

**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 2007-08**

**NORTH DAKOTA**



**PART I DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 19, 2008**  
**PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 2009**

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

## INTRODUCTION

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

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

The *NCLB* Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2007-08 consists of two Parts, Part I and Part II.

## **PART I**

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

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

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

## **PART II**

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

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

## GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 2007-08 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, December 19, 2008**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 27, 2009**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2007-08, unless otherwise noted.

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

## TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

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

Initially, a state user will log onto EDEN and be provided with an option that takes him or her to the "SY 2007-08 CSPR". The main CSPR screen will allow the user to select the section of the CSPR that he or she needs to either view or enter data. After selecting a section of the CSPR, the user will be presented with a screen or set of screens where the user can input the data for that section of the CSPR. A user can only select one section of the CSPR at a time. After a state has included all available data in the designated sections of a particular CSPR Part, a lead state user will certify that Part and transmit it to the Department. Once a Part has been transmitted, ED will have access to the data. States may still make changes or additions to the transmitted data, by creating an updated version of the CSPR. Detailed instructions for transmitting the SY 2007-08 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: 10/31/2010
<p>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</p>		
Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2007-08 <input type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2007-08		
Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report: North Dakota Department of Public Instruction		
Address: 600 East Boulevard #201 Bismarck ND 58505		
Person to contact about this report:		
Name: Stephanie Gullickson		
Telephone: 701-328-2176		
Fax: 701-328-2461		
e-mail: <a href="mailto:sgullickson@nd.gov">sgullickson@nd.gov</a>		
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Wayne G. Sanstead		
		Thursday, March 12, 2009, 5:21:11 PM
Signature		Date

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT  
PART I**

For reporting on  
**School Year 2007-08**



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 19, 2008  
5PM EST**

**1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT**

This section requests descriptions of the State's implementation of the *NCLB* academic content standards, academic achievement standards and assessments to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(1) of *ESEA*.

**1.1.1 Academic Content Standards**

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The state has adopted academic content standards in reading/language arts, mathematics, and science. These content standards can be accessed at the following website: <http://www.dpi.state.nd.us/standard/content.shtm>. The state's academic content standards are developed according to protocols administered by the North Dakota Department of Public Instruction. These development protocols can be accessed at the following website: <http://www.dpi.state.nd.us/standard/protocols.pdf>. The current academic content standards for reading/language arts and mathematics were last revised and adopted for the 2004-05 academic year and science was revised and adopted for the 2005-06 academic year. The next scheduled revision of these academic content standards is scheduled for 2010.

No revisions or changes to academic content standards will be undertaken or planned during the next academic year.

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

### 1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

Peer review activity in 2008. The state submitted for peer review in 2008 its standard assessment in science, its alternate assessment based on alternate achievement standards in science, and its alternate assessment based on modified achievement standards in reading/language arts, mathematics, and science. Certain provisions of the state's submission in science are moving toward resolutions with the U.S. Department of Education. The state will resubmit sections of the alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards for a second round of peer review in February 2009.

Revision status of the state's standard assessments. The state will not change its standard assessments in reading/language arts, mathematics, and science until the expected issuance of a new assessment contract during the 2010-11 academic year. No revisions or changes to the state's standard assessments in reading/language arts, mathematics, and science, outside those detailed within the state's peer review submissions, will be undertaken or planned during the next academic year.

Revision status of the state's alternate assessment based on alternate achievement standards. No revisions or changes to the state's alternate assessment based on alternate achievement standards, outside those detailed within the state's peer review submissions, will be undertaken or planned during the 2007-08 academic year. The state will incorporate designed improvements into its alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards for the 2008-09 academic year, consistent with specifications within the state's peer review submissions; however, it has not yet been determined whether these designed improvements will require any amendments to established achievement standard cut scores.

Revision status of the state's alternate assessment based on modified achievement standards. The state has administered an alternate assessment based on modified achievement standards for several years, including reading/language arts, mathematics, and science. The state will resubmit its alternate assessment based on modified achievement standards to the U.S. Department of Education for peer review in February 2008, as reported above. No revisions or changes to the state's alternate assessment based on modified achievement standards, outside those specified within the state's peer review submissions, will be undertaken or planned in outlying years.

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

#### 1.1.4 Assessments in Science

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

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

State's assessments and academic achievement standards in science not yet approved.

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

## 1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

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

### 1.2.1 Participation of All Students in Mathematics Assessment

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

The student group "children with disabilities (*IDEA*)" includes children who participated in the regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments.

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	50,130	49,554	98.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	4,386	4,265	97.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	471	463	98.3
Black, non-Hispanic	1,008	979	97.1
Hispanic	918	857	93.4
White, non-Hispanic	43,346	42,989	99.2
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	7,212	7,064	98.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,613	1,573	97.5
Economically disadvantaged students	16,179	15,902	98.3
Migratory students	126	93	73.8
Male	25,776	25,472	98.8
Female	24,328	24,056	98.9

**Comments:** Per the EdFacts Coordinator: N081 data is reported using a category called "Full Academic Year Status". Assessment data received by the state did not always have this field filled out, and as N081 required this as part of every record submitted, this caused a difference in record counts for Children with Disabilities. North Dakota has no comment and stands by its data.

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

### 1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Mathematics Assessment

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	1,583	22.3
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	3,912	55.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	985	13.9
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	630	8.9
Total	7,110	

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

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



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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	50,130	49,465	98.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	4,386	4,235	96.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	471	454	96.4
Black, non-Hispanic	1,008	960	95.2
Hispanic	918	862	93.9
White, non-Hispanic	43,346	42,953	99.1
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	7,212	6,967	96.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,613	1,564	97.0
Economically disadvantaged students	16,179	15,833	97.9
Migratory students	126	98	77.8
Male	25,776	25,408	98.6
Female	24,328	24,031	98.8

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

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

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

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	1,589	22.1
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	3,685	51.4
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	1,259	17.5
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	641	8.9
Total	7,174	

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

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

### 1.2.5 Participation of All Students in the Science Assessment

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	22,051	21,692	98.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,897	1,819	95.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	202	193	95.5
Black, non-Hispanic	417	403	96.6
Hispanic	356	319	89.6
White, non-Hispanic	19,179	18,958	98.8
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	3,074	2,984	97.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	693	675	97.4
Economically disadvantaged students	6,743	6,575	97.5
Migratory students	54	35	64.8
Male	11,373	11,186	98.4
Female	10,670	10,498	98.4

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

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

**Note:** New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

### 1.2.6 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Science Assessment

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	620	21.0
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	1,813	61.5
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	257	8.7
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	257	8.7
Total	2,947	

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

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

**Note:** New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

### 1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

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

#### 1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics

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

The student group "children with disabilities (*IDEA*)" includes children who participated in the regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments.

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

#### 1.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts

This section is similar to 1.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State's *NCLB* reading/language arts assessment.

