

2009 HOUSE EDUCATION

HB 1501

## 2009 HOUSE STANDING COMMITTEE MINUTES

Bill/Resolution No. HB 1501

House Education Committee

☐ Check here for Conference Committee

Hearing Date: February 3, 2009

Recorder Job Number: 8451

Committee Clerk Signature

*Carmen Hart*

Minutes:

**Rep. Steve Zaiser, District 21, central portions of Fargo,** introduced HB 1501. He submitted a hog house amendment. **(See Attachment 1.)** There is one method of building a school without a vote of the people who reside in the district. The passage of HB 1501 as amended would no longer allow a third party to plan and construct the building to lease back to the school district without a vote having at least 60% of the people in favor of the project prior to the commencement of the project. This bill has been worked over many times. He has been involved in this project so long and he feels it is so important that he wanted to tighten it up so that this bill would not negatively impact any other school activities with any other arrangements that school districts have with park boards, cities, or with other political subdivisions. Presently there is one school district in the state of North Dakota that utilizes the building authority.

**Vice Chair Lisa Meier:** What school district does utilize the building authority and has caused all this dissension\_\_?

**Rep. Zaiser:** The school district that does use it is Fargo.

**Rep. David Rust:** Basically what your hog house amendment does is it limits the authorities of the school board in this area?

**Rep. Zaiser:** I don't know if I would characterize it that way. It basically says when it comes to a new school building or a significantly remodeled school building, if there is a lease arrangement there has to be a vote. There has to be a vote regardless.

**Rep. David Rust:** But it does. Right now evidently the board has the authority to do that and this would limit the board's authority so they cannot do that. Is that correct?

**Rep. Zaiser:** Fargo is now doing it, but in my opinion, and based on statute, I believe they are doing it illegally. This building authority is in code and allows specifically and identified to be used by cities and by counties. It is not allowed to be used by school districts unless all of the individuals are totally unrelated to the school district, and the school district from the inception of the building authority has had their business manager and two board members as members of the authority. Based on that information I feel it is a violation of state statute, but this would clarify the issue for me. Essentially it would limit them.

**Rep. Karen Karls:** When was the last time Fargo voted on a bond issue for a school?

**Rep. Zaiser:** The last time as far as I understand, it was 1990. There have been four schools constructed since, and there is planning for a fifth. Fargo school enrollment has been going down. Contrary to common opinion, the Bismarck School District is the largest in the state. Fargo is no longer the largest school district. Fargo has more people but have less children for every so many adults.

**Rep. Jerry Kelsh:** Would this imply that if they had the money, they would not have to go into indebtedness of any kind, they could build a school without the vote?

**Rep. Zaiser:** No. This purpose of this bill is to require that any school or major modification would require a vote of the people. This just covers up the loophole with the building authority. Do you want me to walk through the hog house amendment?

**Chairman Kelsch:** It looks to me that it is fairly explanatory. It is more concise than what the bill was.

**Attachments 2 & 3 were handed out by Rep. Zaiser showing some trends on Bismarck and Fargo enrollments.**

**Rep. Lyle Hanson:** Does Fargo still have the unlimited mill levy?

**Rep. Zaiser:** That was voted and Fargo no longer has the unlimited mill levy.

**Rep. Lyle Hanson:** When they proposed a new high school, was the unlimited mill levy still in existence?

**Rep. Zaiser:** No.

**Rep. Lyle Hanson:** Did they put mills on to build the new high school?

**Rep. Zaiser:** No.

**Rep. Lyle Hanson:** So what's the argument, then?

**Rep. Zaiser:** The argument is that when they build these schools, like the high school—I think it was \$55 million which is a chunk of change—there were many people in the community that felt that it wasn't needed and there wasn't a vote. That's really the issue—to have the people vote on whether or not it is appropriate to spend that kind of money on a school or not. Have the school board be accountable to the residents.

**Rep. Lyle Hanson:** Really that is no different than us saying you can build something new at NDSU, and we don't get the vote of the people of the state of North Dakota. Same difference isn't it?

**Rep. Zaiser:** You are exactly correct. It is the same thing, but there is a very different thing too. It is a local subdivision and people are a lot closer to their government. Fargo is the only school district in the state that doesn't vote on its schools.

**Rep. Lyle Hanson:** Fargo has its own section in the Century Code because the Fargo School District was developed before we had a state.

**Rep. Zaiser:** You are correct. If you will read the first line in the hog house amendment, starting out reading notwithstanding any other provision of law. The board of a school district may not enter into an agreement pursuant to Internal Revenue Service, ruling 63-20 which is a nonprofit 501 3C under which payments of any kind will be required by the district and then it goes on to say without a vote. It supersedes Fargo's supposed own spot in the Century Code. Some people might say I am speaking against Fargo. On the other hand, I am speaking for Fargo and for accountability and total engagement and happiness with the end result. I am as pro education as anybody. If any young person talks to me, I talk to them about the importance of education, a liberal arts education which begins in the high school and that continues on after that. I feel accountability is an important part of operating a local political subdivision.

