

MICROFILM DIVIDER

OMB/RECORDS MANAGEMENT DIVISION

SFN 2053 (2/85) 5M



ROLL NUMBER

DESCRIPTION

1275

2007 HOUSE EDUCATION

HB 1275

2007 HOUSE STANDING COMMITTEE MINUTES

Bill/Resolution No. **HB 1275**

House Education Committee

Check here for Conference Committee

Hearing Date: **5 February 2007**

Recorder Job Number: **2790 and 2796**

Committee Clerk Signature

Jan Prindle

Minutes:

Tom Decker, DPI, introduced the bill. (Testimony Attached.)

Representative Karls: When open enrollment is approved, I just assumed that the foundation aid payment follows.

Decker: Foundation aid did follow, but that is only half the cost of the student's education. So the effect in the long term is that the sending district is escaping half the cost of that resident student's education and imposing that cost on the receiving district. Receiving districts have been willing to take some number of students because at least in the short run may not cost the additional money. In the long run, any amount less than full cost is subsidization of the district. That is a very significant tax shelter for the sending district.

Representative Hunskor: Would you walk us through the current flow of money versus what it would be like if this bill becomes law.

Decker: Right now when an open enrolled student goes from District A to District B all that follows is foundation aid and tuition apportionment. Right now that is about 39 to 40% of the cost of education on the average. For every student a receiving district takes they are picking up over half the cost of those students. The state law allows them to decide if they have room or not. Now, as we have established on our discussions on equity, we want the money to

follow as well. Tuition free agreements would go away as well. Automatically in all cases, the cost of education would follow that student.

Representative Sukat: There are a number of students in our District 1 that attend District A so the aid is following them, but the tuition part is not following them. So the way I understand now, District 1 would have to pay tuition to District A. Private schools are not involved in this at all.

Decker: You understand it right. This does not involve private schools, it's between public schools.

Representative Mueller: The implication is that those enrolling out are going to pay to school the open enrollee attends. In addition there can be no side arrangements by school districts to accommodate one another in regard to open enrollment. If they don't charge the tuition they are going to have their state aid held back. Is that really what we want to be doing here?

Decker: That is already a provision in law. If you buy the basic argument that resident districts should pay the full cost of their students' education wherever they attend, then it doesn't matter—they should pay the cost.

Paul Johnson, superintendent, Bismarck School District, testified in favor of the bill.
(Testimony Attached.)

Representative Mueller: Since you are losing the amount of money you are, have you or your board considered not taking students.

Johnson: That has happened over time. At one time this was a positive thing for the Bismarck School District. It isn't anymore. My recommendation will be to not accept open enrolled students anymore. Unless this legislation passes, there is simply no reason for us to accept open enrollment students.

Representative Hunskor: If that were to happen and you had a couple of students that were open enrolled in your school and then there are two younger students and then it is their turn, how would you deal with that.

Johnson: We did this years ago to try to accommodate families. Frankly, I don't think we have the option and not others. We would simply have to close it off. We cannot pick and choose who comes into our district so we would have to simply say we're not going to do it anymore.

Bev Nielson, ND School Board Association, testified in opposition on this bill. While it would be an economic benefit to some of our districts, it could be financially devastating to some of our districts. Receiving districts have always had the option to refuse students if it had a negative impact on them financially. Back in 93 when this passed the very argument that is being now was made and those proposing it said this would absolutely not happen. I don't believe it would have passed if local tax money would have had to be paid. In the majority of cases, those districts are willing and able to provide the services to the students that choose to open enroll out. They don't want them to leave. They lose foundation aid when they leave. They don't have any choice in letting them go. It would have been extremely helpful if the printout DPI furnished had a final column which would show the net cost to the sending district. That is critical information you need to have before you make this decision. Districts would be double taxing their residents to pay tuition out to schools when they are offering those very services at home. Again, the receiving district has options and the sending district does not have the option to say we cannot afford to let you go.

Representative Herbel: What implications does this have for the kindergarten through 8 that send their kids to high schools?