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

#### 1.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science

This section is similar to 1.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State's *NCLB* science assessment administered at least one in each of the following grade spans 3 through 5, 6 through 9, and 10 through 12.

Limited English Proficiency (LEP) students includes recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months. Do not include former LEP students.

**1.3.1.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 3**

<b>Grade 3</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	6,763	5,846	86.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	604	424	70.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	75	62	82.7
Black, non-Hispanic	158	105	66.5
Hispanic	137	101	73.7
White, non-Hispanic	5,789	5,154	89.0
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	1,072	771	71.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	214	141	65.9
Economically disadvantaged students	2,484	1,958	78.8
Migratory students	19	13	68.4
Male	3,471	3,037	87.5
Female	3,284	2,802	85.3
<b>Comments:</b> North Dakota has no comment and stands by its data.			

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

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

<b>Grade 3</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	6,753	5,130	76.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	601	332	55.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	73	57	78.1
Black, non-Hispanic	156	98	62.8
Hispanic	135	74	54.8
White, non-Hispanic	5,788	4,569	78.9
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	1,062	653	61.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	212	90	42.5
Economically disadvantaged students	2,480	1,678	67.7
Migratory students	17	5	29.4
Male	3,463	2,577	74.4
Female	3,282	2,547	77.6
<b>Comments:</b> North Dakota has no comment and stands by its data.			

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

**1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 3**

<b>Grade 3</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	0	0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	0	0	0.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.0
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	0	0	0.0
Female	0	0	0.0
<b>Comments:</b> North Dakota assessment in science is administered at grades 4, 8, and 11 only.			

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

**Note:** New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

**1.3.1.2 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 4**

<b>Grade 4</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	6,893	5,370	77.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	645	349	54.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	77	61	79.2
Black, non-Hispanic	166	91	54.8
Hispanic	125	89	71.2
White, non-Hispanic	5,880	4,780	81.3
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	1,077	699	64.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	236	128	54.2
Economically disadvantaged students	2,515	1,686	67.0
Migratory students	21	13	61.9
Male	3,579	2,844	79.5
Female	3,313	2,526	76.3
<b>Comments:</b> North Dakota has no comment and stands by its data.			

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

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

<b>Grade 4</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	6,888	5,228	75.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	645	334	51.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	78	53	68.0
Black, non-Hispanic	162	95	58.6
Hispanic	133	70	52.6
White, non-Hispanic	5,870	4,676	79.7
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	1,065	656	61.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	238	102	42.9
Economically disadvantaged students	2,509	1,611	64.2
Migratory students	28	5	17.9
Male	3,573	2,622	73.4
Female	3,314	2,605	78.6
<b>Comments:</b> North Dakota has no comment and stands by its data.			

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

**1.3.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 4**

<b>Grade 4</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	6,892	4,490	65.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	648	223	34.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	76	48	63.2
Black, non-Hispanic	167	75	44.9
Hispanic	122	53	43.4
White, non-Hispanic	5,879	4,091	69.6
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	1,077	570	52.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	236	73	30.9
Economically disadvantaged students	2,514	1,347	53.6
Migratory students	18	5	27.8
Male	3,577	2,423	67.7
Female	3,314	2,067	62.4
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

**Note:** New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

**1.3.1.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 5**

<b>Grade 5</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	6,945	5,534	79.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	640	349	54.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	58	47	81.0
Black, non-Hispanic	159	95	59.8
Hispanic	155	100	64.5
White, non-Hispanic	5,933	4,943	83.3
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	1,014	648	63.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	221	101	45.7
Economically disadvantaged students	2,402	1,650	68.7
Migratory students	13	5	38.5
Male	3,566	2,835	79.5
Female	3,373	2,695	79.9
<b>Comments:</b> North Dakota has no comment and stands by its data.			

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

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

<b>Grade 5</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	6,932	4,722	68.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	638	297	46.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	56	35	62.5
Black, non-Hispanic	157	76	48.4
Hispanic	155	72	46.5
White, non-Hispanic	5,926	4,242	71.6
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	1,002	511	51.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	217	68	31.3
Economically disadvantaged students	2,393	1,344	56.2
Migratory students	13	0	0.0
Male	3,556	2,329	65.5
Female	3,370	2,389	70.9
<b>Comments:</b> North Dakota has no comment and stands by its data.			

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

**1.3.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 5**

<b>Grade 5</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	0	0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	0	0	0.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.0
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	0	0	0.0
Female	0	0	0.0
<b>Comments:</b> North Dakota assessment in science is administered at grades 4, 8, and 11 only.			

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

**Note:** New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

**1.3.1.4 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 6**

<b>Grade 6</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	6,967	5,612	80.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	590	349	59.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	76	63	82.9
Black, non-Hispanic	144	93	64.6
Hispanic	110	70	63.6
White, non-Hispanic	6,046	5,036	83.3
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	1,016	633	62.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	221	113	51.1
Economically disadvantaged students	2,261	1,611	71.3
Migratory students	10	4	40.0
Male	3,556	2,864	80.5
Female	3,408	2,745	80.5
<b>Comments:</b> North Dakota has no comment and stands by its data.			

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

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

<b>Grade 6</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	6,941	5,031	72.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	582	286	49.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	73	60	82.2
Black, non-Hispanic	140	83	59.3
Hispanic	111	63	56.8
White, non-Hispanic	6,034	4,538	75.2
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	995	516	51.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	221	81	36.7
Economically disadvantaged students	2,244	1,375	61.3
Migratory students	10	3	30.0
Male	3,537	2,462	69.6
Female	3,401	2,566	75.4
<b>Comments:</b> North Dakota has no comment and stands by its data.			

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

**1.3.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 6**

<b>Grade 6</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	0	0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	0	0	0.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.0
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	0	0	0.0
Female	0	0	0.0
<b>Comments:</b> North Dakota assessment in science is administered at grades 4, 8, and 11 only.			

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

**Note:** New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

**1.3.1.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 7**

<b>Grade 7</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	7,177	5,607	78.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	608	313	51.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	58	50	86.2
Black, non-Hispanic	117	68	58.1
Hispanic	132	71	53.8
White, non-Hispanic	6,262	5,105	81.5
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	982	548	55.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	242	105	43.4
Economically disadvantaged students	2,172	1,406	64.7
Migratory students	12	5	41.7
Male	3,686	2,880	78.1
Female	3,490	2,727	78.1
<b>Comments:</b> North Dakota has no comment and stands by its data.			

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

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

<b>Grade 7</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	7,153	5,568	77.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	597	328	54.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	57	47	82.5
Black, non-Hispanic	115	75	65.2
Hispanic	131	80	61.1
White, non-Hispanic	6,253	5,038	80.6
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	963	549	57.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	238	95	39.9
Economically disadvantaged students	2,150	1,425	66.3
Migratory students	12	6	50.0
Male	3,671	2,734	74.5
Female	3,481	2,834	81.4
<b>Comments:</b> North Dakota has no comment and stands by its data.			