**Rep. David Rust:** You use 60%. Did you have any consideration for over 50%.

**Rep. Zaiser:** I did but that is the Fargo number upon all referred measures and everything.

**Rep. Lee Myxter:** If this had been in place in the last ten years, would there have been any schools built in Fargo considering the population in Fargo?

**Rep. Zaiser:** I believe so. I think the elementary schools would have been constructed in my opinion. I cannot answer that.

**Rep. Lee Myxter:** With this 60% and considering the age and the fact that over half the people in Fargo live in apartments and taxes, obviously, are quite high, I would suggest to you that there would be no schools built if this would pass. You couldn't get a 60%.

**Rep. John Wall:** Four buildings have been built without board approval since the 1990s.

Have there not been board elections? Are people not turning out and voting off board members?

**Rep. Zaiser:** Up until this last election, there always has been a difficult time to get enough people to run for the office. This last election was different. There were I believe seven or eight people running for four positions, and it was a very competitive highly visible campaign. One of the candidates ran on this issue that the building authority is an inappropriate process and it was also his opinion that Fargo is building these schools illegally because they weren't based on Century Code. He won. That was a statement that the citizens were in support of the candidate that ran on the issue opposing the status quo and supporting changes so that we do have elections in schools. Back to Rep. Myxter's question of 60%--that is a difficult threshold to reach, and I am very cognizant of that. That was established some years ago in the city of Fargo for all referrals. Now the reason 60% was put in here was to be consistent with that. Now if there was some research and the committee were to come up and feel that was too high a bar, that could be amended. I don't know if it is legal or not. I used the 60% to be consistent with the other Fargo law.

**Rep. Jerry Kelsh:** Isn't that the bar, though, for every other school district in the state for a bond issue, that 60%?

**Rep. Zaiser:** I don't know.

**Rep. Boucher, District 9,** appeared in support of this bill. This issue has been widely debated in the past. It has been debated extensively in the Fargo community and on talk radio. It has been a discussed issue throughout the state. From a standpoint it being a Fargo issue, he has been reluctant to talk about this issue in this capacity because it probably is a matter that is best resolved locally but the bill that you have before you doesn't preclude that from

happening. He thinks that the concern that bothers a great deal of people around the state of North Dakota is the very issue of what has been happening—expending large amounts of taxpayers' dollars for building projects without a vote of the people. Sixty percent is the threshold in most of these bond issues. He found that people do believe that it should be a decision made by the citizens of the school district if you are going to expend large amounts of school district money and obligate taxpayers to large amounts of indebtedness.

**Rep. Lee Myxter:** I can name you five schools right across the border in Moorhead that have had the bond issues five times in the last five or six years and they have all failed. They haven't had the 60%. They are laying off teachers. They are cutting them. My worry is that if this passes, nothing will happen in Fargo anymore. There will be no more progress or building in Fargo in the school system.

**Rep. Boucher:** I live in a community that twenty some years ago had two bond issues. They are not easy. It took several times and several votes to accomplish, but in the end the people did make the decision that they wanted a new building and a new school. The important part to remember is they want to be part of the process, because they are the ones paying the bill.

**Rep. Jerry Kelsh:** Fargo is the only school district in the state that operates, that doesn't have to have a vote. Is that correct?

**Rep. Boucher:** To my knowledge at this time, they are the only district that has done it this way. We know that Fargo has unique status because it was an existing school district at the time North Dakota became a state. Does that allow them to do this and not allow other school districts? I couldn't tell you the history on that. As I understand, they are the only school district at this particular point in time. We don't want this happening in other school districts in our state.

**Rep. Zaiser** asked if he could answer the last question. Can other school districts in the state use the financing mechanisms that Fargo has used or will plan on using on terms of using a nonprofit in a lease factor arrangement? Any school district in the state can utilize that concept. All they have to do is have an independently formed nonprofit building authority. That building authority will have some credible people on it. It would sell bonds for the construction of the school. It would be their school and then they could lease it back to the district.

**Rep. Lee Myxter:** Would this preclude any remodeling? Any kind of indebtedness? Is it only new buildings?

**Rep. Zaiser:** Unless they were to decide they wanted to use it on a lease arrangement. The point is to try to provide a deterrent to it this way because it doesn't have accountability.

Opposition

**Bev Nielson, NDSBA,** appeared in opposition of HB 1501. We don't have a specific resolution having to do with building authority. We do, however, have a policy in opposing bills that reduce board authority, and in this case we see that it does do that. In our opinion the Attorney General's opinion was clear that Fargo School District was legally funding their schools. My larger concern has to do with the 60% vote. Our association has thought for a long time that 41% of the people should not make the decisions for the school district. We think that it all should be majority. We have some concerns about some unintended things.

**Rep. David Rust:** At one time the state of North Dakota enjoyed about 70% of its population in grades 1-12. Do you know what it is now?

**Bev Nielson:** I don't know exactly, but I know it is not 70%.

**Rep. David Rust:** Is it closer to 30%?

**Bev Nielson:** I couldn't give you a number. I just know that in sitting by Fargo where you have all the college students, all the young people, and then you have the older population, that getting a 50% of the people to care about whether your buildings are up to date and ready for technology and those types of things, it is very difficult to get a 60%.

