards are only a guide from the SEA for LEAs to use in the determination of how their local standards should be written, but they served as the basis for schools to have an idea of what students should be able to do by the 8th grade to be considered “technology literate.”</p> <p>Teachers across the state continue to use the Professional</p>

Goals, Objectives, Targets	Narrative
	<p>Competency Continuum (PCC). This is a self-assessment that ND has used since the 2000-01 school year and is the method for determining the progress of educators toward proficiency in the use of technology and in integrating it into the curriculum.</p> <p>These tools and their use move North Dakota in the direction of meeting the three goals of EETT.</p>
<p>Indicator All information on pages 69-71 of Consolidated Application</p>	<p>Use of the North Dakota Professional Competency Continuum (PCC) was carried the method for determining the progress of educators toward proficiency in the use of technology and in integrating it into the curriculum. Results for each year are in the next section.</p> <p>From the North Dakota Education Technology Plan for 2001-2003, indicators, along with their Essential Conditions, are below:</p> <p>Shared Vision - To what extent is the vision of technology integration focused on student learning, research-based, forward thinking and powerful?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Clarity and Articulation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the vision clear, shared with all staff and community? ▪ Focused on Student Learning: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the vision focused on student learning, aligned with current standards and being translated into classroom practice? ▪ Ownership and Commitment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do all stakeholder groups participate in an ongoing planning process? • Is there a sense of urgency to move the vision into practice? <p>Technology Access and Use - To what extent are the availability, organization and capacity of technology tools sufficient to support instructional learning practices?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Technology Distribution: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the student/workstation ratio meet current recommendations? • Is the equipment available for use for anytime, anywhere learning? • Is the equipment equitably deployed (gender, race/ethnicity, special needs, grade level, classroom, etc.)?" ▪ Tool Capacity: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are a range of technology tools (including peripheral devices and software) available as resources for instruction? • Are there policies/procedures for equitable replacement of equipment in place? • Is a plan in place for the selection and purchase of software? ▪ Connectivity: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are LANs and WANs robust and stable? • Is Internet access available to all students?

Goals, Objectives, Targets	Narrative
	<p>Leadership Capacity and Proficiency – To what extent is appropriate, necessary leadership present to successfully guide technology and learning initiatives?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Effective Technology Use: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are the leaders expected to be proficient and effective in using technology? • Do the leaders use technology to accomplish administrative tasks? ▪ Advocacy: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do the leaders visibly take ownership and develop strategies to put vision into practice? • Do the leaders convey a sense of urgency about technology use for student learning? • Do leaders support innovative models? (portable classrooms, e-pals, teacher collaborative projects, etc.). Do leaders provide for the funds necessary to successfully integrate technology?" ▪ Support Professional Development: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do the leaders support an effective professional development model? (technology lunches, mentors, train-the-trainer, etc.) • Are professional development opportunities made available? • Are they supported by adequate resources? • Are professional development activities assessed for appropriateness and effectiveness? <p>Educator Capacity and Proficiency - To what extent are educators prepared to support students in achieving high academic performance through the effective uses of technology?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Tool Mastery: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent has the staff mastered essential tools that meet building or district needs or expectations? ▪ Expectations and Focus: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What technology skills and classroom practices are expected? • Is the flashlight on the curriculum or the technology itself? ▪ Innovators: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What percentage of staff are innovators? • Are there visible signs of effective instructional models? • Are success stories being told? <p>Professional Development Program - To what extent are the professional learning opportunities designed to enable instructional staff to successfully practice technology- supported, standards-based instruction?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Content: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the major content focus on the technology (learning tools) or the pedagogy (research-based instructional practices)? • Does the content address knowledge of technology and curriculum standards?