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

**1.3.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 7**

<b>Grade 7</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	0	0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	0	0	0.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.0
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	0	0	0.0
Female	0	0	0.0
<b>Comments:</b> North Dakota assessment in science is administered at grades 4, 8, and 11 only.			

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

**Note:** New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

**1.3.1.6 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 8**

<b>Grade 8</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	7,341	5,165	70.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	638	289	45.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	57	49	86.0
Black, non-Hispanic	111	41	36.9
Hispanic	112	58	51.8
White, non-Hispanic	6,423	4,728	73.6
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	1,019	446	43.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	256	105	41.0
Economically disadvantaged students	2,284	1,304	57.1
Migratory students	15	10	66.7
Male	3,792	2,661	70.2
Female	3,546	2,503	70.6
<b>Comments:</b> North Dakota has no comment and stands by its data.			

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

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

<b>Grade 8</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	7,315	5,424	74.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	624	326	52.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	55	44	80.0
Black, non-Hispanic	107	51	47.7
Hispanic	112	73	65.2
White, non-Hispanic	6,417	4,930	76.8
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	996	488	49.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	255	102	40.0
Economically disadvantaged students	2,264	1,435	63.4
Migratory students	15	7	46.7
Male	3,782	2,684	71.0
Female	3,530	2,739	77.6
<b>Comments:</b> North Dakota has no comment and stands by its data.			

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

**1.3.3.6 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 8**

<b>Grade 8</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	7,339	4,652	63.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	639	199	31.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	56	42	75.0
Black, non-Hispanic	112	38	33.9
Hispanic	111	47	42.3
White, non-Hispanic	6,425	4,327	67.3
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	1,024	380	37.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	256	56	21.9
Economically disadvantaged students	2,282	1,099	48.2
Migratory students	14	5	35.7
Male	3,792	2,503	66.0
Female	3,544	2,148	60.6
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

**Note:** New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

**1.3.1.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - High School**

High School	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	7,468	4,142	55.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	540	162	30.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	62	33	53.2
Black, non-Hispanic	124	35	28.2
Hispanic	86	32	37.2
White, non-Hispanic	6,656	3,880	58.3
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	884	274	31.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	183	38	20.8
Economically disadvantaged students	1,784	734	41.1
Migratory students	3	0	0.0
Male	3,822	2,166	56.7
Female	3,642	1,975	54.2
<b>Comments:</b> North Dakota has no comment and stands by its data.			

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

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

High School	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	7,483	4,864	65.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	548	232	42.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	62	41	66.1
Black, non-Hispanic	123	55	44.7
Hispanic	85	45	52.9
White, non-Hispanic	6,665	4,491	67.4
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	884	355	40.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	183	43	23.5
Economically disadvantaged students	1,793	925	51.6
Migratory students	3	2	66.7
Male	3,826	2,298	60.1
Female	3,653	2,563	70.2
<b>Comments:</b> North Dakota has no comment and stands by its data.			

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

**1.3.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Science - High School**

<b>High School</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	7,461	4,389	58.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	536	164	30.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	61	28	45.9
Black, non-Hispanic	124	39	31.5
Hispanic	86	37	43.0
White, non-Hispanic	6,654	4,121	61.9
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	883	294	33.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	183	27	14.8
Economically disadvantaged students	1,779	801	45.0
Migratory students	3	0	0.0
Male	3,817	2,482	65.0
Female	3,640	1,904	52.3
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

**Note:** New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

**1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY**

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

**1.4.1 All Schools and Districts Accountability**

In the table below, provide the total number of schools and districts and the total number of those schools and districts that made AYP based on data for the SY 2007-08. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2007-08	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2007-08
Schools	455	288	63.3
Districts	187	114	61.0
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

**1.4.2 Title I School Accountability**

In the table below, provide the total number of public Title I schools by type and the total number of those schools that made AYP based on data for the SY 2007-08 school year. Include only public Title I schools. Do not include Title I programs operated by local educational agencies in private schools. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2007-08	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2007-08
All Title I schools	305	190	62.3
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	73	31	42.5
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	232	159	68.5
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

**1.4.3 Accountability of Districts That Received Title I Funds**

In the table below, provide the total number of districts that received Title I funds and the total number of those districts that made AYP based on data for SY 2007-08. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2007-08	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2007-08
161	87	54.0
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

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

#### 1.4.4 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

##### 1.4.4.1 List of Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

In the following table, provide a list of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 for the SY 2008-09 based on the data from SY 2007-08. For each school on the list, provide the following:

- District Name and NCES ID Code
- School Name and NCES ID Code
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the school met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2008-09 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: School Improvement – Year 1, School Improvement – Year 2, Corrective Action, Restructuring Year 1 (planning), or Restructuring Year 2 (implementing))<sup>1</sup>
- Whether (yes or no) the school is or is not a Title I school (*This column **must be completed** by States that choose to list all schools in improvement. Column is optional for States that list only Title I schools.*)
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003(a).
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003 (g).

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

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

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

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

**1.4.4.3 Corrective Action**

In the table below, for schools in corrective action, provide the number of schools for which the listed corrective actions under *NCLB* were implemented in SY 2007-08 (based on SY 2006-07 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

<b>Corrective Action</b>	<b># of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2007-08</b>
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	10
Extension of the school year or school day	7
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	0
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	0
Replacement of the principal	5
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	2
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	0
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

**1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2**

In the table below, for schools in restructuring – year 2 (implementation year), provide the number of schools for which the listed restructuring actions under *NCLB* were implemented in SY 2007-08 (based on SY 2006-07 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

<b>Restructuring Action</b>	<b># of Title I Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented</b>
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	0
Reopening the school as a public charter school	0
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	0
Take over the school by the State	0
Other major restructuring of the school governance	13
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Contract with Outside Expert - Linda Mood Bell Program (2) Contract with Outside Expert - Native American High Performing Learning Communities (3) Contract with Outside Expert - McREL (3) Contract with Outside Expert - Ashlock Consulting/Endivision Research and Evaluation(3) Contract with Outside Expert - High Schools That Work (2)
---

## 1.4.5 Districts That Received Title I Funds Identified for Improvement

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

In the following table, provide a list of districts that received Title I funds and were identified for improvement or corrective action under Section 1116 for the SY 2008-09 based on the data from SY 2007-08. For each district on the list, provide the following:

- District Name and NCES ID Code
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the district met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2008-09 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: Improvement or Corrective Action<sup>2</sup>)
- Whether the district is a district that received Title I funds. Indicate "Yes" if the district received Title I funds and "No" if the district did not receive Title I funds. (**This column must be completed by States that choose to list all districts or all districts in improvement.** This column is optional for States that list only districts in improvement that receive Title I funds.)

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

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

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

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

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

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

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

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

The North Dakota Department of Public Instruction has a strong Title I School Support Team (SST). The team's main purpose is to provide technical assistance to North Dakota schools and districts that have been identified for program improvement and to assist Title I practitioners on the implementation of Title I program improvement requirements at the local level.