Nielson: They already pay tuition to the high school and they are allowed a tax levy specifically for the high school because they don't offer the service. This would not affect

them. The reason the NDSBA is objecting is that we feel you need to know how devastating it is to those districts that are going to have to pay the tuition.

Representative Haas: If you think about this purely from a conceptual standpoint. Is your opinion the same?

Neilson: The problem is I don't know how our system could survive the way it is if kids were making choices all the time and districts would have to pay tuition for those kids out and how they would set their budget and how they would tax their residents. It's a whole different scenario that has not been thought out and is very confusing. If the state were paying 100% of the costs and it just went where the kids went then it wouldn't be as much of an issue, but when you are offering those services at home then how do you tax extra for those kids. That's the question and we would like you to think about it.

Kathy Mauch, school board member of Apple Creek School District, testified in opposition to the bill. (Testimony Attached.) When a parent comes to us and wants to open enroll a child out of our district into Bismarck we handle that very personally on our level. We talk to them and want to know why. Almost every time it's for the convenience of the parents. When they come into our district, it's because those parents want their child to go to school in a small school setting and get that more individualized education.

Vice Chairman Meier: How many students do you have in your school?

Mauch: We have 55 in kindergarten through 6 right now.

Representative Herbel: How do you address the situation in the receiving school district and justify their costs.

Mauch: They did not have to take our children. At one point it was advantageous for Bismarck to take our kids. We don't tax for those kids and use it to run our school. I understand that it costs them and I would say that the \$95.0 percentage wise is probably just

as significant, if not more so, than the dollar amount that Bismarck is talking about. I don't think that in one year 18% of our budget does not come close to \$95.0.

Representative Herbel: What is your general fund mil levy?

Mauch: Don't quote me for certain. I think it is 85 mils and our high school is 127 mils so our total is close to 190 mils.

Representative Haas: If you are not willing to pay the tuition and Bismarck is educating those kids if the area where they live is contiguous to the Bismarck district, would you agree to allow the annexation of that property to the Bismarck district and then you wouldn't have to worry about it.

Mauch: All the property is not contiguous. What you would be asking us to do is dissolve our district and become a part of Bismarck. Not all of the families' property is contiguous. I'm not saying we don't want to pay tuition, but it never has had to be a part of open enrollment in the past and to make it all happen in one year it would absolutely be our demise. I understand Bismarck's position too. It negates the whole thing of open enrollment. It negates legislative intent when that bill was passed and it is wrong.

Representative Herbel: You kind of indicated that if this didn't hit you all at one time, it wouldn't be as painful. Would you consider doing this over a period of 3 to 5 years?

Mauch: I could work with that, but it still negates open enrollment. It is not open enrollment if the tuition has to go with it.

Representative Hanson: If Bismarck does not take your students anymore, where would you go?

Mauch: This does not refer to high school students. We already pay tuition for them. This is for 6th and under students.

Dean Bard, ND Small Organized Schools, testified in opposition to the bill. This is not an easy situation. Years ago the situation was that the district where parents wanted to send

their students to another district, they would have to apply for a tuition agreement. Invariably, what happened was that the sending district would deny it and the receiving district would approve it. It then went to a 3 member county committee to make the decision whether the kids would be allowed to go to another district. By and large that committee would let kids go where they wanted to. That created a problem. That was when the agreement came about that there would be no tuition. That seemed to work pretty good. In the 90s we came up with the idea that we should let kids go where they wanted to go regardless and the open enrollment bill came into being. Our association did not oppose. We were afraid of the concept because we thought there would be an exodus from the small districts but we did not oppose it because there was such a groundswell from parents in favor of it. We thought we would be left with the property that would produce tax dollars. In those days larger districts were eager to take in students because the percentage of state aid was higher. In the rural districts where you get to the point where you cannot sustain a classroom anymore, that stings. You have to look at this from the standpoint of the larger districts having a better opportunity to shuffle to accommodate the inflow of kids. The losing districts don't have that opportunity. It's a tough situation and it's gotten tougher since the level of state aid has slid downward over the years. We would hope the answer is not to saddle the sending districts with these extra costs because I don't think they could stand it.

Representative Mueller: Do you think there are sending districts that encourage this because they have less obligation to generate tax dollars.

