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 2009-10

PART I DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 17, 2010
PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 2011

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202

INTRODUCTION

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

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

The *NCLB* Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2009-10 consists of two Parts, Part I and Part II.

PART I

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

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

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

PART II

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

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

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 2009-10 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, December 17, 2010**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 18, 2011**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2009-10, unless otherwise noted.

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

TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

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

Initially, a state user will log onto EDEN and be provided with an option that takes him or her to the "SY 2009-10 CSPR". The main CSPR screen will allow the user to select the section of the CSPR that he or she needs to either view or enter data. After selecting a section of the CSPR, the user will be presented with a screen or set of screens where the user can input the data for that section of the CSPR. A user can only select one section of the CSPR at a time. After a state has included all available data in the designated sections of a particular CSPR Part, a lead state user will certify that Part and transmit it to the Department. Once a Part has been transmitted, ED will have access to the data. States may still make changes or additions to the transmitted data, by creating an updated version of the CSPR. Detailed instructions for transmitting the SY 2009-10 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/).

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

	OMB Number: 1810-0614
	Expiration Date: 10/31/2010

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, 2009-10 ___Part II, 2009-10

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):
Denise Juneau, State Superintendent

_____ _____
Signature Date

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART I

For reporting on

School Year 2009-10

PART I DUE DECEMBER 17, 2010
5PM EST

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

STANDARDS OF ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

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

1.1.1 Academic Content Standards

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

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

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

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. (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 (BPE) 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.

Content Standards: Science, Approved by BPE, 2006, Implemented 2008
Content Standards: Mathematics, Approved by BPE, 2009, Implementation 2011
Content Standards: Communication Arts (Reading), Approval 2010, Implementation 2011

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

1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts and Science

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Math and reading standards have been revised and approved. New test blueprints are being developed to match the standards.

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

1.1.3 Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities

1.1.3.1 Percentages of Funds Used for Standards and Assessment Development and Other Purposes

For funds your State had available unders ESEA section 6111 (Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities) during SY 2009-10, estimate what percentage of the funds your State used for the following (round to the nearest ten percent).

Purpose	Percentage (rounded to the nearest ten percent)
To pay the costs of the development of the State assessments and standards required by section 1111(b)	70.0
To administer assessments required by section 1111(b) or to carry out other activities described in section 6111 and other activities related to ensuring that the State's schools and local educational agencies are held accountable for the results	30.0
Comments:	

1.1.3.2 Uses of Funds for Purposes Other than Standards and Assessment Development

For funds your State had available under ESEA 6111 (Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities) during SY 2009-10 that were used for purposes other than the costs of the development of the State assessments and standards required by section 1111(b), for what purposes did your State use the funds? (Enter "yes" for all that apply and "no" for all that do not apply).

Purpose	Used for Purpose (yes/no)
Administering assessments required by section 1111(b)	Yes
Developing challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards and aligned assessments in academic subjects for which standards and assessments are not required by section 1111(b)	No
Developing or improving assessments of English language proficiency necessary to comply with section 1111(b)(7)	Yes
Ensuring the continued validity and reliability of State assessments, and/or refining State assessments to ensure their continued alignment with the State's academic content standards and to improve the alignment of curricula and instructional materials	Yes
Developing multiple measures to increase the reliability and validity of State assessment systems	No
Strengthening the capacity of local educational agencies and schools to provide all students the opportunity to increase educational achievement, including carrying out professional development activities aligned with State student academic achievement standards and assessments	Yes
Expanding the range of accommodations available to students with limited English proficiency and students with disabilities (IDEA) to improve the rates of inclusion of such students, including professional development activities aligned with State academic achievement standards and assessments	Yes
Improving the dissemination of information on student achievement and school performance to parents and the community, including the development of information and reporting systems designed to identify best educational practices based on scientifically based research or to assist in linking records of student achievement, length of enrollment, and graduation over time	Yes
Other	No
Comments:	

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

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

1.2.1 Participation of all Students in Mathematics Assessment

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

The student group "children with disabilities (IDEA)" includes children who participated in the regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments. Do not include former students with disabilities (IDEA). Do not include students only covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	74,421	73,845	99.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	8,638	8,544	98.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	925	922	99.7
Black, non-Hispanic	888	880	99.1
Hispanic	2,112	2,088	98.9
White, non-Hispanic	61,858	61,411	99.3
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	8,861	8,521	96.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,048	2,023	98.8
Economically disadvantaged students	31,304	30,967	98.9
Migratory students	137	134	97.8
Male	38,474	38,117	99.1
Female	35,947	35,728	99.4
Comments:			

1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Mathematics Assessment

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	2,676	31.4
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	5,177	60.8
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	668	7.8
Total	8,521	
Comments:		

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	74,420	73,768	99.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	8,637	8,522	98.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	925	921	99.6
Black, non-Hispanic	888	875	98.5
Hispanic	2,112	2,079	98.4
White, non-Hispanic	61,858	61,371	99.2
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	8,861	8,440	95.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,048	2,011	98.2
Economically disadvantaged students	31,303	30,913	98.8
Migratory students	137	134	97.8
Male	38,473	38,049	98.9
Female	35,947	35,719	99.4
Comments:			

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

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	2,704	32.0
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	5,064	60.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	672	8.0
Total	8,440	
Comments:		

1.2.5 Participation of All Students in the Science Assessment

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	31,848	31,624	99.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	3,497	3,448	98.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	426	425	99.8
Black, non-Hispanic	342	340	99.4
Hispanic	884	876	99.1
White, non-Hispanic	26,699	26,535	99.4
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	3,714	3,663	98.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	816	804	98.5
Economically disadvantaged students	12,540	12,425	99.1
Migratory students	60	60	100.0
Male	16,467	16,338	99.2
Female	15,381	15,286	99.4
Comments:			

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

1.2.6 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Science Assessment

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	1,336	36.5
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	2,044	55.8
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	283	7.7
Total	3,663	
Comments:		

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

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

1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics

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

The student group "children with disabilities (*IDEA*)" includes children who participated, and for whom a proficiency level was assigned in the regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments. Do not include former students with disabilities (IDEA). The student group "limited English proficient (LEP) students" does include recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months. Do not include former LEP students.

1.3.1.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	10,640	7,372	69.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,338	563	42.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	140	103	73.6
Black, non-Hispanic	151	85	56.3
Hispanic	323	202	62.5
White, non-Hispanic	8,688	6,419	73.9
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	1,295	527	40.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	303	81	26.7
Economically disadvantaged students	4,970	2,907	58.5
Migratory students	25	12	48.0
Male	5,446	3,782	69.4
Female	5,194	3,590	69.1
Comments: Changing and moving student populations affect the outcome of these students.			

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

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	10,602	9,015	85.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,339	916	68.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	140	114	81.4
Black, non-Hispanic	150	119	79.3
Hispanic	319	257	80.6
White, non-Hispanic	8,654	7,609	87.9
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	1,258	743	59.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	302	145	48.0
Economically disadvantaged students	4,948	3,854	77.9
Migratory students	25	19	76.0
Male	5,417	4,490	82.9
Female	5,185	4,525	87.3
Comments: Changing and moving student populations affect the outcome of these students.			

1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments:			

1.3.1.2 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	10,357	7,168	69.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,291	574	44.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	119	92	77.3
Black, non-Hispanic	124	75	60.5
Hispanic	290	159	54.8
White, non-Hispanic	8,533	6,268	73.5
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	1,322	482	36.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	359	86	24.0
Economically disadvantaged students	4,752	2,743	57.7
Migratory students	22	12	54.5
Male	5,354	3,694	69.0
Female	5,003	3,474	69.4
Comments: Changing and moving student populations affect the outcome of the migratory students.			

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

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	10,324	8,604	83.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,286	796	61.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	118	102	86.4
Black, non-Hispanic	123	92	74.8
Hispanic	290	215	74.1
White, non-Hispanic	8,507	7,399	87.0
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	1,289	704	54.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	358	127	35.5
Economically disadvantaged students	4,728	3,570	75.5
Migratory students	22	14	63.6
Male	5,332	4,333	81.3
Female	4,992	4,271	85.6
Comments: Changing and moving student populations affect the outcome of the migratory students.			

1.3.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	10,362	6,904	66.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,291	468	36.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	119	82	68.9
Black, non-Hispanic	124	63	50.8
Hispanic	291	153	52.6
White, non-Hispanic	8,537	6,138	71.9
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	1,332	553	41.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	362	55	15.2
Economically disadvantaged students	4,752	2,593	54.6
Migratory students	22	9	40.9
Male	5,357	3,603	67.3
Female	5,005	3,301	66.0
Comments: Changing and moving student populations affect the outcome of the migratory students.			

1.3.1.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	10,612	7,486	70.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,317	541	41.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	119	90	75.6
Black, non-Hispanic	144	87	60.4
Hispanic	307	193	62.9
White, non-Hispanic	8,725	6,575	75.4
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	1,248	457	36.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	326	70	21.5
Economically disadvantaged students	4,722	2,781	58.9
Migratory students	22	17	77.3
Male	5,536	3,884	70.2
Female	5,076	3,602	71.0
Comments: Changing and moving student populations affect the outcome of the migratory students.			

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

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	10,590	9,154	86.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,310	842	64.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	119	109	91.6
Black, non-Hispanic	143	119	83.2
Hispanic	303	250	82.5
White, non-Hispanic	8,715	7,834	89.9
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	1,228	689	56.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	323	114	35.3
Economically disadvantaged students	4,709	3,693	78.4
Migratory students	22	19	86.4
Male	5,522	4,662	84.4
Female	5,068	4,492	88.6
Comments:			

1.3.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments:			

1.3.1.4 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	10,525	7,221	68.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,214	516	42.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	117	92	78.6
Black, non-Hispanic	120	68	56.7
Hispanic	286	175	61.2
White, non-Hispanic	8,788	6,370	72.5
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	1,227	356	29.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	292	59	20.2
Economically disadvantaged students	4,524	2,552	56.4
Migratory students	18	14	77.8
Male	5,432	3,700	68.1
Female	5,093	3,521	69.1
Comments: Changing and moving student populations affect the outcome of the migratory students.			

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

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	10,505	9,093	86.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,210	791	65.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	117	102	87.2
Black, non-Hispanic	121	104	86.0
Hispanic	285	228	80.0
White, non-Hispanic	8,772	7,868	89.7
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	1,205	620	51.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	291	97	33.3
Economically disadvantaged students	4,515	3,532	78.2
Migratory students	18	15	83.3
Male	5,416	4,558	84.2
Female	5,089	4,535	89.1
Comments:			

1.3.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments:			

1.3.1.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	10,548	7,150	67.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,221	492	40.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	123	91	74.0
Black, non-Hispanic	125	66	52.8
Hispanic	304	173	56.9
White, non-Hispanic	8,775	6,328	72.1
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	1,211	308	25.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	299	47	15.7
Economically disadvantaged students	4,379	2,354	53.8
Migratory students	12	6	50.0
Male	5,435	3,634	66.9
Female	5,113	3,516	68.8
Comments: Changing and moving student populations affect the outcome of these students.			

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

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	10,551	8,912	84.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,223	779	63.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	121	108	89.3
Black, non-Hispanic	123	97	78.9
Hispanic	303	238	78.5
White, non-Hispanic	8,781	7,690	87.6
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	1,212	557	46.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	298	98	32.9
Economically disadvantaged students	4,380	3,273	74.7
Migratory students	12	9	75.0
Male	5,435	4,435	81.6
Female	5,116	4,477	87.5
Comments: Changing and moving student populations affect the outcome of these students.			

1.3.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments:			

1.3.1.6 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	10,701	7,178	67.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,158	457	39.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	159	120	75.5
Black, non-Hispanic	103	52	50.5
Hispanic	316	166	52.5
White, non-Hispanic	8,965	6,383	71.2
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	1,146	276	24.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	239	33	13.8
Economically disadvantaged students	4,178	2,197	52.6
Migratory students	17	11	64.7
Male	5,533	3,702	66.9
Female	5,168	3,476	67.3
Comments: Changing and moving student populations affect the outcome of the migratory students.			

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

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	10,706	9,067	84.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,157	714	61.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	159	143	89.9
Black, non-Hispanic	102	90	88.2
Hispanic	317	247	77.9
White, non-Hispanic	8,971	7,873	87.8
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	1,151	518	45.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	238	64	26.9
Economically disadvantaged students	4,174	3,111	74.5
Migratory students	17	15	88.2
Male	5,528	4,501	81.4
Female	5,178	4,566	88.2
Comments: Changing and moving student populations affect the outcome of the migratory students.			