Goals, Objectives, Targets	Narrative
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the content provide curriculum connections supported by technology? • Are specific skills and practices identified, expected and measured for student results? ▪ Process: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the professional development program/model provide comprehensive means/methods to acquire new knowledge and skills? • Is there a balance between "overview" type professional development and "deep" professional development? • How many have participated in professional development opportunities? ▪ Sustainability: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are multiple sustainable elements (budget, leadership, adequate staffing, incentives, policies, accountability, etc.) in place? • Are expectations established for skills and practices for all teachers and staff? • Are technical support staff expected and given the opportunity to maintain a current knowledge base? • Are the skills acquired assimilated into the classroom? <p>Designs for Effective Teaching and Learning - To what extent are the teachers using technology to create and support a student-centered learning environment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Instructional Practices: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What percentage of classroom instruction is student-centered (independent/collaborative processes)? ▪ Curriculum Linking: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there an effective link between curriculum and the use of technology? ▪ Attitude Toward Technology: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How do teachers feel about the use of technology as an instructional tool? ▪ Pedagogical Readiness: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are instructional strategies aligned with “evolving” uses of technology? (Innovative learning practices; cooperative grouping, multiple intelligences, problem-based learning, etc.) ▪ Assessment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What assessment practices are used? • Are multiple assessments used to measure the same competencies? • Are assessments effective? • Are technology tools employed for assessment? ▪ Standards-based Instruction: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is technology supporting standards-based instruction? • Information Technologies: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How often is technology used for information research?

Goals, Objectives, Targets	Narrative
	<p>Technical Support - To what extent is hardware and software support available to ensure successful instructional and learning practices.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Budget: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the budget allow for real-time technical support? • Can support personnel make critical purchases necessary to keep technology functional? ▪ Support Personnel: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there an adequate ratio of personnel (1 full-time support person to 100 workstations or less) to support hardware demands? ▪ Equipment Maintenance: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the equipment maintained to maximize instruction? ▪ Response Time: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is response time adequate? ▪ Software Support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is software support sufficient?
<p>Target <i>Indicate status of data in 2002-03 school year (SY).</i> BASELINE DATA</p>	<p>1. No minimum level of proficiency was established for technology skills for educators, but the progress toward higher levels of competency in the areas of technology skills and ability to integrate technology into the curriculum was tracked in educators' use of the PCC since the 2000-01 school year. Steady increases have been noted in each year. All self-reported data is based on a 10 point scale. *See table below with PCC data</p> <p>2. Have 100% of LEAs that were awarded a discretionary grant contract with EduTech to perform assessment of their project using ND GEUT. **See information below</p>
<p>Target <i>Indicate status of data in 2003-04 school year</i></p>	<p>1. Assist LEAs in using data from PCC to help make sound decisions about technology related professional development and the obligation of at least 25% of EETT funding received. Educators continue to make gains in their level of skills and ability to integrate technology into the curriculum.</p> <p>EduTech in cooperation with the North Dakota Educational Technology Council (ND ETC) provided professional development to school administrators to assist them in learning to better use the data from their PCC results to make decisions about where they should be focusing technology related professional development. * PCC data in table below.</p> <p>2. Have 100% of LEAs that were awarded a discretionary grant contract with EduTech to perform assessment of their project using ND GEUT. **See information below</p>
<p>Target</p>	<p>1. Assist LEAs in using data from PCC to help make sound decisions</p>

Goals, Objectives, Targets	Narrative
<i>Set target for 2004-05 school year.</i>	<p>about technology related professional development and the obligation of at least 25% of EETT funding received. Educators continue to make gains in their level of skills and ability to integrate technology into the curriculum. * PCC data in table below.</p> <p>2. Have 100% of LEAs that were awarded a discretionary grant contract with EduTech to perform assessment of their project using ND GEUT. **See information below</p>
<p>Target <i>Set target for 2005-06 school year</i></p>	SEA changed PCC from being optional to requiring that schools assure in their consolidated application for federal title funding that at least 85% of the staff in the LEA has taken the PCC in the previous school year. This data will assist LEAs in making decisions about the professional development that they should be providing in the area of technology for their staff.
<p>Target <i>Set target for 2006-07 school year.</i></p>	<p>1. 85% participation PCC</p> <p>2. Have 100% of LEAs that were awarded a discretionary grant contract with EduTech to perform assessment of their project using ND GEUT.</p>
<p>Target <i>Set target for 2007-08 school</i></p>	<p>1. 90% participation in PCC</p> <p>2. Have 100% of LEAs that were awarded a discretionary grant contract with EduTech to perform assessment of their project using ND GEUT.</p>
<p>Assessment of Progress <i>Status of progress on indicator</i> <i>(1) Target met</i> <i>(2) Target not met</i></p>	<p>1. PCC targets have been met. 2. ND GEUT targets (revised to only include LEAs that received discretionary grants)</p>
<p>Measurement tool(s) used to assess progress of indicators.</p>	<p>North Dakota Professional Competency Continuum was used to continue to measure the progress educators are making in their skills in using technology and integrating it into the curriculum in meaningful ways that increase student achievement.</p> <p>North Dakota Guide for the Effective Use of Technology (ND GEUT) was used to measure progress that was made by schools that received discretionary funds through EETT – the cost to do this evaluation was too high to be done statewide for every school that received a “formula” award. Each discretionary grantee received additional funding to pay for EduTech to complete an assessment of their project using the ND GEUT. ** a complete report on the progress is available for the LEAs that received discretionary awards in the 2002-03 school year</p>
<p>Explanation for not making progress - <i>Description of why target(s) was not met for SY 03-04, and steps that will</i></p>	Progress was not made in the use of the ND GEUT to evaluate all schools in the state because of the cost of the evaluation was such that the SEA could not cover it with statewide technical assistance funds, and the LEAs could not be asked to spend their formula funds to