Bard: I don't think so, but it could happen. I'm not aware of any specific instances where that is a fact.

Chairman Kelsch closed the hearing of HB 1275.

2007 HOUSE STANDING COMMITTEE MINUTES

Bill/Resolution No. **HB 1275**

House Education Committee

Check here for Conference Committee

Hearing Date: **6 February 2007**

Recorder Job Number: **2920**

Committee Clerk Signature

Jan Prindle

Minutes:

Vice Chairman Meier opened discussion of HB 1275.

Jerry Coleman, DPI, provided a handout to replace the one he distributed at the hearing yesterday. That one was incorrect and this replaces it. The bill provides for tuition for open enrolled students. I pulled the wrong numbers in. I pulled in the average cost rather than what the simulation for the tuition cost for that school district. This schedule corrects. Please replace it with this schedule.

Discussion closed.

2007 HOUSE STANDING COMMITTEE MINUTES

Bill/Resolution No. **HB 1275**

House Education Committee

Check here for Conference Committee

Hearing Date: **7 February 2007**

Recorder Job Number: **3306**

Committee Clerk Signature

Jan Prendler

Minutes:

Chairman Kelsch opened discussion of HB 1275.

Vice Chairman Meier: I move a **Do Pass**. **There was no second.**

Representative Hanson: I move a substitute motion: **Do Not Pass**.

Representative Johnson: **I Second**. After hearing the testimony I agree when open enrollment was discussed, there is no way that could have passed with this provision. I think it would be devastating to too many schools.

Representative Sukat: The Williston School District, along with many others, is hit hard. Astronomically. You are looking at \$700.0 in debt for 116 outgoing students. They are pulling buses up to the door and trucking kids to School District 8 and the numbers it looks like the outgo will be about \$6.0 to \$7.0 per student based on the state average. I surely couldn't support this.

Chairman Kelsch: At 7:54 this morning I got chewed on by the Williston superintendent. The message has been delivered twice now. The Mandan superintendent has not chewed on me because he knows the reason why I did this.

Representative Hunsakor: I gave you a letter from the Kenmare superintendent and he talks about the reorganization there and there are 33 students open enrolled into the Glenburn district. They had the option to say no but they are receiving them. His feeling is that they

just reorganized and this creates a large financial problem if this bill passes. I'm going to resist the bill also.

Representative Hanson: Several sessions I had a bill that you couldn't run a bus into another district without the permission of that district. It's failed both times. In Jamestown we have 40 kids coming in and 75 going out. That's why I'm not going to support this bill.

Representative Mueller: The superintendent in Valley City said he was receiving 40 -50 students from Maple Valley and some of Valley City are going to Maple Valley. If we are going to have tuition follow the student we have to base the tuition on something. He used numbers like this. It costs him \$9800 at Maple Valley, in Valley City he is doing it for about \$6000. What happens he has to pay \$9800 to Maple Valley and only is able to charge \$6000.

Representative Herbel: I agree with the concept of the bill. I hate seeing schools getting a free lunch, but at the same time when I look at the numbers and see the devastating effect it will have on some districts, it's going to be a big problem. I don't think I can justify supporting the bill. I would like to see some other way to do this. And, they do have the option to not accept those kids.

Chairman Kelsch: Just because this wasn't included when open enrollment was passed, it's not something that wasn't looked at or thought about. It may not have been the right thing to do at that time; however, twelve years later may be the time to do it. I thought it was a good opportunity to have the discussion. My school district loses money, but that's not to say that I necessarily agree that it's the wrong thing to do. I think that if a school district is educating a kid, those monies should be with the kid. That's why I introduced the bill and philosophically that's how I feel about equity. I understand school districts stand to lose money. I often wonder why are students open enrolling. We heard a couple of examples. I have probably one of the poorest examples. It's a colleague of mine who lives in Marina Bay and decided it was more convenient for them if their kids are at the school behind where the husband works.

I asked what kind of educational opportunities are they getting? What kind of school is it?

They transferred from Fort Lincoln, one of the newest elementary schools, to one of the older elementary in Bismarck—what are the differences in education. She said she really didn't care, it was just a matter of convenience for them so the kids could walk to their father's office after work. I found that to be a horrible reason for open enrollment, but I know it happens.

