CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: Parts I and II

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

For reporting on

School Year 2004-2005

PART I DUE MARCH 6, 2006
PART II DUE APRIL 14, 2006

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON DC 20202

INTRODUCTION

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

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

- Title I, Part A - *Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies*
- Title I, Part B, Subpart 3 - *William F. Goodling Even Start Family Literacy Programs*
- Title I, Part C - *Education of Migratory Children*
- Title I, Part D - *Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk*
- Title I, Part F - *Comprehensive School Reform*
- Title II, Part A - *Improving Teacher Quality State Grants* (*Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund)*
- Title II, Part D - *Enhancing Education through Technology*
- Title III, Part A - *English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement Act*
- Title IV, Part A, Subpart 1 - *Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities State Grants*
- Title IV, Part A, Subpart 2 - *Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Activities (Community Service Grant Program)*
- Title IV, Part B - *21st Century Community Learning Centers*
- Title V, Part A - *Innovative Programs*
- Title VI, Section 6111 - *Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities*
- Title VI, Part B - *Rural Education Achievement Program*

The NCLB Consolidated State Performance Report for the 2004-2005 school year consists of two information collections. Part I of this report is due to the Department by March 6, 2006 . Part II is due to the Department by April 14, 2006.

PART I

Part I of the Consolidated State Report, which States must submit to the Department by **March 6, 2006** , requests information related to the five ESEA Goals, established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application, and information required for the Annual State Report to the Secretary, as described in section 1111(h)(4) of ESEA. The five ESEA Goals established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application are as follows:

- **Performance goal 1:** By 2013-2014, all students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.

- **Performance goal 2** : All limited English proficient students will become proficient in English and reach high academic standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.

- **Performance goal 3** : By 2004-2005, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.

- **Performance goal 4** : All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free, and conducive to learning.

- **Performance Goal 5** : All students will graduate from high school.

PART II

Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report consists of information related to State activities and outcomes of specific ESEA programs for the 2004-2005 school year. Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report is due to the Department by **April 14, 2006**. The information requested in Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report for the 2004-2005 school year necessarily varies from program to program. However, for all programs, the specific information requested for this report meets the following criteria.

1. The information is needed for Department program performance plans or for other program needs.
2. The information is not available from another source, including program evaluations.
3. The information will provide valid evidence of program outcomes or results.
4. The Consolidated State Performance Report is the best vehicle for collection of the data.

The Department is continuing to work with the Performance-Based Data Management Initiative (PBDMI) to streamline data collections for the 2004-2005 school year and beyond.

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the 2004-2005 school year must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **March 6, 2006** . Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **April 14, 2006**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the 2004-2005 school year, unless otherwise noted.

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

TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

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

Initially, a state user will log onto EDEN and be provided with an option that takes him or her to the "2004-2005 CSPR". The main CSPR screen will allow the user to select the section of the CSPR that he or she needs to either view or enter data. After selecting a section of the CSPR, the user will be presented with a screen or set of screens where the user can input the data for that section of the CSPR. A user can only select one section of the CSPR at a time. After a state has included all available data in the designated sections of a particular CSPR Part, a lead state user will certify that Part and transmit it to the Department. Once a Part has been transmitted, ED will have access to the data. States may still make changes or additions to the transmitted data, by creating an updated version of the CSPR. Detailed instructions for transmitting the 2004-2005 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN website (https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/).

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

	OMB Number: 1810-0614
	Expiration Date: 07/31/2006

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

Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting:
__X__Part I, 2004-2005 ___Part II, 2004-2005

Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report:
Montana Office of Public Instruction

Address:
Po Box 202501
Helena, MT 59620-2501

Person to contact about this report:

Name: Nancy Coopersmith
Telephone: (406) 444-5541
Fax: (406) 444-1373
e-mail: ncoopersmith@mt.gov

Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Nancy Coopersmith

_____ 5/9/2006 7:09 PM EST
Signature Date

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART I

For reporting on

School Year 2004-2005

PART I DUE MARCH 6, 2006

1.1. STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

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

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

STATE RESPONSE

Pursuant to Administrative Rules of Montana, 10.54.2503 Standards Review Schedule (1) Montana's Content and Performance Standards shall be reviewed and revised on a five-year cycle beginning July 1, 2005. (2) A schedule for review of specific programs shall be established as a collaborative process with the office of public instruction and the board of public education with input from representatives of accredited schools. (3) The standards review process shall use context information, criteria, processes, and procedures identified by the office of public instruction with input from representatives of accredited schools.

The review of the 1999 K-12 Science Standards began during the summer 2005 with an anticipated adoption date of fall 2006. The K-16 writing team is following the guidelines outlined by the Board of Public Education.

The Montana Standards process remains as stated below.

Standards – The Montana Office of Public Instruction, in partnership with the Montana Board of Public Education and Montana education stakeholders, facilitated a process to complete the revision of K-12 content standards and performance descriptors in all subject areas, thereby developing the Montana K-12 Standards Framework. The Montana K-12 Standards Framework describes what all public school students will know and be able to do upon graduation from the Montana education system. The Board adopted the standards into Administrative Rules of Montana, Chapter 54, Content Standards and Performance Descriptors.

The Montana K-12 Standards Framework defines the general knowledge of what all students should know, understand, and be able to do in each subject area and sets specific expectations for student learning at three benchmarks along the K-12 continuum. These benchmarks are at the end of fourth grade, eighth grade, and upon graduation. Performance descriptors define student achievement at each of these benchmarks at four performance levels: advanced, proficient, nearing proficiency, and novice. The content standards, benchmark expectations, and corresponding performance levels provide teachers, parents, students, and the public with a clear understanding of what students are expected to learn and how well they are able to apply their learning.

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

STATE RESPONSE

Following a Request for Proposals (RFP) process which included Montana educators, Measured Progress, a testing contractor from New Hampshire was chosen for the Montana Criterion-Referenced Test (CRT) and CRT-Alternate. The following is the Montana CRT and the CRT-Alternate administration schedule

School year 2003-2004: Reading and math in grades 4, 8, and 10
School year 2004-2005: Reading and math in grades 4, 8, and 10
School year 2005-2006: Reading and math in grades 3-8 and 10
School year 2006-2007: Reading and math in grades 3-8 and 10
School year 2007-2008:
Reading and math in grades 3-8 and 10
Science in grades 4, 8, and 10

The contract with Measured Progress includes professional development and test development. In addition, the Office of Public Instruction provides other professional development related to assessment. Educators from across the state and representative of Montana's population have participated in the activities; in addition, video tapes and related materials are available for check out from the Office of Public Instruction Resource Center. The following is a sample of the opportunities for participation in professional development.