Goals, Objectives, Targets	Narrative
<i>taken to ensure progress.</i>	evaluate their progress toward the goals, or there would be no funding to spend on working toward those goals. Out of 195 formula awards, only fourteen were for more than \$20,000. There was no way to evaluate these LEAs using the ND GEUT.

If for any reason you have modified or added Goal(s), objectives, indicators, and/or targets since submitting the State Consolidated Application, please indicate in the chart below.

Original Goal(s), objectives, indicators, and/or targets (Indicate page number and item label as designated in the State Consolidated Application or restate goal.)	Modification or Additions
Page 70 – goal of making the ND GEUT (from state tech plan) available for all LEAs to use to assess progress toward the Nine Essential Conditions	It was determined that this was not possible based on the amounts of funding awarded in the formula portion of this program. Only discretionary grant awards were required to be evaluated using this tool. LEAs that choose to use the ND GEUT to on their own are welcome to contract with EduTech to do so, but are not required to share the results with the SEA.

***PCC data for 2000-01 through 2003-04 based on a 10 point scale**

School Name	Competency	Indicator	PCC1	PCC2	PCC3	PCC4
			00-01	01-02	02-03	03-04
All ND Schools	Core Technology Skills	Total: Core Technology Skills	4.05	5.3	5.94	6.07
All ND Schools	Core Technology Skills	Hardware/Other	3.64	4.68	5.25	5.42
All ND Schools	Core Technology Skills	Applications	4.78	5.95	6.54	6.63
All ND Schools	Core Technology Skills	Information Tools	4.18	5.49	6.18	6.32
All ND Schools	Core Technology Skills	Network Tools	3.77	5.08	5.76	5.86
All ND Schools	Core Technology Skills	Multimedia/Presentation Tools	3.34	4.63	5.29	5.42
All ND Schools	Core Technology Skills	Hardware/Computer	3.86	5.14	5.76	5.91
All ND	Curriculum. Learning	Total: Curriculum. Learning and	3.8	4.93	5.55	5.64