1.3.3.6 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	10,743	6,762	62.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,158	360	31.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	159	108	67.9
Black, non-Hispanic	103	49	47.6
Hispanic	320	153	47.8
White, non-Hispanic	9,003	6,092	67.7
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	1,198	344	28.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	239	18	7.5
Economically disadvantaged students	4,201	2,012	47.9
Migratory students	19	10	52.6
Male	5,560	3,659	65.8
Female	5,183	3,103	59.9
Comments: Changing and moving student populations affect the outcome of the migratory students.			

1.3.1.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - High School

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	10,462	6,049	57.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,005	285	28.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	145	101	69.7
Black, non-Hispanic	113	44	38.9
Hispanic	262	113	43.1
White, non-Hispanic	8,937	5,506	61.6
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	1,072	207	19.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	205	21	10.2
Economically disadvantaged students	3,442	1,465	42.6
Migratory students	18	10	55.6
Male	5,381	3,169	58.9
Female	5,081	2,880	56.7
Comments: Changing and moving student populations affect the outcome of these students.			

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

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	10,490	8,498	81.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	997	587	58.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	147	131	89.1
Black, non-Hispanic	113	81	71.7
Hispanic	262	176	67.2
White, non-Hispanic	8,971	7,523	83.9
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	1,097	443	40.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	201	58	28.9
Economically disadvantaged students	3,459	2,441	70.6
Migratory students	18	13	72.2
Male	5,399	4,103	76.0
Female	5,091	4,395	86.3
Comments: Changing and moving student populations affect the outcome of these students.			

1.3.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Science - High School

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	10,519	4,565	43.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	999	166	16.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	147	69	46.9
Black, non-Hispanic	113	28	24.8
Hispanic	265	78	29.4
White, non-Hispanic	8,995	4,224	47.0
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	1,133	179	15.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	203	3	1.5
Economically disadvantaged students	3,472	1,043	30.0
Migratory students	19	7	36.8
Male	5,421	2,519	46.5
Female	5,098	2,046	40.1
Comments: Changing and moving student populations affect the outcome of these students.			

1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY

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

1.4.1 All Schools and Districts Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public elementary and secondary schools and districts in the State, including charters, and the total number of those schools and districts that made AYP based on data for the SY 2009-10. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2009-10	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2009-10
Schools	821	596	72.6
Districts	416	277	66.6
Comments:			

1.4.2 Title I School Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public Title I schools by type and the total number of those schools that made AYP based on data for the SY 2009-10 school year. Include only public Title I schools. Do not include Title I programs operated by local educational agencies in private schools. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2009-10	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2009-10
All Title I schools	627	445	71.0
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	208	111	53.4
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	419	334	79.7
Comments:			

1.4.3 Accountability of Districts That Received Title I Funds

In the table below, provide the total number of districts that received Title I funds and the total number of those districts that made AYP based on data for SY 2009-10. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds in SY 2009-10	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2009-10	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2009-10
299	172	57.5
Comments:		

1.4.4 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

1.4.4.1 List of Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

In the following table, provide a list of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 for the SY 2010-11 based on the data from SY 2009-10. For each school on the list, provide the following:

- District Name
- District NCES ID Code
- School Name
- School NCES ID Code
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the school met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2010-11 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: School Improvement - Year 1, School Improvement - Year 2, Corrective Action, Restructuring Year 1 (planning), or Restructuring Year 2 (implementing)[1]
- Whether (yes or no) the school is or is not a Title I school (*This column **must be completed** by States that choose to list all schools in improvement. Column is optional for States that list only Title I schools.*)
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003(a).
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003 (g).

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter school data.
Download template: Question 1.4.4.1 (Get MS Excel Viewer).

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

				Area(s) in Which School Met AYP for SY 2009-10									
				Reading/Language Arts		Mathematics		Other Academic Indicator					
District Name	LEA NCES/CCD ID Code	School Name	School NCES/CCD ID Code	Proficiency Target Met (Yes/No)	Participation Rate Target Met (Yes/No)	Proficiency Target Met (Yes/No)	Participation Rate Target Met (Yes/No)	Academic Indicator Met (Yes/No) (elementary/ middle	Graduation Rate Met (Yes/No) (high school)	School Improvement Status for SY 2009-10	Title I School (Yes/No)	Provided assistance by LEA through 1003(a) during SY 2009-10 (Yes/No)	Provided assistance by LEA through 1003(g) during SY 2009-10 (Yes/No)
Anaconda H S	3002030	Anaconda High School	00015	No	Yes	No	Yes	NA	No	Corrective Action	Yes	No	No
Arlee Elem	3002220	Arlee 7-8	00900	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	School Improvement - Year 2	Yes	No	No
Arlee Elem	3002220	Arlee Elementary	00019	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	School Improvement - Year 2	Yes	No	No
Ashland Elem	3000008	Ashland 7-8	01051	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	School Improvement - Year 2	Yes	No	No
Ashland Elem	3000008	Ashland School	00023	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	Restructuring Year 1 (planning)	Yes	Yes	No
Belgrade Elem	3003290	Belgrade Intermediate	00295	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	School Improvement - Year 2	Yes	No	No
Belgrade H S	3003330	Belgrade High School	00046	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	NA	Yes	School Improvement - Year 2	No	No	No
Bigfork H S	3003840	Bigfork High School	00058	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	NA	Yes	School Improvement - Year 1	Yes	No	No
Billings Elem	3003870	Newman School	00075	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	School Improvement - Year 1	Yes	NA	NA
Billings Elem	3003870	Ponderosa School	00079	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	School Improvement - Year 2	Yes	No	No
Billings Elem	3003870	Beartooth School	01092	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	School Improvement - Year 2	Yes	No	No
Billings Elem	3003870	Lewis & Clark 7-8	00870	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	School Improvement - Year 2	Yes	No	No
Billings Elem	3003870	Burlington School	00065	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	School Improvement - Year 1	Yes	NA	NA
Billings Elem	3003870	Orchard School	00077	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	School Improvement - Year 2	Yes	No	No
Billings Elem	3003870	Riverside 7-8	00903	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Restructuring Year 2 (implementing)	Yes	No	No
Billings Elem	3003870	Castle Rock 7-8	00869	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	School Improvement - Year 2	No	NA	NA
Billings Elem	3003870	Will James 7-8	00904	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	School Improvement - Year 1	No	NA	NA
Billings Elem	3003870	McKinley School	00072	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	School Improvement - Year 2	Yes	No	No
Billings H S	3003900	Skyview High School	00871	No	Yes	No	No	NA	No	School Improvement - Year 2	No	NA	NA
Billings H S	3003900	Billings Sr High School	00090	No	Yes	No	Yes	NA	No	Corrective Action	Yes	No	No
Billings H S	3003900	Billings West High School	00091	No	No	No	No	NA	Yes	School Improvement - Year 2	No	NA	NA
Bonner Elem	3004260	Bonner School	00100	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	School Improvement - Year 1	Yes	No	No
Bonner Elem	3004260	Bonner 7-8	01012	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	NA	School Improvement - Year 1	Yes	No	No
Box Elder Elem	3004440	Box Elder School	00103	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Corrective Action	Yes	No	No
Box Elder H S	3004500	Box Elder High School	00104	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	School Improvement - Year 1	No	NA	NA
Bozeman Elem	3004560	Chief Joseph Middle	00112	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	School Improvement - Year 1	Yes	No	No
Bozeman Elem	3004560	Whittier School	00110	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	School Improvement - Year 2	Yes	No	No
Bozeman Elem	3004560	Sacajawea Middle School	00165	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	School Improvement - Year 1	No	No	No
Bozeman H S	3004590	Bozeman High School	00113	No	Yes	No	Yes	NA	Yes	School Improvement - Year 1	Yes	No	No
Brockton Elem	3005010	Barbara Gilligan School	00124	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	School Improvement - Year 2	Yes	No	No
Brockton Elem	3005010	Barbara Gilligan 7-8	01046	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Restructuring Year 2 (implementing)	Yes	Yes	No
Brockton H S	3005040	Brockton High School	00125	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Restructuring Year 2 (implementing)	Yes	Yes	No
Browning Elem	3005140	Napi School	00132	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Restructuring Year 2 (implementing)	Yes	No	No
Browning Elem	3005140	K W Bergan School	00131	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Restructuring Year 2 (implementing)	Yes	No	No
Browning Elem	3005140	Vina Chattin School	00134	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Restructuring Year 2 (implementing)	Yes	No	No
Browning Elem	3005140	Browning Middle School	00872	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Restructuring Year 2 (implementing)	Yes	No	No
Browning H S	3005190	Browning High School	00136	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	NA	No	Restructuring Year 2 (implementing)	Yes	No	No
Butte Elem	3005280	East Middle School	00905	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Restructuring Year 2 (implementing)	Yes	No	No
Butte Elem	3005280	Whittier School	00153	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	School Improvement - Year 1	Yes	NA	NA
Butte Elem	3005280	West Elementary School	00906	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	School Improvement - Year 1	Yes	NA	NA
Butte H S	3005310	Butte High School	00156	No	Yes	No	Yes	NA	No	Corrective Action	Yes	No	No
Colstrip Elem	3007050	Pine Butte Elementary	00873	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	School Improvement - Year 2	Yes	NA	NA
Columbia Falls Elem	3007110	Ruder Elementary	00198	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	School Improvement - Year 1	Yes	NA	NA
Columbia Falls Elem	3007110	Columbia Falls 7-8	00195	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	School Improvement - Year 1	Yes	NA	NA
Columbia Falls Elem	3007110	Columbia Falls Grade 6	00197	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	School Improvement - Year 2	Yes	No	No
Columbia Falls Elem	3007110	Canyon Elementary	00200	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	School Improvement - Year 1	Yes	No	No