Workshops Presented
Teacher as Assessor
Examining Student Work
Student-based Classroom
Reading the Reports
Strategies for Constructed Response Items
Classroom Use of Test Results

Test Development Participation
Development of grade level expectations
Item writing and revision and content and bias review
Benchmarking constructed response items
Standard setting
Pilot testing
CRT-Alternate test development
CRT-Alternate Expanded Academic Benchmarks

Test development includes the following steps:
External alignment of the Measured Progress off-the-shelf test Progress Towards Standards, (PTS) to Montana Content Standards (Norman Webb alignment model was used)
Grade-Level Expectations (GLEs) in reading and math were developed for grades 3, 5, 6 and 7 and revised for grades 4, 8 and 10

Development of items necessary to augment Progress Towards Standards (PTS) to cover Montana Standards
Educators from across the state representative of Montana's population participated in item writing and revision, content and bias reviews, pilot testing, item analysis and selection, and benchmarking constructed response items.
Montana educators participated in national (PTS) content and bias review committee meetings

Test administration training
Test coordinator and administrator manuals reviewed in detail

Video broadcasts at more than 20 sites across the state
Videos available for checkout from the Office of Public Instruction
Video stream online
Video of training included with testing material shipment

Benchmarking and scoring – Montana educators participated in benchmarking and scoring of constructed-response items.

Standard setting--Montana educators participate in standard setting. The Bookmark was used for the CRT; the Modified Body of Work was used for the CRT-Alternate

Results reported to sc

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

STATE RESPONSE

- Standard setting for grades 4, 8, and 10 in reading and math for the Criterion-Reference Test (CRT) and Criterion-Referenced Test-Alternate (CRT-Alt) was conducted and included participation by Montana educators from across the state representative of Montana's population. Measured Progress provided the training and facilitated the panels. The Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) reviewed the methods and results.
- The method used for the CRT is the Modified Bookmark. For the CRT-Alternate, the Modified Body of Work method was used. For both methods, Measured Progress provided the facilitators, materials, training, and impact data generated by the cut score choices. For both the CRT and the CRT-Alternate, the educator/panelists were divided into six grade/content area groups of about 15 people each group working independently of the other groups.

Performance descriptors for the CRT are:

Advanced: **This level denotes superior performance**

This level denotes superior performance

Proficient**:** This level denotes solid academic performance for each benchmark. Students reaching this level have demonstrated competency over challenging subject matter, including subject-matter knowledge, application of such knowledge to real-world situations, and analytical skills appropriate to the subject matter.

Nearing Proficiency: This level denotes that the student has partial mastery or prerequisite knowledge and skills fundamental for proficient work at each benchmark

Novice: This level denotes that the student is beginning to attain the prerequisite knowledge and skills that are fundamental for work at each benchmark.

- To measure the knowledge, skills, and abilities of students with significant cognitive disabilities, using Montana content standards in reading and math, expanded benchmarks were developed within grade span expectations. Beginning with the standards, the development encompassed the essence of the standard, grade level expectations, and expanded benchmarks with grade level expectations. The expanded benchmarks describe the scope and sequence of the acquisition of content related knowledge, skills, and abilities along a learning continuum in which the standards become reachable and teachable.

Performance descriptors for the CRT-Alternate are:

Advanced: The student at the Advanced level accurately and independently demonstrates the ability to carry out comprehensive content specific performance indicators.

Proficient: The student at the Proficient level, given limited prompting, demonstrates the ability to respond

accurately in performing a wide variety of content specific performance indicators.

***Nearing Proficiency*:** The student at the Nearing Proficiency level, given moderate prompting, demonstrates the ability to respond accurately in performing a narrow set of content specific performance indicators.

Novice: The student at the Novice level, given physical assistance and/or modeling, is supported to participate in content specific performance indicators.

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

Participation of All Students in 2004-2005 State Assessments

In the following tables, please provide the total number and percentage for each of the listed subgroups of students who participated in the State's 2004-2005 school year academic assessments.

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

1.2.1 Student Participation in 2004-2005 School Year Test Administration

1.2.1.1 2004-2005 School Year Mathematics Assessment

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Tested
All Students	34661	99.8
American Indian/Alaska Native	3763	99.6
Asian/Pacific Islander	353	100.0
Black, non-Hispanic	272	100.0
Hispanic	687	99.6
White, non-Hispanic	29586	99.9
Students with Disabilities	4136	99.8
Limited English Proficient	1381	99.9
Economically Disadvantaged	11040	99.8
Migrant	96	100.0
Male	17717	99.8
Female	16938	99.9

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.2.1.2 2004-2005 School Year Reading/Language Arts Assessment

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Tested
All Students	34600	99.7
American Indian/Alaska Native	3754	99.4
Asian/ Pacific Islander	352	99.7
Black, non-Hispanic	271	99.6
Hispanic	684	99.1
White, non-Hispanic	29539	99.7
Students with Disabilities	4130	99.6
Limited English Proficient	1369	99.1
Economically Disadvantaged	11023	99.6
Migrant	95	99.0
Male	17688	99.7
Female	16906	99.7

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in State Assessment System

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

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

1.2.2.1 Participation of Students with Disabilities the in 2004-2005 School Year Test Administration - Math Assessment

	Total Number of Students with Disabilities Tested	Percent of Students with Disabilities Tested
Regular Assessment, with or without accommodations	3647	90.0
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	355	8.7

1.2.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities the in 2004-2005 School Year Test Administration - Reading/Language Arts Assessment

	Total Number of Students with Disabilities Tested	Percent of Students with Disabilities Tested
Regular Assessment, with or without accommodations	3647	90.0
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	355	8.7

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

In the following charts, please provide student achievement data from the 2004-2005 school year test administration. Charts have been provided for each of grades 3 through 8 and high school to accommodate the varied State assessment systems in mathematics and reading/language arts during the 2004-2005 school year. States should provide data on the total number of students tested as well as the percentage of students scoring at the proficient or advanced levels for those grades in which the State administered mathematics and reading/language arts assessments during the 2004-2005 school year.

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

1.3.1 Grade 3 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05
All Students		
American Indian/Alaska Native		
Asian/Pacific Islander		
Black, non-Hispanic		
Hispanic		
White, non-Hispanic		
Students with Disabilities		
Limited English Proficient		
Economically Disadvantaged		
Migrant		
Male		
Female		

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.2 Grade 3 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05
All Students		
American Indian/Alaska Native		
Asian/Pacific Islander		
Black, non-Hispanic		
Hispanic		
White, non-Hispanic		
Students with Disabilities		
Limited English Proficient		
Economically Disadvantaged		
Migrant		
Male		
Female		

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.3 Grade 4 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05
All Students	10708	56.1
American Indian/Alaska Native	1249	30.6
Asian/Pacific Islander	108	63.9
Black, non-Hispanic	112	44.6
Hispanic	238	48.7
White, non-Hispanic	9001	59.9
Students with Disabilities	1328	31.7
Limited English Proficient	399	18.3
Economically Disadvantaged	4149	44.1
Migrant	42	52.4
Male	5486	58.3
Female	5219	53.9