The Title I School Support Team consists of members from across the state of North Dakota who are known for their knowledge of program improvement issues and distinguished efforts within education.

During the 2007-2008 school year, the Title I School Support Team began an expansion into a more comprehensive statewide system of support for schools and districts identified in need of improvement (program improvement) The North Dakota Department of Public Instruction has a strong partnership with the NCCC to train Title I School Support Team Members so they can better assist schools and district in improvement.

All Title I School Support Team Members were assigned schools identified for program improvement in various stages. Their main goal was to act as a liaison on behalf of the department in order to keep close contact with their assigned schools by gathering information, answering questions on program improvement issues, acting as a guidance coach, and tracking needs and efforts in a very comprehensive manner. Members of the Title I School Support Team are paid a stipend for their time and effort for all required initiatives. All members of the Title I School Support Team take part in an initial training session in the summer, participate in training sessions via conference call sponsored by the NCCC, attend the annual Title I Program Improvement Workshop, and make four quarterly contacts with their assigned schools reporting the outcome to the state Title I office.

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

**1.4.5.3 Corrective Action**

In the table below, for districts in corrective action, provide the number of districts in corrective action in which the listed corrective actions under *NCLB* were implemented in SY 2007-08 (based on SY 2006-07 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

<b>Corrective Action</b>	<b># of Districts receiving Title I funds in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2007-08</b>
Implementing a new curriculum based on State standards	2
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	0
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	0
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	3
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	0
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	0
Restructured the district	5
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2006-07 and beginning of SY 2007-08 as a corrective action)	0
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

**1.4.7 Appeal of AYP and Identification Determinations**

In the table below, provide the number of districts and schools that appealed their AYP designations based on 2007-08 data and the results of those appeals.

	<b># Appealed Their AYP Designations</b>	<b># Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation</b>
Districts	9	0
Schools	18	3
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2007-08 data was complete	06/09/08
---	----------

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

### 1.4.8 School Improvement Status

In the section below, "Schools in Improvement" means Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of *ESEA* for SY 2007-08.

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

The table below pertains only to schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08.

- In the **SY 2007-08 column**, provide the total number and percentage of students in schools receiving School Improvement funds in SY 2007-08 who were:
  - Proficient in mathematics as measured by your State's assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* in SY 2007-08.
  - Proficient in reading/language arts as measured by your State's assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* in SY 2007-08.
  - Total number of schools for which the data in this table are reported. This should be the total number of schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08.
- In the **SY 2006-07 column**, provide the requested data for the same schools whose student proficiency data are reported for SY 2007-08. No total is requested for schools in SY 2006-07.

Category	SY 2007-08	SY 2006-07
Total number of students who were enrolled in schools that received assistance through Section 1003 (a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	1,649	2,117
Total number of students who were proficient in <b>mathematics</b> in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	3,122	3,053
Percentage of students who were proficient in <b>mathematics</b> in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	189.3	144.2
Total number of students who were proficient in <b>reading/language arts</b> in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	2,799	3,013
Percentage of students who were proficient in <b>reading/language arts</b> in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	169.7	142.3
Number of schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	16	
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

**Note:** New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

#### 1.4.8.2 School Improvement Status and School Improvement Assistance

In the table below, indicate the number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08 that:

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

Category	# of Schools
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08 that <b>made adequate yearly progress</b> based on testing in SY 2007-08	12
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08 that <b>exited improvement status</b> based on testing in SY 2007-08	1
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08 that <b>did not make adequate yearly progress</b> based on testing in SY 2007-08	25
<b>Comments:</b> Our information is accurate.	

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

**Note:** New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

**1.4.8.3 Effective School Improvement Strategies**

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

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4	Column 5	Column 6	Column 7
<b>Effective Strategy or Combination of Strategies Used</b>  (See response options in "Column 1 Response Options Box" below.)  If your State's response includes a "5" (other strategies), identify the specific strategy(s) in Column 2.	<b>Description of "Other Strategies"</b>  This response is limited to 500 characters.	<b>Number of schools in which the strategy(s) was used</b>	<b>Number of schools that used the strategy(s), made AYP, and exited improvement status</b>	<b>Number of schools that used the strategy(s), made AYP, but did not exit improvement status</b>	<b>Most common other Positive Outcome from the Strategy</b>  (See response options in "Column 6 Response Options Box" below)	<b>Description of "Other Positive Outcome" if Response for Column 6 is "D"</b>  This response is limited to 500 characters.
1		13	1	12	B	
2		18	1	17	C	
3		7	1	6	B	
<b>Comments:</b> Schools used multiple strategies to make AYP.						

Column 1 Response Options Box
1 = Provide customized technical assistance and/or professional development that is designed to build the capacity of LEA and school staff to improve schools and is informed by student achievement and other outcome-related measures.
2 = Utilize research-based strategies or practices to change instructional practice to address the academic achievement problems that caused the school to be identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.
3 = Create partnerships among the SEA, LEAs and other entities for the purpose of delivering technical assistance, professional development, and management advice.
4 = Provide professional development to enhance the capacity of school support team members and other technical assistance providers who are part of the Statewide system of support and that is informed by student achievement and other outcome-related measures.
5 = Implement other strategies determined by the SEA or LEA, as appropriate, for which data indicate the strategy is likely to result in improved teaching and learning in schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.
6 = Combination 1: Schools using a combination of strategies from above. Please use Column 2 to indicate which of the above strategies comprise this combination.
7 = Combination 2: Schools using a combination of strategies from above. Please use Column 2 to indicate which of the above strategies comprise this combination.
8 = Combination 3: Schools Using a combination of strategies from above. Please use Column 2 to indicate which of the above strategies comprise this combination.

Column 6 Response Options Box
A = Improvement by at least five percentage points in two or more AYP reporting cells
B = Increased teacher retention
C = Improved parental involvement
D = Other

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

**Note:** New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

#### 1.4.8.4 Sharing of Effective Strategies

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

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

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

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

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

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

The North Dakota Department of Public Instruction has a strong Title I School Support Team (SST). The team's main purpose is to provide technical assistance to North Dakota schools and districts that have been identified for program improvement and to assist Title I practitioners on the implementation of Title I program improvement requirements at the local level.

The Title I School Support Team consists of members from across the state of North Dakota who are known for their knowledge of program improvement issues and distinguished efforts within education.

During the 2007-2008 school year, the Title I School Support Team began an expansion into a more comprehensive statewide system of support for schools and districts identified in need of improvement (program improvement) The North Dakota Department of Public Instruction has a strong partnership with the NCCC to train Title I School Support Team Members so they can better assist schools and district in improvement.

