

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT:
Parts I and II**

for
STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS
under the
ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT
As amended by the
No Child Left Behind Act of 2001

For reporting on
School Year 2005-2006



PART I DUE DECEMBER 1, 2006
PART II DUE FEBRUARY 1, 2007

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON DC 20202

INTRODUCTION

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

The Consolidated State Application and Report includes the following ESEA programs:

- Title I, Part A – *Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies.*
- Title I, Part B, Subpart 3 – *William F. Goodling Even Start Family Literacy Programs.*
- Title I, Part C – *Education of Migratory Children.*
- Title I, Part D – *Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk.*
- Title I, Part F – *Comprehensive School Reform.*
- Title II, Part A – *Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund).*
- Title II, Part D – *Enhancing Education through Technology.*
- 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 IV, Part B – *21st Century Community Learning Centers.*
- 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.*

In addition to the programs cited above, the Title X, Part C - *Education for Homeless Children and Youths* program data will be incorporated in the CSPR for 2005-2006.

The NCLB Consolidated State Performance Report for the 2005-2006 school year consists of two information collections. Part I of this report is due to the Department by December 1, 2006 . Part II is due to the Department by February 1, 2007.

PART I

Part I of the Consolidated State Report, which States must submit to the Department by **December 1, 2006**, 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 ESEA. The five ESEA Goals established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application are as follows:

- **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.

PART II

Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report consists of information related to State activities and outcomes of specific ESEA programs for the 2005-2006 school year. Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report is due to the Department by **February 1, 2007**. The information requested in Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report for the 2005-2006 school year necessarily varies from program to program. However, for all programs, 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.
3. The information will provide valid evidence of program outcomes or results.
4. The Consolidated State Performance Report is the best vehicle for collection of the data.

The Department is continuing to work with the Performance-Based Data Management Initiative (PBDMI) to streamline data collections for the 2005-2006 school year and beyond.

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the 2005-2006 school year must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **December 1, 2007**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **February 1, 2007**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the 2005-2006 school year, unless otherwise noted.

The format states will use to submit the Consolidated State Performance Report has changed to an online submission. 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 "2005-06 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 2005-2006 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

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

OMB Number: 1810-0614
Expiration Date: 07/31/2007

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

Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting:
 Part I, 2005-2006 Part II, 2005-2006

Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report:
North Dakota Department of Public Instruction

Address:
600 East Boulevard Avenue #201
Bismarck ND 58505

Person to contact about this report:

Name: Beverly Fischer
Telephone: 701-328-1028
Fax: 701-328-2461
e-mail: bfischer@nd.gov

Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Wayne G. Sanstead

Thursday, November 30, 2006, 9:29:07

AM
Signature

Date

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART I

For reporting on
School Year 2005-2006



PART I DUE DECEMBER 1, 2006

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

Section 1111(b)(1) of ESEA requires States to adopt challenging academic content and achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science and to develop assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(3) in the required grade levels. In the following sections, States are asked to provide a detailed description of their progress in meeting the NCLB standards and assessments requirements.

1.1.1 Please provide a detailed description of the State's progress in adopting challenging academic content standards in science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(1).

State Response

The state has completed the development and has formally approved the adoption of the state's challenging academic content standards in science. These science content standards were submitted to the U.S. Department of Education for the purposes of peer review in April 2006. These science content standards have been developed according to the state's content and achievement development protocols. These science content standards have been approved by the State Superintendent as required under state law.

Please refer to these science content standards at the following web address:
<http://www.dpi.state.nd.us/standard/content/science/index.shtm>.

1.1.2 Please provide a detailed description of the State's progress in developing and implementing, in consultation with LEAs, assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(3) in the required grade levels. Please provide in your response a description of the State's progress in developing alternate assessments for students with disabilities, including alternate assessments aligned to alternate achievement standards and those aligned to grade-level achievement standards.

State Response

The state has completed the development and initiated the implementation of statewide assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(3) in the required grade levels 3-8 and 11. The state administered these three-subject assessments statewide in October and November 2006. Scoring will be completed in December and reports will be issued to schools, districts, and the state in early February.

Please refer to the following web address for details on the state's standard assessments:
<http://www.dpi.state.nd.us/testing/assess/index.shtm>.

The state has completed the development and initiated the implementation of statewide alternate assessments for students with disabilities aligned to grade-level alternate achievement standards. The state administered these three-subject, alternate assessments beginning in October 2006. Scoring will be completed in early February and reports will be issued to schools, districts, and the state in February.

The state submitted supporting evidence of the state's assessment program, including its alternate assessments, to the U.S. Department of Education for the purposes of peer review in April 2006.

Please refer to the following web address for details on the state's alternate assessments:
<http://www.dpi.state.nd.us/speced/resource/alternate/index.shtm>.

1.1.3 Please provide a detailed description of the State's progress in setting, in consultation with LEAs, academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(1). If applicable, please provide in your response a description of the State's progress in developing alternate achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.

State Response

The state has completed the setting of academic achievement standards in mathematics and reading/language arts that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(3). The state submitted evidence of the setting of these academic achievement standards to the U.S. Department of Education for the purposes of peer review in April 2006.

The state is scheduled to set in March 2007 the academic achievement standards in science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(3). The state submitted the protocols and supporting evidence of the process that will be followed to set the science academic achievement standards to the U.S. Department of Education for the purposes of peer review in April 2006.

Please refer to the following web address for details on the state's assessments, including science:
<http://www.dpi.state.nd.us/testing/assess/index.shtm>.

The state is scheduled to set in March 2007 the academic alternate achievement standards in science for students with disabilities aligned to grade-level alternate achievement standards. The state submitted the protocols and supporting evidence of the process that will be followed to set the science alternate achievement standards to the U.S. Department of Education for the purposes of peer review in April 2006.

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

Participation of All Students in 2005-2006 State Assessments

In the following tables, please provide the total number and percentage for each of the listed subgroups of students who participated in the State's 2005-2006 school year academic assessments.

The data provided below for students with disabilities should include participation results from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act and do not include results from students covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

1.2.1 Student Participation in 2005-2006 School Year Test Administration**1.2.1.1 2005-2006 School Year Mathematics Assessment**

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Tested
All Students	51453	99.12
American Indian or Alaska Native	4491	97.80
Asian or Pacific Islander	426	97.71
Black, non-Hispanic	763	97.82
Hispanic	765	98.20
White, non-Hispanic	44911	99.38
Students with Disabilities	7301	98.07
Limited English Proficient	2154	97.33
Economically Disadvantaged	15784	98.53
Migrant	62	91.18
Male	26486	99.05
Female	24967	99.19

Comments: Eden Total Student Count = 51920 because 8 student records had several categories missing.

