

NORTH DAKOTA (ND) REPORT CARD



LAWS The state of North Dakota **does not mandate identifying or serving** “gifted children.” Yet, there is **partial funding** for gifted programs.

Opportunity to Be Identified as Gifted		
	Grade or Rank	Notes and Explanation
ACCESS	Access to Identification Rank	F 29.57% of students attend a school that identifies students with gifts and talents Rank among 50 states and DC in access 42nd
	Equity of Access Between Title I and Non-Title I Schools Rank	F Students in Title I schools are identified at 75% of the rate of those in Non-Title I schools (7.45% vs. 10.06% yields a ratio of 0.75 between Title I and Non-Title I schools). 16th
	Equity of Access by Race	A 1.22 AIAN A 1.63 Black A 1.01 Latinx A 1.17 NHPI The ratio of race access to general access in schools that identify indicates whether students proportionally attend schools that identify. Ratios close to or greater than 1.00 means good access, so underrepresentation is not a function of lack of access.

	Underserved Groups (in schools that identify)	Category	Statewide	City	Suburb	Town	Rural
			Grade—RI	Grade—RI	Grade—RI	Grade—RI	Grade—RI
EQUITY	AIAN Equity (n=3,706)	Overall	A -1.13	F -0.28	F -0.26	F -0.51	A -1.09
		Non-Title I	F -0.40	F -0.50	F -0.13	F -0.55	F -0.00
		Title I	A -1.46	F -0.05	F -0.36	F -0.31	A -1.13
	Black Equity (n=2,497)	Overall	F -0.31	F -0.26	F -0.28	F -0.51	F -0.00
		Non-Title I	F -0.33	F -0.28	F -0.38	F -0.55	F -0.00
		Title I	F -0.30	F -0.28	F -0.26	F -0.49	F -0.00
	Latinx Equity (n=1,403)	Overall	F -0.38	F -0.51	F -0.47	F -0.31	F -0.35
		Non-Title I	F -0.50	F -0.68	F -0.43	F -0.39	F -0.34
		Title I	F -0.31	F -0.36	F -0.51	F -0.28	F -0.35
NHPI Equity (n=123)	Overall	F -0.65	D -0.82	F -0.00	F -0.78	A -1.94	
	Non-Title I	F -0.48	F -0.55		F -0.00	A -3.62	
	Title I	C -0.87	A -1.63	F -0.00	A -1.65	F -0.00	

MISSINGNESS **Students Missing From Gifted Education Identification: 71% at the Lower Boundary. Grade: Fail. Rank: 42**
North Dakota identified 2,861 students as gifted in 2016. Statewide, the number of missing students in schools that do not identify and in schools that underidentify ranges from 7,062 to 8,264, (71% to 74%) with most of these missing students coming from Title I schools and from underserved populations. For example, 47 Latinx children are identified, with 365 to 426 (89% to 90%) missing. These numbers are detailed in Table 7 in the accompanying state report.

SUMMARY **Key Findings and Recommendations**
Without legislation for gifted identification or services, only about 30% of children from North Dakota even attend a school where they could be identified. Disproportionality exists between Title I and Non-Title I schools and across races concerning proportionality of students who are identified. A student who attends a Title I school in North Dakota and who is AIAN, Black, Latinx, or Two or More Races is less likely to be identified than those in Non-Title Schools and who are White or Asian. And large numbers of all children are missing from gifted identification due to lack of access. Clear policy changes are needed to give access to, and equitably identify and serve, students with gifts and talents in North Dakota.

Note. A blank indicates there are no students in that setting from this group; a zero indicated that although there are students in this setting none are identified with gifts and talents, a strikethrough indicates fewer than 10 students and an unstable RI. AIAN=American Indian or Alaska Native, NHPI=Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander

NORTH DAKOTA DETAILED NARRATIVE REPORT

Introduction

1. Laws

Though partially funded gifted education is not mandated nor are identification and services, North Dakota regulations are embedded in the North Dakota Century Code chapter Special Education and say: "Student who is gifted" means an individual who is identified by qualified professionals as being capable of high performance and who needs educational programs and services beyond those normally provided in a regular education program" and "A school district may provide special education to students who are gifted." More information can be found at <https://law.justia.com/codes/north-dakota/2013/title-15.1/chapter-15.1-32/>

2. Opportunity to Be Identified With Gifts and Talents

With no mandate to identify or serve students with gifts and talents, North Dakota is ranked 42nd in access to being identified with gifts and talents, with only 29.57% of its students attending the 17.88% of its schools that actually identify students as such in 2015–2016. In 2000, access was lowest at 22.94%.