**Dr. Doug Johnson, NDCEL,** also appeared in opposition of HB 1501. He had the same concerns about the 60% vote. During the 33 years he served in the Bismarck Public Schools, he went through at least six bond issues. He also had concerns about the unintended consequences. He gave the example of the Bismarck School District leasing space from a nearby church for kindergarten because not enough room at Northridge Elementary. Where do they fall within this section of this new hog house amendment? He asked that the committee look at that and find an answer to that particular question.

**Rep. Phillip Mueller:** In terms of the leasing which is in the amendment, it ties it into the district's project. I don't know that we are really talking the 60% on that part of it?

**Dr. Doug Johnson:** I am not quite sure so those are questions that I think we need to investigate. I know that the Bismarck School District had to make some improvements at the church space they leased for those kindergartners. The question I have would have the superintendent of public instruction approve that? I don't know?

**Kevin Hoherz, Principal, Stanley High School,** has concerns about the leasing part of this bill. Stanley is in an unique situation. We are in a school district that is increasing school enrollment. This year we have increased by over 40 students. We increased by 10 students at semester time at the high school. We have hired a new English teacher at semester time, and this teacher is rotating classrooms through free periods. She doesn't have a homeroom, per say. What we are looking at is leasing some modular units to house our overflow students.

Next year we have a special needs student that is moving up to the high school that is going to

need a private classroom for himself. That will eliminate one more classroom that we have in our school, so we will probably be looking for two new classrooms next year. It looks like we will have to lease some modular units. If these would be included in the terminology, that would put us in a bind.

The hearing was closed.

## 2009 HOUSE STANDING COMMITTEE MINUTES

Bill/Resolution No. HB 1501

House Education Committee

☐ Check here for Conference Committee

Hearing Date: February 11, 2009

Recorder Job Number: 9219

Committee Clerk Signature



Minutes:

**Rep. Corey Mock** handed out the amendment. The amendment is a clarification in language. It is more consistent as Anita Thomas had mentioned to Rep. Zaiser and other cosponsors. This is more in line with the intent of the bill stating that if there is ever an acquisition, improvement, or construction of any property undertaken by the school board that would cause indebtedness to the school board, it would have to be approved by 60% of the qualified electors in that district. The language in the bill doesn't fully acknowledge that. This is a hoghouse amendment that does the intent of Rep. Zaiser and the cosponsors wish to accomplish.

**Rep. Corey Mock** moved the amendment. **Rep. Jerry Kelsh** seconded the motion.

Voice vote taken. Motion carries. The chair will note that there was one dissenting I.

**Rep. Jerry Kelsh** moved to further amend. In the second paragraph of the amendment on the fifth line down where it says construction, purchase, repair, I would like to remove the word repair because it would say then that if some major damage happened because of an explosion or something to repair that they would have to go to a vote of the people. I don't think they want to go through that process to repair something. It may never happen if they have insurance or whatever, but it could.

**Rep. David Rust** seconded the motion.

Voice vote was taken. Motion carries to accept the amended amendment.

**Rep. David Rust:** I will tell you I will vote against this. It reduces the board's authority. I still maintain that the people who are absolutely the closest to the people in a district are school board members. If they are doing a lousy job, then they will get voted out. I don't like 60% because at one point in time the public schools enjoyed about 70% of the people in the school district had children in school and now it is probably around 30%. To get a 60% majority rule is something that is extremely difficult. It can be done but it takes many times.

**Rep. Lee Myxter:** Basically this comes out of a group of people in Fargo who have a major heartburn with the school district and what the school district has done. I think this is a Fargo problem and should be solved within the city of Fargo with elections and so on. I will vote against it also.

**Chairman Kelsch:** Where was Fargo? They didn't come in and support this.

**Rep. Phillip Mueller:** The opposition from Fargo didn't show up.

**Rep. David Rust** moved a **Do Not Pass as Amended**. **Rep. Brenda Heller** seconded the motion.

**Rep. Jerry Kelsh:** I totally agree with Rep. Rust said about people are very close. That is very true in rural areas. I am not so sure that is true in Fargo. The way Fargo has done several things as building buildings has kind of given local subdivisions a bad name on being able to circumvent the normal process on raising taxes, getting buildings built without going through what everybody else has to go through. If you were going to build a school in Tioga, you would have to have a vote of 60% of the people. Fargo has figured out a way not to do that and there is some anger. They did try to rectify with one or two new school board members last summer.

**Rep. Bob Hunskor:** It seems as long as this has been going on that if the people in Fargo had a heartbeat over it, they would have rose up and created a situation.

**Rep. Mike Schatz:** Can they refer these types of things to a vote of the people?

Chairman Kelsch asked Rep. Lee Myxter because he is from Fargo.

**Rep. Lee Myxter:** I honestly don't know.

**Rep. Mike Schatz:** They can recall the school board members. That is another option. A vote by the common school board is not referable, I assume.