Eden Total Number of Students Tested = 51456 because 3 students omitted their gender category.

- 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.

1.2.1.2 2005-2006 School Year Reading/Language Arts Assessment

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Tested
All Students	51408	99.03
American Indian or Alaska Native	4509	98.19
Asian or Pacific Islander	417	95.64
Black, non-Hispanic	727	93.21
Hispanic	762	97.82
White, non-Hispanic	44889	99.33
Students with Disabilities	7300	98.05
Limited English Proficient	2099	94.85
Economically Disadvantaged	15768	98.43
Migrant	62	91.18
Male	26456	98.93
Female	24952	99.13

Comments: Eden Total Student Count = 51920 because 8 student records had several categories missing.

Eden Total Number of Students Tested = 51456 because 3 students omitted their gender category.

- 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.

1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in State Assessment System

Students with disabilities (as defined under IDEA) participate in the State's assessment system either by taking the regular State assessment, with or without accommodations, by taking an alternate assessment aligned to grade-level standards, or by taking an alternate assessment aligned to alternate achievement standards. In the following table, please provide the total number and percentage of students with disabilities who participated in these various assessments.

The data provided below should include participation results from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act and do not include results from students covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

1.2.2

1.2.2.1 Participation of Students with Disabilities the in 2005-2006 School Year Test Administration -- Math Assessment

	Total Number of Students with Disabilities Tested	Percent of Students with Disabilities Tested
Regular Assessment, with or without accommodations	6202	84.95
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.00
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	1099	15.05

Comments:

1.2.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities the in 2005-2006 School Year Test Administration -- Reading/Language Arts Assessment

	Total Number of Students with Disabilities Tested	Percent of Students with Disabilities Tested
Regular Assessment, with or without accommodations	6247	85.58
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.00
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	1053	14.42

Comments:

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

In the following charts, please provide student achievement data from the 2005-2006 school year test administration. Charts have been provided for each of grades 3 through 8 and high school to accommodate the varied State assessment systems in mathematics and reading/language arts during the 2005-2006 school year. States should provide data on the total number of students tested as well as the percentage of students scoring at the proficient or advanced levels for those grades in which the State administered mathematics and reading/language arts assessments during the 2005-2006 school year.

The data for students with disabilities should include participation results from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, including results from alternate assessments, and do not include results from students covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

1.3.1 Grade 3 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	6878	85.96
American Indian or Alaska Native	635	66.77
Asian or Pacific Islander	55	85.45
Black, non-Hispanic	143	73.43
Hispanic	126	76.19
White, non-Hispanic	5908	88.57
Students with Disabilities	1024	69.63
Limited English Proficient	355	61.69
Economically Disadvantaged	2401	77.80
Migrant	7	85.71
Male	3537	86.57
Female	3341	85.30

Comments: Other Ethnicity: 11 63.64%

Within acceptable ranges due to population mobility.

- 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.

1.3.2 Grade 3 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	6881	80.83
American Indian or Alaska Native	637	57.46
Asian or Pacific Islander	54	68.52
Black, non-Hispanic	138	74.64
Hispanic	126	64.29
White, non-Hispanic	5914	84.04
Students with Disabilities	1028	68.68
Limited English Proficient	349	56.16
Economically Disadvantaged	2401	72.30
Migrant	7	85.71
Male	3537	79.47
Female	3344	82.27

Comments: Other Ethnicity: 12 41.67%

Within acceptable ranges due to population mobility.

- 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.

1.3.3 Grade 4 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	6979	79.81
American Indian or Alaska Native	616	59.74
Asian or Pacific Islander	78	85.90
Black, non-Hispanic	132	65.91
Hispanic	113	69.03
White, non-Hispanic	6028	82.32
Students with Disabilities	1113	63.34
Limited English Proficient	325	52.62
Economically Disadvantaged	2345	70.70
Migrant	11	81.82
Male	3585	80.78
Female	3394	78.79

Comments: Other Ethnicity: 12 66.67%

Within acceptable ranges due to population mobility.

- 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.

1.3.4 Grade 4 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	6997	77.23
American Indian or Alaska Native	616	57.79
Asian or Pacific Islander	77	80.52
Black, non-Hispanic	130	72.31
Hispanic	112	60.71
White, non-Hispanic	6047	79.66
Students with Disabilities	1117	61.41
Limited English Proficient	320	48.13
Economically Disadvantaged	2348	67.72
Migrant	11	54.55
Male	3592	74.69
Female	3405	79.91

Comments: Other Ethnicity: 15 46.67%

Within acceptable ranges due to population mobility.

- 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.

1.3.5 Grade 5 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	7067	78.41
American Indian or Alaska Native	625	52.96
Asian or Pacific Islander	58	82.76
Black, non-Hispanic	111	57.66
Hispanic	111	67.57
White, non-Hispanic	6147	81.54
Students with Disabilities	1069	54.82
Limited English Proficient	358	51.40
Economically Disadvantaged	2247	67.60
Migrant	13	61.54
Male	3643	78.56
Female	3424	78.24

Comments: Other Ethnicity: 15 73.33%

Within acceptable ranges due to population mobility.

- 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.

1.3.6 Grade 5 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	7061	72.44
American Indian or Alaska Native	627	48.48
Asian or Pacific Islander	58	67.24
Black, non-Hispanic	108	58.33
Hispanic	112	51.79
White, non-Hispanic	6141	75.57
Students with Disabilities	1070	52.99
Limited English Proficient	355	42.54
Economically Disadvantaged	2247	60.75
Migrant	13	38.46
Male	3640	69.40
Female	3421	75.68

Comments: Other Ethnicity: 15 66.67%

Within acceptable ranges due to population mobility.

- 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.

1.3.7 Grade 6 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	7219	75.62
American Indian or Alaska Native	646	46.59
Asian or Pacific Islander	48	87.50
Black, non-Hispanic	93	47.31
Hispanic	102	58.82
White, non-Hispanic	6320	79.21
Students with Disabilities	1087	51.43
Limited English Proficient	287	47.74
Economically Disadvantaged	2317	62.54
Migrant	10	70.00
Male	3722	76.30
Female	3497	74.89

Comments: Other Ethnicity: 10 60.00%

Within acceptable ranges due to population mobility.