Access for Students From Poverty: Non-Title I and Title I Schools

As shown in Table 1, 8.76% of students who attend schools that identify students with gifts and talents were identified in 2015–2016. Nationally, on average, 9.57% of students are identified among schools that identify. Compared with other states, North Dakota identifies a smaller percentage of students, ranking 25th among the 50 states and DC, in which percentage identified ranges from 24.37% (MD) to 0% (DC). As shown in Table 2, a closer look at this number (8.76%) by considering whether students attend a Title I or Non-Title I school reveals inequity between these school types. Each year, a greater percentage of students in Non-Title I schools are identified than in Title I schools, with the largest difference occurring in 2016 with 10.06% and 7.54% respectively, yielding a ratio of 0.75. This means that students in Title I schools are identified at 75% of the rate of those in Non-Title I schools.

TABLE 1

North Dakota Students Who Have Access to Identification as Gifted and Schools That Identify Students

Year	Total Students	Total Students in Schools That ID GT	Students ID as		Total Schools That ID GT
			GT From Schools That Have GT ID	Total Schools	
2015-2016	110,436	32,657	2,861	481	86
		29.57%	8.76%		17.88%
2013-2014	104,208	30,600	2,385	451	83
		29.36%	7.79%		18.40%
2011-2012	101,134	31,222	3,296	468	88
		30.87%	10.56%		18.80%
2000	107,155	24,586	2,536	502	81
		22.94%	10.31%		16.14%

TABLE 2

Number and Percentage of Students Identified With Giftedness Overall and by Title I Status, With Difference Between Non-Title I and Title I Schools in North Dakota

Year	Total Identified GT Students	Number and % ID		Ratio of ID in Title I Schools Compared With Non-Title I Schools
		GT in Non-Title I Schools	ID GT in Title I Schools	
2015-2016	2,861	1,578	1,277	
		10.06%	7.54%	0.75
2013-2014	2,385	1,230	1,149	
		8.77%	6.95%	0.79
2011-2012	3,296	1,546	1,727	
		11.84%	9.93%	0.84

Note. Total students identified may not equal students in Title I and Non-Title I schools because a few schools in each state did not designate Title I status.

TABLE 3

2015-2016 Ratio of Non-Title I and Title I Schools With/Without Gifted Access With Grand Ratio of Title I Ratio to Non-Title I Ratio in North Dakota

Year	Total Schools	Ratio Non-Title I			Ratio Title I		Grand Ratio Title I Ratio/Non-Title I Ratio
		Schools No ID # and %	Schools With ID # and %	Title I With ID /Non-Title I No ID	Title I Schools No ID # and %	Title I Schools With ID # and %	
2015-2016	481	174	36		220	49	
		36.17	7.48	0.21	45.74	10.19	0.22
2013-2014	451	158	33		209	49	
		35.03	7.32	0.21	46.34	10.86	0.23
2011-2012	468	140	29		237	57	
		29.91	6.20	0.21	50.64	12.18	0.24

TABLE 4

2015–2016 Access to Identification as Gifted in All Schools and by Race With a Ratio of Race to All

Race	Total Students	Students in Schools That ID GT		Ratio of Race to All
		N	%	
North Dakota–All	110,436	32,657	29.57%	
AIAN	10,353	3,740	36.12%	1.22
Asian	1,834	898	48.96%	1.66
Black	5,182	2,497	48.19%	1.63
Latinx	4,700	1,403	29.85%	1.01
NHPI	355	123	34.65%	1.17
TMR	1,285	307	23.89%	0.81
White	86,727	23,689	27.31%	0.92

Note. TMR=Two or More Races

Table 3 provides descriptive data concerning the numbers and percentage of schools with Title I status and whether or not they identify students with gifts and talents. These data help explain whether there are differences in opportunity for identification based on what type of school (Title I or Non-Title I) a student attends. In comparing schools that identify to schools that don't identify for each type of school (Non-Title I or Title I), ratios more than 1.00 would indicate a larger percentage of schools of that type identify than do not identify; ratios close to 1.00 would indicate about the same percentage of schools identify as do not identify; and ratios less than 1.00 would indicate a smaller percentage of schools identify than do not identify. The grand ratio compares the ratio of Title I to Non-Title I, with the same indicators (Ratio > 1.00 means a larger proportional representation of schools that identify within Title I schools than Non-Title I; ratio near 1.00 means about the same in percentage of schools identifying; ratio <1.00 means a greater proportional representation of schools that identify within Non-Title I schools than Title I schools). For North Dakota in 2016, grand ratio (1.08) indicates slightly larger proportion for Title I schools that identify (0.22) when compared to Non-Title I schools that identify (0.21). These data support the conclusion that underrepresentation is not a function of proportionally fewer Title I schools identifying students with gifts and talents.