All Title I School Support Team Members were assigned schools identified for program improvement in various stages. Their main goal was to act as a liaison on behalf of the department in order to keep close contact with their assigned schools by gathering information, answering questions on program improvement issues, acting as a guidance coach, and tracking needs and efforts in a very comprehensive manner. Members of the Title I School Support Team are paid a stipend for their time and effort for all required initiatives. All members of the Title I School Support Team take part in an initial training session in the summer, participate in training sessions via conference call sponsored by the NCCC, attend the annual Title I Program Improvement Workshop, and make four quarterly contacts with their assigned schools reporting the outcome to the state Title I office.

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

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

Note: New section for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

##### 1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2007 (SY 2007-08) Title I, Part A allocation that the SEA reserved in accordance with Section 1003(a) of ESEA and §200.100(a) of ED's regulations governing the reservation of funds for school improvement under Section 1003(a) of ESEA: 4.0 %

**Comments:**

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

**Note:** New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

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

In the tables below, provide the requested information for FY 2007 (SY 2007-08).

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter allocation data.  
Download template: [Question 1.4.8.5.2 \(Get MS Excel Viewer\)](#)

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

**Note:** New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

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

Section 1003(g)(8) of *ESEA* allows States to reserve up to five percent of Section 1003(g) funds for administration and to meet the evaluation and technical assistance requirements for this program. In the space below, identify and describe the specific Section 1003(g) evaluation and technical assistance activities that your State conducted during SY 2007-08.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

North Dakota used the funds available to the SEA under Section 1003(g) to build capacity at the LEA and school levels to improve student achievement, mainly through expanded use of our North Dakota School Support Team. We are limited in our capacity to provide training and technical assistance to our School Support Team due to the limited amount of funds we are allowed to retain at the SEA level from our 1003(a) dollars. The additional 1003(g) funds enabled us to expand our work with the North Central Comprehensive Center to provide further training to our North Dakota School Support Team so that they can continue their work with schools in improvement. Instead of the 3-4 scheduled trainings for the 2007-2008 school year, the additional funds enabled us to offer eight (8) trainings that were facilitated by the North Central Comprehensive Center. The School Support Team members were then better able to build capacity at the LEA and school level to employ effective instructional strategies targeted to the areas that led to the identification for improvement.

North Dakota implemented the following two strategies, utilizing the 1003(g) funds at the state level:  
Create partnerships among SEA, LEAs, and other entities for the purpose of delivering technical assistance, professional development, and management advice.

We chose this strategy pertaining to partnerships so we can continue to work with the North Central Comprehensive Center to provide additional training to our School Support Team.

Provide professional development to enhance the capacity of School Support Team members and other technical assistance providers who are part of the statewide system of support and that is informed by student achievement and other outcome related measures.

We chose this strategy to provide additional professional development to School Support Team members to better enable them to provide customized technical assistance to schools in improvement and share research-based strategies and practices to address their academic achievement problems.

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

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

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

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

**Note:** New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

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

In the space below, describe actions (if any) taken by your State in SY 2007-08 that were supported by **funds other than Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) funds** to address the achievement problems of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of *ESEA*.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

**Note:** New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

### 1.4.9 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

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

#### 1.4.9.1 Public School Choice

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

##### 1.4.9.1.2 Public School Choice – Students

In the table below, provide the number of students who were eligible for public school choice, the number of eligible students who applied for public school choice, and the number who transferred under the provisions for public school choice in Section 1116 of *ESEA*.

Students who are eligible for public school choice includes:

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

	# Students
Eligible for public school choice	0
Applied to transfer	0
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	0

Indicate in the table below the categories of students that are included in the count of eligible students.

	Yes/No
Enrolled in a school identified for improvement	<u>No Response</u>
Transferred in the current school year, only	<u>No Response</u>
Transferred in a prior year and in the current year	<u>No Response</u>
<b>Comments:</b> No, North Dakota does not have any students eligible for public school choice.	

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

**1.4.9.1.3 Funds Spent on Public School Choice**

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

	<b>Amount</b>
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$ 0
<b>Comments:</b> No, North Dakota does not spend any funds on public school choice.	

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

**1.4.9.1.4 Availability of Public School Choice Options**

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

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

	<b># LEAs</b>
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	12
<b>Comments:</b> Our number is correct.	

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

**FAQs about public school choice:**

- a. *How should States report data on Title I public school choice for those LEAs that have open enrollment and other choice programs?* An LEA may consider a student as eligible for and participating in Title I public school choice, and may consider costs for transporting that student towards its funds spent on transportation for public school choice, if the student meets the following conditions:
  - Has a "home" or "neighborhood" school (to which the student would have been assigned, in the absence of a choice program) that receives Title I funds and has been identified, under the statute, as in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring; and
  - Has elected to enroll, at some point since July 1, 2002 (the effective date of the Title I choice provisions), and after the home school has been identified as in need of improvement, in a school that has not been so identified and is attending that school; and
  - Is using district transportation services to attend such a school.<sup>3</sup>
- b. *How do States report on public school choice for those LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice (e.g., LEAs in which all schools in a grade level are in school improvement, LEAs that have only a single school at that grade level, or LEAs whose schools are so remote from one another that choice is impracticable)?* For those LEAs, States should count as eligible all students who attend identified Title I schools. States should report that no eligible schools or students were provided the option to transfer and should provide an explanation why choice is not possible within the LEA in the Comment Section.

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

**1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services**

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

**1.4.9.2.2 Supplemental Educational Services – Students**

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

	<b># Students</b>
Eligible for supplemental educational services	453
Applied for supplemental educational services	318
Received supplemental educational services	242
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

**1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services**

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

	<b>Amount</b>
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$ 393,474
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

**1.5 TEACHER QUALITY**

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

**1.5.1 Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified**

In the table below, provide the number of core academic classes for each of the school types listed and the number of those core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified (as the term is defined in Section 9101(23) of ESEA) and the number taught by teachers who are not highly qualified. The percentage of core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified and the percentage taught by teachers who are not highly qualified will be calculated automatically. Below the table are FAQs about these data. The percentages used for high- and low-poverty schools and the poverty metric used to determine those percentages are reported in 1.5.3.

School Type	# of Core Academic Classes (Total)	# of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	# of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified
All schools	33,679	33,679	100.0	0	0.0
Elementary level					
High-poverty schools	2,221	2,221	100.0	0	0.0
Low-poverty schools	3,854	3,854	100.0	0	0.0
All elementary schools	14,896	14,896	100.0	0	0.0
Secondary level					
High-poverty schools	1,667	1,667	100.0	0	0.0
Low-poverty schools	5,454	5,454	100.0	0	0.0
All secondary schools	18,783	18,783	100.0	0	0.0
<b>Comments:</b> All core academic classes are taught by teachers who are HQ.					