- 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.

1.3.8 Grade 6 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	7209	71.42
American Indian or Alaska Native	649	43.45
Asian or Pacific Islander	48	72.92
Black, non-Hispanic	89	50.56
Hispanic	102	52.94
White, non-Hispanic	6310	74.93
Students with Disabilities	1085	48.57
Limited English Proficient	280	32.14
Economically Disadvantaged	2314	58.04
Migrant	10	40.00
Male	3717	67.50
Female	3492	75.60

Comments: Other Ethnicity: 11 45.45%

Within acceptable ranges due to population mobility.

- 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.

1.3.9 Grade 7 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	7776	68.27
American Indian or Alaska Native	724	40.88
Asian or Pacific Islander	70	81.43
Black, non-Hispanic	94	37.23
Hispanic	119	49.58
White, non-Hispanic	6750	71.96
Students with Disabilities	1098	38.43
Limited English Proficient	334	39.82
Economically Disadvantaged	2507	54.57
Migrant	8	50.00
Male	4007	68.83
Female	3769	67.68

Comments: Other Ethnicity: 19 26.32%

Within acceptable ranges due to population mobility.

- 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.

1.3.10 Grade 7 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	7751	75.68
American Indian or Alaska Native	726	52.89
Asian or Pacific Islander	68	85.29
Black, non-Hispanic	88	54.55
Hispanic	119	57.14
White, non-Hispanic	6729	78.76
Students with Disabilities	1094	53.02
Limited English Proficient	325	45.23
Economically Disadvantaged	2499	64.27
Migrant	8	37.50
Male	3992	71.62
Female	3759	79.99

Comments: Other Ethnicity: 21 38.10%

Within acceptable ranges due to population mobility.

- 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.

1.3.11 Grade 8 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	7884	67.42
American Indian or Alaska Native	711	35.86
Asian or Pacific Islander	57	66.67
Black, non-Hispanic	112	35.71
Hispanic	126	51.59
White, non-Hispanic	6866	71.54
Students with Disabilities	1088	39.71
Limited English Proficient	331	31.12
Economically Disadvantaged	2383	53.34
Migrant	9	33.33
Male	4083	68.97
Female	3800	65.74

Comments: Other Ethnicity: 12 41.67%

Within acceptable ranges due to population mobility.

- 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.

1.3.12 Grade 8 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	7870	72.50
American Indian or Alaska Native	717	46.44
Asian or Pacific Islander	53	75.47
Black, non-Hispanic	102	54.90
Hispanic	124	57.26
White, non-Hispanic	6862	75.79
Students with Disabilities	1085	48.39
Limited English Proficient	314	40.45
Economically Disadvantaged	2378	60.60
Migrant	9	66.67
Male	4075	68.12
Female	3794	77.20

Comments: Other Ethnicity: 12 41.67%

Within acceptable ranges due to population mobility.

- 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.

1.3.13 High School - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	7653	56.83
American Indian or Alaska Native	534	27.53
Asian or Pacific Islander	60	61.67
Black, non-Hispanic	78	29.49
Hispanic	68	32.35
White, non-Hispanic	6892	59.75
Students with Disabilities	822	30.17
Limited English Proficient	164	17.68
Economically Disadvantaged	1584	38.76
Migrant	4	50.00
Male	3909	58.86
Female	3742	54.73

Comments: Other Ethnicity: 21 9.52%

Within acceptable ranges due to population mobility.

- 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.

1.3.14 High School - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	7642	73.16
American Indian or Alaska Native	537	46.74
Asian or Pacific Islander	59	69.49
Black, non-Hispanic	72	52.78
Hispanic	67	50.75
White, non-Hispanic	6886	75.79
Students with Disabilities	821	45.68
Limited English Proficient	156	29.49
Economically Disadvantaged	1581	58.89
Migrant	4	75.00
Male	3903	70.74
Female	3737	75.70

Comments: Other Ethnicity: 21 38.10%

Within acceptable ranges due to population mobility.

- 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.

1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY

1.4.1 For all public elementary and secondary schools and districts in the State (Title I and non-Title I), please provide the total number and percentage of all schools and districts that made adequate yearly progress (AYP), based on data from the 2005-2006 school year.

School Accountability	Total number of public elementary and secondary schools (Title I and non-Title I) in State	Total number of public elementary and secondary schools (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP	Percentage of public elementary and secondary schools (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP
Based on 2005-2006 School Year Data	482	436	90.46

Comments:

District Accountability	Total number of public elementary and secondary districts (Title I and non-Title I) in State	Total number of public elementary and secondary districts (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP	Percentage of public elementary and secondary districts (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP
Based on 2005-2006 School Year Data	197	176	89.34

Comments:

1.4.2 For all Title I schools and districts in the State, please provide the total number and percentage of all Title I schools and districts that made AYP, based on data from the 2005-2006 school year.

Title I School Accountability	Total number of Title I schools in State	Total number of Title I schools in State that made AYP	Percentage of Title I schools in State that made AYP
Based on 2005-2006 School Year Data	342	312	91.23

Comments:

Title I District Accountability	Total number of Title I districts in State	Total number of Title I districts in State that made AYP	Percentage of Title I districts in State that made AYP
Based on 2005-2006 School Year Data	179	158	88.27

Comments:

1.4.3 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

1.4.3.1 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement, Corrective Action, and Restructuring (in 2006-2007 based on the data from 2005-2006)

1.4.3.2 Briefly describe the measures being taken to address the achievement problems of **schools** identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring.

Schools 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 are identified for improvement. Schools 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 schools 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 that are in corrective action receive increased state oversight on all Title I and Program Improvement activities and provisions.

Our School Support Team worked with McREL in the summer of 2006 on strategies to better help schools in Program Improvement.

Please refer to pages 34-46 of North Dakota's June 2002 state plan which overviews North Dakota's statewide system of support available to all schools, but in particular those schools identified for program improvement. Log on to <http://www.dpi.state.nd.us/grants/DOEapp.pdf> to access this information.

1.4.4 Title I Districts Identified For Improvement.

1.4.4.1 Title I Districts Identified for Improvement and Corrective Action (in 2006-2007 based on the data from 2005-2006)

1.4.4.2 Briefly describe the measures being taken to address the achievement problems of districts identified for improvement and corrective action.