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.4 Grade 4 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05
All Students	10712	74.8
American Indian/Alaska Native	1249	48.2
Asian/Pacific Islander	108	83.3
Black, non-Hispanic	112	79.5
Hispanic	239	63.2
White, non-Hispanic	9004	78.6
Students with Disabilities	1329	41.3
Limited English Proficient	398	28.1
Economically Disadvantaged	4152	63.6
Migrant	42	64.3
Male	5489	71.4
Female	5220	78.3

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.5 Grade 5 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05
All Students		
American Indian/Alaska Native		
Asian/Pacific Islander		
Black, non-Hispanic		
Hispanic		
White, non-Hispanic		
Students with Disabilities		
Limited English Proficient		
Economically Disadvantaged		
Migrant		
Male		
Female		

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.6 Grade 5 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05
All Students		
American Indian/Alaska Native		
Asian/Pacific Islander		
Black, non-Hispanic		
Hispanic		
White, non-Hispanic		
Students with Disabilities		
Limited English Proficient		
Economically Disadvantaged		
Migrant		
Male		
Female		

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.7 Grade 6 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05
All Students		
American Indian/Alaska Native		
Asian/Pacific Islander		
Black, non-Hispanic		
Hispanic		
White, non-Hispanic		
Students with Disabilities		
Limited English Proficient		
Economically Disadvantaged		
Migrant		
Male		
Female		

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.8 Grade 6 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05
All Students		
American Indian/Alaska Native		
Asian/Pacific Islander		
Black, non-Hispanic		
Hispanic		
White, non-Hispanic		
Students with Disabilities		
Limited English Proficient		
Economically Disadvantaged		
Migrant		
Male		
Female		

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.9 Grade 7 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05
All Students		
American Indian/Alaska Native		
Asian/Pacific Islander		
Black, non-Hispanic		
Hispanic		
White, non-Hispanic		
Students with Disabilities		
Limited English Proficient		
Economically Disadvantaged		
Migrant		
Male		
Female		

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.10 Grade 7 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05
All Students		
American Indian/Alaska Native		
Asian/Pacific Islander		
Black, non-Hispanic		
Hispanic		
White, non-Hispanic		
Students with Disabilities		
Limited English Proficient		
Economically Disadvantaged		
Migrant		
Male		
Female		

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.11 Grade 8 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05
All Students	12188	62.5
American Indian/Alaska Native	1369	31.0
Asian/Pacific Islander	110	67.3
Black, non-Hispanic	91	45.1
Hispanic	226	48.7
White, non-Hispanic	10392	67.1
Students with Disabilities	1556	26.3
Limited English Proficient	529	19.5
Economically Disadvantaged	4077	47.3
Migrant	41	58.5
Male	6237	63.5
Female	5970	61.2

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.12 Grade 8 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05
All Students	12199	63.2
American Indian/Alaska Native	1373	32.3
Asian/Pacific Islander	110	77.3
Black, non-Hispanic	91	52.7
Hispanic	225	44.4
White, non-Hispanic	10400	67.6
Students with Disabilities	1557	22.1
Limited English Proficient	526	15.4
Economically Disadvantaged	4083	48.1
Migrant	40	47.5
Male	6220	56.6
Female	5976	70.0

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.13 High School - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05
All Students	11765	55.5
American Indian/Alaska Native	1145	19.8
Asian/Pacific Islander	135	54.8
Black, non-Hispanic	69	39.1
Hispanic	223	41.7
White, non-Hispanic	10193	59.9
Students with Disabilities	1252	17.2
Limited English Proficient	453	7.5
Economically Disadvantaged	2814	36.9
Migrant	13	23.1
Male	6016	54.9
Female	5749	56.1

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.14 High School - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05
All Students	11689	67.0
American Indian/Alaska Native	1132	36.1
Asian/Pacific Islander	134	67.2
Black, non-Hispanic	68	61.8
Hispanic	220	61.4
White, non-Hispanic	10135	70.6
Students with Disabilities	1244	24.1
Limited English Proficient	445	17.1
Economically Disadvantaged	2788	51.0
Migrant	13	53.8
Male	5979	59.2
Female	5710	75.1

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY

1.4.1 For all public elementary and secondary schools and districts in the State (Title I and non-Title I), please provide the total number and percentage of all schools and districts that made adequate yearly progress (AYP), based on data from the 2004-2005 school year.

School Accountability	Total number of public elementary and secondary schools (Title I and non-Title I) in State	Total number of public elementary and secondary schools (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP	Percentage of public elementary and secondary schools (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP
Based on 2004-2005 School Year Data	848	791	93.3

District Accountability	Total number of public elementary and secondary districts (Title I and non-Title I) in State	Total number of public elementary and secondary districts (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP	Percentage of public elementary and secondary districts (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP
Based on 2004-2005 School Year Data	436	405	92.9

1.4.2 For all Title I schools and districts in the State, please provide the total number and percentage of all Title I schools and districts that made AYP, based on data from the 2004-2005 school year.

Title I School Accountability	Total number of Title I schools in State	Total number of Title I schools in State that made AYP	Percentage of Title I schools in State that made AYP
Based on 2004-2005 School Year Data	670	622	92.8

Title I District Accountability	Total number of Title I districts in State	Total number of Title I districts in State that made AYP	Percentage of Title I districts in State that made AYP
Based on 2004-2005 School Year Data	342	314	91.8

1.4.3 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

1.4.3.1 In the following chart, please provide a list of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under section 1116 for the 2005-2006 school year, based upon data from the 2004-2005 school year. For each school listed, please provide the name of the school's district, the areas in which the school missed AYP (e.g., missing reading proficiency target, reading participation rate, other academic indicator), and the school improvement status for the 2005 - 2006 school year (e.g., school in need of improvement year 1, school in need of improvement year 2, corrective action, restructuring - planning, restructuring - implementation). Additionally, for any Title I school identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring for the 2005 - 2006 school year, that made AYP based upon data from the 2004-2005 school year, please add "Made AYP 2004-2005."