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

Data table includes classes taught by special education teachers who provide direct instruction core academic subjects.	<u>Yes</u>
---	------------

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

--

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

**FAQs about highly qualified teachers and core academic subjects:**

- a. *What are the core academic subjects?* English, reading/language arts, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, and geography [Title IX, Section 9101(11)]. While the statute includes the arts in the core academic subjects, it does not specify which of the arts are core academic subjects; therefore, States must make this determination.
- b. *How is a teacher defined?* An individual who provides instruction in the core academic areas to kindergarten, grades 1 through 12, or ungraded classes, or individuals who teach in an environment other than a classroom setting (and who maintain daily student attendance records) [from NCES, CCD, 2001-02]
- c. *How is a class defined?* A class is a setting in which organized instruction of core academic course content is provided to one or more students (including cross-age groupings) for a given period of time. (A course may be offered to more than one class.) Instruction, provided by one or more teachers or other staff members, may be delivered in person or via a different medium. Classes that share space should be considered as separate classes if they function as separate units for more than 50% of the time [from NCES Non-fiscal Data Handbook for Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education, 2003].
- d. *Should 6th-, 7th-, and 8th-grade classes be reported in the elementary or the secondary category?* States are responsible for determining whether the content taught at the middle school level meets the competency requirements for elementary or secondary instruction. Report classes in grade 6 through 8 consistent with how teachers have been classified to determine their highly qualified status, regardless of whether their schools are configured as elementary or middle schools.
- e. *How should States count teachers (including specialists or resource teachers) in elementary classes?* States that count self-contained classrooms as one class should, to avoid over-representation, also count subject-area specialists (e.g., mathematics or music teachers) or resource teachers as teaching one class. On the other hand, States using a departmentalized approach to instruction where a self-contained classroom is counted multiple times (once for each subject taught) should also count subject-area specialists or resource teachers as teaching multiple classes.
- f. *How should States count teachers in self-contained multiple-subject secondary classes?* Each core academic subject taught for which students are receiving credit toward graduation should be counted in the numerator and the denominator. For example, if the same teacher teaches English, calculus, history, and science in a self-contained classroom, count these as four classes in the denominator. If the teacher were Highly Qualified to teach English and history, he/she would be counted as Highly Qualified in two of the four subjects in the numerator.
- g. *What is a "high-poverty school"?* Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "high-poverty" schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State. The poverty quartile breaks are reported later in this section.
- h. *What is a "low-poverty school"?* Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "low-poverty" schools as schools in the bottom quartile of poverty in the State. The poverty quartile breaks are reported later in this section.

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

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

In 2007-2008 all teacher assignments met the provisions of HQT statewide.

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

In 2007-2008 all teacher assignments met the provisions of HQT statewide.

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

### 1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

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

	<b>High-Poverty Schools</b> (more than what %)	<b>Low-Poverty Schools</b> (less than what %)
Elementary schools	46.1	27.0
Poverty metric used	Percent of free and reduced lunch	
Secondary schools	42.8	23.8
Poverty metric used	Percent of free and reduced lunch	
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

#### FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

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

**1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS**

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

**1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs**

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

**Table 1.6.1 Definitions:**

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

## 1.6.2 Student Demographic Data

### 1.6.2.1 Number of ALL LEP Students in the State

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of ALL LEP students in the State. LEP students are defined as all students assessed for English language proficiency (ELP) using an annual State ELP assessment as required under Section 1111(b)(7) of *ESEA* in the reporting year and who meet the LEP definition in Section 9101(25).

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

Number of ALL LEP students in the State	5,377
<b>Comments:</b> The number of limited English proficient students is generated from the State Automated Reporting (STARS) and is based on district reporting.	

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

**Note:** New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

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

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

	#
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	2,577
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

### 1.6.2.3 Most Commonly Spoken Languages in the State

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

Language	# LEP Students
Ojibwa	1,755
Spanish	855
Dakota/Lakota	694
North American Indian	534
Bosnian	292

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

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

### 1.6.3 Student Performance Data

This section collects data on LEP student English language proficiency, as required by Sections 1111(h)(4)(D) and 3121(b)(1).

#### 1.6.3.1.1 ALL LEP Participation in State Annual English Language Proficiency Assessment

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

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	5,823
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	0
Total	5,823
<p><b>Comments:</b> The number of LEP tested is higher than the number of LEP students reported in 1.6.2.1. The number of students tested is provided by the English language proficiency assessment testing vendor that serves North Dakota. The total LEP count is based on self-reporting by school districts in STARS... This discrepancy is due to several factors:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Incomplete reporting by school districts of LEP students,</li> <li>2. Loss of data in roll over of state data from old electronic reporting system to new system.</li> <li>3. Possibility of continual testing of LEP students that should be exited.</li> </ol>	

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

**Note:** New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

#### 1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

	#
Number proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	1,566
Percent proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	26.9
<p><b>Comments:</b> The number is 26.9%</p>	

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

**Note:** New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

**1.6.3.2.1 Title III LEP Participation in English Language Proficiency**

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

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	2,850
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	1,516
Total	4,366
<p><b>Comments:</b> The number of LEP tested is higher than the number of LEP students reported in 1.6.2.1. The number of students tested is provided by the English language proficiency assessment testing vendor that serves North Dakota. The total LEP count is based on self-reporting by school districts in STARS... This discrepancy is due to several factors:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Incomplete reporting by school districts of LEP students,</li> <li>2. Loss of data in roll over of state data from old electronic reporting system to new system.</li> <li>3. Possibility of continual testing of LEP students that should be exited.</li> </ol> <p>DOE comment: Number tested/not tested exceeds number Title 3 served by 1,789. See this above comment for explanation.</p>	

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

**Note:** New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

**1.6.3.2.2 Title III LEP English Language Proficiency Results**

In the table below, provide the results from the annual State English language proficiency assessment for Title III-served LEP students who participated in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12.

**Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:**

1. **Making Progress** = Number of Title III LEP students who met the definition of "Making Progress" as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
2. **ELP Attainment** = Number of Title III LEP students who attained English language proficiency as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
3. **Results** = Number and percent of Title III LEP students who met the State definition of "Making Progress" and the number and percent that met the State definition of "Attainment" of English language proficiency.

	Results	
	#	%
Making progress	1,206	47.0
ELP attainment	216	8.0
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

**1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments**

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

**1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language**

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

State offers the State reading/language arts content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
State offers the State mathematics content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
State offers the State science content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

**Note:** New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

**1.6.3.5.2 Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given**

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

Language(s)
<b>Comments:</b> No Native language assessments given.

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

**1.6.3.5.3 Native Language of Reading/Language Arts Tests Given**

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

Language(s)
<b>Comments:</b> No Native language assessments given.

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

**1.6.3.5.4 Native Language of Science Tests Given**

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

Language(s)
<b>Comments:</b> No Native language assessments given.