Representative Haas: If you look at this print out we got from Jerry Coleman, the greatest impact is around the larger communities surrounded by elementary schools. The necessary precursor bill that needs to be passed before we can pass this bill is to put all land into a high school district. That would take away all of the arguments for not passing this bill.

Representative Hunskor: The people I talked to in the school district in my part of the world, even the ones that are going to hurt with this bill, say we know you are moving in the right direction. It's a good way to go, but it's too much, too fast. It's going to come, but I don't think it's good right now. We're not ready for it and it needs to be looked at; but, we'll go that way in time.

Representative Sukat: I think this theory is good. In our district we have School District 8 and Trenton that is just 13 miles down the road and kids end up going to Trenton because of free lunches and sports—because they cannot compete in Williston—but can in Trenton. We have a lot of kids out of Williston that end up in School District just because they want to be in a smaller school. I'm not so sure all that open enrollment isn't okay. They should have the opportunity, but jumping into this thing all at one time, it's just not possible. If there were way we could put this together to be done over a period of time, that would have some potential. That's something we should be looking at.

Chairman Kelsch: I know, Representative Haas, you were thinking about it by phasing in at maybe 25%, 50%, 75%--that way.

Representative Haas: We had talked about that. It was brought up during Committee discussion.

Representative Wall: Does current law forbid such as Bismarck, in their situation with Apple Creek, contractually negotiating for an amount additional to foundation aid?

Chairman Kelsch: For their high school students they currently pay, but not for the elementary students if they come in to the school district. Tom (Decker), would you come forward and explain how those contracts work.

Decker: If you don't provide the grade level services, any district will pay full tuition for those students. There is no provision in law for Bismarck to negotiate some amount of payment for open enrolled students. According to the attorney general, school districts only have the authority specifically granted them by law and there is no specific authority in law for Bismarck and Apple Creek to negotiate any kind of payment for these open enrolled students.

Chairman Kelsch: Other than foundation aid, there would be nothing above that.

Representative Johnson: I think another thing is the discrepancy as to how much it costs to educate between districts: \$9.0 in some districts, \$6.0 in another district. Wouldn't there not be an effort to put on some extra buses and try to lure students to that \$9.0 district?

Chairman Kelsch: It's possible, but do you really think there are superintendents out there that are that devious?

Representative Hanson: I call the question.

Chairman Kelsch: The question has been called for the **Do Not Pass on HB 1275**.

A roll call vote was taken. Yes: 8, No: 4, Absent: 1 (Solberg)

FISCAL NOTE
 Requested by Legislative Council
 01/10/2007

Bill/Resolution No.: HB 1275

1A. **State fiscal effect:** *Identify the state fiscal effect and the fiscal effect on agency appropriations compared to funding levels and appropriations anticipated under current law.*

	2005-2007 Biennium		2007-2009 Biennium		2009-2011 Biennium	
	General Fund	Other Funds	General Fund	Other Funds	General Fund	Other Funds
Revenues	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Expenditures	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Appropriations	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

1B. **County, city, and school district fiscal effect:** *Identify the fiscal effect on the appropriate political subdivision.*

2005-2007 Biennium			2007-2009 Biennium			2009-2011 Biennium		
Counties	Cities	School Districts	Counties	Cities	School Districts	Counties	Cities	School Districts
\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

2A. **Bill and fiscal impact summary:** *Provide a brief summary of the measure, including description of the provisions having fiscal impact (limited to 300 characters).*

This bill would require school districts of residence to pay tuition, as provided for in state law, for any resident student who attends a public school outside the district of residence. There is no fiscal impact on the school districts collectively.

B. **Fiscal impact sections:** *Identify and provide a brief description of the sections of the measure which have fiscal impact. Include any assumptions and comments relevant to the analysis.*

Section One of the bill eliminates tuition-free agreements. Section Two of the bill requires payment of full tuition for open-enrolled students. The bill, if passed, would result in transfer of funds between local districts.