Title I Schools Identified for Improvement, Corrective Action, and Restructuring (in 2005 - 2006 based on the data from 2004-2005)

See attached file

State Name	District Name	NCES/CCD ID Code	School Name	NCES/CCD ID Code	Area(s) in which school missed AYP						School Improvement Status for SY 2005-2006
					Reading/Language Arts		Mathematics		Other Academic Indicator		
					Proficiency Target	Participation Rate	Proficiency Target	Participation Rate	Academic Indicator (elementary/ middle schools)	Graduation Rate (high school)	
Did not make AYP											
Montana	Pryor Elem	3021720	Pryor 7-8	00930	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	RYr2
Montana	Plenty Coups H S	3013360	Plenty Coups High School	00398	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	RYr3
Montana	Hardin Elem	3013310	Hardin Primary	00396	FEEDER	FEEDER	FEEDER	FEEDER	FEEDER	FEEDER	ImYr2
Montana	Hardin Elem	3013310	Hardin Intermediate	00395	Made	Made	Missed	Made	Made	NA	ImYr2
Montana	Hardin Elem	3013310	Crow Agency School	00392	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	RYr3
Montana	Hardin Elem	3013310	Hardin Middle School	00394	Missed	Made	Missed	Made	Made	NA	ImYr2
Montana	Hardin H S	3013340	Hardin High School	00397	Missed	Missed	Missed	Missed	NA	Missed	ImYr2
Montana	Lodge Grass Elem	3017010	Lodge Grass School	00533	Missed	Made	Missed	Made	Made	NA	RYr3
Montana	Lodge Grass Elem	3017010	Lodge Grass 7-8	00931	Missed	Made	Missed	Made	Made	NA	RYr3
Montana	Lodge Grass H S	3017040	Lodge Grass High School	00534	Missed	Missed	Missed	Missed	NA	Made	RYr2
Montana	Wyola Elem	3028800	Wyola School	00804	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	RYr3
Montana	Hays-Lodge Pole K-12 Schls	3013660	Lodge Pole School	00097	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	ImYr1
Montana	Hays-Lodge Pole K-12 Schls	3013660	Hays-Lodge Pole High Sch	00413	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	RYr3
Montana	Hays-Lodge Pole K-12 Schls	3013660	Hays-Lodge Pole 7-8	00934	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	RYr3
Montana	Browning Elem	3005140	K W Bergan School	00131	FEEDER	FEEDER	FEEDER	FEEDER	FEEDER	FEEDER	RYr3
Montana	Browning Elem	3005140	Napi School	00132	Missed	Made	Missed	Made	Made	NA	RYr3
Montana	Browning Elem	3005140	Vina Chattin School	00134	FEEDER	FEEDER	FEEDER	FEEDER	FEEDER	FEEDER	RYr3
Montana	Browning Elem	3005140	Browning Middle School	00872	Missed	Made	Missed	Made	Made	NA	RYr3
Montana	Browning H S	3005190	Browning High School	00136	Missed	Made	Missed	Made	NA	Missed	RYr3
Montana	Box Elder Elem	3004440	Box Elder 7-8	00985	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	RYr2
Montana	Box Elder H S	3004500	Box Elder High School	00104	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	ImYr2
Montana	Rocky Boy Elem	3022750	Rocky Boy School	00666	Missed	Made	Missed	Made	Made	NA	RYr3
Montana	Rocky Boy H S	3028911	Rocky Boy High School	01086	Missed	Made	Missed	Made	NA	Made	RYr3
Montana	Auchard Creek Elem	3002490	Auchard Creek School	00026	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	ImYr1
Montana	Heart Butte Elem	3013740	Heart Butte Elementary	00414	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	ImYr2
Montana	Heart Butte Elem	3013740	Heart Butte 7-8	01031	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	RYr3
Montana	Heart Butte H S	3000099	Heart Butte High School	00924	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	RYr3
Montana	Poplar Elem	3021240	Poplar 5-6 School	01044	FEEDER	FEEDER	FEEDER	FEEDER	FEEDER	FEEDER	RYr3
Montana	Poplar Elem	3021240	Poplar School	00637	Missed	Missed	Missed	Missed	Made	NA	ImYr2
Montana	Poplar Elem	3021240	Poplar 7-8	00636	Missed	Missed	Missed	Missed	Made	NA	RYr3
Montana	Poplar H S	3021270	Poplar High School	00638	Missed	Missed	Missed	Missed	NA	Missed	RYr3
Montana	Wolf Point Elem	3028590	Wolf Point 7-8	00798	Missed	Made	Missed	Made	Made	NA	ImYr2
Montana	Brockton Elem	3005010	Barbara Gilligan 7-8	01046	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	RYr3
Montana	Brockton H S	3005040	Brockton High School	00125	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	RYr3
Montana	Lame Deer Elem	3016050	Lame Deer School	00494	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	RYr3
Montana	Lame Deer Elem	3016050	Lame Deer 7-8	01049	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	RYr3

Montana	Lame Deer H S	3000095	Lame Deer High School	00137	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	RYr2
Montana	Ashland Elem	3000008	Ashland School	00023	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	ImYr1
Montana	Frazer Elem	3011420	Frazer Elementary	00310	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	RYr2
Montana	Frazer Elem	3011420	Frazer 7-8	01072	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	RYr3
Montana	Frazer H S	3011460	Frazer High School	00311	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	RYr3
Montana	Yellowstone Academy Elem	3028860	Yellowstone Academy Elem	00806	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	ImYr2
Made AYP											
Montana	Anaconda Elem	3002010	Fred Moodry 7-8	00014	Made	Made	Made	Made	Made	NA	HImYr1
Montana	Lewistown Elem	3016490	Garfield School	00507	Made	Made	Made	Made	Made	NA	HImYr1
Montana	Columbia Falls Elem	3007110	Columbia Falls 7-8	00195	Made	Made	Made	Made	Made	NA	HImYr1
Montana	Columbia Falls Elem	3007110	Columbia Falls Grade 6	00197	FEEDER	FEEDER	FEEDER	FEEDER	FEEDER	NA	HImYr1
Montana	Lavina K-12 Schools	3016290	Lavina School	00502	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	HImYr1
Montana	Box Elder Elem	3004440	Box Elder School	00103	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	HImYr1
Montana	Arlee Elem	3002220	Arlee 7-8	00900	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	HImYr1
Montana	Polson Elem	3021060	Polson 7-8	00632	Made	Made	Made	Made	Made	NA	HImYr1
Montana	Polson Elem	3021060	Polson 5-6 School	01087	FEEDER	FEEDER	FEEDER	FEEDER	FEEDER	FEEDER	HImYr1
Montana	Polson H S	3021090	Polson High School	00633	Made	Made	Made	Made	NA	Made	HImYr1
Montana	Ronan Elem	3022790	Ronan Middle School	00668	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	HImYr1
Montana	Helena Elem	3000005	Central School	00418	Made	Made	Made	Made	Made	NA	HImYr1
Montana	Missoula Elem	3018570	Porter Middle School	00565	Made	Made	Made	Made	Made	NA	HImYr1
Montana	Dodson Elem	3009090	Dodson 7-8	01028	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	HImYr1
Montana	Wolf Point Elem	3028590	Southside School	00797	FEEDER	FEEDER	FEEDER	FEEDER	FEEDER	FEEDER	HImYr1
Montana	Wolf Point H S	3028620	Wolf Point High School	00799	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	HImYr1
Montana	Colstrip Elem	3007050	Pine Butte Elementary Sch	00873	Made	Made	Made	Made	Made	NA	HImYr1
Montana	Butte Elem	3005280	East Middle School	00905	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	HImYr1
Montana	Billings Elem	3003870	Riverside 7-8	00903	Made on Appeal	Made on Appeal	Made on Appeal	Made on Appeal	Made on Appeal	Made on Appeal	HImYr1
Montana	Billings H S	3003900	Billings Sr High School	00090	Made on Appeal	Made on Appeal	Made on Appeal	Made on Appeal	Made on Appeal	Made on Appeal	HImYr1
Montana	Wolf Point Elem	3028590	Northside School	00796	Made	Made	Made	Made	Made	NA	HCYr1
Montana	Harlem H S	3013400	Harlem High School	00400	Made	Made	Made	Made	NA	Made	HRYr2
Montana	Rocky Boy Elem	3022750	Rocky Boy 7-8	00986	Made	Made	Made	Made	Made	NA	HRYr2
Montana	Brockton Elem	3005010	Barbara Gilligan School	00124	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	HRYr2