**Chairman Kelsch:** I wonder if they could start an initiated measure against them.

**DO NOT PASS AS AMENDED, 9 YEAS, 4 NAYS, 1 ABSENT AND NOT VOTING. Rep.**

**David Rust** is the carrier of this bill.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO HOUSE BILL NO. 1501

Page 1, line 1, after "A BILL" replace the remainder of the bill with "for an Act to provide voter approval of school district building projects funded through a building authority or other indirect means.

**BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF NORTH DAKOTA:**

**SECTION 1. Voter approval of building authority or other indirect funding methods - School construction project approval.**

1. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the board of a school district may not enter an agreement pursuant to internal revenue service revenue ruling 63-20 under which payments of any kind would be required by the district to any building authority or other entity that incurs indebtedness or other obligation in connection with the acquisition, improvement, or construction of any property or structure to be used by the district, unless the agreement has been approved by a vote of at least sixty percent of the qualified electors of the district voting on the question if the acquisition, improvement, or construction subject to the agreement would require an election were the acquisition, improvement, or construction undertaken by the district through the issuance of bonds.
2. The board of a school district may not enter an agreement pursuant to internal revenue service revenue ruling 63-20 under which payments of any kind would be required by the district to any building authority or other entity that incurs indebtedness or other obligation regarding the construction, purchase, repair, improvement, modernization, or renovation of any building or facility to be used by the district without the approval of the superintendent of public instruction under section 15.1-36-01, if approval by the superintendent would be required were the project undertaken by the district itself."

Renumber accordingly

Date: 2-11-09  
Roll Call Vote #: 1

2009 HOUSE STANDING COMMITTEE ROLL CALL VOTES  
BILL/RESOLUTION NO. 1501

| House | Education | Committee |
|-------|-----------|-----------|
|-------|-----------|-----------|

☐ Check here for Conference Committee

Legislative Council Amendment Number 90/29.0101

Action Taken ☒ Do Pass ☐ Do Not Pass ☒ Amended

Motion Made By Rep Mock Seconded By Rep Kelsh

[illegible]

Total (Yes) \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

**Absent** \_\_\_\_\_

**Floor Assignment** \_\_\_\_\_

**If the vote is on an amendment, briefly indicate intent:**

motion carries  
to accept  
amendment  
one dissenting I

VR  
2/11/09

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO HOUSE BILL NO. 1501

Page 1, line 1, after "A BILL" replace the remainder of the bill with "for an Act to provide voter approval of school district building projects funded through a building authority or other indirect means.

**BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF NORTH DAKOTA:**

**SECTION 1. Voter approval of building authority or other indirect funding methods - School construction project approval.**

1. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the board of a school district may not enter an agreement pursuant to internal revenue service revenue ruling 63-20 under which payments of any kind would be required by the district to any building authority or other entity that incurs indebtedness or other obligation in connection with the acquisition, improvement, or construction of any property or structure to be used by the district, unless the agreement has been approved by a vote of at least sixty percent of the qualified electors of the district voting on the question if the acquisition, improvement, or construction subject to the agreement would require an election were the acquisition, improvement, or construction undertaken by the district through the issuance of bonds.
2. The board of a school district may not enter an agreement pursuant to internal revenue service revenue ruling 63-20 under which payments of any kind would be required by the district to any building authority or other entity that incurs indebtedness or other obligation regarding the construction, purchase, improvement, modernization, or renovation of any building or facility to be used by the district without the approval of the superintendent of public instruction under section 15.1-36-01, if approval by the superintendent would be required were the project undertaken by the district itself."

Renumber accordingly

Date: 2-11-09  
Roll Call Vote #: 2

2009 HOUSE STANDING COMMITTEE ROLL CALL VOTES  
BILL/RESOLUTION NO. 1501

| House | Education | Committee |
|-------|-----------|-----------|
|-------|-----------|-----------|

☐ Check here for Conference Committee

**Legislative Council Amendment Number** \_\_\_\_\_

Action Taken ☒ Do Pass ☐ Do Not Pass ☒ Amended

Motion Made By Rep Kersh Seconded By Rep Rust

[illegible]

**Total**      **(Yes)** \_\_\_\_\_ **No** \_\_\_\_\_

**Absent** \_\_\_\_\_

## Floor Assignment

**If the vote is on an amendment, briefly indicate intent:**

motion carries to  
accept amended  
amendment

Date: 2-11-09  
Roll Call Vote #: 7

2009 HOUSE STANDING COMMITTEE ROLL CALL VOTES  
BILL/RESOLUTION NO. 1501

House Education Committee

☐ Check here for Conference Committee

Legislative Council Amendment Number \_\_\_\_\_

Action Taken ☐ Do Pass ☒ Do Not Pass ☒ Amended

Motion Made By Rep Rust Seconded By Rep Heller

| Representatives          | Yes | No | Representatives      | Yes | No |
|--------------------------|-----|----|----------------------|-----|----|
| Chairman RaeAnn Kelsch   | ✓   |    | Rep. Lyle Hanson     | ✓   |    |
| Vice Chairman Lisa Meier | ✓   |    | Rep. Bob Hunsakor    | ✓   |    |
| Rep. Brenda Heller       | ✓   |    | Rep. Jerry Kelsh     |     | ✓  |
| Rep. Dennis Johnson      |     |    | Rep. Corey Mock      | ✓   |    |
| Rep. Karen Karls         |     | ✓  | Rep. Phillip Mueller |     | ✓  |
| Rep. Mike Schatz         |     | ✓  | Rep. Lee Myxter      | ✓   |    |
| Rep. John D. Wall        | ✓   |    |                      |     |    |
| Rep. David Rust          | ✓   |    |                      |     |    |
|                          |     |    |                      |     |    |
|                          |     |    |                      |     |    |
|                          |     |    |                      |     |    |
|                          |     |    |                      |     |    |
|                          |     |    |                      |     |    |
|                          |     |    |                      |     |    |