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 districts are identified for improvement. 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.shtml> to access this information.

The application for additional funds for Program Improvement districts is available on the web. Districts are given an opportunity to apply for additional funding after all applications have been processed for schools identified for improvement.

Our School Support Team worked with McREL in the summer of 2006 on strategies to better help districts in Program Improvement.

Please refer to pages 34-46 of North Dakota's June 2002 state plan which overviews North Dakota's statewide system of support available to all districts, but in particular those districts identified for program improvement. Log on to <http://www.dpi.state.nd.us/grants/DOEapp.pdf> to access this information.

1.4.5 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

1.4.5.1 Public School Choice	Number
1. Please provide the number of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring from which students transferred under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	0
2. Please provide the number of public schools to which students transferred under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	0
How many of these schools were charter schools?	0
3. Please provide the number of students who transferred to another public school under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	0
4. Please provide the number of students who were eligible to transfer to another public school under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	0
Optional Information:	
5. If the State has the following data, the Department would be interested in knowing the following:	
6. The number of students who applied to transfer to another public school under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	0
7. The number of students, among those who applied to transfer to another public school under the Title I public school choice provisions, who were actually offered the opportunity to transfer by their LEAs, during the 2005-2006 school year.	0
Comments: Question 'How many of these schools were charter schools?' not applicable.	

1.4.5.2 Supplemental Educational Services	
	Number
1. Please provide the number of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring whose students received supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	16
2. Please provide the number of students who received supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	205
3. Please provide the number of students who were eligible to receive supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	2483
Optional Information:	
If the State has the following data, the Department would be interested in knowing the following:	
4. The number of students who applied to receive supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	226
Comments:	

1.5 TEACHER AND PARAPROFESSIONAL QUALITY

1.5.1 In the following table, please provide data from the 2005-2006 school year for classes in the core academic subjects being taught by "highly qualified" teachers (as the term is defined in Section 9101(23) of the ESEA), in the aggregate for all schools and in "high-poverty" and "low-poverty" elementary schools (as the terms are defined in Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) of the ESEA). Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "high-poverty" schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State and "low-poverty" schools as schools in the bottom quartile of poverty in the State. Additionally, please provide information on classes being taught by highly qualified teachers by the elementary and secondary school level.

School Type	Total Number of Core Academic Classes	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers
All Schools in State	35356	33907	95.90
Elementary Level			
High-Poverty Schools	3832	3813	99.50
Low-Poverty Schools	4961	4949	99.80
All Elementary Schools	16584	16526	99.70
Secondary Level			
High-Poverty Schools	2665	2391	89.70
Low-Poverty Schools	8191	7666	93.60
All Secondary Schools	18772	17381	92.60
Comments:			

Definitions and Instructions

What are the core academic subjects?

English, reading or 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.

How is a teacher defined?

An individual who provides instruction in the core academic areas to kindergarten, grades 1 through 12, or un-graded 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]

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 percent of the time [from NCES Non-fiscal Data Handbook for Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education, 2003].

Should 6th, 7th, and 8th grade classes be reported in the elementary or 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. See Question A-14 in the August 3, 2006, Non-Regulatory Guidance for additional information. Report classes in grade 6 through 8 consistent with how teachers have been classified to determine their highly qualified status, regardless if their schools are configured as elementary or middle schools.

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.

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 English, calculus, history, and science are taught in a self-contained classroom by the same teacher, count these as four classes in the denominator. If the teacher is Highly Qualified in English and history, he/she would be counted as Highly Qualified in two of the four subjects in the numerator.

1.5.2 For those classes in core academic subjects being taught by teachers who are **not highly qualified** as reported in Question 1.5.1, estimate the percentages of those classes in the following categories (Note: Percentages should add to 100 percent of classes taught by not highly qualified teachers for each level).

Reason For Being Classified as Not Highly Qualified	Percentage
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL CLASSES	
a) Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	0.30
b) Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	0.00
c) Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	0.00
d) Other (please explain)	0.00
SECONDARY SCHOOL CLASSES	
a) 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)	7.40
b) Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	0.00
c) Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	0.00
d) Other (please explain)	0.00
Comments:	

1.5.3 Please report the State poverty quartile breaks for high- and low-poverty elementary and secondary schools used in the table in Question 1.5.1.

	High-Poverty Schools (more than what %)	Low-Poverty Schools (less than what %)
Elementary Schools	46.10	26.95
Poverty Metric Used	Free and Reduced Meal Counts (October, 2005)	
Secondary Schools	41.70	23.00
Poverty Metric Used	Free and Reduced Meal Counts (October, 2005)	

Comments:

Definitions and Instructions

How are the poverty quartiles determined?

Separately rank order elementary and secondary schools from highest to lowest on your percent poverty measure. Divide the list into 4 equal groups. Schools in the first (highest group) are high-poverty schools. Schools in the last group (lowest group) are the low-poverty schools. Generally, states use the percentage of students who qualify for the free or reduced price lunch program for this calculation.

Since the poverty data are collected at the school and not classroom level, how do we classify schools as either elementary or secondary for this purpose?

States may include as elementary schools all schools that serve children in grades K-5 (including K-8 or K-12 schools) and would therefore include as secondary schools those that exclusively serve children in grades 6 and higher.

1.5.4 Paraprofessional Quality. NCLB defines a qualified paraprofessional as an employee who provides instructional support in a program supported by Title I, Part A funds who has (1) completed two years of study at an institution of higher education; (2) obtained an associate's (or higher) degree; or (3) met a rigorous standard of quality and be able to demonstrate, through a formal State or local academic assessment, knowledge of and the ability to assist in instructing reading, writing, and mathematics (or, as appropriate, reading readiness, writing readiness, and mathematics readiness) (Section 1119(c) and (d).) For more information on qualified paraprofessionals, please refer to the Title I paraprofessionals Guidance, available at:

<http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/paraguidance.doc>

In the following chart, please provide data from the 2005-2006 school year for the percentage of Title I paraprofessionals (excluding those with sole duties as translators and parental involvement assistants) who are qualified.

School Year	Percentage of Qualified Title I Paraprofessionals
2005-2006 School Year	98.60

Comments:

1.6 ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY

1.6.1.1 English Language Proficiency (ELP) Standards

Has the State developed ELP standards (k-12) as required under Section 3113(b)(2) and are these ELP standards fully approved, adopted, or sanctioned by the State governing body?