Schools	and Assessment	Assessment				
All ND Schools	Curriculum. Learning and Assessment	Curriculum (design)	3.92	5.16	5.75	5.87
All ND Schools	Curriculum. Learning and Assessment	Teaching/Learning Strategies	3.62	4.88	5.57	5.64
School Name	Competency	Indicator	PCC1	PCC2	PCC3	PCC4
			00-01	01-02	02-03	03-04
All ND Schools	Curriculum. Learning and Assessment	New Roles for Educators	4.32	5.36	5.89	5.94
All ND Schools	Curriculum. Learning and Assessment	New Roles for Students	4.0	5.08	5.67	5.74
All ND Schools	Curriculum. Learning and Assessment	Assessment	3.22	4.28	4.99	5.14
All ND Schools	Classroom and Instructional Management	Total: Classroom and Instructional Management	4.09	5.35	5.98	6.12
All ND Schools	Classroom and Instructional Management	Organization and Use	3.58	5.12	5.84	5.98
All ND Schools	Classroom and Instructional Management	Access and Location	4.06	5.31	5.89	6.04
All ND Schools	Classroom and Instructional Management	Instructional Management	4.3	5.46	6.12	6.25
All ND Schools	Professional Practice	Total: Professional Practice	4.0	5.35	6.06	6.19
All ND Schools	Professional Practice	Uses of Technology for Personal Productivity	4.87	6.31	6.99	7.08
All ND Schools	Professional Practice	Professional Collaboration	4.26	5.77	6.53	6.68
All ND Schools	Professional Practice	Communication to/with Stakeholders	4.43	5.85	6.63	6.74
All ND Schools	Professional Practice	Professional Growth (PD)	3.71	5.09	5.98	6.11
All ND Schools	Professional Practice	Community Outreach	2.88	3.84	4.4	4.5
All ND Schools	Professional Practice	Ethical Use	3.8	5.2	5.81	6
All ND Schools	Professional Practice	Professional Resources	3.8	5.24	5.96	6.18
All ND Schools	Professional Practice	Resource Acquisition	3.83	5.09	5.63	5.77
All ND Schools	Administrative Competency	Total: Administrative Competency	5.14	6.52	7.06	7.29
All ND Schools	Administrative Competency	Modeling Effective Use	5.48	6.9	7.62	7.75

All ND Schools	Administrative Competency	Leading Professional Development	5.28	6.62	7.09	7.31
All ND Schools	Administrative Competency	Leading And Managing Systemic Change	4.57	5.95	6.36	6.75
All ND Schools	Administrative Competency	Maintaining A Knowledge Base	4.88	6.29	6.78	7.03

** Results of the use of the ND GEUT for the nine schools that received grants in the first round of competitive grants are available for your review, but are not being attached to this report. Requests for this report should be sent to Christopher Kalash at ckalash@state.nd.us . Please specify whether you prefer a CD or paper copy.

**IX. Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act
(Title IV, Part A)**

A. Performance Measures

Instructions: In the following chart, please identify:

- Each of your State indicators as submitted in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application;
- The instrument or data source used to measure the indicator;
- The frequency with which the data are collected (annually, semi-annually, biennially) and year of the most recent collection;
- The baseline data and year the baseline was established; and
- Targets for the years in which your State has established targets.

Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of collection	Targets	Actual Performance
The percentage of students who engaged in a physical fight on school property.	UMIRS	Frequency: Annual Year of most recent collection: 2003-2004	2002-2003: Baseline 2003-2004: maintain or lessen incidences by 7% 2004-2005: maintain or lessen incidences by 7% 2005-2006: maintain or lessen incidences by 7% 2006-2007: maintain or lessen incidences by 7% 2007-2008: maintain or lessen incidences by 7%	2002-2003: 0.2% 2003-2004: 0.17% Baseline: 0.2% Year established: 2002-2003
The percentage of students who carried a weapon on school property.	UMIRS	Frequency: Annual Year of most recent collection: 2003-2004	2002-2003: Baseline 2003-2004: maintain or lessen incidences by 5% 2004-2005: maintain or lessen incidences by 5% 2005-2006: maintain or lessen incidences by 5% 2006-2007: maintain or lessen incidences by 5% 2007-2008: maintain or lessen incidences by 5%	2002-2003: 0.04% 2003-2004: 0.05% Baseline: 0.04% Year established: 2002-2003