3. **State fiscal effect detail:** *For information shown under state fiscal effect in 1A, please:*

A. **Revenues:** *Explain the revenue amounts. Provide detail, when appropriate, for each revenue type and fund affected and any amounts included in the executive budget.*

None.

B. **Expenditures:** *Explain the expenditure amounts. Provide detail, when appropriate, for each agency, line item, and fund affected and the number of FTE positions affected.*

None.

C. **Appropriations:** *Explain the appropriation amounts. Provide detail, when appropriate, for each agency and fund affected. Explain the relationship between the amounts shown for expenditures and appropriations. Indicate whether the appropriation is also included in the executive budget or relates to a continuing appropriation.*

None.

Name:	Thomas Decker	Agency:	Public Instruction
Phone Number:	328-2267	Date Prepared:	01/10/2007

Date: _____

Roll Call Vote #: _____

2007 HOUSE STANDING COMMITTEE ROLL CALL VOTES

BILL/RESOLUTION NO. _____

House Education Committee

Check here for Conference Committee

Legislative Council Amendment Number _____

Action Taken as Pass

Motion Made By Meier Seconded By _____

Representatives	Yes	No	Representatives	Yes	No
Chairman Kelsch			Rep Hanson		
V Chairman Meier			Rep Hunskor		
Rep Haas			Rep Mueller		
Rep Herbel			Rep Myxter		
Rep Johnson			Rep Solberg		
Rep Karls					
Rep Sukut					
Rep Wall					

Total Yes _____ No _____

Absent _____

Floor Assignment _____

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

Second
No

Date: 7 Feb
Roll Call Vote #: 2

2007 HOUSE STANDING COMMITTEE ROLL CALL VOTES

BILL/RESOLUTION NO. 1275

House Education Committee

Check here for Conference Committee

Legislative Council Amendment Number _____

Action Taken do Not Pass

Motion Made By Hanson Seconded By Johnson

Representatives	Yes	No	Representatives	Yes	No
Chairman Kelsch		✓	Rep Hanson	✓	
V Chairman Meier		✓	Rep Hunskor	✓	
Rep Haas		✓	Rep Mueller	✓	
Rep Herbel	✓		Rep Myxter	✓	
Rep Johnson	✓		Rep Solberg		
Rep Karls		✓			
Rep Sukut	✓				
Rep Wall	✓				

Total Yes 8 No 4

Absent 1 (Solberg)

Floor Assignment Johnson

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

REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

HB 1275: Education Committee (Rep. R. Kelsch, Chairman) recommends DO NOT PASS
(8 YEAS, 4 NAYS, 1 ABSENT AND NOT VOTING). HB 1275 was placed on the
Eleventh order on the calendar.

2007 TESTIMONY

HB 1275

HB 1275
5 Feb 07

TESTIMONY ON HB 1275
EDUCATION COMMITTEE
February 5, 2007
by Thomas Decker, Director, School Finance
(701) 328-2267
Department of Public Instruction

Chairperson Kelsch, members of the committee, for the record, I am Tom Decker, Director, School Finance & Organization, Department of Public Instruction.

House Bill 1275 changes the law in regards to obligation to pay tuition.

I addressed your committee earlier in the session on another bill about the need for clarification of state policy in regard to district of residence obligation to support the education of their resident students.

We passed the Open Enrollment Law in 1993 without requiring tuition because we believed the greater good at the time, was served by having parents and students in the position to choose their school of attendance.

Arguably, we should have required those districts to pay tuition for their resident students who open enrolled out at the time of the Open Enrollment Law was initially passed. We didn't do that. In the years sense, open enrollment has become quite popular.

Either through open enrollment or tuition waivers, another vehicle which allows students to attend outside their district of residence without their resident districts paying the full cost of their education, many students attend schools in places other than their district of residence. The effect is to offset or fail to cover the full cost of education on the part of the resident district. The handout attached to my testimony shows the number of students who are open enrolled in and out of every district in the state.