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

**Note:** New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

**1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP Students**

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

**1.6.3.6.1 Title III Served MFLEP Students by Year Monitored**

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

Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) students include:

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

**Table 1.6.3.6.1 Definitions:**

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

# Year One	# Year Two	Total
272	279	551
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

**1.6.3.6.2 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Mathematics**

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

**Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:**

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
141	64	45.4	77
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

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

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

**Table 1.6.3.6.3 Definitions:**

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
141	100	70.9	41
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

**1.6.3.6.4 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Science**

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

**Table 1.6.3.6.4 Definitions:**

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
141	38	27.0	103
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

**Note:** New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

#### 1.6.4 Title III Subgrantees

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

##### 1.6.4.1 Title III Subgrantee Performance

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

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

	#
Total number of subgrantees for the year	9
Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	0
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	0
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	3
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	3
Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	3
Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2006-07 and 2007-08)	4
Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2007-08 for not meeting Title III AMAOs	2
Number of subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2004-05, 2005-06, 2006-07, and 2007-08)	2
<b>Comments:</b> corrected data provided.	

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

##### 1.6.4.2 State Accountability

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

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

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

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

##### 1.6.4.3 Termination of Title III Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

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

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

### 1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students

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

#### 1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students

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

##### Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:

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

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants
497	77	2

If state reports zero (0) students in programs or zero (0) subgrants, explain in comment box below.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The number of LEP tested is higher than the number of LEP students reported in 1.6.2.1. The number of students tested is provided by the English language proficiency assessment testing vendor that serves North Dakota. The total LEP count is based on self-reporting by school districts in STARS... This discrepancy is due to several factors:

1. Incomplete reporting by school districts of LEP students,
2. Loss of data in roll over of state data from old electronic reporting system to new system.
3. Possibility of continual testing of LEP students that should be exited.

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

### 1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development

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

#### 1.6.6.1 Teacher Information

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

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

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

	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	60
Estimate number of <b>additional</b> certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	56

Explain in the comment box below if there is a zero for any item in the table above.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

**1.6.6.2 Professional Development (PD) Activities of Subgrantees Related to the Teaching and Learning of LEP Students**

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

**Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:**

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

<b>Type of Professional Development Activity</b>	<b># Subgrantees</b>	
Instructional strategies for LEP students	9	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	9	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	9	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	2	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	5	
Other (Explain in comment box)	0	
<b>Participant Information</b>	<b># Subgrantees</b>	<b># Participants</b>
PD provided to content classroom teachers	9	260
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	9	45
PD provided to principals	9	25
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	9	10
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	9	30
PD provided to community based organization personnel	9	25
Total	9	395

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

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

### 1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities

This section collects data on State grant activities.

#### 1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process

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

##### Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:

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

Example: State received SY 2007-08 funds July 1, 2007, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2007, for SY 2007-08 programs. Then the "# of days/\$\$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
07/01/08	09/01/08	60
<b>Comments:</b> There are 44 days for distribution.		

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

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

In the comment box below, describe how your State can shorten the process of distributing Title III funds to subgrantees.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

North Dakota can shorten the process of distributing Title III funds by providing more support to the Title III office to disseminate information and approve applications.
---

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

**1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS**

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

	#
Persistently Dangerous Schools	0
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

**1.8 GRADUATION RATES AND DROPOUT RATES**

This section collects graduation and dropout rates.

**1.8.1 Graduation Rates**

In the table below, provide the graduation rates calculated using the methodology that was approved as part of the State's accountability plan for the **previous school year** (SY 2006-07). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	87.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	64.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	88.6
Black, non-Hispanic	77.9
Hispanic	72.3
White, non-Hispanic	90.1
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	79.6
Limited English proficient	73.8
Economically disadvantaged	83.5
Migratory students	33.3
Male	86.0
Female	89.6
<b>Comments:</b> North Dakota has no comment and stands by its data.	

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

**FAQs on graduation rates:**

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

**1.8.2 Dropout Rates**

In the table below, provide the dropout rates calculated using the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's (NCES) Common Core of Data (CCD) for the **previous school year** (SY 2006-07). Below the table is a FAQ about the data collected in this table.

<b>Student Group</b>	<b>Dropout Rate</b>
All Students	2.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	7.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	0.7
Black, non-Hispanic	3.5
Hispanic	3.9
White, non-Hispanic	1.8
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	0.0
Limited English proficient	0.0
Economically disadvantaged	0.0
Migratory students	0.0
Male	2.7
Female	2.0
<b>Comments:</b> North Dakota has no comment and stands by its data.	

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

**FAQ on dropout rates:**

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

**1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS PROGRAM**

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

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

	#	# LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	192	16
LEAs with subgrants	3	3
Total	195	19
<b>Comments:</b> Three agencies who receive the subgrant did not report homeless data. They have two ways to complete it, either SFN 54047 or on STARS.		

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

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

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

**1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youths**

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

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b># of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs Without Subgrants</b>	<b># of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs With Subgrants</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	11	7
K	31	39
1	28	43
2	16	36
3	23	50
4	23	39
5	22	23
6	26	22
7	21	12
8	32	19
9	16	26
10	20	9
11	21	13
12	23	35
Ungraded	0	0
Total	313	373

**Comments:** Error was a duplicated number in kindergarten. Corrected to reflect accurate number of homeless children/youth enrolled in public school in LEA with subgrants.

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

**1.9.1.2 Primary Nighttime Residence of Homeless Children and Youths**

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

	<b># of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs Without Subgrants</b>	<b># of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs With Subgrants</b>
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	143	54
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	129	230
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	18	22
Hotels/Motels	23	67
Total	313	373

**Comments:** The total number of Homeless Children/Youth enrolled in LEA's with and without subgrants does not equal the total number of Homeless Children/Youth enrolled in LEA's with and without subgrants because when the LEA or Liaison is entering the data into STARS, they are choosing more than one night-time residency or choosing unknown/other.

Hotels and motels were duplicated because many families are doubled-up in hotel/motels. Corrected numbers reflect number of students enrolled in LEA with subgrants.

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

## 1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

### 1.9.2.1 Homeless Children and Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

Age/Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	6
K	33
1	33
2	28
3	39
4	32
5	20
6	16
7	13
8	14
9	24
10	9
11	10
12	29
Ungraded	0
Total	306
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

### 1.9.2.2 Subpopulations of Homeless Students Served

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

	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied youth	52
Migratory children/youth	0
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	77
Limited English proficient students	32
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

**1.9.2.3 Educational Support Services Provided by Subgrantees**

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

	# McKinney-Vento Subgrantees That Offer
Tutoring or other instructional support	2
Expedited evaluations	2
Staff professional development and awareness	3
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	3
Transportation	3
Early childhood programs	1
Assistance with participation in school programs	3
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	0
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	3
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	3
Coordination between schools and agencies	3
Counseling	2
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	3
Clothing to meet a school requirement	3
School supplies	3
Referral to other programs and services	3
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	2
Other (optional – in comment box below)	0
Other (optional – in comment box below)	0
Other (optional – in comment box below)	0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

**1.9.2.4 Barriers To The Education Of Homeless Children And Youth**

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

	# Subgrantees Reporting
Eligibility for homeless services	3
School Selection	1
Transportation	3
School records	2
Immunizations	1
Other medical records	0
Other Barriers – in comment box below	0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

### 1.9.2.5 Academic Progress of Homeless Students

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

#### 1.9.2.5.1 Reading Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Reading Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	29	14
4	25	10
5	17	7
6	18	7
7	15	8
8	24	8
High School	17	8
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

#### 1.9.2.5.2 Mathematics Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Mathematics Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	29	15
4	24	14
5	17	9
6	18	7
7	15	8
8	24	7
High School	17	7
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

## 1.10 MIGRANT CHILD COUNTS

This section collects the Title I, Part C, Migrant Education Program (MEP) child counts which States are required to provide and may be used to determine the annual State allocations under Title I, Part C. The child counts should reflect the reporting period of September 1, 2007 through August 31, 2008. This section also collects a report on the procedures used by States to produce true, accurate, and valid child counts.