Total (Yes) 9 No 4

Absent \_\_\_\_\_

Floor Assignment Rep Rust

If the vote is on an amendment, briefly indicate intent:

**REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE**

**HB 1501: Education Committee (Rep. R. Kelsch, Chairman) recommends AMENDMENTS AS FOLLOWS** and when so amended, recommends **DO NOT PASS** (9 YEAS, 4 NAYS, 1 ABSENT AND NOT VOTING). HB 1501 was placed on the Sixth order on the calendar.

Page 1, line 1, after "A BILL" replace the remainder of the bill with "for an Act to provide voter approval of school district building projects funded through a building authority or other indirect means.

**BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF NORTH DAKOTA:**

**SECTION 1. Voter approval of building authority or other indirect funding methods - School construction project approval.**

1. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the board of a school district may not enter an agreement pursuant to internal revenue service revenue ruling 63-20 under which payments of any kind would be required by the district to any building authority or other entity that incurs indebtedness or other obligation in connection with the acquisition, improvement, or construction of any property or structure to be used by the district, unless the agreement has been approved by a vote of at least sixty percent of the qualified electors of the district voting on the question if the acquisition, improvement, or construction subject to the agreement would require an election were the acquisition, improvement, or construction undertaken by the district through the issuance of bonds.
2. The board of a school district may not enter an agreement pursuant to internal revenue service revenue ruling 63-20 under which payments of any kind would be required by the district to any building authority or other entity that incurs indebtedness or other obligation regarding the construction, purchase, improvement, modernization, or renovation of any building or facility to be used by the district without the approval of the superintendent of public instruction under section 15.1-36-01, if approval by the superintendent would be required were the project undertaken by the district itself."

Renumber accordingly

2009 TESTIMONY

HB 1501

**North Dakota  
School District Profile Demographics  
2006-2007**

Bismarck Public School District #1

08-001



Paul K Johnson, Superintendent  
Paul Govig, School Board President  
806 N Washington St  
Bismarck, ND 58501-3623

For general information about the School District Profiles program,  
contact the North Dakota Department of Public Instruction.  
(701) 328-2260

A Vehicle for  
Local Educational Improvement

Designed by:  
North Dakota Department of Public Instruction  
In accordance with NDCC 15.1-06-18

Published 4/3/2008

All data reported in this document was the most readily available at the time of publication.

# School District 2006-2007

| Fast Facts   |                   |                               |
|--|-------------------|-------------------------------|
| <u>District</u>                                      |                   |                               |
| Grades Served  |                   | PK-12                         |
| Number of Schools                                    |                   | 22                            |
| Headquarter County                                   |                   | BURLEIGH                      |
| <u>Grade Level</u>                                   | <u>Enrollment</u> | <u>FTE Classroom Teachers</u> |
| K-6  | 5520              | 265                           |
| 7-8  | 1661              | 88.01                         |
| 9-12   | 3469              | 168.72                        |
| Total K-12   | 10650             | 521.73                        |
| <u>Full-time Equivalent Staff in School District</u> |                   | <u>FTE</u>                    |
| Admin/Superintendents, Principals                    |                   | 31.22                         |
| Classroom Teachers                                   |                   | 521.73                        |
| Other Licensed Staff                                 |                   | 248                           |
| Support Staff  |                   | 549.9                         |
| Total FTE Staff                                      |                   | 1350.85                       |

# School District 2005-2006

| Fast Facts   |                   |                               |
|--|-------------------|-------------------------------|
| <u>District</u>                                      |                   |                               |
| Grades Served  |                   | PK-12                         |
| Number of Schools                                    |                   | 22                            |
| Headquarter County                                   |                   | BURLEIGH                      |
| <u>Grade Level</u>                                   | <u>Enrollment</u> | <u>FTE Classroom Teachers</u> |
| K-6  | 5378              | 261                           |
| 7-8  | 1619              | 73.08                         |
| 9-12   | 3552              | 153.23                        |
| Total K-12   | 10549             | 487.31                        |
| <u>Full-time Equivalent Staff in School District</u> |                   | <u>FTE</u>                    |
| Admin/Superintendents, Principals                    |                   | 31.11                         |
| Classroom Teachers                                   |                   | 487.31                        |
| Other Licensed Staff                                 |                   | 249.42                        |
| Support Staff  |                   | 528.71                        |
| Total FTE Staff                                      |                   | 1296.55                       |