Anytime we allow a student to attend school in a district other than their district of residence, where only state foundation aid follows the student, the receiving district gets only half of the cost of that students' education. As a short term issue, that might be tolerable, but since we have established open enrollment as an important policy for students and parents in North Dakota, it is time we address the issue of equitable funding to follow those students. When we are spending as much time and effort as we are currently spending trying to provide an equitable method of distribution of aid to schools generally, we would be remiss not to take the opportunity to deal with this important equity issue as well.

Every time a district sends a resident student to a neighboring district to get an education, the resident districts, as things are now in North Dakota, are escaping or shifting thousands of dollars of cost obligation from the district of residence to the district of attendance. Covering the full cost of education should be the obligation of the resident district for every resident student. If need be, we could phase in tuition payment according to the formula currently in law, over a period of two to four years but we need to do something to address the inequities involved in the current situation.

Some will argue that to require tuition payment will simply result in a money shuffle between districts. If paying your bills is viewed as money shuffling, lets get started.

HB 1275

Revised 2/5/2007

To correct Tuition Amounts

JL

Open Enrollment/Tuition Calculation Report
2006-2007 School Year

Codist	Dname	DTYPE	DENK12	Open Enr In	Open Enr Out	Tuition KG	Tuition 1-6	Tuition 7-8	Tuition 9-12
1013	Hettinger 13	1	312	8	2	5,279.06	6,516.70	4,728.04	4,638.65
2002	Valley City 2	1	1,094	56	29	3,221.16	4,455.90	5,684.89	3,283.45
2046	Litchville-Marion 46	1	165	12	26	5,949.48	7,442.01	6,340.95	8,176.73
2065	N Central 65	1	148	7	14	7,730.71	7,958.75	8,092.90	9,285.96
2082	Wimbledon-Courtenay 82	1	150	-	7	7,618.24	7,018.91	6,425.21	9,797.29
3005	Minnewaukan 5	1	217	3	18	5,208.55	7,753.90	7,009.54	7,070.18
3006	Leeds 6	1	167	6	4	7,523.59	6,308.98	6,786.90	5,709.17
3009	Maddock 9	1	183	34	3	7,828.63	5,203.49	6,137.98	4,951.96
3016	Oberon 16	2	40	-	8	10,117.51	11,910.37	8,275.18	-
3029	Warwick 29	1	189	-	20	8,465.99	7,787.72	4,168.06	10,222.85
3030	Ft Totten 30	1	176	-	-	-	-	-	21,333.03
4001	Billings Co 1	2	48	9	20	19,606.34	24,141.46	20,893.51	794.87
5001	Bottineau 1	1	667	36	-	4,382.59	5,345.29	4,816.98	4,861.91