Access for Students by Racial Groups

Finally, we examined access to identification by race (Table 4). To do this, we looked at the percentage of students in North Dakota in 2015–2016 who attended schools that identified students with gifts and talents, which is 29.57%, then we compared that percentage with the percentage of students from each race who attend schools that identify students with gifts and talents. If, for example, fewer students from a given race attend schools where they have the opportunity for identification, then this could explain underidentification of this group of students. A simple ratio of the percentage of students of a given race who attend schools that identify to the percentage of students overall who

TABLE 5

Breakdown by Race Among All, Non-Title I, and Title I Schools, With Ratio of Title I/Non-Title I Identified in 2015–2016

Race	RI in All Schools That ID	RI in Non-Title I Schools That ID	RI in Title I Schools That ID	Ratio of Title I/Non-Title I
AIAN	1.13	0.40	1.46	3.65
Asian	1.37	1.78	0.72	0.41
Black	0.31	0.33	0.30	0.93
Latinx	0.38	0.50	0.31	0.61
NHPI	0.65	0.48	0.87	1.81
TMR	0.37	0.29	0.47	1.63
White	1.09	1.08	1.04	0.96

attend such schools provides an equity ratio. Ratios close to or greater than 1.00 indicate that the group has proportional access in that they attend schools that identify at or greater than the rate of all students. Table 4 contains these results, with students of Two or More Races attending schools that identify at only 0.81 (i.e., 23.89%/29.57%) the rate of overall groups. So one reason TMR youth in North Dakota are missing from gifted identification can be attributed to the fact that they are 19% less likely to attend schools where they have the opportunity for identification.

3. Equity Across Underserved Groups

In 2015–2016, nationally, a disparity exists between Non-Title I schools (13.46% identified) and Title I schools (7.86% identified) that identify students with gifts and talents for a ratio of 0.58, meaning Title I schools identify students at only 58% the rate of Non-Title I schools. In North Dakota, this rate is 75%. Additional disparity exists among racial groups, with Asian and White students well-represented and students who are AIAN, Black, Latinx, NHPI, and Two or More Races underrepresented. We used representation indices (RIs) to examine equity among Title I status, race, and locale for students in North Dakota.

In Table 5, RIs are reported by race and Title I status, with a ratio between Title I and Non-Title I shown to quantify the extent of well- or underrepresentation between these two settings. RIs and ratios less than 1.00 indicate underrepresentation. For the report card, as described in the methods, RIs less than 0.80 are considered failing. In North Dakota, for AIAN and NHPI youth, attending a Title I school improves proportional identification (1.46 vs. 0.40; 0.87 vs. 0.48, respectively). Identification also improves for TMR students attending Title I schools (0.47 vs. 0.29), yet they are underrepresented in both settings. Black and Latinx students are underrepresented in both settings but worse in Title I schools (0.30 vs. 0.33; 0.31 vs. 0.50, respectively). Asian students are well represented in Non-Title I schools yet underrepresented in Title I schools (1.78 vs. 0.72), and White students are well represented in all schools.

TABLE 6**RIs by Race and Locale With Non-Title I and Title I Status**

	City	Suburb	Town	Rural
AIAN Overall (n=3,706)	0.28	0.26	0.51	1.09
AIAN Non-Title I (n=622)	0.50	0.13	0.55	0.00
AIAN Title I (n=3,084)	0.05	0.36	0.31	1.13
Asian Overall (n=898)	1.73	1.26	0.67	0.86
Asian Non-Title I (n=476)	2.12	1.63	1.00	1.21
Asian Title I (n=422)	0.64	1.08	0.25	0.00
Black Overall (n=2,497)	0.26	0.28	0.51	0.00
Black Non-Title I (n=975)	0.28	0.38	0.55	0.00
Black Title I (n=1,522)	0.28	0.26	0.49	0.00
Latinx Overall (n=1,403)	0.51	0.47	0.31	0.35
Latinx Non-Title I (n=535)	0.68	0.43	0.39	0.34
Latinx Title I (n=868)	0.36	0.51	0.28	0.35
NHPI Overall (n=123)	0.82	0.00	0.78	1.94
NHPI Non-Title I (n=62)	0.55		0.00	3.62
NHPI Title I (n=61)	1.63	0.00	1.65	0.00
TMR Overall (n=307)	0.48		0.66	0.20
TMR Non-Title I (n=138)	0.24		0.68	0.33
TMR Title I (n=169)	0.97		0.69	0.00
White Overall (n=23,688)	1.13	1.17	1.16	0.93
White Non-Title I (n=12,881)	1.05	1.07	1.14	1.07
White Title I (n=10,807)	1.27	1.26	1.18	0.69