Developed	<u>Yes</u>
Approved, adopted, sanctioned	<u>Yes</u>
Operationalized (e.g., Are standards being used by district and school teachers?)	<u>Yes</u>

Please provide a detailed description of the State's progress in establishing, implementing, and operationalizing English Language Proficiency (ELP) standards for raising the level of ELP, that are derived from the four domains of speaking, listening, reading, and writing, and that are aligned with achievement of the challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards described in section 1111(b)(1).

STATE RESPONSE

North Dakota has adopted the English Language Proficiency (ELP) Standards developed through the World-class Instructional Design and Assessment (WIDA) Consortium. The adoption of these standards has been recommended by the North Dakota State English Language Learner Advisory Committee and is supported by the State Superintendent. As an elected official, the State Superintendent has the final authority to approve state documents, policies and procedures. There is no need for additional board or committee approval. The WIDA standards are currently available on the WIDA website at http://www.wida.us/Resources/standards/index.html/portal_url. North Dakota is in the process of formatting the materials to North Dakota standard protocol, including an introduction and letter from the State Superintendent. The standards will then be published on the North Dakota Department of Public Instruction website.

School districts are in the process of operationalizing and using the standards. Since the state recently changed from standards developed through the Mountain West Assessment Consortium (MWAC) to WIDA standards, not all districts are familiar with the new standards. Fargo Public has done training on their own in October of 2006. State wide training will be conducted in the summer of 2007.

The North Dakota ELP standards are derived from the four domains of speaking, listening, reading, and writing. These standards were developed in alignment with state academic content and student academic achievement standards in the original member states of the WIDA Consortium. An alignment study with the North Dakota academic content and student achievement standards will take place in June of 2007. Gaps detected through the alignment study will be addressed as state content standards and ELP standards are revised. Each set of standards follows a revision schedule protocol that allows for necessary changes based on new research, alignment students and other issues.

1.6.1.2 Alignment of Standards

Please provide a detailed description of the State's progress for linking/aligning the State English Proficiency Standards to the State academic content and student academic achievement standards in English language arts/reading and mathematics.

STATE RESPONSE

An alignment study between the ND ELP standards developed through the WIDA Consortium and the ND State academic content and student academic achievement standards in English language arts/reading and mathematics will be conducted in June of 2007. This alignment study will use the model developed by Dr. Norm Webb with the University of Wisconsin. It will involve a variety of teachers, including those with backgrounds in content, along with English Language Proficiency.

1.6.2 English Language Proficiency (ELP) Assessments

1. The expectation for the full administration of the new or enhanced ELP assessment(s) that are aligned with the State's English language proficiency (ELP) standards as required under Section 3113 (b)(2) is spring 2007. Please indicate if the State has conducted any of the following:

- An independent alignment study Yes
- Other evidence of alignment No

2. Provide an updated description of the State's progress in developing and implementing the new or enhanced ELP assessments. Specifically describe how the State ensures:

1. The annual assessment of all LEP students in the State in grades k-12;
2. The ELP assessment(s) which address the five domains of listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension;
3. ELP assessments are based on ELP standards;
4. Technical quality (validity, reliability, etc.)

STATE RESPONSE

1. North Dakota has adopted the Assessing Comprehension and Communication in English State-to-State for English Language Learners (ACCESS) test as the State English Language Proficiency Assessment. ACCESS has been developed through the WIDA Consortium and is aligned with the WIDA ELP Standards. Because the ACCESS test was originally developed based on the WIDA standards, as opposed to a test developed by a commercial vendor, the standards and assessment are closely aligned. In order to further document this alignment, though, additional alignment studies have been conducted. The WIDA Consortium is conducting another alignment study in December, involving teachers from all states.

2. North Dakota is in full compliance with requirements to assess the English language proficiency of students who qualify as limited in the English language in all grades in the State.

1. North Dakota schools have been annually assessing the English language proficiency of students limited in the English language in grades kindergarten through 12 grade using commercially available, "off the shelf" tests. Assessment data has been reported since the state began requiring this reporting in 2002. School districts reported 5735 LEP students in 2005 - 2006.

2. The ACCESS test that North Dakota has adopted addresses the five domains of listening, speaking, reading, writing and comprehension.

3. ACCESS is based on ELP standards

4. The ACCESS test, which is used by the WIDA Consortium, consisting of more than a dozen states is valid, reliable and has high technical quality. The technical quality report on the ACCESS test is available at <http://www.wida.us/ACCESSForELLs/>. North Dakota will implement ACCESS on a statewide basis in March of 2007.

columns 4-8 should equate to the number (#) and percentage (%) of all students identified as limited English proficient in column 3.

1.6.3.2 Data Reflecting the Most Common Languages Spoken in the State		
2005-2006 Data of the Most Common Languages Spoken by LEPs		
Language	Number of ALL LEP Students in the State	Percentage of ALL LEP Students in the State
1. Ojibwa	1818	33.90
2. Other	1231	23.00
3. Spanish	493	9.20
4. American Indian	289	5.40
5. Bosnian	279	5.20
6. Dakota	157	2.90
7. Fang	85	1.60
8. Siouan Language	83	1.60
9. German	81	1.50
10. Arabic	71	1.30

Comments: This is the first year North Dakota has collected data on language backgrounds of students using the language codes provided by EDEN. School districts had trouble finding the appropriate code. Some languages used by North Dakota students were not listed. Therefore, there is an over-identification of students in the "Other" category.

- In the above chart, list the ten most commonly spoken languages in your State. Indicate the number and percentage of LEP students that speak each of the languages listed in table 1.6.3.2.

1.6.4 Immigrant Children and Youth Data

Programs and activities for immigrant children and youth

Definitions:

- **# immigrants enrolled in the State** = number of students, who meet the definition of immigrant children and youth in Section 3301(6), enrolled in the elementary or secondary schools in the State
- **# immigrants served by Title III** = 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
- **# of immigrants subgrants** = number of subgrants made in the State under Section 3114(d)(1), with the funds reserved for immigrant education programs/activities

**Table 1.6.4 Education Programs for Immigrant Students
2005-2006**

# Immigrants enrolled in the State	# Immigrants served by Title III	# Immigrant subgrants
856	0	0

Comments:

STATE RESPONSE: (Provide information on what has changed, e.g., sudden influx of large number of immigrant children and youth, increase/change of minority language groups, sudden population change in school districts that are less experienced with education services for immigrant students in the State during the 2 previous years.)