				Area(s) in Which School Met AYP for SY 2009-10									
				Reading/Language Arts		Mathematics		Other Academic Indicator					
District Name	LEA NCES/CCD ID Code	School Name	School NCES/CCD ID Code	Proficiency Target Met (Yes/No)	Participation Rate Target Met (Yes/No)	Proficiency Target Met (Yes/No)	Participation Rate Target Met (Yes/No)	Academic Indicator Met (Yes/No) (elementary/ middle	Graduation Rate Met (Yes/No) (high school)	School Improvement Status for SY 2009-10	Title I School (Yes/No)	Provided assistance by LEA through 1003(a) during SY 2009-10 (Yes/No)	Provided assistance by LEA through 1003(g) during SY 2009-10 (Yes/No)
Columbia Falls H S	3007140	Columbia Falls High Schl	00203	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	NA	Yes	School Improvement - Year 2	No	NA	NA
Corvallis K-12 Schools	3007410	Corvallis High School	00215	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	Yes	School Improvement - Year 1	Yes	NA	NA
Cut Bank Elem	3000003	Cut Bank 7-8	00234	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	School Improvement - Year 1	Yes	NA	NA
Cut Bank Elem	3000003	Cut Bank Elementary	00233	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	School Improvement - Year 2	Yes	No	No
Deer Lodge Elem	3008670	E F Duvall 7-8	00246	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	School Improvement - Year 1	Yes	NA	NA
Dillon Elem	3008910	Parkview School	00257	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	School Improvement - Year 1	Yes	NA	NA
Dillon Elem	3008910	Mary Innes School	00255	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	School Improvement - Year 1	Yes	NA	NA
Dodson K12	3009120	Dodson School	00260	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Corrective Action	No	NA	NA
Eureka Elem	3010080	Eureka Middle School 5-8	01000	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	School Improvement - Year 1	Yes	NA	NA
Fairview Elem	3010210	Fairview School	00282	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	School Improvement - Year 1	Yes	NA	NA
Flathead H S	3015420	Glacier High School	00358	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	Yes	School Improvement - Year 1	Yes	NA	NA
Flathead H S	3015420	Flathead High School	00470	No	Yes	No	Yes	NA	No	School Improvement - Year 2	No	NA	NA
Florence-Carlton K-12	3011100	Florence-Carlton HS	00301	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	Yes	School Improvement - Year 1	Yes	NA	NA
Forsyth Elem	3011160	Forsyth 7-8	00302	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	School Improvement - Year 1	Yes	No	No
Forsyth Elem	3011160	Forsyth Elementary	00303	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	School Improvement - Year 1	Yes	NA	NA
Forsyth H S	3011190	Forsyth High School	00304	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	School Improvement - Year 2	Yes	No	No
Frazer Elem	3011420	Frazer 7-8	01072	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Restructuring Year 2 (implementing)	Yes	No	No
Frazer Elem	3011420	Frazer Elementary	00310	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Restructuring Year 2 (implementing)	Yes	Yes	No
Frazer H S	3011460	Frazer High School	00311	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Restructuring Year 2 (implementing)	Yes	No	No
Frenchtown K-12	3011520	Frenchtown Elementary	00312	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	School Improvement - Year 1	Yes	No	No
Glendive Elem	3012510	Washington Middle	00952	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	School Improvement - Year 2	Yes	No	No
Great Falls Elem	3013040	Longfellow School	00363	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	School Improvement - Year 2	Yes	No	No
Great Falls Elem	3013040	East Middle School	00882	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Restructuring Year 1 (planning)	Yes	No	No
Great Falls Elem	3013040	Whittier School	00378	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	School Improvement - Year 1	Yes	No	No
Great Falls Elem	3013040	North Middle School	00883	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	School Improvement - Year 2	No	NA	NA
Great Falls H S	3013050	Great Falls High School	00380	No	Yes	No	Yes	NA	No	Restructuring Year 1 (planning)	Yes	No	No
Great Falls H S	3013050	C M Russell High School	00379	No	Yes	No	Yes	NA	No	School Improvement - Year 2	No	NA	NA
Hamilton K-12 Schools	3013260	Daly School	00384	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	School Improvement - Year 1	Yes	NA	NA
Hamilton K-12 Schools	3013260	Hamilton High School	00389	No	Yes	No	Yes	NA	Yes	School Improvement - Year 2	Yes	No	No
Hamilton K-12 Schools	3013260	Hamilton Middle School	00388	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	School Improvement - Year 1	Yes	No	No
Hamilton K-12 Schools	3013260	Washington School	00387	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	School Improvement - Year 1	Yes	NA	NA
Hardin Elem	3013310	Hardin Intermediate	00395	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	Restructuring Year 2 (implementing)	Yes	No	No
Hardin Elem	3013310	Crow Agency School	00392	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Restructuring Year 2 (implementing)	Yes	No	No
Hardin Elem	3013310	Hardin Middle School	00394	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Restructuring Year 2 (implementing)	Yes	No	No
Hardin Elem	3013310	Hardin Primary	00396	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Restructuring Year 2 (implementing)	Yes	No	No
Hardin H S	3013340	Hardin High School	00397	No	Yes	No	Yes	NA	No	Restructuring Year 2 (implementing)	Yes	No	No
Harlem Elem	3013395	Harlem Elementary	00399	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Corrective Action	Yes	No	No
Harlem Elem	3013395	Harlem 7-8	00909	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Restructuring Year 1 (planning)	Yes	No	No
Harlem H S	3013400	Harlem High School	00400	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	School Improvement - Year 2	Yes	No	No
Harlowton Elem	3013440	Hillcrest School	00401	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	School Improvement - Year 1	Yes	No	No
Havre Elem	3013560	Havre Middle School	00406	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Corrective Action	Yes	No	No
Havre Elem	3013560	Highland Park School	00408	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	School Improvement - Year 2	Yes	No	No
Havre Elem	3013560	Lincoln-McKinley School	00409	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	School Improvement - Year 2	Yes	No	No
Havre Elem	3013560	Sunnyside School	00410	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Corrective Action	Yes	No	No
Havre H S	3013590	Havre High School	00411	No	Yes	No	Yes	NA	Yes	School Improvement - Year 2	Yes	No	No
Hays-Lodge Pole K-12	3013660	Lodge Pole School	00097	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Restructuring Year 2 (implementing)	Yes	Yes	No

				Area(s) in Which School Met AYP for SY 2009-10									
				Reading/Language Arts		Mathematics		Other Academic Indicator					
District Name	LEA NCES/CCD ID Code	School Name	School NCES/CCD ID Code	Proficiency Target Met (Yes/No)	Participation Rate Target Met (Yes/No)	Proficiency Target Met (Yes/No)	Participation Rate Target Met (Yes/No)	Academic Indicator Met (Yes/No) (elementary/ middle	Graduation Rate Met (Yes/No) (high school)	School Improvement Status for SY 2009-10	Title I School (Yes/No)	Provided assistance by LEA through 1003(a) during SY 2009-10 (Yes/No)	Provided assistance by LEA through 1003(g) during SY 2009-10 (Yes/No)
Hays-Lodge Pole K-12	3013660	Hays-Lodge Pole 7-8	00934	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Restructuring Year 2 (implementing)	Yes	Yes	No
Hays-Lodge Pole K-12	3013660	Hays-Lodge Pole High Sch	00413	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Restructuring Year 2 (implementing)	Yes	Yes	No
Heart Butte K-12	3000099	Heart Butte 7-8	01031	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Restructuring Year 2 (implementing)	Yes	No	No
Heart Butte K-12	3000099	Heart Butte High School	00924	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Restructuring Year 2 (implementing)	Yes	Yes	No
Heart Butte K-12	3000099	Heart Butte Elementary	00414	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	School Improvement - Year 2	Yes	Yes	No
Helena Elem	3000005	Broadwater School	00415	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	School Improvement - Year 1	Yes	NA	NA
Helena Elem	3000005	Bryant School	00416	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	School Improvement - Year 1	Yes	NA	NA
Helena Elem	3000005	C R Anderson Middle Schl	00886	No	No	No	No	Yes	NA	School Improvement - Year 2	No	NA	NA
Helena Elem	3000005	Central School	00418	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	School Improvement - Year 1	Yes	No	No
Helena Elem	3000005	Four Georgians School	00419	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	School Improvement - Year 1	No	NA	NA
Helena Elem	3000005	Helena Middle School	00885	No	No	No	No	Yes	NA	Restructuring Year 1 (planning)	Yes	No	No
Helena Elem	3000005	Jim Darcy School	00505	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	School Improvement - Year 1	No	NA	NA
Helena Elem	3000005	Rossiter School	00424	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	School Improvement - Year 2	No	NA	NA
Helena H S	3013830	Capital High School	00429	No	Yes	No	Yes	NA	No	School Improvement - Year 2	No	NA	NA
Helena H S	3013830	Helena High School	00430	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	NA	No	Restructuring Year 1 (planning)	Yes	No	No
Hellgate Elem	3013860	Hellgate Middle School	01010	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	School Improvement - Year 1	Yes	NA	NA
Hellgate Elem	3013860	Lower Grade Hellgate	00432	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	School Improvement - Year 1	Yes	NA	NA
Hot Springs Elem	3014610	Hot Springs School	00448	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	School Improvement - Year 1	Yes	No	No
Jefferson H S	3015120	Jefferson High School	00461	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	NA	No	School Improvement - Year 2	Yes	No	No
Kila Elem	3015570	Kila School	00480	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	School Improvement - Year 1	Yes	NA	NA
Lame Deer Elem	3016050	Lame Deer 7-8	01049	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	Restructuring Year 2 (implementing)	Yes	No	No
Lame Deer Elem	3016050	Lame Deer School	00494	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Restructuring Year 2 (implementing)	Yes	Yes	No
Lame Deer H S	3000095	Lame Deer High School	00137	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Restructuring Year 2 (implementing)	Yes	Yes	No
Laurel Elem	3016200	Laurel Middle School	00890	No	No	No	No	Yes	NA	School Improvement - Year 1	Yes	No	No
Laurel Elem	3016200	West School	00499	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	School Improvement - Year 1	Yes	NA	NA
Laurel Elem	3016200	Fred W Graff School	00497	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	School Improvement - Year 1	Yes	NA	NA
Lewistown Elem	3016490	Garfield School	00507	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	School Improvement - Year 1	Yes	No	No
Lewistown Elem	3016490	Highland Park School	00508	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	School Improvement - Year 1	Yes	No	No
Libby K-12 Schools	3016530	Libby Elementary School	00512	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	School Improvement - Year 1	Yes	NA	NA
Libby K-12 Schools	3016530	Libby High School	00518	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	NA	Yes	School Improvement - Year 2	Yes	No	No
Libby K-12 Schools	3016530	Libby Middle School	00517	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	School Improvement - Year 1	Yes	No	No
Lincoln County H S	3016770	Lincoln Co High School	00521	No	Yes	No	Yes	NA	No	Corrective Action	Yes	No	No
Lincoln K-12 Schools	3016810	Lincoln 7-8	00996	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	School Improvement - Year 1	Yes	NA	NA
Livingston Elem	3016880	Sleeping Giant Middle	01021	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	School Improvement - Year 1	Yes	NA	NA
Lockwood Elem	3016950	Lockwood Middle School	00912	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	School Improvement - Year 2	Yes	No	No
Lodge Grass Elem	3017010	Lodge Grass 7-8	00931	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Restructuring Year 2 (implementing)	Yes	No	No
Lodge Grass Elem	3017010	Lodge Grass School	00533	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Restructuring Year 2 (implementing)	Yes	Yes	No
Lodge Grass H S	3017040	Lodge Grass High School	00534	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Restructuring Year 2 (implementing)	Yes	No	No
Miles City Elem	3018410	Washington 7-8	00561	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	School Improvement - Year 2	Yes	NA	NA
Missoula Elem	3018570	Lowell School	00574	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	School Improvement - Year 2	Yes	NA	NA
Missoula Elem	3018570	Meadow Hill Middle	00575	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	School Improvement - Year 2	No	NA	NA
Missoula Elem	3018570	Porter Middle School	00565	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Corrective Action	Yes	No	No
Missoula Elem	3018570	Lewis & Clark School	00572	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	School Improvement - Year 2	Yes	No	No
Missoula H S	3018540	Hellgate High School	00562	No	Yes	No	Yes	NA	No	School Improvement - Year 2	Yes	No	No
Missoula H S	3018540	Sentinel High School	00564	No	Yes	No	Yes	NA	Yes	School Improvement - Year 1	No	NA	NA
Missoula H S	3018540	Big Sky High School	00824	No	Yes	No	Yes	NA	No	Corrective Action	Yes	No	No