Note. Passing grades are in **Green** and failing grades are in **Red**.

Note. A blank indicates there are no students in that setting from this group; a zero indicated that although there are students in this setting none are identified with gifts and talents, a strikethrough indicates fewer than 10 students and an unstable RI.

Note. Overall student numbers may not equal Title I and Non-Title I student numbers because a few schools in each state did not designate Title I status.

Equity in different locales with Non-Title I and Title I status was examined using RIs. Table 6 contains RIs for these groups by race, with RIs less than 0.80 considered failing. Color is used in the table to indicate passing in green or failing in red. Clear patterns exist for racial groups. Black and Latinx students lack proportional identification in North Dakota, with Black RIs ranging from 0.00 (Rural schools) to 0.55 (Town Non-Title I) and Latinx RIs ranging from 0.28 (Town Title I) to 0.51 (City Overall and Suburb Title I). TMR students have equity in one setting, City Title I (RI=0.97) and AIAN youth have equity in Rural Title I and Overall (RIs=1.13 and 1.09). RI for NHPI are difficult to interpret due to low populations numbers. Asian students, also with low numbers, tend to see proportional representation, except in Town and City Title I schools. White youth have proportional representation in all settings with the exception of Rural Title I, where the RI is failing (0.69).

TABLE 7**Lower and Upper Boundaries of Students by Race Missing From GT and Those Identified in 2015-2016**

	Missing Students Lower Boundary ¹			Missing Students Upper Boundary ²			Students Identified as GT	% Missing Lower Boundary	% Missing Upper Boundary
	No ID	ID	Total	No ID	ID	Total			
ND	6,814	248	7,062	7,823	441	8,264	2,861	71.17%	74.28%
AIAN	579		579	665	6	671	370	61.03%	64.47%
Asian	82		82	94		94	108	43.16%	46.57%
Black	235	152	387	270	184	454	67	85.24%	87.15%
Latinx	289	76	365	332	94	426	47	88.59%	90.06%
NHPI	20	4	24	23	5	29	7	77.49%	80.40%
TMR	86	17	103	98	21	119	10	91.12%	92.26%
White	5,523		5,523	6,340	131	6,471	2,252	71.03%	74.18%

Note. Blank cells indicate well-representation of students in this racial category.

¹8.76% of students identified with gifts and talents in schools that identify

²10.06% of students identified with gifts and talents in non-Title I schools that identify

4. Students Missing From Gifted Education Identification

Missing students within the state of North Dakota are calculated using the method described in the State Report Card Methods section. As shown in Table 1, with only 29.57% of students having access to identification, and an average rate of identification of 8.76%, numerous children are missing from the state's gifted population. With 2,861 students identified in 2016, another 7,062 to 8,264 students are missing from gifted identification in North Dakota. In fact, as shown in Table 7, 89% to 90% of North Dakota's Latinx gifted students are not identified; likewise, the percentages of missing Black and AIAN youth range between 85% to 87% and 61% to 64%, respectively, with North Dakota educating the sixth largest percentage of AIAN students. The percentage of missing Asian and White students ranges from 43% to 47% and 71% to 74%, respectively, with missingness among all groups comprised primarily of students who attend schools that do not identify.

Summary

Without legislation for gifted identification or services, only about 30% of children from North Dakota even attend a school where they could be identified. Disproportionality exists between Title I and Non-Title I schools and across races concerning proportionality of students who are identified. A student who attends a Title I school in North Dakota and who is AIAN, Black, Latinx, or Two or More Races is less likely to be identified than those in Non-Title Schools and who are White or Asian. And large numbers of all children are missing from gifted identification due to lack of access. Clear policy changes are needed to give access to, and equitably identify and serve, students with gifts and talents in North Dakota.