Key

SSP - Small Schools Process	FEEDER - school receives AYP status of the school it feeds into	ImYr1 - Improvement Year 1	ImYr2 - Improvement Year 2	CYr3 - Corrective Action Year 3	CYr4 - Corrective Action Year 4	RYr2 - Restructuring Year 2	RYr3 - Restructuring Year 3	H before any designation indicates "Holding"

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

The Title I staff at the Montana Office of Public Instruction have worked with the identified schools in the following ways. Where district-level staff are available, they have assisted in these efforts and added their own initiatives:

1) Mailing of letters giving details on requirements for schools in each improvements status;

2) High Priority Schools and Districts Institute in conjunction with Title I State Conference;

3) Priority status for on-site technical assistance visits and reviews;

4) Regular teleconferencing;

5) High-Risk District Status and on-site technical assistance in three districts;

6) School Support Teams conduct Scholastic Reviews using Montana Office of Public Instruction Correlates of Effective Schools; and

7) Team leaders conduct periodic follow-up calls and visits to continue assistance.

1.4.4 Title I Districts Identified for Improvement.

1.4.4.1 In the following chart, please provide a list of Title I districts identified for improvement or corrective action under section 1116 for the 2005 - 2006 school year, based upon data from the 2004-2005 school year. For each district listed, please provide the areas in which the district missed AYP (e.g., missing reading proficiency target, reading participation rate, other academic indicator), and the district improvement status for the 2005 - 2006 school year (e.g., district in need of improvement year 1, district in need of improvement year 2, corrective action). Additionally for any Title I district identified for improvement or corrective action for the 2005 - 2006 school year that made AYP based on data from the 2004-2005 school year, please add "Made AYP for 2004-2005."

Title I Districts Identified for Improvement and Corrective Action (in 2005 - 2006 based on the data from 2004-2005)

See attached file

State Name	District Name	NCES/CCD ID Code	Area(s) in which district missed AYP						School Improvement Status for SY 2005-2006
			Reading/Language Arts		Mathematics		Other Academic Indicator		
			Proficiency Target	Participation Rate	Proficiency Target	Participation Rate	Academic Indicator (elementary/ middle schools)	Graduation Rate (high school)	
Did Not Make AYP									
Montana	Pryor Elem	3021720	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	CYr3
Montana	Plenty Coups H S	3013360	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	CYr4
Montana	Hardin Elem	3013310	Missed	Made	Missed	Made	Made	NA	ImYr2
Montana	Hardin H S	3013340	Missed	Missed	Missed	Missed	NA	Missed	ImYr2
Montana	Lodge Grass Elem	3017010	Missed	Missed	Missed	Missed	Made	NA	CYr4
Montana	Lodge Grass H S	3017040	Missed	Missed	Missed	Missed	NA	Made	CYr3
Montana	Wyola Elem	3028800	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	CYr4
Montana	Harlem Elem	3013395	Missed	Made	Made	Made	Made	NA	CYr3
Montana	Hays-Lodge Pole K-12 Schls	3013660	Missed	Missed	Missed	Missed	Made	NA	CYr4
Montana	Browning Elem	3005140	Missed	Made	Missed	Missed	Made	NA	CYr4
Montana	Browning H S	3005190	Missed	Made	Missed	Made	NA	Missed	CYr4
Montana	Box Elder H S	3004500	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	ImYr2
Montana	Rocky Boy Elem	3022750	Missed	Missed	Missed	Missed	Made	NA	CYr4
Montana	Rocky Boy H S	3028911	Missed	Made	Missed	Made	NA	Made	CYr4
Montana	Auchard Creek Elem	3002490	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	ImYr1
Montana	Heart Butte Elem	3013740	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	CYr4
Montana	Heart Butte H S	3000099	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	CYr4
Montana	Poplar Elem	3021240	Missed	Missed	Missed	Missed	Made	NA	CYr4
Montana	Poplar H S	3021270	Missed	Missed	Missed	Missed	NA	Made	CYr4
Montana	Wolf Point Elem	3028590	Missed	Made	Missed	Made	Made	NA	ImYr2
Montana	Brockton Elem	3005010	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	CYr4
Montana	Brockton H S	3005040	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	CYr4
Montana	Lame Deer H S	3000095	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	CYr3
Montana	Ashland Elem	3000008	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	ImYr2
Montana	Frazer Elem	3011420	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	CYr4
Montana	Frazer H S	3011460	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	CYr4

Montana	Yellowstone Academy Elem	3028860	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	ImYr2
Made AYP									
Montana	Great Falls Elem	3013040	Made	Made	Made	Made	Made	NA	HImYr1
Montana	Miles City Elem	3018410	Made	Made	Made	Made	Made	NA	HImYr1
Montana	Kalispell Elem	3015450	Made	Made	Made	Made	Made	NA	HImYr1
Montana	Columbia Falls Elem	3007110	Made	Made	Made	Made	Made	NA	HImYr1
Montana	Cut Bank Elem	3000003	Made	Made	Made	Made	Made	NA	HImYr1
Montana	Havre Elem	3013560	Made on Appeal	Made on Appeal	Made on Appeal	Made on Appeal	Made on Appeal	Made on Appeal	HImYr1
Montana	Arlee Elem	3002220	Made	Made	Made	Made	Made	NA	HImYr1
Montana	Polson Elem	3021060	Made	Made	Made	Made	Made	NA	HImYr1
Montana	Polson H S	3021090	Made	Made	Made	Made	NA	Made	HImYr1
Montana	Ronan Elem	3022790	Made	Made	Made	Made	Made	NA	HImYr1
Montana	Helena Elem	3000005	Made	Made	Made	Made	Made	NA	HImYr1
Montana	St Regis K-12 Schools	3024930	Made	Made	Made	Made	Made	NA	HImYr1
Montana	Missoula Elem	3018570	Made	Made	Made	Made	Made	NA	HImYr1
Montana	Missoula H S	3018540	Made on Appeal	Made on Appeal	Made on Appeal	Made on Appeal	Made on Appeal	Made on Appeal	HImYr1
Montana	Seeley Lake Elem	3023730	Made	Made	Made	Made	Made	NA	HImYr1
Montana	Powell County H S	3021450	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	HImYr1
Montana	Wolf Point H S	3028620	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	HImYr1
Montana	Butte Elem	3005280	Made	Made	Made	Made	Made	NA	HImYr1
Montana	Harlowton Elem	3013440	Made	Made	Made	Made	Made	NA	HImYr1
Montana	Billings Elem	3003870	Made on Appeal	Made on Appeal	Made on Appeal	Made on Appeal	Made on Appeal	Made on Appeal	HImYr1
Montana	Billings H S	3003900	Made on Appeal	Made on Appeal	Made on Appeal	Made on Appeal	Made on Appeal	Made on Appeal	HImYr1
Montana	Lockwood Elem	3016950	Made	Made	Made	Made	Made	NA	HImYr1
Montana	Laurel Elem	3016200	Made	Made	Made	Made	Made	NA	HImYr1
Montana	Huntley Project K-12 Schools	3014700	Made	Made	Made	Made	Made	Made	HImYr1
Montana	Harlem H S	3013400	Made	Made	Made	Made	NA	Made	HCYr3
Montana	Box Elder Elem	3004440	Made	Made	Made	Made	Made	NA	HCYr3
Montana	Lame Deer Elem	3016050	Made	Made	Made	Made	Made	NA	HCYr3