				Area(s) in Which School Met AYP for SY 2009-10									
				Reading/Language Arts		Mathematics		Other Academic Indicator					
District Name	LEA NCES/CCD ID Code	School Name	School NCES/CCD ID Code	Proficiency Target Met (Yes/No)	Participation Rate Target Met (Yes/No)	Proficiency Target Met (Yes/No)	Participation Rate Target Met (Yes/No)	Academic Indicator Met (Yes/No) (elementary/ middle	Graduation Rate Met (Yes/No) (high school)	School Improvement Status for SY 2009-10	Title I School (Yes/No)	Provided assistance by LEA through 1003(a) during SY 2009-10 (Yes/No)	Provided assistance by LEA through 1003(g) during SY 2009-10 (Yes/No)
Mountain View Elem	3000004	Mountain View	00899	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	School Improvement - Year 1	No	NA	NA
Park H S	3020100	Park High School	00611	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	NA	No	School Improvement - Year 1	Yes	No	No
Pendroy Elem	3020240	Pendroy School	00615	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	School Improvement - Year 1	Yes	No	No
Plenty Coups H S	3013360	Plenty Coups High School	00398	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Restructuring Year 2 (implementing)	Yes	Yes	No
Polson Elem	3021060	Linderman School	00631	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	School Improvement - Year 2	Yes	No	No
Polson Elem	3021060	Cherry Valley School	00630	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	School Improvement - Year 2	Yes	No	No
Polson H S	3021090	Polson High School	00633	No	Yes	No	Yes	NA	No	Restructuring Year 2 (implementing)	Yes	No	No
Poplar Elem	3021240	Poplar School	00637	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Restructuring Year 2 (implementing)	Yes	No	No
Poplar Elem	3021240	Poplar 5-6 School	01044	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	Restructuring Year 2 (implementing)	Yes	No	No
Poplar Elem	3021240	Poplar 7-8	00636	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Restructuring Year 2 (implementing)	Yes	No	No
Poplar H S	3021270	Poplar High School	00638	No	Yes	No	Yes	NA	No	Restructuring Year 2 (implementing)	Yes	No	No
Pryor Elem	3021720	Pryor Elem School	00647	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Restructuring Year 1 (planning)	Yes	Yes	No
Pryor Elem	3021720	Pryor 7-8	00930	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Restructuring Year 2 (implementing)	Yes	No	No
Rocky Boy Elem	3022750	Rocky Boy 7-8	00986	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Restructuring Year 2 (implementing)	Yes	No	No
Rocky Boy Elem	3022750	Rocky Boy School	00666	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Restructuring Year 2 (implementing)	Yes	Yes	No
Rocky Boy H S	3028911	Rocky Boy High School	01086	No	Yes	No	Yes	NA	No	Restructuring Year 2 (implementing)	Yes	Yes	No
Ronan Elem	3022790	Pablo Elementary	00667	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	School Improvement - Year 2	Yes	No	No
Ronan Elem	3022790	K William Harvey Elem	00669	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	School Improvement - Year 2	Yes	No	No
Ronan Elem	3022790	Ronan Middle School	00668	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	School Improvement - Year 1	Yes	NA	NA
Ronan H S	3022800	Ronan High School	00670	No	Yes	No	Yes	NA	No	School Improvement - Year 2	Yes	No	No
Seeley Lake Elem	3023730	Seeley Lake Elementary	00689	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	School Improvement - Year 1	Yes	No	No
Shelby H S	3023910	Shelby High School	00694	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	No	School Improvement - Year 2	Yes	No	No
St Ignatius K-12 Schools	3006110	St Ignatius Middle School	00994	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	School Improvement - Year 1	Yes	NA	NA
Stevensville Elem	3025020	Stevensville 7-8	00718	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	School Improvement - Year 1	Yes	NA	NA
Stevensville H S	3025050	Stevensville High School	00720	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	Yes	School Improvement - Year 1	Yes	NA	NA
Target Range Elem	3025890	Target Range School	00734	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	School Improvement - Year 2	Yes	No	No
Thompson Falls Elem	3026070	Thompson Falls 7-8	01052	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	School Improvement - Year 2	Yes	No	No
Thompson Falls Elem	3026070	Thompson Falls Elem Schl	00737	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	School Improvement - Year 1	Yes	NA	NA
Three Forks Elem	3026160	Three Forks Elem School	00740	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	School Improvement - Year 1	Yes	NA	NA
Troy Elem	3026550	Troy 7-8	00999	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	School Improvement - Year 2	Yes	No	No
Troy Elem	3026550	W F Morrison School	00748	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	School Improvement - Year 1	Yes	NA	NA
Whitefish H S	3027790	Whitefish High School	00775	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	Yes	School Improvement - Year 1	Yes	NA	NA
Whitehall Elem	3027810	Whitehall Elementary	00777	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	School Improvement - Year 1	Yes	NA	NA
Wolf Point Elem	3028590	Southside School	00797	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Restructuring Year 2 (implementing)	Yes	No	No
Wolf Point Elem	3028590	Northside School	00796	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	Restructuring Year 2 (implementing)	Yes	NA	NA
Wolf Point Elem	3028590	Wolf Point 7-8	00798	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	Restructuring Year 2 (implementing)	Yes	No	No
Wolf Point H S	3028620	Wolf Point High School	00799	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	Yes	Restructuring Year 2 (implementing)	Yes	NA	NA
Wyola Elem	3028800	Wyola School	00804	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	NA	Restructuring Year 2 (implementing)	Yes	Yes	No
Wyola Elem	3028800	Wyola 7-8	00355	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	School Improvement - Year 1	Yes	No	No

1.4.4.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for schools in corrective action, provide the number of schools for which the listed corrective actions under *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2009-10 (based on SY 2008-09 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2009-10
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	6
Extension of the school year or school day	
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	
Replacement of the principal	
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	2
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	2
Comments:	

1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2

In the table below, for schools in restructuring – year 2 (implementation year), provide the number of schools for which the listed restructuring actions under *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2009-10 (based on SY 2008-09 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Restructuring Action	# of Title I Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	
Reopening the school as a public charter school	
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	
Takeover the school by the State	
Other major restructuring of the school governance	44
Comments:	

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Reorganization into effective schools correlate teams with building leadership teams directing school improvement efforts.

1.4.5 Districts That Received Title I Funds Identified for Improvement

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

In the following table, provide a list of districts that received Title I funds and were identified for improvement or corrective action under Section 1116 for the SY 2010-11 based on the data from SY 2009-10. For each district on the list, provide the following:

- District Name
- District NCES ID Code
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State'ts Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the district met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2010-11 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: Improvement or Corrective Action[2])
- Whether the district is a district that received Title I funds. Indicate "Yes" if the district received Title I funds and "No" if the district did not receive Title I funds. (**This column must be completed by States that choose to list all districts or all districts in improvement.** This column is optional for States that list only districts in improvement that receive Title I funds.)

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter district data.
Download template: Question 1.4.5.1 (Get MS Excel Viewer).

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

		Area in Which District Met AYP for SY 2009-10							
		Reading/Language Arts		Mathematics		Other Academic Indicator			
District Name	LEA NCES/CCD ID Code	Proficiency Target Met (Yes/No)	Participation Rate Target Met (Yes/No)	Proficiency Target Met (Yes/No)	Participation Rate Target Met (Yes/No)	Indicator Met (Yes/No) (elementary/ middle	Graduation Rate Met (Yes/No) (high school)	District Improvement Status for SY 2009-10	District Receiving Title I Funds (Yes/No)
Anaconda Elem	3002010	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	Improvement	Yes
Anaconda H S	3002030	No	Yes	No	Yes	NA	No	Corrective Action	Yes
Arlee Elem	3002220	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Improvement	Yes
Ashland Elem	3000008	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	Corrective Action	Yes
Belgrade H S	3003330	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	NA	Yes	Improvement	No
Bigfork H S	3003840	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	NA	Yes	Improvement	Yes
Billings Elem	3003870	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Corrective Action	Yes
Billings H S	3003900	No	Yes	No	No	NA	No	Corrective Action	Yes
Bonner Elem	3004260	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	Improvement	Yes
Box Elder Elem	3004440	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Corrective Action	Yes
Box Elder H S	3004500	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Improvement	No
Bozeman Elem	3004560	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Improvement	Yes
Bozeman H S	3004590	No	Yes	No	Yes	NA	Yes	Improvement	Yes
Brockton H S	3005040	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Corrective Action	Yes
Browning Elem	3005140	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Corrective Action	Yes
Browning H S	3005190	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	NA	No	Corrective Action	Yes
Butte Elem	3005280	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Corrective Action	Yes
Butte H S	3005310	No	Yes	No	Yes	NA	No	Corrective Action	Yes
Colstrip Elem	3007050	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Improvement	Yes
Columbia Falls Elem	3007110	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Corrective Action	Yes
Columbia Falls H S	3007140	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	NA	Yes	Improvement	No
Culbertson Elem	3007830	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Improvement	No
Cut Bank Elem	3000003	No	No	No	No	Yes	NA	Corrective Action	Yes
Darby K-12 Schools	3008280	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Improvement	Yes
Deer Lodge Elem	3008670	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Corrective Action	Yes
DeSmet Elem	3008880	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	Improvement	Yes
Dillon Elem	3008910	No	No	No	No	Yes	NA	Improvement	Yes
Dodson Elem	3009090	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Corrective Action	No
Dutton/Brady K-12	3000102	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	Improvement	Yes
East Helena Elem	3009560	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	Improvement	Yes
Eureka Elem	3010080	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	Improvement	Yes
Evergreen Elem	3010920	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	Improvement	Yes

		Area in Which District Met AYP for SY 2009-10							
		Reading/Language Arts		Mathematics		Other Academic Indicator			
District Name	LEA NCES/CCD ID Code	Proficiency Target Met (Yes/No)	Participation Rate Target Met (Yes/No)	Proficiency Target Met (Yes/No)	Participation Rate Target Met (Yes/No)	Indicator Met (Yes/No) (elementary/ middle	Graduation Rate Met (Yes/No) (high school)	District Improvement Status for SY 2009-10	District Receiving Title I Funds (Yes/No)
Fairview Elem	3010210	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	Improvement	Yes
Flathead H S	3015420	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	Yes	Improvement	Yes
Forsyth Elem	3011160	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	Improvement	Yes
Forsyth H S	3011190	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Improvement	Yes
Frazer Elem	3011420	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	Corrective Action	Yes
Frazer H S	3011460	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Corrective Action	Yes
Frenchtown K-12	3011520	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Improvement	Yes
Glasgow K-12	3012420	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Improvement	Yes
Glendive Elem	3012510	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Improvement	Yes
Great Falls Elem	3013040	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Corrective Action	Yes
Great Falls H S	3013050	No	Yes	No	Yes	NA	No	Corrective Action	Yes
Hamilton K-12	3013260	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Corrective Action	Yes
Hardin Elem	3013310	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Corrective Action	Yes
Hardin H S	3013340	No	Yes	No	Yes	NA	No	Corrective Action	Yes
Harlem Elem	3013395	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Corrective Action	Yes
Harlem H S	3013400	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Improvement	Yes
Harlowton Elem	3013440	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Improvement	Yes
Havre Elem	3013560	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Corrective Action	Yes
Havre H S	3013590	No	Yes	No	Yes	NA	Yes	Improvement	Yes
Hays-Lodge Pole K-	3013660	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Corrective Action	Yes
Heart Butte K-12	3000099	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Corrective Action	Yes
Helena Elem	3000005	No	No	No	No	Yes	NA	Corrective Action	Yes
Helena H S	3013830	No	Yes	No	Yes	NA	No	Corrective Action	Yes
Hellgate Elem	3013860	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	Improvement	Yes
Hot Springs Elem	3014610	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Improvement	Yes
Huntley Project K-	3014700	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Improvement	Yes
Jefferson H S	3015120	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	NA	No	Improvement	Yes
Kila Elem	3015570	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	Improvement	Yes
Lame Deer Elem	3016050	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Corrective Action	Yes
Lame Deer H S	3000095	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Corrective Action	Yes
Laurel Elem	3016200	No	No	No	No	Yes	NA	Corrective Action	Yes
Lewistown Elem	3016490	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Improvement	Yes

		Area in Which District Met AYP for SY 2009-10							
		Reading/Language Arts		Mathematics		Other Academic Indicator			
District Name	LEA NCES/CCD ID Code	Proficiency Target Met (Yes/No)	Participation Rate Target Met (Yes/No)	Proficiency Target Met (Yes/No)	Participation Rate Target Met (Yes/No)	Indicator Met (Yes/No) (elementary/ middle	Graduation Rate Met (Yes/No) (high school)	District Improvement Status for SY 2009-10	District Receiving Title I Funds (Yes/No)
Libby K-12 Schools	3016530	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Improvement	Yes
Lincoln County H S	3016770	No	Yes	No	Yes	NA	No	Corrective Action	Yes
Lincoln K-12	3016810	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	NA	Improvement	Yes
Lockwood Elem	3016950	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	Improvement	Yes
Lodge Grass Elem	3017010	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Corrective Action	Yes
Lodge Grass H S	3017040	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Corrective Action	Yes
Lolo Elem	3017130	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Improvement	Yes
Lone Rock Elem	3017190	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	Improvement	Yes
Miles City Elem	3018410	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Corrective Action	Yes
Missoula Elem	3018570	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	Corrective Action	Yes
Missoula H S	3018540	No	Yes	No	Yes	NA	No	Corrective Action	Yes
Mountain View	3000004	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Improvement	No
Nashua K-12	3019170	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Improvement	No
Noxon Elem	3000090	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	Improvement	Yes
Park H S	3020100	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	NA	No	Improvement	Yes
Pendroy Elem	3020240	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Improvement	Yes
Plenty Coups H S	3013360	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Corrective Action	Yes
Polson Elem	3021060	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Corrective Action	Yes
Polson H S	3021090	No	Yes	No	Yes	NA	No	Corrective Action	Yes
Poplar Elem	3021240	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Corrective Action	Yes
Poplar H S	3021270	No	Yes	No	Yes	NA	No	Corrective Action	Yes
Pryor Elem	3021720	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Corrective Action	Yes
Rocky Boy Elem	3022750	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Corrective Action	Yes
Rocky Boy H S	3028911	No	Yes	No	Yes	NA	No	Corrective Action	Yes
Ronan Elem	3022790	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Corrective Action	Yes
Ronan H S	3022800	No	Yes	No	Yes	NA	No	Improvement	Yes
Roundup Elem	3023040	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	Improvement	Yes
Shelby Elem	3023900	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	Corrective Action	Yes
Shelby H S	3023910	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	No	Improvement	Yes
Shepherd Elem	3023940	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	Improvement	Yes
Smith Valley Elem	3002850	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	Improvement	Yes
St Ignatius K-12	3006110	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Improvement	Yes