## School District Environment

School district environment includes unique characteristics of students, their families, and the school district in general. Indicators such as percent of students receiving free and reduced meals (economic status), transportation information (sparsity/density), and minority enrollment (diversity) reflect the school district environment. The combination of these factors and others required different resources and processes to affect student performance.

|                                 | <u>District</u> | <u>State Total/Average</u> |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|----------------------------|
| School District Square Miles    | 198.10          | 356.31                     |
| Merged/Consolidated/5 Years     | -               | -                          |
| 5-Year Enrollment Trend         | 1.1%            | -9.1%                      |
| Total Enrollment                | 10650           | 490.3                      |
| Special Education Enrollment    | 12.9%           | 14.4%                      |
| Nonpublic School Enrollment     | 13.2%           | 6.8%                       |
| Home Based Instruction Students | 0.1%            | 1.4%                       |
| Open Enrollment                 |                 |                            |
| In                              | 2.8%            | 3.2%                       |
| Out                             | 0.4%            | 3.2%                       |
| Enrollment by Race              |                 |                            |
| White                           | 90.9%           | 86.9%                      |
| American Indian/Alaskan Native  | 6.6%            | 8.6%                       |
| Black                           | 1.0%            | 1.8%                       |
| Hispanic                        | 0.7%            | 1.8%                       |
| Asian                           | 0.7%            | 1.0%                       |
| Free and Reduced Eligible       | 20.0%           | 31.0%                      |
| Transportation                  |                 |                            |
| Percent of Students Transported | 11.8%           | 27.8%                      |
| Average Route Length            | 32              | 45.9                       |

## School District Resources

School district resources represent the equipment, materials, facilities, time, and staff allocated to operate the school. Parents, community organizations, businesses, and other groups may also provide resources that are not shown here. How resources are used, as well as the type and amount of resources available, will typically influence how well students perform.

|                                     | <u>District</u> | <u>State Total/Average</u> |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------|----------------------------|
| Total Revenue                       | \$87,578,108    | \$862,745,077              |
| Local/County                        | \$39,810,717    | \$391,103,007              |
| State                               | \$35,022,136    | \$342,183,236              |
| Federal                             | \$10,627,160    | \$120,778,330              |
| Other                               | \$2,118,095     | \$8,680,504                |
| Mill Levy                           |                 |                            |
| General Fund                        | \$169.20        | \$193.01                   |
| Total                               | \$179.20        | \$220.87                   |
| Taxable Valuation/Pupil             | \$46,572        | \$17,521                   |
| Instructional Cost/Pupil            | \$6,538         | \$7,102                    |
| Total Cost/Pupil                    | \$7,518         | \$8,514                    |
| Student/Classroom Teacher Ratio     | 20.4            | 16.6                       |
| Student/Counselor Ratio             | 384.5           | 230.2                      |
| Student/Computer Ratio              | 2.5             | 2.3                        |
| Student/Librarian Staff Ratio       | 760.7           | 503.2                      |
| Average Salaries/Full-time          |                 |                            |
| Teachers                            | \$42,776        | \$38,592                   |
| Administrators                      | \$88,858        | \$67,581                   |
| Other Licensed                      | \$48,871        | \$45,135                   |
| Staff/Average Years of Experience   | 16.2            | 16.8                       |
| Staff with Masters Degree or Higher | 39.1%           | 32.2%                      |

## School District Resources

School district resources represent the equipment, materials, facilities, time, and staff allocated to operate the school. Parents, community organizations, businesses, and other groups may also provide resources that are not shown here. How resources are used, as well as the type and amount of resources available, will typically influence how well students perform.

|                                     | <u>District</u> | <u>State Total/Average</u> |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------|----------------------------|
| Total Revenue                       | \$79,256,253    | \$829,206,451              |
| Local/County                        | \$36,254,931    | \$369,642,029              |
| State                               | \$33,632,466    | \$335,692,702              |
| Federal                             | \$9,256,285     | \$116,450,652              |
| Other                               | \$112,570       | \$7,421,068                |
| Mill Levy                           |                 |                            |
| General Fund                        | \$234.56        | \$194.93                   |
| Total                               | \$255.02        | \$223.37                   |
| Taxable Valuation/Pupil             | \$14,534        | \$16,185                   |
| Instructional Cost/Pupil            | \$6,257         | \$6,726                    |
| Total Cost/Pupil                    | \$6,940         | \$8,040                    |
| Student/Classroom Teacher Ratio     | 21.6            | 16.9                       |
| Student/Counselor Ratio             | 380.8           | 232.6                      |
| Student/Computer Ratio              | 2.1             | 2.4                        |
| Student/Librarian Staff Ratio       | 753.5           | 495.7                      |
| Average Salaries/Full-time          |                 |                            |
| Teachers                            | \$41,266        | \$37,540                   |
| Administrators                      | \$86,985        | \$65,702                   |
| Other Licensed                      | \$48,223        | \$43,939                   |
| Staff/Average Years of Experience   | 16.1            | 16.6                       |
| Staff with Masters Degree or Higher | 36.7%           | 30.6%                      |