North Dakota schools continue to enroll new immigrant students at a steady rate. No school district received significant growth or changes from the previous two years.

1.6.5 Definition of Proficient

If the State has made changes since the last Consolidated State Performance Report submission (for school year 2004-2005), please provide the State's definition of "proficient" in English as defined by the State's English language proficiency standards and assessments under Section 3122(a)(3). Please include the following in your response:

1. The test score range or cut scores for each of the State's ELP assessments;
2. A description of how the five domains of listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension are incorporated or weighted in the State's definition of "proficient" in English;
3. Other criteria used to determine attaining proficiency in English.

STATE RESPONSE

North Dakota's definition of Proficient has not changed since the 2003 - 2004 Consolidated State Performance Report.

1.6.6 Definition of Making Progress

If the State has made changes since the last Consolidated State Performance Report submission (for school year 2004-2005), please provide the State's definition of "making progress" in learning English as defined by the State's English language proficiency standards and assessment(s) in Section 3122(a)(3).

Please include the following in your response:

1. A description of the English language proficiency levels and any sub-levels as defined by the State's English language proficiency standards and assessments;
2. A description of the criteria students must meet to progress from one proficiency level to the next (e.g., narrative descriptions, cut scores, formula, data from multiple sources).

STATE RESPONSE

North Dakota's definition of making progress in learning English has not changed since the 2003 - 2004 Consolidated State Performance Report.

1.6.7 Definition of Cohort

If the State has made changes since the last Consolidated State Performance Report submission (for school year 2004-2005), please provide the State's definition of "cohort." Include a description of the specific characteristics of the cohort(s) in the State, e.g., grade/grade span or other characteristics.

STATE RESPONSE

North Dakota's definition of "Cohort" has not changed since the 2003 - 2004 Consolidated State Performance Report.

1.6.8 Information on the Acquisition of English Language Proficiency for ALL Limited English Proficient Students in the State.

Please provide information on the progress made by **ALL LEP students in your State** in learning English and attaining English language proficiency.

Did your State apply the Title III English language proficiency annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) to **ALL LEP** students in the State? Yes

If yes, you may use the format provided below to report the requested information.

English Language Proficiency	Percent and Number of ALL LEP Students in the State Who Made Progress in Learning English				Percent and Number of ALL LEP Students in the State Who Attained English Proficiency			
	Projected AMAO Target		Actual		Projected AMAO Target		Actual	
2005-2006 School Year	% 80.00	# 3782	% 91.30	# 4319	% 25.00	# 1182	% 15.40	# 730

If no, please describe the different evaluation mechanism used by the State to measure both the progress of ALL LEP students in learning English and in attaining English language proficiency and provide the data from that evaluation.

North Dakota data reported in Tables 1.6.8 and 1.6.9 is based on continuous data from the W scores calculated using the Woodcock Munoz. Cut scores were established for making progress toward attaining English, and for attained English proficiency. These cut scores are not directly equivalent to the "levels" provided in Table ****. Hence, there is a difference in the number of students identified as having attained proficiency. When the cut scores are used a total of 730 students were identified as attaining English language proficiency while *** were identified as reaching Level 5 which is considered English proficient.

1.6.9 Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs) for English Language Proficiency for Title III Participants

Critical synthesis of data reported by Title III subgrantees

[SEC. 3121(a) p. 1701, 3123(b)(1, 3) p.1704]

Provide the results of Title III LEP students in meeting the State English language proficiency (ELP) annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) for making progress and attainment of English language proficiency as required in Table 1.6.9.

TABLE 1.6.9 INSTRUCTIONS:

Report **ONLY** the results from State English language proficiency assessment(s) for LEP students who participate in Title III English language instruction educational programs in grades K-12.

Blackened cells in this form indicate information which, each SEA should collect and maintain, but which is not being collected at this time.

Definitions:

1. **MAKING PROGRESS** = as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
2. **DID NOT MAKE PROGRESS** = The number and percentage of Title III LEP students who did not meet the State definition of "Making Progress."
3. **ATTAINED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY** = as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
4. **TOTAL** = the total number of students from **making progress**, **not making progress**, and **attainment**, for each year in the table. The figure reported in this cell should be an unduplicated count of LEP students who participate in Title III English language instruction educational programs in grades K-12.
5. **AMAO TARGET** = the AMAO target for the year as established by State and submitted to OELA in the CSA (September 2003 submission), or as amended and approved, for each objective for "Making progress" and "Attainment" of English language proficiency.
6. **ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS** = The number and percentage of Title III LEP students who met/did not meet the State definitions of "Making Progress" and the number and percentage of Title III LEP students who met the definition for "Attainment" of English language proficiency.

1.6.9 Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs) for English Language Proficiency for Title III Participants			
	2005-2006		
	AMAO TARGET	ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS	
	%	#	%
MAKING PROGRESS	80.00	1769	80.10
DID NOT MAKE PROGRESS		264	
ATTAINED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY	25.00	161	7.30
TOTAL		2194	

Explanation of data for Table

Check the answer to the following question.

Are monitored* LEP students reflected in the Table "Attainment" "Achievement Results"? No

* Monitored LEP students are those who

- have achieved "proficient" on the State ELP assessment
- have transitioned into classrooms that are not designed for LEP students
- are no longer receiving Title III services, and who are being monitored for academic content achievement for 2 years after transition

1.6.10 Title III program effectiveness in assisting LEP students to meet State English language proficiency and student academic achievement standards

[SEC. 3122(b)(2) p. 1703, 3123(b)(1, 4) p.1704-5, 3121(b)(2) p. 1701,]

Provide the count for each year.

It is not necessary to respond to the items in this form, which reference other collections. The information provided by each SEA to those other collections will be collected by OELA and utilized to produce the Biennial Report.

Title III Subgrantee Information

	2005-2006
Total number of Title III subgrantees for each year	10
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for making progress	7
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for attaining English proficiency	0
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for AYP	4
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs*	0
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met 2 AMAOs	3
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met 1 AMAO	7
Total number of Title III subgrantees that did not meet any AMAO	3
Total number of Title III subgrantees that did not meet AMAOs for two consecutive years	0
Total number of Title III subgrantees with an improvement plan for not meeting Title III AMAOs	0
Total number of Title III subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (beginning in 2007-08)	0
Did the State meet all three Title III AMAOs? *	<u>No</u>

Comments:

* Meeting all three Title III AMAOs means meeting each State set target for each objective: Making Progress, Attaining Proficiency and making AYP.