		Area in Which District Met AYP for SY 2009-10							
		Reading/Language Arts		Mathematics		Other Academic Indicator			
District Name	LEA NCES/CCD ID Code	Proficiency Target Met (Yes/No)	Participation Rate Target Met (Yes/No)	Proficiency Target Met (Yes/No)	Participation Rate Target Met (Yes/No)	Indicator Met (Yes/No) (elementary/ middle	Graduation Rate Met (Yes/No) (high school)	District Improvement Status for SY 2009-10	District Receiving Title I Funds (Yes/No)
Stevensville H S	3025050	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	Yes	Improvement	Yes
Superior K-12	3025470	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Improvement	Yes
Target Range Elem	3025890	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Improvement	Yes
Three Forks Elem	3026160	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Improvement	Yes
Townsend K-12	3004980	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Improvement	Yes
Troy Elem	3026550	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	Improvement	Yes
West Valley Elem	3027570	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Improvement	Yes
West Yellowstone K-	3027630	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Improvement	Yes
Whitefish Elem	3027740	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Improvement	Yes
Whitefish H S	3027790	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	Yes	Improvement	Yes
Whitehall Elem	3027810	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	Improvement	Yes
Wolf Point Elem	3028590	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	Corrective Action	Yes
Wolf Point H S	3028620	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	Yes	Corrective Action	Yes
Wyola Elem	3028800	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	NA	Corrective Action	Yes

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The current statewide system of support in Montana includes several components:

School Support System Specialists (2) and Coordinator (1) - These positions were created at the Montana Office of Public Instruction (OPI) to continue the design and implementation of all the components of the statewide system of support. The specialists make a presentation on the system to local school boards before the district receives the services of the components described below. They also oversee regionally the rest of these components described below. The coordinator handles all logistics and scheduling of the various components and ensures reports are proofed, finalized, and disseminated.

Scholastic Review Teams (SRT) - These teams are made up of distinguished educators who are part-time state employees of the OPI. They conduct a comprehensive review and evaluation of a district's operation using the Montana Correlates and Indicators of Effective Schools (adapted from Kentucky and incorporating language from Creating Sacred Places, Beyond the Seventh Generation, an OERI funded project conducted by the National Indian School Board Association). The SRT writes a report, delivered in person by the OPI School Support System Specialists, with findings and recommendations that are to form the basis of the district's continuous improvement process (and plan). All districts that have been or are currently in corrective action year two (and several in corrective action year one and Improvement year one or two) have received a Scholastic Review for a total of 34 districts. Most of these districts are high poverty and located on or near the seven American Indian reservations in Montana.

School Coaches - these are ten distinguished educators who are part-time state employees of the OPI who will spend three to five days per month on-site in the schools of districts in corrective action year two or higher. They will be change facilitators who assist the district superintendent, school principals, and staff to implement the recommendations of the SRT. They have received initial two-day training from personnel of the Education Northwest, which is followed by four additional 1.5-day trainings and monthly coaches' meetings facilitated by the OPI School Support System Specialists. The on-site visits began in October for the 2008-2009 school year.

Instructional Coaches - These are ten distinguished educators who are part-time employees of the OPI who will spend three to five days per month on-site in the schools of districts in corrective action year two or higher. They will work directly with the teachers to improve instructional methodology, classroom discipline, and assist in developing professional learning communities in the school. They received an inital two-day training from the OPI, with follow-up training each month. The instructional coaches began their visits in August 2009.

1.4.5.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for districts in corrective action, provide the number of districts in corrective action in which the listed corrective actions under *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2009-10 (based on SY 2008-09 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Corrective Action	# of Districts receiving Title I funds in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2009-10
Implemented a new curriculum based on State standards	49
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	
Restructured the district	
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2008-09 and beginning of SY 2009-10 as a corrective action)	
Comments:	

1.4.7 Appeal of AYP and Identification Determinations

In the table below, provide the number of districts and schools that appealed their AYP designations based on SY 2009-10 data and the results of those appeals.

	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts	17	2
Schools	20	3
Comments:		

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2009-10 data was complete	07/30/20

1.4.8 School Improvement Status

In the section below, "Schools in Improvement" means Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of *ESEA* for SY 2009-10.
Note: With the exception of 1.4.8.5.3, in section 1.4.8 references to 1003(g) mean refers to FY 2008 and/or FY 2007 1003(g) funds that may have been used to assist schools during SY 2009-10.

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

The table below pertains only to schools that received assistance through section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2009-10.

Note: In section 1.4.8 references to 1003(g) mean FY 2008 and/or FY 2007 1003(g) funds that may have been used to assist schools during SY 2009-10

Instructions for States that during SY 2009-10 administered assessments required under section 1116 of ESEA after fall 2009 (i.e., non fall-testing states):

- In the **SY 2009-10 column**, provide the total number and percentage of students in schools receiving School Improvement funds in SY 2009-10 who were:
  - Proficient in mathematics as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA that were administered* in SY 2009-10.
  - Proficient in reading/language arts as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* in SY 2009-10.
  - In SY 2008-09 column, provide the requested data for the same schools whose student proficiency data are reported for SY 2009-10.

States that in SY 2009-10 administered assessments required under section 1116 of ESEA during fall 2009 (i.e., fall-testing states):

- In the **SY 2009-10 column**, provide the total number and percentage of students in schools receiving School Improvement funds in SY 2009-10 who were:
  - Proficient in mathematics as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* that were administered in fall 2010.
  - Proficient in reading/language arts as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* that were administered in fall 2010.
  - In the **SY 2008-09 column**, provide the requested data for the same schools whose student proficiency data are reported in the SY 2009-10 column.

Category	SY 2009-10	SY 2008-09
Total number of students who completed the **mathematics** assessment and for whom proficiency level was assigned and were enrolled in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10	764	20,923
Total number of students who were proficient or above in **mathematics** in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10	155	12,963
Percentage of students who were proficient or above in **mathematics** in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10	20.3	62.0
Total number of students who completed the **reading/language arts** assessment and for whom proficiency level was assigned and were enrolled in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10	751	20,923
Total number of students who were proficient or above in **reading/language arts** in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10	333	16,928
Percentage of students who were proficient in **reading/language arts** in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10	44.3	80.9
Comments:		

1.4.8.2 School Improvement Status and School Improvement Assistance

In the table below, indicate the number of schools receiving assistance through section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2009-10 that:

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

Category	# of Schools
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2009-10 that **made adequate yearly progress** based on testing in SY 2009-10	2
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2009-10 that **exited improvement status** based on testing in SY 2009-10	

Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2009-10 that **did not make adequate yearly progress** based on testing in SY 2009-10	15
Comments:	

1.4.8.3 Effective School Improvement Strategies

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

For fall-testing States, responses for this item would be based on assessments administered in fall 2010. For all other States the responses would be based on assessments administered during SY 2009-10.

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4	Column 5	Column 6	Column 7
Effective Strategy or Combination of Strategies Used (See response options in *"Column 1 Response Options Box"* below.) If your State's response includes a "5" (other strategies), identify the specific strategy(s) in Column 2.	**Description of "Other Strategies"** This response is limited to 500 characters.	**Number of schools in which the strategy (strategies) was(were) used**	**Number of schools that used the strategy(strategies) and exited improvement status based on testing after the schools received this assistance**	**Number of schools that used the strategy (strategies), made AYP based on testing after the schools received this assistance, but did not exit improvement status**	**Most common other Positive Outcome from the strategy (strategies)** (See response options in *"Column 6 Response Options Box"* below)	**Description of "Other Positive Outcome" if Response for Column 6 is "D"** This response is limited to 500 characters.
6 = Combo 1	1, 2 & 4	32	0	2	A	
Comments:						

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

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

1.4.8.4 Sharing of Effective Strategies

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

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Effective strategies have been shared at three school improvement conferences for served schools. School coaches share effective strategies in their regional meetings and periodic trainings and then pass those on to their individual school personnel during on-site coaching visits (3-5 per month).

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

1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2009 (SY 2009-10) Title I, Part A allocation that the SEA reserved in accordance with Section 1003(a) of *ESEA* and §200.100(a) of ED's regulations governing the reservation of funds for school improvement under Section 1003(a) of *ESEA*: 4.0 %

Comments:

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

For SY 2009-10 there is no need to upload a spreadsheet to answer this question in the CSPR.

1.4.8.5.2 will be answered automatically using data submitted to EDFacts in Data Group 694, School improvement funds allocation table, from File Specification N/X132. You may review data submitted to EDFacts using the report named "Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Allocations to LEAs and Schools - CSPR 1.4.8.5.2 (EDEN012)" from the EDFacts Reporting System.

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

Section 1003(g)(8) of *ESEA* allows States to reserve up to five percent of Section 1003(g) funds for administration and to meet the evaluation and technical assistance requirements for this program. In the space below, identify and describe the specific Section 1003(g) evaluation and technical assistance activities that your State conducted during SY 2009-10.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Monitoring and oversight activities were conducted to ensure districts were expending funds according to their stated improvement strategies and action plans. Advice and assistance was provided where districts had deviated from their approved plans and spending timelines.

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

In the space below, describe actions (if any) taken by your State in SY 2009-10 that were supported by **funds other than Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) funds** to address the achievement problems of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of *ESEA*.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Indian Education Achievement funds, appropriated by the state Legislature in the 2009 session, have been used to support meetings with teams from districts with Tier I and Tier III schools eligible for SIG funding under Section 1003(g) and to pilot promising instructional strategies in several schools in either corrective action or restructuring.

1.4.9 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

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

1.4.9.1 Public School Choice

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

1.4.9.1.2 Public School Choice – Students

In the table below, provide the number of students who were eligible for public school choice, the number of eligible students who applied to transfer, and the number who transferred under the provisions for public school choice under Section 1116 of *ESEA*. The number of students who were eligible for public school choice should include:

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

The number of students who applied to transfer should include:

1. All students who applied to transfer in the current school year but did not or were unable to transfer.
2. All students who transferred in the current school year under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116; and
3. All students who previously transferred under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116 and are continuing to transfer for the current school year under Section 1116.

For any of the respective student counts, States should indicate in the Comment section if the count does not include any of the categories of students discussed above.

	# Students
Eligible for public school choice	43,593
Applied to transfer	4
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	4
Comments:	

1.4.9.1.3 Funds Spent on Public School Choice

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

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	$ 0

1.4.9.1.4 Availability of Public School Choice Options

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

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

	# LEAs
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	57

FAQs about public school choice:

a. How should States report data on Title I public school choice for those LEAs that have open enrollment and other choice programs? For those LEAs that implement open enrollment or other school choice programs in addition to public school choice under Section 1116 of ESEA, the State may consider a student as having applied to transfer if the student meets the following:

- Has a "home" or "neighborhood" school (to which the student would have been assigned, in the absence of a school choice program) that receives Title I funds and has been identified, under the statute, as in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring; and
- Has elected to enroll, at some point since July 1, 2002 (the effective date of the Title I choice provisions), and after the home school has been identified as in need of improvement, in a school that has not been so identified and is attending that school; and
- Is using district transportation services to attend such a school.

In addition, the State may consider costs for transporting a student meeting the above conditions towards the funds spent by an LEA on transportation for public school choice if the student is using district transportation services to attend the non-identified school.

b. How should States report on public school choice for those LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice? In the count of LEAS that are not able to offer public school choice (for any of the reasons specified in 1.4.9.1.4), States should include those LEAs that are unable to offer public school choice at one or more grade levels. For instance, if an LEA is able to provide public school choice to eligible students at the elementary level but not at the secondary level, the State should include the LEA in the count. States should also include LEAs that are not able to provide public school choice at all (i.e., at any grade level). States should provide the reason(s) why public school choice was not possible in these LEAs at the grade level(s) in the Comment section. In addition, States may also include in the Comment section a separate count just of LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice at any grade level.

For LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice at one or more grade levels, States should count as eligible for public school choice (in 1.4.9.1.2) all students who attend identified Title I schools regardless of whether the LEA is able to offer the students public school choice.