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

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

### FAQs on Child Count:

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

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

**1.10.1 Category 1 Child Count**

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number by age/grade of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, resided in your State for one or more days during the reporting period of September 1, 2007 through August 31, 2008. This figure includes all eligible migrant children who may or may not have participated in MEP services. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

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

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can be Counted for Funding Purposes</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	108
K	61
1	70
2	74
3	38
4	74
5	62
6	40
7	32
8	36
9	42
10	44
11	28
12	11
Ungraded	2
Out-of-school	0
Total	722

**Comments:**

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

**1.10.1.1 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases**

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

For the category 1 child count North Dakota did not experience an increase or decrease of 10%.

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

**1.10.2 Category 2 Child Count**

In the table below, enter by age/grade the unduplicated statewide number of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, were served for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods that occurred within the reporting period of September 1, 2007 through August 31, 2008. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. Count a child who moved to different schools within the State and who was served in both traditional summer and year-round school intersession programs only once. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

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

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	92
K	43
1	35
2	28
3	27
4	35
5	28
6	11
7	13
8	14
9	18
10	11
11	7
12	1
Ungraded	1
Out-of-school	0
Total	364
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

**1.10.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases**

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

For the category 2 child count North Dakota did experience a decrease of 10% from last years count. The reason for the decrease is the main agricultural activity for many years for the migrant workers in the state of North Dakota was to weed and thin the beet and the potato fields. Machines and chemicals are now doing a majority of the weeding and thinning. Therefore this process has eliminated the need for some of our migrant workers in the passed years. Now the beet and potato farmers in the state of North Dakota are employing a majority of our migrant workers to help with seeding the beets and potatoes and then transporting the beets and potatoes to the processing plants. This process does not require the same numbers of migrant workers as North Dakota has had in the past years.

Once again the summer of 2008 many of the Minnesota summer migrant centers that border North Dakota chose to run a program which resulted in a decrease in North Dakota's 2008 summer program. Also due to declining enrollment North Dakota had to close a migrant summer program.

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

**1.10.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures**

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

**1.10.3.1 Student Information System**

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

**1.10.3.2 Data Collection and Management Procedures**

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Yes, the state of North Dakota used the MIS 2000 system to compile and generate 06-07 Category 1 and Category 2 child counts.

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The state of North Dakota has two summer migrant education centers. The child and family data is collected by a Tri Valley Head Start recruiter. The Tri Valley Head Start recruiter interviews the families at the school, home or the place of employment. The Tri Valley Head Start recruiters require documentation showing a qualifying move. Without documentation of a qualifying move, the migrant family's children will not be served in the summer migrant education program. This information is entered on a Certificate of Eligibility (C.O.E.). This C.O.E. is completed and submitted to the State Office. The data that is collected on the C.O.E. is the required MSIX data elements. The family and child information is collected during the summer migrant school and the regular school year.

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

For the State to maintain the Category 1 count, the State does a fall migrant survey to all schools in North Dakota. The schools in North Dakota who indicate they have migrant students during the regular school year fill out a C.O.E on all students who were not enrolled in the summer migrant program. Please note 95% of the migrant students in North Dakota enrolled in the regular school year were also enrolled in the summer migrant program. If the summer migrant students are also enrolled during the regular school year, the State will use the same C.O.E.s that was completed during the summer migrant program on those students. For students who were not enrolled during the summer migrant program, the State Migrant Office contacts the Local Education Agency to verify student information and eligibility information.

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

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

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

**1.10.3.3 Methods Used To Count Children**

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

MIS 2000 has edit functions to separate the category 1 and category 2 counts. For the category 1 count, a date is used to get the count example (9/1/07 - 8/31/08). This report also includes an "R" for Fall enrollment. After running a printout of all the students who are in this date range, our state compares results with the schools districts who reported migrant students during the regular school year to see if the LEA count and the SEA count are the same. For the Category 2, count the date that is used, for example, would be 9/1/07- 8/31/08. This report also includes an "S" for summer school. After the MIS 2000 report is run on this count, a comparison is made from the MIS 2000 report to the State's student enrollment report that was run throughout the North Dakota summer program.

The MIS 2000 information system is set up to include children ages 3-21 years of age. The system also automatically checks to see if a student meets the three-year eligibility requirement. The recruiters are informed at the yearly spring recruiter workshop what the eligibility years are for the upcoming summer migrant education program. For example, in 2008 if a family made a move in 2006, 2007, 2008 and any move after September 1, 2005 the family still will have made a qualifying three-year move. A recruiter is at each migrant center that completes the C.O.E. and verifies that the family has met a qualifying move and will be working at a qualifying agricultural activity.

Using the three-year eligibility rule, MIS 2000 ran our state a printout of our A-1 count. In addition, it ran us a copy of the number of students who were documented with a C.O.E who were in the State during the period 9/1/07 - 8/31/08. Our data entry specialist then contacted our two migrant centers, by both faxing and phoning, to verify whether the students who represented the difference between the two counts were still residents of North Dakota.

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

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

The category 1 and category 2 counts are enrollment based reports. This means that a student's enrollment must meet the report's criteria in order to be counted. For example students who have graduated will not have enrollments in the migrant database for subsequent years; therefore, those students would not be included in the counts. MIS2000 also has a termination code for students who graduated in our database. However, this is used to indicate that a student's graduation is associated with a specific enrollment. This wouldn't be brought forward to new enrollments that were created after a student graduated.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

**1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes**

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Below is the description the State of North Dakota used for the 2008 summer migrant program to test the accuracy of the State's eligibility determination. Because of the time frame of our seven-week summer migrant program, North Dakota has chosen to require the migrant families to show documentation of a qualifying move. The recruiter must see documentation that would prove that the migrant family did make a qualifying move and that the family will be doing agricultural work. Examples of the documentation are as follows: school records, rental agreements, Social Service documents etc. If no documentation was brought by the migrant family, the children are not enrolled in the summer migrant program.

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

Almost 90% of the migrant families that North Dakota serves during the summer migrant education program return summer after summer.

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Once again because of a seven week summer migrant program only and the size of the North Dakota summer migrant program our State feels very confident about the accuracy of the 2008 reported child counts and the eligibility of the migrant families.

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