1.6.11 On the following tables for 2005-2006, please provide data regarding the academic achievement of monitored LEP students who transitioned into classrooms not designated for LEP students and who are no longer receiving services under Title III. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned in 2005-2006 school year.

1.6.11.1 Number and percent of former Title III served, monitored LEP students scoring at the proficient and advanced levels on the State reading language arts assessments			
Grade/Grade Span	Students Proficient & Advanced		
	#	%	
3	1	16.00	
4	0	0.00	
5	0	0.00	
6	0	0.00	
7	0	0.00	
8	0	0.00	
H.S.	0	0.00	

Comments:

1.6.11.2 Number and percent of former Title III served, monitored LEP students scoring at the proficient and advanced levels on the State mathematics assessments			
Grade/Grade Span	Students Proficient & Advanced		
	#	%	
3	2	33.00	
4	0	0.00	
5	1	100.00	
6	0	0.00	
7	0	0.00	
8	0	0.00	
H.S.	0	0.00	

Comments:

1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS

1.7.1 In the following chart, please provide data for the number of schools identified as persistently dangerous as determined by the State by the start of the 2006-2007 school year. For further guidance on persistently dangerous schools, please refer to the Unsafe School Choice Option Non-Regulatory Guidance, available at:

	Number of Persistently Dangerous Schools
2006-2007 School Year	0

Comments:

1.8 GRADUATION AND DROPOUT RATES**1.8.1 Graduation Rates**

Section 200.19 of the Title I regulations issued under the No Child Left Behind Act on December 2, 2002, defines graduation rate to mean:

- The percentage of students, measured from the beginning of high school, who graduate from public high school with a regular diploma (not including a GED or any other diploma not fully aligned with the State's academic standards) in the standard number of years; or,
- Another more accurate definition developed by the State and approved by the Secretary in the State plan that more accurately measures the rate of students who graduate from high school with a regular diploma; and
- Avoids counting a dropout as a transfer.

1. The Secretary approved each State's definition of the graduation rate, consistent with section 200.19 of the Title I regulations, as part of each State's accountability plan. Using the definition of the graduation rate that was approved as part of your State's accountability plan, in the following chart please provide graduation rate data for the 2004-2005 school year.

2. For those States that are reporting transitional graduation rate data and are working to put into place data collection systems that will allow the State to calculate the graduation rate in accordance with Section 200.19 for all the required subgroups, please provide a detailed progress report on the status of those efforts.

1.8.1 Graduation Rates	
High School Graduates	Graduation Rate
Student Group	2004-2005 School Year
All Students	86.71
American Indian or Alaska Native	63.25
Asian or Pacific Islander	78.33
Black, non-Hispanic	75.00
Hispanic	81.44
White, non-Hispanic	89.02
Students with Disabilities	85.70
Limited English Proficient	66.67
Economically Disadvantaged	78.00
Migrant	0.00
Male	84.57
Female	88.99
Comments:	
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.	

1.8.2 Dropout Rate

For purposes of calculating and reporting a dropout rate for this performance indicator, States should use the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistics' (NCES) Common Core of Data

Consistent with this requirement, States must use NCES' definition of "high school dropout," An individual who: 1) was enrolled in school at some time during the previous school year; and 2) was not enrolled at the beginning of the current school year; and 3) has not graduated from high school or completed a state- or district-approved educational program; and 4) does not meet any of the following exclusionary conditions: a) transfer to another public school district, private school, or state- or district approved educational program (including correctional or health facility programs); b) temporary absence due to suspension or school-excused illness; or c) death.

In the following chart, please provide data for the 2004-2005 school year for the percentage of students who drop out of high school, disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged.

1.8.2 Dropout Rate	
Dropouts	Dropout Rate
Student Group	2004-2005 School Year
All Students	1.87
American Indian or Alaska Native	6.51
Asian or Pacific Islander	2.93
Black, non-Hispanic	7.89
Hispanic	3.06
White, non-Hispanic	1.37
Students with Disabilities	0.00
Limited English Proficient	0.00
Economically Disadvantaged	0.00
Migrant	0.00
Male	2.23
Female	1.48
Comments: The department has verified that these numbers are correct.	
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.	

Provide the following information for homeless children and youth in your State for the 2005-2006 school year (as defined by your State). To complete this form, compile data for LEAs with and without subgrants.

1.9.1 DATA FROM ALL LEAs WITH AND WITHOUT MCKINNEY-VENTO SUBGRANTS

1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTH PROGRAM

1.9.1.1 How does your State define the period that constitutes a school year? (e.g., "The school year shall begin on the first day of July and end on the thirtieth day of June" or "A total of 175 instructional days").

STATE RESPONSE

The school year begins on July 1 and ends on June 30 of the following year.

1.9.1.2 What are the totals in your State as follows:

	Total Number in State	Total Number LEAs Reporting
LEAs without Subgrants	197	113
LEAs with Subgrants	4	4

Comments:

1.9.1.3 Number of Homeless Children And Youth In The State

Provide the number of homeless children and youth in your State enrolled in public school (compulsory grades--excluding pre-school) during the 2005-2006 school year according to grade level groups below:

Grade Level	Number of homeless children/youth enrolled in public school in LEAs without subgrants	Number of homeless children/youth enrolled in public school in LEAs with subgrants
K	9	38
1	18	37
2	10	29
3	17	30
4	12	38
5	12	33
6	9	36
7	18	31
8	45	24
9	46	32
10	44	19
11	27	12
12	26	33

Comments:

1.9.1.4 Primary Nighttime Residence Of Homeless Children And Youth

Of the total number of homeless children and youth (excluding preschoolers), provide the numbers who had the following as their primary nighttime residence at the time of initial identification by LEAs.

Primary nighttime residence	* Number of homeless children/ youth-- excluding preschoolers LEAs without subgrants	* Number of homeless children/ youth-- excluding preschoolers LEAs with subgrants
Shelters	0	99
Doubled-up	53	94
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, etc.)	0	103
Hotels/Motels	0	106
Unknown	0	67

Comments: The Fargo Public School District reported they were unable to provide information on a nighttime residence for 62 children of the 128 that the district reports as homeless.

All other district numbers correspond with the number of children reported.

The discrepancies come from the numbers reported in the report submitted by the Fargo Public School District.

* The primary nighttime residence is the basis for identifying homeless children and youth. The totals should match the totals in item #3 above.