Comments:

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

1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

1.4.9.2.2 Supplemental Educational Services – Students

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

	# Students
Eligible for supplemental educational services	11,563
Applied for supplemental educational services	88
Received supplemental educational services	88
Comments:	

1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services

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

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	$ 289,088
Comments:	

1.5 TEACHER QUALITY

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

1.5.1 Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified

In the table below, provide the number of core academic classes for the grade levels listed, the number of those core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified, and the number taught by teachers who are not highly qualified. The percentage of core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified and the percentage taught by teachers who are not highly qualified will be calculated automatically. Below the table are FAQs about these data.

	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified
All classes	23,545	22,085	93.8	1,460	6.2
All elementary classes	12,048	11,239	93.3	809	6.7
All secondary classes	11,497	10,846	94.3	651	5.7

Montana defines grades K-8 as elementary and grades 9-12 as secondary. The collection method used for 2008-2009 was a written response from schools summarizing total numbers of core classes and total number of core classes taught by a highly qualified teacher. The confidence level was low regarding this data and a more automated collection method was used in 2009-2010. Had a similar method to the 2009-2010 collection been used in 2008-2009 the increase in the reported number of elementary classes would be approximately 9% rather than the 52%.

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

Data table includes classes taught by special education teachers who provide direct instruction core academic subjects.	Yes

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Montana counts elementary classes so that a full-day self-contained classroom equals one class.

FAQs about highly qualified teachers and core academic subjects:

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

b. *How is a teacher defined?* An individual who provides instruction in the core academic areas to kindergarten, grades 1 through 12, or ungraded classes, or individuals who teach in an environment other than a classroom setting (and who maintain daily student attendance records) [from NCES, CCD, 2001-02]

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

d. *Should 6th-, 7th-, and 8th-grade classes be reported in the elementary or the secondary category?* States are responsible for determining whether the content taught at the middle school level meets the competency requirements for elementary or secondary instruction. Report classes in grade 6 through 8 consistent with how teachers have been classified to determine their highly qualified status, regardless of whether their schools are configured as elementary or middle schools.

e. *How should States count teachers (including specialists or resource teachers) in elementary classes?* States that count self-contained classrooms as one class should, to avoid over-representation, also count subject-area specialists (e.g., mathematics or music teachers) or resource teachers as teaching one class. On the other hand, States using a departmentalized approach to instruction where a self-contained classroom is counted multiple times (once for each subject taught) should also count subject-area specialists or resource teachers as teaching multiple classes.

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

g. *What is the reporting period?* The reporting period is the school year. The count of classes must include all semesters, quarters, or terms of the school year. For example, if core academic classes are held in summer sessions, those classes should be included in the count of core academic classes. A state determines into which school year classes fall.

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

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

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

	Percentage
Elementary School Classes	
Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	0.0
Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	6.0
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	94.0
Other (please explain in comment box below)	
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

	Percentage
Secondary School Classes	
Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	86.0
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	9.0
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	5.0
Other (please explain in comment box below)	
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

In the table below, provide the number of core academic classes for each of the school types listed and the number of those core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified. The percentage of core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified will be calculated automatically. The percentages used for high- and low-poverty schools and the poverty metric used to determine those percentages are reported in the second table. Below the tables are FAQs about these data.

This means that for the purpose of establishing poverty quartiles, some classes in schools where both elementary and secondary classes are taught would be counted as classes in an elementary school rather than as classes in a secondary school in 1.5.3. This also means that such a 12th grade class would be in different category in 1.5.3 than it would be in 1.5.1.

NOTE: No source of classroom-level poverty data exists, so States may look at school-level data when figuring poverty quartiles. Because not all schools have traditional grade configurations, and because a school may not be counted as both an elementary and as a secondary school, States may include as elementary schools all schools that serve children in grades K through 5 (including K through 8 or K through 12 schools).

School Type	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified
Elementary Schools			
High Poverty Elementary Schools	2,302	2,052	89.1
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	1,833	1,609	87.8
Secondary Schools			
High Poverty secondary Schools	1,693	1,472	86.9
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	4,299	4,135	96.2

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

	High-Poverty Schools (more than what %)	**Low-Poverty Schools** (less than what %)
Elementary schools	58.2	23.2
Poverty metric used	Free and Reduced Lunch Percentage	
Secondary schools	47.2	24.7
Poverty metric used	Free and Reduced Lunch Percentage	

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

a. *What is a "high-poverty school"?* Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "high-poverty" schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State.

b. *What is a "low-poverty school"?* Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "low-poverty" schools as schools in the bottom quartile of poverty in the State.

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

d. *Since the poverty data are collected at the school and not classroom level, how do we classify schools as either elementary or secondary for this purpose?* States may include as elementary schools all schools that serve children in grades K through 5 (including K through 8 or K through 12 schools) and would therefore include as secondary schools those that exclusively serve children in grades 6 and higher.

1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

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

1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

1. **Types of Programs =** Types of programs described in the subgrantee's local plan (as submitted to the State or as implemented) that is closest to the descriptions in http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/files/uploads/5/Language_Instruction_Educational_Programs.pdf.
2. **Other Language =** Name of the language of instruction, other than English, used in the program.

Check Types of Programs	Type of Program	Other Language
No Response	Dual language	
No Response	Two-way immersion	
No Response	Transitional bilingual programs	
No Response	Developmental bilingual	
Yes	Heritage language	Dakota, Crow, Cree, Salish, Kootenai
Yes	Sheltered English instruction	
Yes	Structured English immersion	
No Response	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)	
Yes	Content-based ESL	
Yes	Pull-out ESL	
Yes	Other (explain in comment box below)	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Supplemental Reading Instruction

1.6.2 Student Demographic Data

1.6.2.1 Number of ALL LEP Students in the State

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of ALL LEP students in the State who meet the LEP definition under Section 9101(25).

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

Number of ALL LEP students in the State	3,804
Comments:	

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

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

	#
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	1,343
Comments:	

1.6.2.3 Most Commonly Spoken Languages in the State

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

Language	# LEP Students
German	285
North American Indian	245
Spanish; Castilian	127
Russian	66
Uncoded languages	18

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

These figures indicate language of impact but do not necessarily indicate that sutdents are fluent speakers of the language. Other significant languages are Blackfeet - 1,194, Crow - 1,041, Cree - 309, Cheyenne - 295. The total for North American Indian languages that includes identified tribal languages is 3,217.

1.6.3 Student Performance Data

This section collects data on LEP student English language proficiency, as required by Sections 1111(h)(4)(D) and 3121(a)(2).

1.6.3.1.1 All LEP Students Tested on the State Annual English Language Proficiency Assessment

In the table below, please provide the number of ALL LEP students tested and not tested on annual State English language proficiency assessment (as defined in 1.6.2.1).

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	3,175
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	629
Total	3,804
Comments: The ELP data come from the student database, AIM Live (based on production data), the AIM snapshot (reviewed and stored), and the ELP bar code data. The information for the bar code labels is extracted from AIM Live approximately mid-way through the ELP testing window. Districts update their AIM data at any time to reflect changes in student status, such as LEP to former LEP, newly identified students, etc., which may not allow time for the AIM snapshot data to be correctly adjusted, resulting in students listed as LEP who don't take the ELP assessment, and students not listed as LEP taking the ELP. The 2009-2010 data indicated that there were 3,743 bar code labels, 3,973 students assessed, 3,920 LEP students in the October snapshot, 577 voided bar code labels and 75 students in bar code labels but not assessed or in voided bar code labels.	

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

	#
Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	2,248
Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	70.8
Comments:	

1.6.3.2.1 Title III LEP Students Tested on the State Annual English Language Proficiency (ELP) Assessment

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

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	1,140
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	181
Total	1,321
Comments: The ELP data come from the student database, AIM Live (based on production data), the AIM snapshot (reviewed and stored), and the ELP bar code data. The information for the bar code labels is extracted from AIM Live approximately mid-way through the ELP testing window. Districts update their AIM data at any time to reflect changes in student status, such as LEP to former LEP, newly identified students, etc., which may not allow time for the AIM snapshot data to be correctly adjusted, resulting in students listed as LEP who don't take the ELP assessment, and students not listed as LEP taking the ELP. The 2009-2010 data indicated that there were 3,743 bar code labels, 3,973 students assessed, 3,920 LEP students in the October snapshot, 577 voided bar code labels and 75 students in bar code labels but not assessed or in voided bar code labels.	
In the table below, provide the number of Title III students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time and whose progress cannot be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO1. Report this number ONLY if the State did not include these students in establishing AMAO1/ making progress target and did not include them in the calculations for AMAO1/ making progress (# and % making progress).	
	#
Number of Title III students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time whose progress cannot be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO 1.	428

1.6.3.2.2

Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:

1. **Annual Measureable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs) =** State targets for the number and percent of students making progress and attaining proficiency.
2. **Making Progress =** Number and percent of Title III LEP students that met the definition of "Making Progress" as defined by the State and submitted to ED in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
3. **ELP Attainment =** Number and percent of Title III LEP students that meet the State definition of "Attainment" of English language proficiency submitted to ED in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
4. **Results =** Number and percent of Title III LEP students that met the State definition of "Making Progress" and the number and percent that met the State definition of "Attainment" of English language proficiency.

In the table below, provide the State targets for the number and percentage of States making progress and attaining English proficiency for this reporting period. Additionally, provide the results from the annual State English language proficiency assessment for Title III-served LEP students who participated in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12. If your State uses cohorts, provide us with the range of targets, (i.e., indicate the lowest target among the cohorts, e.g., 10% and the highest target among a cohort, e.g., 70%).

	Results		Targets	
	#	%	#	%
Making progress	146	20.5	570	50.00
Attained proficiency	241	21.1	342	30.00
Comments:				

1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments

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

1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language

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

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

1.6.3.5.2 Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given

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

Language(s)
Comments:

1.6.3.5.3 Native Language of Reading/Language Arts Tests Given

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

Language(s)
Comments:

1.6.3.5.4 Native Language of Science Tests Given

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

Language(s)
Comments:

1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students

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

1.6.3.6.1 Title III Served MFLEP Students by Year Monitored

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

Monitored Former LEP students include:

- Students who have transitioned out of a language instruction educational program.
- Students who are no longer receiving LEP services and who are being monitored for academic content achievement for 2 years after the transition.

Table 1.6.3.6.1 Definitions:

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

# Year One	# Year Two	Total
65	19	84
Comments:		

1.6.3.6.2 In the table below, report the number of MFLEP students who took the annual mathematics assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned out of language instruction educational programs and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:

1. **# Tested =** State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in mathematics in all AYP grades.
2. **# At or Above Proficient =** State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual mathematics assessment.
3. **% Results =** Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the number tested.
4. **# Below proficient =** State-aggregated number of MFLEP students in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school) who did not score proficient on the State NCLB mathematics assessment.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
68	34	50.0	34
Comments:			

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

In the table below, report results MFLEP students who took the annual reading/language arts assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned out of language instruction educational programs and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

Table 1.6.3.6.3 Definitions:

1. **# Tested =** State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in reading/language arts in all AYP grades.
2. **# At or Above Proficient =** State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment.
3. **% Results =** Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the total number tested.
4. **# Below proficient =** State-aggregated number MFLEP students in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations(3 through 8 and once in high school) who did not score proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment. This will be automatically calculated.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
68	46	67.6	22
Comments:			

1.6.3.6.4 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Science

In the table below, report results for monitored former LEP students who took the annual science assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned out of language instruction educational programs and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

Table 1.6.3.6.4 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
23	5	21.7	18
Comments:			

1.6.4 Title III Subgrantees

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

1.6.4.1 Title III Subgrantee Performance

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

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

	#
# - Total number of subgrantees for the year	39
# - Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	1
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	8
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	20
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	20
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	7
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2008-09 and 2009-10)	39
# - Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2009-10 for not meeting Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years	0
# - Number of subgrantees that have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2006-07, 2007-08, 2008-09, and 2009-10)	35

Provide information on how the State counted consortia members in the total number of subgrantees and in each of the numbers in table 1.6.4.1.

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments: AMAO determinations are made on the basis of each district participating in consortia.