Key

SSP - Small Schools Process	FEEDER - school receives AYP status of the school it feeds into	ImYr1 - Improvement Year 1	ImYr2 - Improvement Year 2	CYr3 - Corrective Action Year 3	CYr4 - Corrective Action Year 4	H before any designation indicates "Holding"

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

The Title I staff at the Montana Office of Public Instruction have worked with the identified districts in the following ways. Where district-level staff are available, they have assisted in these efforts and added their own initiatives:

1) Mailing of letters giving details on requirements for schools in each improvements status;

2) High Priority Schools and Districts Institute in conjunction with Title I State Conference;

3) Priority status for on-site technical assistance visits and reviews;

4) Regular teleconferencing;

5) High-Risk District Status and on-site technical assistance in three districts;

6) School Support Teams conduct Scholastic Reviews using Montana Office of Public Instruction Correlates of Effective Schools (specific correlates are designated for district level accountability); and

7) Team leaders conduct periodic follow-up calls and visits to continue assistance.

1.4.5 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

1.4.5.1 Public School Choice

1. Please provide the number of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring from which students transferred under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2004-2005 school year. __8__

2. Please provide the number of public schools to which students transferred under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2004-2005 school year. __14__ How many of these schools were charter schools? __0__

3. Please provide the number of students who transferred to another public school under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2004-2005 school year. __29__

4. Please provide the number of students who were eligible to transfer to another public school under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2004-2005 school year. __3172__

Optional Information :

5. If the State has the following data, the Department would be interested in knowing the following:

6. The number of students who applied to transfer to another public school under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2004-2005 school year. ____

7. The number of students, among those who applied to transfer to another public school under the Title I public school choice provisions, who were actually offered the opportunity to transfer by their LEAs, during the 2004-2005 school year. ____

Optional Information Items 1 & 2 are N/A

1.4.5.2 Supplemental Educational Services

1. Please provide the number of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring whose students received supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2004-2005 school year. __5__

2. Please provide the number of students who received supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2004-2005 school year. __23__

3. Please provide the number of students who were eligible to receive supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2004-2005 school year. __4319__

Optional Information :

If the State has the following data, the Department would be interested in knowing the following:

4. The number of students who applied to receive supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2004-2005 school year. ____

Optional Information is N/A

1.5 TEACHER AND PARAPROFESIONAL QUALITY

1.5.1 In the following table, please provide data from the 2004-2005 school year for classes in the core academic subjects being taught by "highly qualified" teachers (as the term is defined in Section 9101(23) of the ESEA), in the aggregate for all schools and in "high-poverty" and "low-poverty" elementary schools (as the terms are defined in Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) of the ESEA). Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "high-poverty" schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State and "low-poverty" schools as schools in the bottom quartile of poverty in the State. Additionally, please provide information on classes being taught by highly qualified teachers by the elementary and secondary school level.

School Type	Total Number of Core Academic Classes	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers
All Schools in State	28147	27850	98.9
Elementary Level			
High-Poverty Schools	2661	2632	98.9
Low-Poverty Schools	2097	2081	99.2
All Elementary Schools	14578	14466	99.2
Secondary Level			
High-Poverty Schools	1503	1457	96.9
Low-Poverty Schools	5643	5587	99.0
All Secondary Schools	13569	13384	98.6

Definitions and Instructions

What are the core academic subjects?

English, reading or language arts, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, and geography [*Title IX,* Section 9101(11)]. While the statute includes the arts in the core academic subjects, it does not specify which of the arts are core academic subjects; therefore, States must make this determination.

How is a teacher defined?

An individual who provides instruction in the core academic areas to kindergarten, grades 1 through 12, or un-graded classes; or individuals who teach in an environment other than a classroom setting (and who maintain daily student attendance records) [from NCES, CCD, 2001-02]

How is a class defined?

A class is a setting in which organized instruction of core academic course content is provided to one or more students (including cross-age groupings) for a given period of time. (A course may be offered to more than one class). Instruction, provided by one or more teachers or other staff members, may be delivered in person or via a different medium. Classes that share space should be considered as separate classes if they function as separate units for more than 50 percent of the time [from NCES Non-fiscal Data Handbook for Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education, 2003.

Should 6th, 7th, and 8th grade classes be reported in the elementary or secondary category?

States are responsible for determining whether the content taught at the middle school level meets the competency requirements for elementary or secondary instruction. See Question A-14 in the August 3, 2005, Non-Regulatory Guidance for additional information. Report classes in grade 6 though 8 consistent with how teachers have been classified to determine their highly qualified status, regardless if their schools are configured as elementary or middle schools.

How should States count teachers (including specialists or resource teachers) in elementary classes?

States that count self-contained classrooms as one class should, to avoid over-representation, also count subject-area specialists (e.g., mathematics or music teachers) or resource teachers as teaching one class.

On the other hand, States using a departmentalized approach to instruction where a self-contained classroom is counted multiple times (once for each subject taught) should also count subject-area specialists or resource teachers as teaching multiple classes.

How should States count teachers in self-contained multiple subject secondary classes?

Each core academic subject taught for which students are receiving credit toward graduation should be counted in the numerator and the denominator. For example, if English, calculus, history, and science are being taught in a self-contained classroom by the same teacher, count these as four classes in the denominator. If the teacher is Highly Qualified in English and history, he/she would be counted as Highly Qualified in two of the four subjects in the numerator.