<p>The percentage of students offered, sold or given an illegal drug on school property.</p>	<p>UMIRS</p>	<p>Frequency: Annual Year of most recent collection: 2003-2004</p>	<p>2002-2003: Baseline 2003-2004: maintain or lessen incidences by 5% 2004-2005: maintain or lessen incidences by 5% 2005-2006: maintain or lessen incidences by 5% 2006-2007: maintain or lessen incidences by 5% 2007-2008: maintain or lessen incidences by 5%</p>	<p>2002-2003: 0.09% 2003-2004: 0.11% Baseline: 0.09% Year established: 2002-2003</p>
<p>The percentage of alcohol related out of school suspensions and expulsions.</p>	<p>UMIRS</p>	<p>Frequency: Annual Year of most recent collection: 2003-2004</p>	<p>2002-2003: Not a ND priority area in 2002-2003 2003-2004: maintain or lessen incidences by 7% 2004-2005: maintain or lessen incidences by 7% 2005-2006: maintain or lessen incidences by 7% 2006-2007: maintain or lessen incidences by 7% 2007-2008: maintain or lessen incidences by 7%</p>	<p>2002-2003: 0.13% 2003-2004: 0.1% Baseline: 0.13% Year established: 2002-2003</p>
<p>The number of persistently dangerous schools, as defined by State.</p>	<p>UMIRS</p>	<p>Frequency: Annual Year of most recent collection: 2003-2004</p>	<p>2002-2003: 0 2003-2004: 0 2004-2005: 0 2005-2006: 0 2006-2007: 0 2007-2008: 0</p>	<p>2002-2003: 0 2003-2004: 0 Baseline: 0 Year established: 2002-2003</p>
<p>The number of schools in which all students are able to work from a networked computer.</p>	<p>UMIRS</p>	<p>Frequency: Annual Year of most recent collection: 2003-2004</p>	<p>2002-2003: 100% 2003-2004: 100% 2004-2005: 100% 2005-2006: 100% 2006-2007: 100% 2007-2008: 100%</p>	<p>2002-2003: 100% 2003-2004: 100% Baseline: 100% Year established: 2002-2003</p>

* 2002-2003 data was limited to K-12 public enrollment, 2003-2004 data includes public, non-public and BIA K-12 students. DPI has determined a "programming glitch" in the data base housing the reporting forms which gave different numbers each time a query was run. This has since been corrected.

B. Suspension and Expulsion Data

Instructions: In the following charts, indicate the number of out-of-school suspensions and expulsions for elementary, middle, and high school students for each of the underlined incidents.

Please also provide the State’s definition of an elementary, middle, and high school, as well as the State’s definition of each of the incidents underlined below.

(If your State does not collect data in the same format as requested by this form, the State may provide data from a similar question, provided the State includes a footnote explaining the differences between the data requested and the data the State is able to supply.)

School Type	State Definition
Elementary School	
Middle School	
High School	

*North Dakota does not have a specific definition for elementary, middle and high school. School districts determine which grade groupings work best for the population served, building size, transportation, etc. so there are a number of elementary, middle and high school configurations in this state. The total number of enrolled students in public, non-public and BIA schools: 109,461.

All public, non-public and BIA schools completed the suspension/expulsion report.

1. The number of out-of-school suspensions and expulsions for physical fighting.

State definition of physical fighting: ND Statute includes the following:

- a) Aggravated Assault: willfully causes serious bodily injury to another human being or knowingly causes substantial bodily injury to another human being with a dangerous weapon or other weapon (NDCC: Chapter 12.1-17-02);
- b) Assault: willfully causes substantial bodily injury to another human being; or negligently causes substantial bodily injury to another human by means of a firearm, destructive device, or other weapon (NDCC: Chapter 12.1.17.01.1)
- c) Simple Assault: willfully causes bodily injury to another human being or negligently causes bodily injury to another human being by means of a firearm, destructive device or weapon (NDCC: Chapter 12.1-17-01).

SUSPENSIONS	Number for 2003-2004 school year	Number of LEAs reporting
Elementary	10	439
Middle		
High School		

EXPULSIONS	Number for 2003-2004 school year	Number of LEAs reporting
Elementary	0	439
Middle		
High School		

2. The number of out-of-school suspensions and expulsions for weapons possession

State definition of weapons: ND Statute includes: a) firearm: Any weapon which will, is designed to, or may readily be converted to expel a projectile by the action of an explosive; the frame or receiver of any such weapon; any firearm muffler or firearm silencer; or any machine gun (Handgun, shotgun, rifle, or bomb.) b) knife: considered a weapon if the blade is 2.5 inches or longer. c) other objects: The weapon involved was another known object (e.g. chain, nunchakus, brass knuckles, billy club, electrical weapon, or device; stun gun, BB or pellet gun.)

SUSPENSIONS	Number for 2003-2004 school year	Number of LEAs reporting
Elementary	37	439
Middle		
High School		

EXPULSIONS	Number for 2003-2004 school year	Number of LEAs reporting
Elementary	7	439
Middle		
High School		

3. The number of alcohol-related out-of-school suspensions and expulsions.

State definition of alcohol-related: The incident is alcohol-related if those involved were under the influence of alcohol at the time of the incident, or if there is evidence that they had been drinking, based on testing or investigation at the scene. Possession, use, or sale of alcohol is included.