## School District Programs

School district programs represent that which happens within schools to translate the available resources into student performance. Student contact days per year, the number and variety of subjects taught, and the districts high school graduation requirements are relatively easy to measure. Other critical features of schools and schooling, such as school climate, are more difficult to assess. Many school programs critical to student performance are developed at the school level within a district-wide plan.

|                                       | <u>District</u> | <u>State Total/Average</u> |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------|----------------------------|
| Student Contact Days                  | 173             |                            |
| Professional Development Days         | 6.0             |                            |
| Graduation Requirements/Credits       | 21.00           |                            |
| Total Courses Offered (9-12)          | 140             |                            |
| Courses Provided via Correspondence   |                 |                            |
| Courses Provided via Electronic Media |                 |                            |
| Adv. Math/Science by Gender (9-12)    |                 |                            |
| Male                                  | 782             | 7,868                      |
| Female                                | 808             | 8,230                      |
| Accreditation/Quality Indicators      |                 |                            |
| Education Improvement Plan            | Y               |                            |
| Curriculum Plan                       | Y               |                            |
| Professional Development Plan         | Y               |                            |
| Student Evaluation Plan               | Y               |                            |
| Post-Secondary Enrollment Options     | Y               |                            |
| Gifted and Talented Services          | Y               |                            |
| Alternative High School Program       | Y               |                            |
| Safe/Drug Free Schools Program        | Y               |                            |
| Kindergarten 90 Days                  | Y               |                            |
| American College Test (ACT)           |                 |                            |
| Average Score                         | 21.4            | 20.5                       |
| Students Tested                       | 85.00%          | 69.60%                     |
| Number of High School Graduates       | 769             | 7,503                      |

## Supplemental District Information

| School Name                   | Grades<br>Served | State<br>Accreditation<br>Status |
|-------------------------------|------------------|----------------------------------|
| BECEP Center                  | PK-0K            | -                                |
| Bismarck High School          | 10-12            | Accred                           |
| Centennial Elem School        | 0K-06            | Accred                           |
| Century High School           | 10-12            | Accred                           |
| Dorothy Moses Elem School     | 0K-06            | Accred                           |
| Grimsrud Elem School          | 0K-06            | Accred                           |
| Highland Acres Elem School    | 0K-06            | Accred                           |
| Horizon Middle School         | 07-09            | Accred                           |
| Jeannette Myhre Elem School   | 0K-06            | Accred                           |
| Northridge Elem School        | 0K-06            | Accred                           |
| Pioneer Elem School           | 0K-06            | Accred                           |
| Prairie Rose Elem School      | 0K-06            | Accred                           |
| Rita Murphy Elem School       | 0K-06            | Accred                           |
| Riverside Elem School         | 0K-06            | Accred                           |
| Robert Place Miller School    | 0K-06            | Accred                           |
| Roosevelt Elem School         | 0K-06            | Accred                           |
| Saxvik Elem School            | 0K-06            | Accred                           |
| Simle Middle School           | 07-09            | Accred                           |
| Solheim Elem School           | 0K-06            | Accred                           |
| South Central Alt High School | 09-12            | Accred                           |
| Wachter Middle School         | 07-09            | Accred                           |
| Will Moore Elem School        | 0K-06            | Accred                           |

**North Dakota  
School District Profile Demographics  
2006-2007**

Fargo Public School District #1

09-001



David J Flowers, Superintendent  
Laura Carley, School Board President  
415 4th St N  
Fargo, ND 58102-4514

For general information about the School District Profiles program,  
contact the North Dakota Department of Public Instruction.  
(701) 328-2260

A Vehicle for  
Local Educational Improvement

Designed by:  
North Dakota Department of Public Instruction  
In accordance with NDCC 15.1-06-18

Published 4/3/2008

All data reported in this document was the most readily available at the time of publication.

# School District 2006-2007

| Fast Facts   |                   |                               |
|--|-------------------|-------------------------------|
| <u>District</u>                                      |                   |                               |
| Grades Served  |                   | PK-12                         |
| Number of Schools                                    |                   | 22                            |
| Headquarter County                                   |                   | CASS                          |
| <u>Grade Level</u>                                   | <u>Enrollment</u> | <u>FTE Classroom Teachers</u> |
| K-6  | 5608              | 270.35                        |
| 7-8  | 1631              | 76.15                         |
| 9-12   | 3407              | 178.7                         |
| Total K-12   | 10646             | 525.2                         |
| <u>Full-time Equivalent Staff in School District</u> |                   | <u>FTE</u>                    |
| Admin/Superintendents, Principals                    |                   | 35.4                          |
| Classroom Teachers                                   |                   | 525.2                         |
| Other Licensed Staff                                 |                   | 336.65                        |
| Support Staff  |                   | 428.44                        |
| Total FTE Staff                                      |                   | 1325.69                       |

## School District Environment

School district environment includes unique characteristics of students, their families, and the school district in general. Indicators such as percent of students receiving free and reduced meals (economic status), transportation information (sparsity/density), and minority enrollment (diversity) reflect the school district environment. The combination of these factors and others required different resources and processes to affect student performance.