1.6.4.2 State Accountability

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

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

State met all three Title III AMAOs	No
Comments:	

1.6.4.3 Termination of Title III Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

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

1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students

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

1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students

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

Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:

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

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants
168	135	3

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development

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

1.6.6.1 Teacher Information

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

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

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

	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	179
Estimate number of **additional** certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	45

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

1.6.6.2 Professional Development Activities of Subgrantees Related to the Teaching and Learning of LEP Students

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

Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:

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

Type of Professional Development Activity	# Subgrantees	
Instructional strategies for LEP students	9	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	0	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	0	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	0	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	3	
Other (Explain in comment box)	9	
Participant Information	**# Subgrantees**	**# Participants**
PD provided to content classroom teachers	12	654
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	9	147
PD provided to principals	10	74
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	6	20
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	7	98
PD provided to community based organization personnel	1	40
Total		1,033

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Curriculum Development/Implementation: 8
Reading Instruction: 1
Total: 9

1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities

This section collects data on State grant activities.

1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process

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

Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:

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

Example: State received SY 2009-10 funds July 1, 2009, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2009, for SY 2009-10 programs. Then the "# of days/$$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/$$ Distribution
07/06/09	07/01/10	1
Comments: The E-Grant System application opened the second week of May 2009.		

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS

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

	#
Persistently Dangerous Schools	
Comments: Montana's response to 1.7 is "0."	

1.8 GRADUATION RATES AND DROPOUT RATES

This section collects graduation and dropout rates.

1.8.1 Graduation Rates

In the table below, provide the graduation rates calculated using the methodology that was approved as part of the State's accountability plan for the **previous school year** (SY 2008-09). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	80.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	60.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	85.0
Black, non-Hispanic	73.0
Hispanic	71.0
White, non-Hispanic	83.7
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	74.7
Limited English proficient	53.0
Economically disadvantaged	79.8
Migratory students	92.3
Male	79.4
Female	82.2
Comments: Montana's subgroup information is more reliable this reporting year and these data reflect the change.	

FAQs on graduation rates:

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.8.2 Dropout Rates

In the table below, provide the dropout rates calculated using the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's (NCES) Common Core of Data (CCD) for the **previous school year** (SY 2008-09). Below the table is a FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Dropout Rate
All Students	3.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	8.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	2.5
Black, non-Hispanic	4.7
Hispanic	5.5
White, non-Hispanic	2.9
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	3.5
Limited English proficient	6.3
Economically disadvantaged	5.1
Migratory students	3.6
Male	3.9
Female	3.2
Comments:	

FAQ on dropout rates:

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

1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS PROGRAM

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

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

	#	# LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	415	20
LEAs with subgrants	7	7
Total	422	27
Comments:		

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

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

1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youths

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

Age/Grade	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs With Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	1	85
K	9	126
1	12	130
2	16	140
3	13	131
4	15	115
5	5	101
6	10	91
7	8	72
8	7	63
9	5	67
10	11	53
11	9	58
12	16	76
Ungraded	0	0
Total	137	1,308
Comments:		

1.9.1.2 Primary Nighttime Residence of Homeless Children and Youths

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

	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs With Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	7	389
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	112	679
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	5	65
Hotels/Motels	13	175
Total	137	1,308
Comments:		

1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

1.9.2.1 Homeless Children and Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

Age/Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	85
K	126
1	130
2	140
3	131
4	115
5	101
6	91
7	72
8	63
9	67
10	53
11	58
12	76
Ungraded	0
Total	1,308
Comments:	

1.9.2.2 Subgroups of Homeless Students Served

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

	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied youth	107
Migratory children/youth	22
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	119
Limited English proficient students	8
Comments:	

1.9.2.3 Educational Support Services Provided by Subgrantees

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

	# McKinney-Vento Subgrantees That Offer
Tutoring or other instructional support	5
Expedited evaluations	4
Staff professional development and awareness	6
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	5
Transportation	7
Early childhood programs	3
Assistance with participation in school programs	7
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	5
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	6
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	5
Coordination between schools and agencies	7
Counseling	4
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	3
Clothing to meet a school requirement	5
School supplies	7
Referral to other programs and services	7
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	5
Other (optional – in comment box below)	0
Other (optional – in comment box below)	0
Other (optional – in comment box below)	0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.9.2.4 Barriers To The Education Of Homeless Children And Youth

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

	# Subgrantees Reporting
Eligibility for homeless services	3
School Selection	4
Transportation	2
School records	3
Immunizations	2
Other medical records	0
Other Barriers – in comment box below	0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.9.2.5 Academic Progress of Homeless Students

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

1.9.2.5.1 Reading Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or Above Proficient
3	78	55
4	65	45
5	62	47
6	49	31
7	51	38
8	38	25
High School	20	12
Comments:		

1.9.2.5.2 Mathematics Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or Above Proficient
3	78	41
4	65	36
5	62	34
6	48	20
7	51	25
8	38	13
High School	19	6
Comments:		

1.10 MIGRANT CHILD COUNTS

This section collects the Title I, Part C, Migrant Education Program (MEP) child counts which States are required to provide and may be used to determine the annual State allocations under Title I, Part C. The child counts should reflect the reporting period of September 1, 2009 through August 31, 2010. This section also collects a report on the procedures used by States to produce true, accurate, and valid child counts.

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

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

FAQs on Child Count:

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

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

1.10.1 Category 1 Child Count

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number by age/grade of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, resided in your State for one or more days during the reporting period of September 1, 2009 through August 31, 2010. This figure includes all eligible migrant children who may or may not have participated in MEP services. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

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

Age/Grade	12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	98
K	54
1	50
2	71
3	69
4	65
5	78
6	57
7	56
8	73
9	61
10	77
11	52
12	48
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	25
Total	934
Comments:	

1.10.1.1 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Category 1 Child Count represents 8 fewer children identified in the 2009-10 Child Count compared with the previous year, for a total of 934. There were 942 children identified in the 2008-09 Child Count. This is an .8% (less than 10%) decrease. This is primarily due to the use of genetic beet seed which eliminated the use of traditional manual hoeing and thinning. As a result, migrant laborers were not hired again in one of our largest project locations.

1.10.2 Category 2 Child Count

In the table below, enter by age/grade the unduplicated statewide number of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, were served for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods that occurred within the reporting period of September 1, 2009 through August 31, 2010. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. Count a child who moved to different schools within the State and who was served in both traditional summer and year-round school intersession programs only once. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

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

Age/Grade	Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	85
K	44
1	36
2	54
3	49
4	55
5	64
6	48
7	50
8	63
9	51
10	71
11	45
12	36
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	16
Total	767
Comments:	

1.10.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Category 2 Child Count represents a 2% increase in the number of children identified and served during the summer session. This is due primarily to the larger and longer cherry harvest.

1.10.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures

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

1.10.3.1 Student Information System

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The state of Montana utilizes the New Generation System (NGS) as its primary source of Child Count data compilation. The NGS was the primary source used for the previous year Child Count (2008-09); it was used for both the Category 1 and Category 2 Child Count for the 2009-10 submission.

1.10.3.2 Data Collection and Management Procedures

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The data for the Category 2 count were collected and maintained in the same manner that the data for the Category 1 count were collected and maintained. That is, core eligibility, family history and demographic data is collected by trained recruiters through a direct family interview and documented on a Certificate of Eligibility (COE) which complies with all of the National COE requirements. Data is collected throughout the reporting period between September 1 of 2009 and August 31 of 2010.
Data are then entered into the NGS database by trained data entry personnel and reviewed by local and state data administrators. Project Sites also use NGS to run data checks and various reports throughout the reporting period prior to submitting final data to the SEA. The data are organized within the NGS to reflect all eligibility information required by statute and obtained during the interview which has been documented on the COE. Each COE is validated and checked for accuracy by the local project director and the SEA Data Administrator.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The SEA sponsors annual NGS data entry training which is required before any staff can obtain a password to the NGS system. Ongoing training for state level staff is also conducted each year. Trained project directors and/data entry personnel then input core eligibility, demographic, health and education data into the New Generation System. Academic and Health data are updated as they become available and students are enrolled and withdrawn from the NGS system as they arrive or depart from a particular location. The NGS is a student specific database, which organizes all of the pertinent student data based on the COE and other academic and or supportive data available. For example, a student withdrawal record includes all information regarding credits, supplemental services, PFS, status and other requirements of the ESEA Title I Part C MEP. Prior to inputting any data collected on the COE at the local level, the COE must have been validated at the local level by a project administrator and finally at the state level by SEA staff.
The SEA Data Administrator is the only person who can enter a Migrant Status designation in the Montana student information system, Achievement in Montana or AIM, during the regular school term. In this way, only students with a valid COE on file at the SEA can be designated as migrant during the regular school term, when migrant children are spread throughout the state in more than 50 LOAs. The academic achievement information from AIM regarding migrant students enrolled during the regular term are then entered into NGS by the State Data Administrator.
All required demographic, academic and health files for students enrolled in the Montana MEP are contained in NGS and uploaded into MSIX.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Category 2 and Category 1 data were collected and maintained in the same manner.

1.10.3.3 Methods Used To Count Children

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The NGS query is programmed to count a student only once statewide in the Category 1 and Category 2 counts. In order to avoid duplication and to assure correct student identification, the NGS creates a unique student identification (USID) number for each new student entered into the NGS centralized database. Before a new student record can be created, the system checks for duplication based on the student's last name or similar last name by using a system-generated "wild card" prompt. The wild card prompt allows data entry personnel to check potential duplicate students by displaying students that have a range of similar information. Potential duplicates are then checked against additional fields such as first name, birthdate and parents' names. Any matches generate further review which is conducted by the Data Review Team at the SEA. Once the data have been entered at the local and/or state level, they are crosschecked against paper copies of the COE by trained local personnel, and then, once again, at the SEA.
A child may not be enrolled in NGS without inputting a qualifying activity. The information in NGS is verified at the local and state levels to ensure that it matches the paper COE. The activity is validated according to the state's quality control processes.
NGS selects students for the unique student count based upon the enrollment period and federal eligibility criteria. This report counts each student once, based upon a unique USID, even if the student has multiple enrollment records within the reporting time period.
Selection Criteria
Below is a list of selection criteria used to create the unique student count:
• Regular and summer enrollments containing an enrollment and withdrawal date are included if the student was enrolled for at least one day during the reporting period.
• The student has a residency verification date within the school year.
• The student is between 3 years and 21 years 11 months old for at least one day during the reporting period.
• The student's most recent qualifying arrival date must be less than 36 months from the beginning of the reporting period.
• If the enrollment record has a termination date, the student must not be terminated prior to the beginning of the reporting period. Students who have graduated high school are NOT given new enrollments in NGS.
• For 12-month counts, any type of eligible enrollment is counted.
• For the summer/intersession (Category 2) counts, the report includes enrollments with a summer or intersession type of enrollment.
Below is an example of the criteria used to gather the data from the database. For these examples, the YR1 and YR2 are used to represent the school year selection. For example, for the 2009-2010 school year option, YR1=2009 and YR2=2010. For the QAD criteria, YR3 represents a date three years prior to the school year date. In order for a student to be eligible for this count, he/she must have made a move within three years. For example, if we are using the school year 2009-2010, YR3=2007. The data for the count is retrieved using the following criteria:
Enrollment Date Information:
o The Withdrawal Date is between 9/1/YR1 and 8/31/YR2 OR
o The Enrollment Date is between 9/1/YR1 and 8/31/YR2 OR
o The Residency Verification date is between 9/1/YR1 and 8/31/YR2
• The Termination Reason does not equal 'G' (Graduated), 'E' (GED) or 'D' (Deceased) and the Termination Date is greater than 8/31/YR1.
• The QAD greater than or equal to 9/1/YR3.
• Birthdate Information:
o The student must be between 3 and 21 years 11 months old to be counted.
o If the student turns 3 during the school year and the enrollment date is greater than birthdate or enrollment is less than birthdate and withdrawal date is greater than birthdate or residency verification date between 9/1/YR1 and 8/31/YR2 and greater than birthdate.
• The Maximum History ID or most current History ID for students meeting above criteria is used.
Criteria for Selecting the Summer Session Students:
• The students are selected by the State, Region or District.
• Enrollment Date Information:
o The Enrollment Date is NOT null (no data entered) and Enrollment Type is equal to 'I' (intersession) and the difference between the QAD and Enrollment Date is less than or equal to three years and Enrollment Date is between 9/1/YR1 and 8/31/YR2 OR
o The Enrollment Type is equal to 'S' (Summer) and the QAD is greater than 5/14/YR3 and the Enrollment Date is between 5/15/YR2 and 8/31/YR2.
• The child must have an instructional or supplemental service.
• The Termination Reason does not equal 'G' (Graduated), 'E' (GED) or 'D' (Deceased) and the Termination Date is greater than 8/31/YR2.
• Birthdate Information:
o The student must be between 3 and 21 years 11 months old to be counted.
o If the student turns 3 during the school year and the enrollment date is greater than birthdate or enrollment is less than birthdate and withdrawal date is greater than birthdate or residency verification date between 9/1/YR1 and 8/31/YR2 and greater than birthdate.
• The Maximum History ID or most current History ID for students meeting above criteria is used.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Montana MEP did not use a different system for its Category 2 count.