5017	Westhope 17	1	117	11	6	8,498.04	6,991.64	9,495.63	7,951.93
5054	Newburg-United 54	1	73	10	17	10,293.54	11,776.86	11,951.38	17,024.08
6001	Bowman County 1	1	442	8	8	16,500.79	5,195.40	8,479.86	6,753.68
6033	Scranton 33	1	163	10	4	11,894.45	5,889.23	7,764.06	8,803.81
7014	Bowbells 14	1	68	-	9	10,004.66	8,755.80	7,263.60	9,518.26
7027	Powers Lake 27	1	118	-	11	5,806.90	6,441.57	4,900.35	8,609.78
7036	Burke Central 36	1	87	1	-	6,249.21	13,034.10	10,278.34	10,565.94
8001	Bismarck 1	1	10,650	307	43	3,549.51	5,307.04	5,024.37	5,506.58
8025	Naughton 25	3	3	-	3	7,907.77	7,485.66	794.87	685.50
8028	Wing 28	1	90	22	-	4,341.49	4,781.58	8,254.53	7,727.26
8029	Baldwin 29	2	19	4	19	9,982.01	8,530.03	5,418.46	-
8033	Menoken 33	2	12	-	41	794.87	13,482.17	14,019.76	794.87
8035	Sterling 35	2	38	-	16	14,926.74	7,933.99	12,561.70	-
8039	Apple Creek 39	2	55	14	48	4,832.96	6,849.29	-	-
8045	Manning 45	3	5	-	15	774.45	7,516.84	-	-
9001	Fargo 1	1	10,646	81	17	5,051.27	6,547.71	6,492.58	6,964.27
9002	Kindred 2	1	691	33	19	2,984.98	3,598.01	3,793.22	3,337.15
9004	Maple Valley 4	1	261	28	47	7,417.22	9,462.08	5,296.38	5,241.91
9006	West Fargo 6	1	5,901	4	126	4,449.03	4,939.51	5,511.20	5,558.52
9007	Mapleton 7	2	67	-	7	7,215.16	9,590.61	-	-
9017	Central Cass 17	1	822	15	6	4,130.74	3,156.17	3,588.13	3,863.73
9080	Page 80	2	98	9	22	7,132.64	7,261.10	-	-
9097	Northern Cass	1	505	70	10	2,897.96	4,961.42	4,096.02	5,093.33
10014	Border Central	Dissolved	-	-	-	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A
10019	Munich 19	1	106	9	3	6,333.21	6,602.93	8,775.22	5,988.66
10023	Langdon Area 23	1	449	4	15	7,624.62	6,834.47	4,298.84	5,493.51
11040	Ellendale 40	1	358	5	15	3,086.13	5,188.09	2,972.00	4,855.19
11041	Oakes 41	1	527	16	4	4,323.94	3,694.12	3,692.78	3,636.28
12001	Divide County 1	1	237	-	1	4,457.62	7,245.41	6,795.42	6,017.98
13008	Dodge 8	2	15	-	3	22,178.95	19,450.72	-	-
13016	Killdeer 16	1	360	68	1	4,307.61	5,467.48	4,852.82	6,499.10
13019	Halliday 19	1	28	2	41	15,540.87	21,479.61	23,480.45	22,606.44
13037	Twin Buttes 37	2	44	-	10	29,749.26	33,469.59	29,753.34	-
14002	New Rockford 2	2	421	17	8	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A
15006	Hazleton-Moffit-Braddock 6	1	137	8	7	6,152.81	6,655.84	3,874.56	7,359.45
15010	Bakker 10	2	4	-	8	14,968.71	14,202.79	794.87	794.87
15015	Strasburg 15	1	161	10	18	5,393.80	4,932.26	5,297.73	4,714.51
15036	Linton 36	1	326	19	6	3,687.23	4,614.23	5,019.74	4,187.17
16049	Carrington 49	1	616	35	15	4,528.55	4,248.28	3,923.47	4,621.74
17003	Beach 3	1	289	1	2	5,404.69	8,145.58	6,840.64	8,264.38