SUSPENSIONS	Number for 2003-2004 school year	Number of LEAs reporting
Elementary	101	439
Middle		
High School		

EXPULSIONS	Number for 2003-2004 school year	Number of LEAs reporting
Elementary	0	439
Middle		
High School		

4. The number of illicit drug-related out-of-school suspensions and expulsions.

State definition of illicit-drug related: The incident is drug-related if those involved were under the influence of drugs at the time of the incident, based on testing or investigation at the time of the incident. The incident may be related to the possession, use, or sale of drugs.

SUSPENSIONS	Number for 2003-2004 school year	Number of LEAs reporting
Elementary	85	439
Middle		
High School		

EXPULSIONS	Number for 2003-2004 school year	Number of LEAs reporting
Elementary	4	439
Middle		
High School		

C. Parent Involvement

Instructions: Section 4116 of the No Child Left Behind Act requires that each State provide information pertaining to the State’s efforts to inform parents of and include parents in drug and violence prevention efforts. Please describe your State’s efforts to include parents in these activities.

The North Dakota Department of Public Instruction (NDDPI) Safe and Drug Free staff encourages schools to include parents in drug and violence prevention efforts in the following ways:

- 1) The Title guidance document explains that schools are required to develop the SDFSC annual plan based on the Principles of Effectiveness which includes having parents involved in the planning process. On the consolidated Title application, the local education agencies (LEAs) are asked to identify the parent members of the district planning team; the 2003-2004 school year identified 127 parent members on the district planning team of 210 districts.

2) During regional SDFSC training sessions, school personnel are asked to include parents in the planning process. They are reminded that with the inception of NCLB, involving parents became a Principle of Effectiveness, so parents must be a part of the district planning process. The SDFSC staff present strategies to increase parental involvement.

3) The SDFSC unit is in the process of updating their web page. A compilation of the suspension/expulsion data will be featured. The web page currently houses the 2003 YRBS data, and lists the trainers available to help schools and communities with their prevention efforts. We will publish a yearly SDFSC status report for ND on the web page.

4) The SDFSC staff is establishing a rapport with the newspapers and other media throughout the state. Through our connection with the media, we will get more information out to the public.

**X. 21st Century Community Learning Centers
(Title IV, Part B)**

Performance data needed for this program will be available from another source. The Department will implement a national evaluation and data reporting system to provide essential data needed to measure program performance. States will be notified and are requested to participate in these activities once they are implemented.

**XI. Innovative Programs
(Title V, Part A)**

A. Please describe **major** results to date of State-level Title V, Part A funded activities to improve student achievement and the quality of education for students. Please use quantitative data if available (e.g., increases in the number of highly qualified teachers).

North Dakota allocates its Title V, Part A funds to support activities related to the development of the State's challenging content and achievement standards in all core subject areas. Additionally, the State uses its Title V, Part A funds to support the State's overall school improvement outreach activities, including professional development to the field.

The State has developed content and achievement standards in core subject areas. These standards are accessible at the following website: <http://www.dpi.state.nd.us/standard/content.shtm> and <http://www.dpi.state.nd.us/standard/perform/index.shtm>. The State's standards are drafted following strict protocols with the direct assistance of approximately 120 teachers per subject area. Local school districts use these standards to develop and align their local curricula and instructional strategies. Effectively, these standards touch the State's approximate 8,000 teachers. Various state and local professional development activities are built around the dissemination of these standards.

B. The table below requests data on student achievement outcomes of **Title V, Part A - funded** LEAs that use **20%** or more of Title V, Part A funds and funds transferred from other programs for **strategic priorities including: (1)** student achievement in reading and math, **(2)** teacher quality, **(3)** safe and drug free schools, **(4)** access for all students to a quality education. Complete the table below using aggregated data from all LEA evaluations of school year 2003-2004 activities funded in whole or in part from Title V, Part A - Innovative Programs funds.