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

Reason For Being Classified as Not Highly Qualified	Percentage
a) Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	38.3
b) Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	0
c) Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	18.8
d) Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	32.3
e) Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	0
f) Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	10.6
g) Other (please explain)	0

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

	High-Poverty Schools	Low-Poverty Schools
Elementary Schools	More than 53.6%	Less than 21.4%
Poverty Metric Used	Free and Reduced Priced Lunch	
Secondary Schools	More than 43.9%	Less than 19.8%
Poverty Metric Used	Free and Reduced Priced Lunch.	

Definitions and Instructions

How are the poverty quartiles determined?

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

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

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

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

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

In the following chart, please provide data from the 2004-2005 school year for the percentage of Title I paraprofessionals (excluding those with sole duties as translators and parental involvement assistants) who are qualified.

School Year	Percentage of Qualified Title I Paraprofessionals
2004-2005 School Year	53.0

1.6 English Language Proficiency

1.6.1.1 English Language Proficiency (ELP) Standards

Has the State developed ELP standards (k-12) as required under Section 3113(b)(2) and are these ELP standards fully approved, adopted, or sanctioned by the State governing body?
Developed __X__Yes ____No
Approved, adopted, sanctioned __X__Yes ____No
Operationalized ____Yes ____No (e.g., Are standards being used by district and school teachers?)

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

STATE RESPONSE

Montana's English Language Proficiency Standards were derived from and are aligned to the approved state Communication Arts(speaking, listening, reading, writing) Standards. The standards formed the basis for the foundation document used in developing the assessment and implementing an Enhanced Assessment grant awarded to the Mountain West Consortium.

1.6.1.2 Alignment of Standards

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

STATE RESPONSE

The Montana English Language Proficiency Standards were developed as part of the initial phase of the Mountain West Assessment Consortium (MWAC) activities. The language arts, mathematics and science frameworks from each of the states in the Consortium were reviewed and examined in order to identify the key standards in their K-12 scope. Commonalities in learning activities and technical vocabulary were identified. From these a consensus list was developed which served as the set of learning standards to be used as the foundation document for the academically oriented English language proficiency assessment. The basis of the framework is that within each mode (listening, speaking, ready and writing), linguistic competence will be assessed in the context of the state English language arts, mathematics and science academic content standards.

1.6.2 English Language Proficiency (ELP) Assessments

1. The expectation for the full administration of the new or enhanced ELP assessment(s) that are aligned with the State's English language proficiency (ELP) standards as required under Section 3113(b)(2) is spring 2006 . Please indicate if the State has conducted any of the following:

- **An independent alignment study __No__**
- **Other evidence of alignment __Yes__**

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

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

STATE RESPONSE

The assessment developed by the Mountain West Consortium addresses the domains of listening, speaking, reading and writing. Comprehension will be measured by combining listening and reading. The assessment is based on the ELP standards which were the foundation document for the development of the assessment. The assessment was developed in accordance with current standards for technical quality under the guidance of Measured Progress, which brought respected credentials to the endeavor, and contracted with experts in the field. Teachers from all eight states participated in the item writing, content and bias review, pilot and field testing, which were carried out in accordance with appropriate practice.

The assessment developed by the Mountain West Consortium was delivered by Measured Progress to the consortium members in the spring of 2005. At that time the Montana SEA determined that it would be necessary to contract with an external agency to carry out the printing, administration, scoring and reporting of the assessment, ideally in collaboration with additional states since Montana's LEP numbers are limited. After contacting all of the consortium members, the Montana SEA found that each state except North Dakota had developed separate plans for assessing its LEP population. Montana and North Dakota have been working together to draft a joint request for proposals(RFP), which was sent to the Montana Department of Administration on December 28th in anticipation of issuing the RFP in March. In discussions carried out with North Dakota it has become apparent that procurement protocol between the states is a complex issue which has yet to be fully resolved; therefore, the ELP assessment has not been administered in the spring of 2006 as hoped. We anticipate full administration in the fall of 2006.

1.6.3 English Language Proficiency Data

In the following tables, please provide English language proficiency (ELP) data from the **2004-2005** school year test administration. The ELP data should be aggregated at the State level.

States may use the sample format below or another format to report the requested information. The information following the chart is meant to explain what is being requested under each column.

1.6.3.1 English Language Proficiency (ELP) Assessment Data

2004-2005 Data for ALL LEP Students in the State						
			Total number and percentage of ALL students identified as LEP at each level of English language proficiency			
Name of ELP Assessment (s) (1)	Total number of ALL Students assessed for ELP (2)	Total number and percentage of ALL students identified as LEP (3)	Number and Percentage at Basic or **Level 1** (4)	Number and Percentage at Intermediate or **Level 2** (5)	Number and Percentage at Advanced or **Level 3** (6)	Number and Percentage at Proficient or **Level 4** (7)

Montana was not able to conduct the first administration of the new assessment because of the unforeseen delay in issuing the RFP for administration and scoring. Montana does not have a system in place to collect data on ELP assessments. Montana is in the process of putting in place a data warehouse that will track individual student data for the first time. It is anticipated that it will be operational in 2007-08.

(1) In column one, provide the name(s) of the English Language Proficiency Assessment(s) used by the State.
(2) In column two, provide the total number of **all** students assessed for limited English proficiency ("assessed" refers to the number of students evaluated using State-selected ELP assessment(s)).
(3) In column three, provide the total number and percentage of **all** students identified as LEP by each State-selected ELP assessment(s) ("identified" refers to the number of students determined to be LEP on State-selected ELP assessments).
(4-7) In columns four-seven, provide the total number and percentage of **all** students identified as LEP at each level of English language proficiency as defined by State-selected ELP assessment(s). The number (#) and percentage (%) of columns 4-7 should equate to the number (#) and percentage (%) of **all** students identified as limited English proficient in column 3.

1.6.3.2 Data Reflecting the Most Common Languages Spoken in the State

2004-2005 Data of the Most Common Languages Spoken by LEPs		
Language	**Number and Percentage of ALL LEP Students in the State**	
1. Crow	1420	20.4
2. Blackfeet	1343	19.3
3. Sioux/Dakota	656	9.4
4. Salish	605	8.7
5. Cheyenne	584	8.4
6. German	501	7.2
7. Assiniboine	363	5.2
8. Cree	337	4.8
9. Spanish	250	3.6
10. Gros Ventre	183	2.6

Figures reflect language of impact, not active speakers.

- In the above chart, list the ten most commonly spoken languages in your State. Indicate the number and percentage of LEP students that speak each of the languages listed in table 1.6.4.1.