Codist	Dname	DTYPE	DENK12	Open Enr In	Open Enr Out	Tuition KG	Tuition 1-6	Tuition 7-8	Tuition 9-12
17006	Lone Tree 6	2	33	-	1	11,499.53	11,726.01	8,698.00	-
18001	Grand Forks 1	1	7,316	140	17	4,457.42	6,059.98	6,325.89	5,830.96
18044	Larimore 44	1	489	30	10	3,262.76	4,761.83	3,868.10	4,907.70
18061	Thompson 61	1	425	45	55	8,435.69	4,313.05	3,500.36	3,979.67
18125	Manvel 125	2	147	6	25	6,532.53	4,114.27	4,230.85	-
18127	Emerado 127	2	67	4	21	21,784.28	9,649.18	7,091.95	-
18128	Midway 128	1	257	4	36	4,220.31	5,982.96	6,444.48	7,226.95
18129	Northwood 129	1	295	38	28	5,035.00	6,254.30	6,741.12	6,803.67
18140	Grand Forks AFB 1	4	-	-	-	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
19018	Roosevelt 18	2	135	1	21	4,261.17	3,585.83	5,034.09	-
19049	Elgin-New Leipzig 49	1	169	6	7	4,891.78	8,350.29	-	6,748.62
20007	Midkota 7	1	118	5	26	7,463.25	9,123.85	11,863.18	10,091.27
20018	Griggs County Central 18	1	297	6	7	7,529.32	4,334.66	5,634.21	4,928.76
21001	Mott-Regent 1	1	242	7	10	4,114.31	5,162.70	5,913.79	4,895.77
21009	New England 9	1	169	12	15	5,846.18	6,756.81	6,446.86	6,787.01
22011	Pettibone-Tuttle 11	2	6	-	7	19,775.51	20,483.35	794.87	794.87
22014	Robinson 14	2	7	-	3	13,015.66	20,520.53	794.87	794.87
22020	Tuttle-Pettibone 20	1	23	-	8	794.87	-	23,542.35	16,495.50
22026	Steele-Dawson 26	1	282	39	4	3,846.51	5,132.13	3,376.04	6,391.52
22028	Tappen 28	1	90	8	22	-	6,963.50	6,267.02	7,163.48
23003	Edgeley 3	1	216	12	18	5,174.33	4,862.35	7,187.23	5,437.32
23007	Kulm 7	1	121	5	8	10,086.61	9,472.39	8,032.07	10,405.25
23008	LaMoure 8	1	321	23	4	3,876.57	5,714.07	3,295.27	4,660.96
23011	Verona 11	Dissolved	-	-	-	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A
24002	Napoleon 2	1	245	6	7	3,367.82	4,214.95	5,208.14	6,022.29
24056	Gackle 56	1	101	2	18	7,838.16	8,176.86	9,558.76	10,626.73
25001	Velva 1	1	410	40	5	3,305.34	4,660.17	2,642.19	5,352.43
25014	Anamoose 14	1	79	8	4	7,178.73	7,150.66	6,615.27	6,224.84
25057	Drake 57	1	129	1	13	7,239.75	7,245.11	7,289.87	6,950.10
25060	TGU 60	1	344	13	31	6,164.89	7,882.44	5,343.55	7,488.13
26004	Zeeland 4	1	52	4	-	15,796.04	8,566.34	15,855.43	15,974.77
26009	Ashley 9	1	148	2	-	5,234.39	7,062.51	6,335.02	5,751.42
26019	Wishek 19	1	230	7	6	4,232.88	4,603.39	4,330.48	5,341.35
27001	McKenzie Co 1	1	539	21	18	5,271.17	6,946.14	5,931.74	6,891.49
27002	Alexander 2	1	41	-	9	26,058.38	14,705.37	20,972.10	23,089.26
27014	Yellowstone 14	2	47	-	-	6,797.17	8,388.63	8,295.17	-
27018	Earl 18	3	3	-	-	9,452.85	10,446.66	794.87	794.87
27019	Bowline Butte	Dissolved	-	-	-	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A
27032	Horse Creek 32	3	6	-	-	794.87	12,847.21	794.87	794.87
27036	Mandaree 36	1	174	-	11	20,006.77	20,962.12	21,803.44	21,432.00
28001	Montefiore 1	1	216	2	30	4,271.49	4,514.44	3,971.54	5,499.43
28004	Washburn 4	1	305	15	5	3,285.26	4,396.17	4,003.57	5,389.38
28008	Underwood 8	1	210	3	18	6,346.06	6,931.62	6,462.27	7,462.89
28050	Max 50	1	145	9	10	5,912.51	5,554.25	2,568.51	5,777.37
28051	Garrison 51	1	331	18	6	4,043.15	6,074.84	6,162.30	5,391.06
28072	Turtle Lake-Mercer 72	1	166	1	4	4,152.07	7,670.54	4,969.41	6,902.48
28085	White Shield 85	1	124	1	10	6,517.46	6,061.44	7,396.47	5,504.28
29003	Hazen 3	1	640	36	14	3,080.61	3,854.00	3,921.75	4,334.47
29020	Golden Valley 20	1	37	-	23	221.10	-	9,076.34	10,648.60
29027	Beulah 27	1	726	33	6	3,009.08	4,710.42	4,394.80	4,833.42
30001	Mandan 1	1	3,144	49	171	2,958.29	4,768.14	4,538.54	4,563.26
30004	Little Heart 4	2	16	2	6	4,344.13	6,138.19	5,918.89	-
30007	New Salem 7	1	329	20	6	3,900.46	4,428.90	3,290.10	4,286.73
30008	Sims 8	2	20	2	6	15,379.39	14,104.33	14,886.80	200.61
30013	Hebron 13	1	162	5	8	5,487.35	4,826.79	3,766.82	8,997.67