|                                 | <u>District</u> | <u>State Total/Average</u> |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|----------------------------|
| School District Square Miles    | 57              | 349.6                      |
| Merged/Consolidated/5 Years     | -               | -                          |
| 5-Year Enrollment Trend         | -5.6%           | -10.1%                     |
| Total Enrollment                | 10747           | 490.5                      |
| Special Education Enrollment    | 12.4%           | 14.3%                      |
| Nonpublic School Enrollment     | 17.9%           | 6.8%                       |
| Home Based Instruction Students | 1.2%            | 1.4%                       |
| Open Enrollment                 |                 |                            |
| In                              | 0.6%            | 3.2%                       |
| Out                             | 0.1%            | 3.1%                       |
| Enrollment by Race              |                 |                            |
| White                           | 89.0%           | 87.3%                      |
| American Indian/Alaskan Native  | 2.3%            | 8.6%                       |
| Black                           | 4.2%            | 1.5%                       |
| Hispanic                        | 2.1%            | 1.7%                       |
| Asian                           | 2.6%            | 0.9%                       |
| Free and Reduced Eligible       | 21.4%           | 30.2%                      |
| Transportation                  |                 |                            |
| Percent of Students Transported | 2.4%            | 28.5%                      |
| Average Route Length            | 30.4            | 47.3                       |

## School District Resources

School district resources represent the equipment, materials, facilities, time, and staff allocated to operate the school. Parents, community organizations, businesses, and other groups may also provide resources that are not shown here. How resources are used, as well as the type and amount of resources available, will typically influence how well students perform.

|  | <u>District</u>      | <u>State Total/Average</u> |
|--|----------------------|----------------------------|
| <b>Total Revenue</b>                       | <b>\$102,063,498</b> | <b>\$862,745,077</b>       |
| Local/County                               | \$61,268,245         | \$391,103,007              |
| State                                      | \$33,002,044         | \$342,183,236              |
| Federal                                    | \$7,458,432          | \$120,778,330              |
| Other                                      | \$334,777            | \$8,680,504                |
| <b>Mill Levy</b>                           |                      |                            |
| General Fund                               | \$219.94             | \$193.01                   |
| Total                                      | \$251.93             | \$220.87                   |
| <b>Taxable Valuation/Pupil</b>             | <b>\$7,200</b>       | <b>\$17,521</b>            |
| <b>Instructional Cost/Pupil</b>            | <b>\$7,812</b>       | <b>\$7,102</b>             |
| <b>Total Cost/Pupil</b>                    | <b>\$8,971</b>       | <b>\$8,514</b>             |
| <b>Student/Classroom Teacher Ratio</b>     | <b>20.3</b>          | <b>16.6</b>                |
| <b>Student/Counselor Ratio</b>             | <b>287.0</b>         | <b>230.2</b>               |
| <b>Student/Computer Ratio</b>              | <b>2.7</b>           | <b>2.3</b>                 |
| <b>Student/Librarian Staff Ratio</b>       | <b>563.3</b>         | <b>503.2</b>               |
| <b>Average Salaries/Full-time</b>          |                      |                            |
| Teachers                                   | \$47,266             | \$38,592                   |
| Administrators                             | \$83,911             | \$67,581                   |
| Other Licensed                             | \$56,599             | \$45,135                   |
| <b>Staff/Average Years of Experience</b>   | <b>15.5</b>          | <b>16.8</b>                |
| <b>Staff with Masters Degree or Higher</b> | <b>50.2%</b>         | <b>32.2%</b>               |

## School District Resources

School district resources represent the equipment, materials, facilities, time, and staff allocated to operate the school. Parents, community organizations, businesses, and other groups may also provide resources that are not shown here. How resources are used, as well as the type and amount of resources available, will typically influence how well students perform.

|                                     | <u>District</u> | <u>State Total/Average</u> |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------|----------------------------|
| Total Revenue                       | \$98,537,217    | \$829,206,451              |
| Local/County                        | \$58,024,359    | \$369,642,029              |
| State                               | \$33,017,087    | \$335,692,702              |
| Federal                             | \$6,964,006     | \$116,450,652              |
| Other                               | \$531,765       | \$7,421,068                |
| Mill Levy                           |                 |                            |
| General Fund                        | \$288.19        | \$194.93                   |
| Total                               | \$318.62        | \$223.37                   |
| Taxable Valuation/Pupil             | \$18,060        | \$16,185                   |
| Instructional Cost/Pupil            | \$7,274         | \$6,726                    |
| Total Cost/Pupil                    | \$8,378         | \$8,040                    |
| Student/Classroom Teacher Ratio     | 21.5            | 16.9                       |
| Student/Counselor Ratio             | 310.6           | 232.6                      |
| Student/Computer Ratio              | 2.9             | 2.4                        |
| Student/Librarian Staff Ratio       | 584.1           | 495.7                      |
| Average Salaries/Full-time          |                 |                            |
| Teachers                            | \$46,245        | \$37,540                   |
| Administrators                      | \$80,840        | \$65,702                   |
| Other Licensed                      | \$54,590        | \$43,939                   |
| Staff/Average Years of Experience   | 16.1            | 16.6                       |
| Staff with Masters Degree or Higher | 50.4%           | 30.6%                      |