1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The accuracy and completeness of the COEs are verified through a quality control process that includes an intensive review and training based on the eligibility section in Pub. Law 107-110 Part C, current regulations and the Draft Non-Regulatory Guidance. The process, which is detailed elsewhere in this report as well, begins with thorough training of local site directors and recruiters who are given periodic updating on statutory or regulatory changes. Each COE is checked at the local and state offices by trained staff to assure that the information provided clearly indicated that the reported children are eligible. COEs with insufficient or inaccurate data are sent back to the local recruiter for clarification. As mentioned above, trained NGS data entry specialists enter data at the local operating agency level (LOA) once it has been verified as accurate.
Montana bases its Category 1 count on new documentation of residency each year. A history line with a residency only flag is created in NGS for each new or updated COE for the Category 1 count. A history line with an "S" (summer) flag is created for each summer enrollment for the Category 2 count. Montana uses the "R" designation for regular term participation, "S" for summer session. We do not use "I" as there is no year-round school in Montana. Participants are those who receive either an educational or supportive service during the regular or summer term. The NGS query is programmed to count a student only once statewide in the Category 1 and Category 2 counts. In order to avoid duplication and to assure correct student identification, NGS creates a unique student identification (USID) number for each new student entered into the NGS centralized database. Before a new student record can be created, the system checks for duplication based on the student's last name or similar last name by using a system-generated "wild card" prompt. The wild card prompt allows data entry personnel to check potential duplicate students by displaying students that have a range of similar information. Potential duplicates are then checked against additional fields such as first name, birthdate and parents' names. Any matches generate further review which is conducted by the Data Review Team at the SEA. In addition, the state education agency (SEA) runs unique student reports on an ongoing basis; these reports are disseminated to the LOAs for crosschecking of student verification. Each LOA is able to query the centralized database for a district level unique student count in both Category 1 and Category 2. The NGS district reports are used in conjunction with the unique student count report to provide an ongoing verification of student enrollment into the system. Once the data have been entered at the local and/or state level, they are crosschecked against paper copies of the COE by trained local personnel, and then, once again, at the SEA. Some larger sites have local databases which are maintained for crosschecking purposes. For those children who are still in residence and who have no changes in demographic information after their original qualifying move, a new parental signature is obtained on a line at the bottom of the original COE. In most cases, however, a new COE is completed for all eligible children on an annual basis and residency is confirmed through a direct interview process. If the recruiter has made multiple attempts for a direct interview with the parent or legal guardian of the migrant student being recruited, and the recruiter has a phone number at which the family can be reached, the recruiter may conduct the interview over the phone. Copies of re-certified COEs with new parental signatures are kept on file at the local level and also sent to the SEA. The SEA establishes a deadline for entering all data into the systems pertaining to a particular reporting year. After the established deadline, the SEA then runs the federal performance report from NGS data. These data are crosschecked against locally submitted performance reports whose numbers have been entered into an Access database at the SEA, as well as against original COEs at the SEA level before submission to OME. Because the Montana program is such a small one, the crosschecking is performed manually at the SEA where the data specialist and the Migrant Director compare reports generated by the NGS, local sites, and hand counting of the COEs themselves. Once any discrepancies have been resolved, final performance report information is submitted to OME.

A Data Management Review Team has also been initiated at the SEA which oversees all data collection and data flow for the purposes of the Comprehensive Needs Assessment and PFS Determination. Utilizing NGS, data can be checked and re-checked for accuracy. The NGS can customize reports as needed for project implementation, such as the compilation of risk factors (i.e., failure on standardized testing, LEP status, retention history, grade-age correlation, Special Education indicators and mobility, etc.).

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.10.3.4. Quality Control Processes

As part of the on-going quality control process that the SEA has crafted to ensure the accuracy of the state's MEP eligibility determinations, policy was established which conforms with the Prospective Re-Interviewing regulation (Section 200.89(b) (2) which states that these re-interviews are conducted annually on current year eligibility determinations using a small sample size of approximately 50 randomly selected COEs. The actual number of COEs selected for re-interviewing is to depend upon the number of children in the project and the type of mobility patterns to which the families conform according to the guidance provided. Following is a summary report which presents an overview of the process used by the MT MEP for 2009-10.

TIMELINE and PROCESSES

Following procedure outlined in the Technical Assistance Guide on Re-Interviewing, the Data Quality Team determined that we would concentrate only on those children who were recruited between September 1 of 2009 and August of 2010 who had a new qualifying move and whose eligibility had not been determined on prior moves. Using an enhanced approach to prospective re-interviewing, the Data Team concentrated on the MT MEP's largest project with current, rather than prior, qualifying moves. Because we chose to do this within a few

weeks of the initial eligibility determination, we knew that some families may not have arrived back in their home base districts in time to be re-interviewed, so a large enough random sample was used to accommodate for non-response. Some families leave their work in the cherry orchards of Montana to go on to other states like Oregon, California and Idaho before they return back to their home base in Washington. Some do not arrive back in time for the fall school enrollment. In order to arrive at 50 completed prospective re-interviews, a sample was drawn from the 565 students who had migrated to the Flathead Valley in Montana from sending districts in Washington State. This was done in order to ensure that interviews performed in Montana were done accurately and with a high degree of reliability.

Through an interstate agreement with the Washington State Migrant Education Program, the prospective re-interviews were conducted in Washington during the months of late August and September of 2010 following the migration of migrant families from the Flathead Valley Montana Migrant Education Program, utilizing a copy of the MT COE and standard re-interviewing protocols. Montana COEs were distributed by the MSDR to the appropriate local school districts in Washington.

A total of 608 migrant children were identified and recruited in Flathead Valley (Polson) project in summer of 2010. 565 of those children were identified as being from Washington State. The remainder were from California, Oregon and Texas. The attached chart depicts the Interstate Migration Statistics for the Flathead Lake MEP. Only states with greater than three students are included in this chart.

States that Flathead Lake MEP Students Migrate from
State: Number of Students
California: 31
Washington: 565

The Data Quality Team then examined all 325 COEs from the Flathead Valley Project which represented a total of 565 students from Washington to determine which school districts in Washington were recorded on the MT COEs (which comports with the National COE requirements).
School District in Washington State
that Flathead Lake MEP students attend
School District(City: Number of Students
Beverly: 16
Ephrata: 8
Grandview: 123
Granger: 40
Kennewick: 19
Mabton: 38
Mattawa: 12
Outlook: 10
Pasco: 9
Prosser: 10
Shelton: 6
Sunnyside: 158
Toppenish: 8
Wapato: 60
Yakima: 34
Students identified on a New Generation System campus report for Polson were ordered via Excel's random number generator. Washington State trained recruiters fluent in Spanish were used to conduct the interviews following the established Montana MEP re-interviewing protocols approved by OME in the former Re-interviewing Initiative. The interviews were conducted in person with one or more of the available parents or guardians. The results of each re-interview were recorded in the WA MSDR system. Results were made available through the MSDR data system. A total of 501 students were located and families re-interviewed. No substantive differences (other than spellings of children's names) were reported between information recorded on the original Montana COE and the subsequent Washington re-interview. This was the most cost-effective and efficient method for prospective re-interviewing that a state like Montana could implement given the shortness of the harvesting season and the interstate nature of the moves and an excellent example of interstate coordination. While the sample is considerably more than required, the MT Data Quality Team thought it the most reliable method of checking our ID and R procedures in our largest site.

RE-INTERVIEWING QUESTIONNAIRE
1. Did you or your family (or part of your family) leave your home temporarily (move) to do agricultural work during the last three years?
2. If yes, what kind of agricultural work were you looking for?
3. What kind of agricultural work were you looking for?
4. If you were unable to find agricultural work, what was the reason?
5. Where did you move from? (City, State)
6. Where did you move to? (City, State)
7. When did you move? (approx. Month/Day/Year)
8. Who made the move? (List all family members who moved)
9. Does/Did this work in agriculture play an important part in providing a living for you or your family?

In the space below, respond to the following question: Throughout the year, what steps are taken by staff to check that child count data are

inputted and updated accurately (and–for systems that merge data–consolidated accurately)?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Montana MEP has very comprehensive identification and recruitment procedures as well as NGS guidelines that are followed by all migrant-funded staff throughout the year. Recruiters, NGS data entry specialists and other migrant-funded staff throughout the state undergo extensive training every year on NGS and eligibility as outlined in the Montana Manual for the Identification and Recruitment of Migrant Students and the NGS Implementation Guidelines for Local Operating Agencies. An Identification and Recruitment workshop is held at the state conference each year and for any new hires throughout the year. All NGS data specialists attend at least one training per year, including training on timely data entry and accuracy. In many LOAs, site directors directly oversee all data entry operations. Montana staff attends the NGS Academy in Texas in conjunction with the Annual Migrant Education Conference. This year, the SEA data manager and professional development specialist attended the Washington State Institute on the MSDR system. A Data Academy targets new data specialists for intensive hands-on sessions and data specialists with at least one-year's experience for advanced sessions on reporting and data manipulation.
At all project areas with significant numbers of eligible children, data is entered into NGS by trained data entry specialists; for those with fewer than 30 children, data is entered by the state Migrant Data Specialist who works closely with the state recruiter regarding these children and all others. The NGS provides discrete and aggregate data on individual identification, age, residency dates, qualifying move dates, and other information pertinent to defining terms of eligibility. The NGS also provides each student with a unique identification number, pertinent school history, academic information and/or supportive services(s) information. These NGS electronic records are then transmitted via the Internet to the succeeding school districts within the NGS consortium for use with placement, credit accrual, testing, and/or health information. Additionally data checks are performed when data is entered into AIM (state student information system) and re-checked using the Performance Report Access program created in-house. No consolidation of data occurs.
Additionally, during the 2009-10 reporting period, a new ID and R manual was completed which conforms with new regulations and procedures in NGS and MSIX. This manual is distributed among project sites and used during ID and R training. An NGS manual is also available for all project sites.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The state MEP verifies that the children included in the two child counts meet the eligibility criteria (i.e., that they were migrant children as defined in 34 CFR 200.40) through ongoing verifications of district certificates of eligibility (COEs) by the eight local operating agencies, identification and recruitment (ID&R) training and guidelines, New Generation System (NGS) training and guidelines, data verification through various NGS reports and the crosschecking of the NGS reports for accuracy with locally submitted performance reports and actual COEs. Finally, the Montana MEP runs multiple system-generated, as well as customized statewide queries off NGS, on an ongoing basis to crosscheck accuracy of data entry. Data verification checks and reports available through the NGS itself may include Unique Student Number, COE/family and age/grade reports that spot check accuracy of data. In addition, further veracity is assured by the re-checking of all data entered into the NGS when it is uploaded into the Performance Report Access program. Data are also scrutinized before their entry into the state student identification system, AIM by the SEA MEP Data Entry Specialist as described above, a person who is annually trained in both the AIM and NGS and MSDR systems.
These three methodologies help to ensure the veracity and validity of the data submitted and are complemented by the Montana MEP's mission to provide the highest level of training possible to all recruiters, data entry personnel and other migrant-funded staff so that errors of commission or omission are eliminated. It is the fundamental belief of the Montana MEP that only eligible migrant students who meet all aspects of the statutory definition should ever be identified as such and that any variation in this policy will not be tolerated.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Montana MEP will seek to correct any errors in identification, recruitment and the subsequent Child Count process by continuous and ongoing recruiter training, quality control checks at the local and state level which include random sampling and re-interviewing. A zero level defect rate is sought as the Identification and Recruitment goal and every effort toward that end is and continues to be made. If any errors are detected, an immediate termination of the student data in question is made, notifications to parents and schools are immediately sent and migrant program services are terminated.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

There are no such concerns about the accuracy of the child count or the eligibility determinations underlying the child count submitted in this report.