1.6.3.3 English Language Proficiency (ELP) Assessment Data

2004-2005 Data for LEP Students in the State Served under Title III						
Name of ELP Assessment(s) (1)	Total number and percentage of students identified as LEP who participated in Title III programs (2)	Total number and percentage of Title III students identified at each level of English language proficiency				Total number and percentage of Title III LEP students transitioned for 2 year monitoring (7)
		Number and Percentage at Basic or **Level 1** (3)	Number and Percentage at Intermediate or **Level 2** (4)	Number and Percentage at Advanced or **Level 3** (5)	Number and Percentage at Proficient or **Level 4** (6)	

Montana was not able to conduct the first administration of the new assessment because of the unforeseen delay in issuing the RFP for administration and scoring. Montana does not have a system in place to collect data on ELP assessments. Montana is in the process of putting in place a data warehouse that will track individual student data for the first time. It is anticipated that it will be operational in 2007-08.

(1) In column one, provide the name of the English Language Proficiency Assessment used by the State.
(2) In column two, provide the total number and percentage of LEP students who participated in a Title III language instruction educational program during the 2004-2005 school year.
(3-6) In columns three-six, provide the total number and percentage of LEP students at each level of English language proficiency who received Title III services during the 2004-2005 school year. The number (#) and percentage (%) of columns 3-6 should equate to the number (#) and percentage (%) of **all** students identified as limited English proficient in column 2.
(7) In column seven, provide the total number and percentage of LEP students who participated in a Title III language instruction educational program during the 2004-2005 school year and who were transitioned into a classroom not tailored for LEP children and are no longer receiving services under Title III.

1.6.4 Immigrant Children and Youth Data

Please provide the following information required under Section 3111©:

1.6.4.1	Number of immigrant children and youth reported in 2004-2005	347
1.6.4.2	Number of immigrant children and youth served in 2004-2005	61
1.6.4.3	Number of subgrants awarded to LEAs for immigrant children and youth programs for 2004-2005	2

1.6.5 Definition of Proficient

If the State has made changes since the last Consolidated State Performance Report submission (for school year 2003-2004), please provide the State's definition of "proficient" in English as defined by the State's English language proficiency standards and assessments under Section 3122(a)(3). Please include the following in your response:

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

STATE RESPONSE

No change has been made.
After the first administration of the new assessment, the State will conduct standard setting and determine cut scores to indicate the levels of proficiency. Scores for listening, speaking, reading and writing, and comprehension will be reported separately.

1.6.6 Definition of Making Progress

If the State has made changes since the last Consolidated State Performance Report submission (for school year 2003-2004), please provide the State's definition of "making progress" in learning English as defined by the State's English language proficiency standards and assessment(s) in Section 3122(a)(3). Please include the following in your response:

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

STATE RESPONSE

No changes were made.

1.6.7 Definition of Cohort

If the State has made changes since the last Consolidated State Performance Report submission (for school year 2003-2004), please provide the State's definition of "cohort." Include a description of the specific characteristics of the cohort(s) in the State, e.g., grade/grade span or other characteristics.
STATE RESPONSE
No changes were made.

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

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

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

___ Yes __X__ No

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

English Language Proficiency	Percent and Number of ALL LEP Students in the State Who Made Progress in Learning English		Percent and Number of ALL LEP Students in the State Who Attained English Proficiency	
2004-2005 School Year	Projected AMAO Target	Actual	Projected AMAO Target	Actual

Montana does not have statewide data on the performance of LEP students on English language proficiency assessments; therefore we have been unable to apply AMAOs to all students in the state. Based on the performance of LEP students on the statewide assessment of reading, the following data indicates progress in learning English.

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

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

Please provide the State's progress in meeting performance targets/annual measurable achievement objectives in LEAs served by Title III.

States may use the sample format below or another format to report the requested information.

English Language Proficiency	Percent and Number of Title III LEP Students in the State Who Made Progress in Learning English		Percent and Number of Title III LEP Students in the State Who Attained English Proficiency	
2004-2005 School Year	Projected AMAO Target	Actual	Projected AMAO Target	Actual

As explained above, Montana does not have a system for collecting data on English language assessments and has not conducted the first administration of the new assessment; therefore the state has not been able to determine the attainment of the AMAOs for LEP students.

1.6.10 Please provide the following data on Title III Programs for the 2004-2005 School Year

	Number:
Number of Title III subgrantees	15
Number of Title III subgrantees that met all three components of Title III annual measurable achievement objectives (making progress, attainment, and AYP)	
Number of Title III subgrantees that did not meet all three components of Title III annual measurable achievement objectives	

As explained above, Montana does not have a system for collecting data on English language assessments and has not conducted the first administration of the new assessment; therefore the state has not been able to determine the attainment of the AMAOs for LEP students.

1.6.11 On the following tables for 2004-2005, please provide data regarding the academic achievement of monitored LEP students who transitioned into classrooms not designated for LEP students and who are no longer receiving services under Title III. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned in 2004-2005 school year.

1.6.11.1 Number and percent of former Title III served, monitored LEP students scoring at the proficient and advanced levels on the State reading language arts assessments

Grade/Grade Span	Students Proficient & Advanced	
	#	%
3		
4	10	38.5
5		
6		
7		
8	6	17.6
H.S.	16	48.5

1.6.11.2 Number and percent of former Title III served, monitored LEP students scoring at the proficient and advanced levels on the State mathematics assessments

Grade/Grade Span	Students Proficient & Advanced	
	#	%
3		
4	10	38.5
5		
6		
7		
8	13	38.2
H.S.	12	36.4

1.7 Persistently Dangerous Schools

In the following chart, please provide data for the number of schools identified as persistently dangerous as determined by the State by the start of the 2005 - 2006 school year. For further guidance on persistently dangerous schools, please refer to the Unsafe School Choice Option Non-Regulatory Guidance, available at:

	Number of Persistently Dangerous Schools
2005-2006 School Year	0

1.8 Graduation and Dropout Rates

1.8.1 Graduation Rates

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

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

1. The Secretary approved each State's definition of the graduation rate, consistent with section 200.19 of the Title I regulations, as part of each State's accountability plan. Using the definition of the graduation rate that was approved as part of your State's accountability plan, in the following chart please provide graduation rate data for the 2003-2004 school year.

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

High School Graduates Student Group	**Graduation Rate** 03-04 School Year
All Students	82.9
American Indian/Alaska Native	59.4
Asian/Pacific Islander	92.9
Black, non-Hispanic	69.4
Hispanic	80.7
White, non-Hispanic	85.6
Students with Disabilities	
Limited English Proficient	
Economically Disadvantaged	
Migrant	
Male	
Female	

Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.8.2 Dropout Rate

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

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

In the following chart, please provide data for the 2003-2004 school year for the percentage of students who drop out of high school, disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged.

Dropouts Student Group	**Dropout Rate** 03-04 School Year
All Students	2.4
American Indian/Alaska Native	6.0
Asian/Pacific Islander	1.4
Black, non-Hispanic	3.8
Hispanic	3.3
White, non-Hispanic	1.9
Students with Disabilities	
Limited English Proficient	
Economically Disadvantaged	
Migrant	
Male	2.6
Female	2.1

Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.