1.9.2 DATA FROM LEAs WITH MCKINNEY-VENTO SUBGRANTS**1.9.2.1 Number Of Homeless Children And Youths Served By McKinney-Vento Subgrants**

Provide the number of homeless children and youth that were served by McKinney-Vento subgrants in your State during the 2005-2006 academic school year disaggregated by grade level groups

Grade levels of homeless children and youth served by subgrants in 2005-2006	Number of homeless children and youth <i>served</i> by subgrants enrolled in school by grade level
K	38
1	37
2	29
3	30
4	38
5	33
6	36
7	31
8	24
9	32
10	19
11	12
12	33

Comments:

1.9.2.2 Number of homeless preschool-age children

Provide the number of homeless preschool-age children in your State in districts with subgrants attending public preschool programs during the 2005-2006 school year (i.e., from birth through pre-K).

Number of homeless preschool-age children enrolled in public preschool in LEAs with subgrants in 2005-2006

71

Comments: The Fargo School District reported no children in their public preschool.

<p>1.9.2.3 Unaccompanied Youths</p> <p>Provide the number of unaccompanied youths served by subgrants during the 2005-2006 school year.</p> <p>Number of homeless unaccompanied youths enrolled in public schools in LEAs with subgrants in 2005-2006</p> <p>115</p> <p>Comments:</p>
--

<p>1.9.2.4 Migrant Children/Youth Served</p> <p>Provide the number of homeless migrant children/youth served by subgrants during the 2005-2006 school year.</p> <p>Number of homeless migrant children/youth enrolled in public schools (Total for LEAs with subgrants)</p> <p>0</p> <p>Comments: There were no migrant children reported as homeless in 2005-2006.</p>
--

<p>1.9.2.5 Number of Children Receiving Educational and School Support Services</p> <p>Provide the number of homeless children and youth served by subgrants and enrolled in school during the 2005-2006 school year that received the following educational and school support services from the LEA</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Educational and school related activities and services</th> <th>Number of homeless students in subgrantee programs that received educational and support services</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Special Education (IDEA)</td> <td>54</td> </tr> <tr> <td>English Language Learners (ELL)</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Gifted and Talented</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Vocational Education</td> <td>15</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Comments: The Fargo School District did not provide information on this section of the report.</p>	Educational and school related activities and services	Number of homeless students in subgrantee programs that received educational and support services	Special Education (IDEA)	54	English Language Learners (ELL)	0	Gifted and Talented	0	Vocational Education	15
Educational and school related activities and services	Number of homeless students in subgrantee programs that received educational and support services									
Special Education (IDEA)	54									
English Language Learners (ELL)	0									
Gifted and Talented	0									
Vocational Education	15									

1.9.2.6 Educational Support Services

Provide the number of subgrantee programs that provided the following educational support services with McKinney-Vento funds.

Services and Activities Provided by the McKinney-Vento subgrant program	Number of your State's subgrantees that offer these services
Tutoring or other instructional support	4
Expedited evaluations	2
Staff professional development and awareness	4
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	4
Transportation	4
Early childhood programs	3
Assistance with participation in school programs	4
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	3
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	4
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	2
Coordination between schools and agencies	4
Counseling	4
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	4
Clothing to meet a school requirement	4
School supplies	4
Referral to other programs and services	4
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	4
Other (optional)	1

Comments:

1.9.2.7 Barriers To The Education Of Homeless Children And Youth

Provide the number of subgrantees that reported the following barriers to the enrollment and success of homeless children and youth during the 2005-2006 school year.

Barriers	List number of subgrantees reporting each barrier
Eligibility for homeless services	1
School selection	3
Transportation	3
School records	2
Immunizations or other medical records	1
Other enrollment issues	2

Comments:

1.9.2.8 Additional Barriers (Optional)

Note any other barriers not listed above that were frequently reported:

List other barriers	List number of subgrantees reporting each barrier
Parents claiming to be home-schooling.	1
Students turning 16 and dropping out of high school.	1
Students claiming to be taking correspondence courses.	1

Comments: School-related clothing. 1

Fees for extra-curricular activities. 1

Before-and after-school day care for working parents. 1

Families reluctant to self-indentify as homeless. 2

1.9.2.9 Academic Progress of Homeless Students

In order to ensure that homeless children and youth have access to education and other services needed to meet the State's challenging academic standards:

a) Check the grade levels in which your State administered a statewide assessment in reading or mathematics; b) note the number of homeless children and youth served by subgrants in 2005-2006 that were included in statewide assessments in reading or mathematics; and c) note the number of homeless children and youth that met or exceeded the State's proficiency level or standard on the reading or mathematics assessment.

Reading Assessment:

School Grade Levels *	a) Reading assessment by grade level (check boxes where appropriate; indicate "DNA" if assessment is required and data is not available for reporting; indicate "N/A" for grade not assessed by State)	b) Number of homeless children/youth taking reading assessment test.	c) Number of homeless children/youth that met or exceeded state proficiency.
Grade 3	Yes	2	1
Grade 4	Yes	8	8
Grade 5	Yes	5	1
Grade 6	Yes	5	4
Grade 7	Yes	5	3
Grade 8	Yes	2	1
Grade 9	Yes	2	3
Grade 10	N/A	0	0
Grade 11	Yes	2	0
Grade 12	Yes	4	3

Comments: Assessment results are reported on students taking the North Dakota State Assessment during the testing window. Many students were not tested, as many districts do not test at all grade levels; other students moved in from out of state.

Mathematics Assessment:

School Grade Levels *	a) Mathematics assessment by grade level (check boxes where appropriate; indicate "DNA" if assessment is required and data is not available for reporting; indicate "N/A" for grade not assessed by State)	b) Number of homeless children/youth taking mathematics assessment test.	c) Number of homeless children/youth that met or exceeded state proficiency.
Grade 3	Yes	4	3
Grade 4	Yes	12	7
Grade 5	Yes	8	1
Grade 6	Yes	5	3
Grade 7	Yes	6	3
Grade 8	Yes	3	1
Grade 9	Yes	3	2
Grade 10	N/A	0	0
Grade 11	Yes	1	0
Grade 12	Yes	6	2

Comments: Districts reported many of the students moved in from out of state or had not been in their district when the North Dakota State Assessment was administered, therefore, the low numbers in assessment results.

* Note: State assessments in grades 3-8 and one year of high school are NCLB requirements. However, States may assess students in other grades as well.