Priority Activity/Area ¹	Number of LEAs that used 20% or more Title V, Part A, including funds transferred into Title V, Part A (see Note) for:	Number of these LEAs that met AYP	Total Number of Students Served
Area 1: Student Achievement in Reading and Math	141	116	81,963
Area 2: Teacher Quality	42	34	27,146
Area 3: Safe and Drug Free Schools	5	2	2,622
Area 4: Increase Access for all Students	18	14	26,199
Note: Funds from REAP and Local Flex (Section 6152) that are used for Title V, Part A purposes and funds transferred into Title V, Part A under the transferability option under section 6132(b).			

B.1 Indicate the number of Title V, Part A funded LEAs that did not use, in school year 2003-2004, 20% or more of Title V, Part A funds including funds transferred from other programs into Title V, Part A, for any of the priority activities/areas listed in the table under B above. 2

B.2 Indicate the number of LEAs shown in B.1 that met AYP in school year 2003-2004. 2

¹ In completing this table, States should include activities described in Section 5131 of the ESEA as follows: Area 1 (activities 3, 9,12,16,19,20,22,26,27), Area 2 (activity 1,2), Area 3 (activity 14,25), Area 4 (activities 4,5,7,8,15,17)

**XII. Rural Education Achievement Program (REAP)
(Title VI, Part B)**

A. Small Rural School Achievement Program (Title VI, Part B, Subpart 1)

Please indicate the number of eligible LEAs that notified the State of the LEA's intention to use the Alternative Uses of Funding authority under section 6211 during the 2003-2004 school year. _____116_____

B. Rural and Low-Income School Program (Title VI, Part B, Subpart 2)

1. LEAs that receive Rural and Low-Income School (RLIS) Program grants may use these funds for any of the purposes listed in the following table. Please indicate in the table the total number of eligible LEAs that used funds for each of the listed purposes during the 2003-2004 school year.

Purpose	Number of LEAs
Teacher recruitment and retention, including the use of signing bonuses and other financial incentives	0
Teacher professional development, including programs that train teachers to utilize technology to improve teaching and to train special needs teachers	1
Educational technology, including software and hardware as described in Title II, Part D	0
Parental involvement activities	1
Activities authorized under the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program (Title IV, Part A)	0
Activities authorized under Title I, Part A	0
Activities authorized under Title III (Language instruction for LEP and immigrant students)	0

2. Describe the progress the State has made in meeting the goals and objectives for the Rural Low-Income Schools Program as described in its June 2002 Consolidated State application. Provide quantitative data where available.

For the school year 2003-2004, only two districts were eligible for the Rural, Low-Income Schools program, and neither of these districts applied for the funds. However, the district that was eligible last year had carryover funds, which they used during the 2003-2004 school year for professional development and parent involvement activities. For the 2003-2004 school year, the district's AYP data shows a district composite score of 60 percent in reading versus 59.67 percent in 2002-2003.

XIII. Funding Transferability for State and Local Educational Agencies (Title VI, Part A, Subpart 2)

A. State Transferability of Funds

Did the State transfer funds under the State Transferability authority of section 6123(a) during the 2003-2004 school year? ___No_____

B. Local Educational Agency Transferability of Funds

1. Please indicate the total number of LEAs that notified the State that they were transferring funds under the LEA Transferability authority of section 6123(b) during the 2003-2004 school year. ___13_____
2. In the charts below, please indicate below the total number of LEAs that transferred funds TO and FROM each eligible program and the total amount of funds transferred TO and FROM each eligible program.

Program	Total Number of LEAs transferring funds <u>TO</u> eligible program	Total amount of funds transferred <u>TO</u> eligible program
Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (section 2121)	0	\$0.00
Educational Technology State Grants (section 2412(a)(2)(A))	4	\$71,296.74
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (section 4112(b)(1))	2	\$9,815.00
State Grants for Innovative Programs (section 5112(a))	7	\$191,220.00
Title I, Part A, Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs	5	\$100,925.05

Program	Total Number of LEAs transferring funds <u>FROM</u> eligible program	Total amount of funds transferred <u>FROM</u> eligible program
Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (section 2121)	11	\$300,988.98
Educational Technology State Grants (section 2412(a)(2)(A))	3	\$16,370.00
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (section 4112(b)(1))	8	\$47,995.50
State Grants for Innovative Programs (section 5112(a))	3	\$7,902.31

The Department plans to obtain information on the use of funds under both the State and LEA Transferability Authority through evaluation studies.