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 2006-07

MONTANA

PART I DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 28, 2007
PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 2008

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

The *NCLB* Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2006-07 consists of two information collections.

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.

Starting with SY 2005-06, collection of data for the Education of Homeless Children and Youths was added to Part I in order to provide timely data for the program's performance measures. This change allowed ED to retire OMB collection 1810-0650. For SY 2006-07, Migrant Education Program child count information that is used for funding purposes is now collected via Part I. This change allowed ED to retire OMB collection 1810-0519

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.
3. The information will provide valid evidence of program outcomes or results.
4. The CSPR is the best vehicle for collection of the data.

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 2006-07 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, December 28, 2007**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 22, 2008**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2006-07, 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 2006-07 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 2006-07 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, 2006-07 ___Part II, 2006-07

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):
Linda McCulloch, State Superintendent

_____ _____
Signature Date

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART I

For reporting on

School Year 2006-07

PART I DUE DECEMBER 28, 2007

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

This section requests descriptions of the State's implementation of the *NCLB* 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. 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 content standards taken or planned."

The response is limited to 8,000 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 beginning July 1 2005. (2) A schedule for review of specific programs shall be established as a collaborative process with the Office of Public Instruction and the Board of Public Education (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.

The Montana Board of Public Education approved the Standards Review Schedule as follows: Science-Approved by BPE November 2006. Library Media, Technology, Mathematics-2007-2008. Communication Arts, Social Studies, Arts, Career and Technology Education, Workplace Competencies-Proposed 2008-2009. School Counseling, World Languages, Health Enhancement-Proposed 2009-2010.

The Montana Standards process remains as stated below.

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

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

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

Note: Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts has been added to this data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts

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 in mathematics or reading/language arts required under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*. 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*. 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 made or planned."

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Prior to school year 2003-2004

Developed criterion-referenced tests (CRT) in reading and math for grades 4 8 and 10.

Developed alternate achievement stndards and assessments (CRT-Alt) based on those standard in reading and math in grades 4 8 and 10.

School year 2003-2004

Administered CRT and CRT-Alt in reading and math in grades 4 8 and 10.

School year 2004-2005

Administered CRT and CRT-Alt in reading and math in grades 4 8 and 10.

Prior to school year 2005-2006

Developed criterion-referenced tests (CRT) in reading and math for grades 3 5 6 and 7.

Developed alternate achievement standards and assessments (CRT-Alt) based on those standards in reading and math in grades 3 5 6 and 7.

School year 2005-2006

Administered CRT and CRT-Alt in reading and math in grades 3-8 and 10.

School year 2006-2007

Administered CRT and CRT-Alt in reading and math in grades 3-8 and 10.

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

Note: The subject of science has been removed from this data element.

1.1.3 Academic Achievement Standards in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts

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 achievement standards in mathematics or reading/language arts implemented to meet the requirements under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*. As applicable, include alternate achievement standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities and modified academic achievement standards 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 content standards taken or planned."

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

For the timeline on the progress of the development of alternate achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities please refer to section 1.1.2 above.

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

Note: The subject of science has been removed from this data element.

1.1.4 Assessments in Science

In the space below, provide a description of the State's progress in developing and implementing assessments in science that meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA in the required grade levels, including remaining major milestones (e.g., field testing) and a timeline for them. 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*.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Prior to school year 2007-2008 Developed criterion-referenced tests (CRT) in science for grades 4 8 and 10. Developed alternate achievement standards and assessments (CRT-Alt) based on science standards in grades 4 8 and 10. School year 2007-2008 Administer CRT and CRT-Alt in reading and math in grades 3-8 and 10. Administer CRT and CRT-Alt in science in grades 4 8 and 10.

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

Note: This table was formerly part of Section 1.1.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.1.5 Academic Achievement Standards in Science

In the space below, provide a description of the State's progress in developing and implementing academic achievement standards in science that meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) in the required grade levels, including remaining major milestones and a timeline for them. As applicable, include alternate achievement standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Refer to 1.1.1 for science standards. Refer to 1.1.4 for science alternate achievement standards.

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

Note: This table was formerly part of Section 1.1.3 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

This section collects data on the participation of students in the State *NCLB* 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 *NCLB* 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 were tested in mathematics. The percentage of students who were tested for mathematics will be calculated automatically.

The student group "children with disabilities (*IDEA*)" includes children who were tested using regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments.

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Tested	Percent of Students Tested
All students	75664	75582	99.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	8337	8308	99.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	704	703	99.9
Black, non-Hispanic	720	720	100.0
Hispanic	1836	1836	100.0
White, non-Hispanic	63883	63831	99.9
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	9253	9223	99.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3153	3143	99.7
Economically disadvantaged students	27611	27565	99.8
Migratory students	174	174	100.0
Male	39021	38973	99.9
Female	36643	36609	99.9

Comments: EDEN files N075 and N077 contain student performance in reading and math. Montana assigns a Novice Proficiency level to any students that did not participate in the assessment and therefore are included in these files.

Sections 1.3.1 through 1.3.14 of the CSPR tries to use the above data for the number of students that participated and received a proficiency level. Unfortunately this does include the non participating students.

Sections 1.2.1 and 1.2.3 of the CSPR contains the number of students that participated in the assessments as submitted in EDEN N081. This would not contain the non participating students.

Source – The table above is produced through EDFacts. The SEA submits the data in file N/X081 that includes data group 588, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly Section 1.2.1.1 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. For the SY 2006-07 CSPR, the total number of students enrolled has been added to this data collection.

1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Mathematics Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of children with disabilities (IDEA) tested during the State's testing window for 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 were tested in mathematics for each type of assessment will be calculated automatically. The total number of children with disabilities (IDEA) tested will also be calculated automatically.

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Tested	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Tested, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	2803	30.1
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	5909	63.5
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	593	6.4
Total	9305	

Comments: Source: Montana Statewide Assessment data and AIM testing window enrollment.

Regular assessment with accommodations include all students who participated with accommodations (both standard and nonstandard).

Montana does not use an alternate assessment scored against grade level achievement standards at this time.

Alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards include students who had invalid results.

Overall participation rates is equal to the number os students tested in Math and in Reading divided by the total number of students with disabilities in the grades assessed.

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

Note: This table was formerly Section 1.2.2.1 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

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 *NCLB* reading/language arts assessment.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Tested	Percent of Students Tested
All students	75664	75468	99.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	8337	8301	99.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	704	695	98.7
Black, non-Hispanic	720	715	99.3
Hispanic	1836	1817	99.0
White, non-Hispanic	63883	63756	99.8
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	9253	9196	99.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3153	3113	98.7
Economically disadvantaged students	27611	27516	99.7
Migratory students	171	171	100.0
Male	39021	38918	99.7
Female	36643	36550	99.8
Comments:			

Source – The same file specification as 1.2.1 is used, but with data group 589 instead of 588.

Note: This table was formerly Section 1.2.1.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. For the SY 2006-07 CSPR, the total number of students enrolled has been added to this data collection.

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 *NCLB* reading/language arts assessment.

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Tested	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Tested, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	2737	29.5
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	5947	64.1
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	596	6.4
Total	9280	

Comments: Source: Montana Statewide Assessment data and AIM testing window enrollment.

Regular assessment with accommodations include all students who participated with accommodations (both standard and nonstandard).

Montana does not use an alternate assessment scored against grade level achievement standards at this time.

Alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards include students who had invalid results.

Overall participation rates is equal to the number os students tested in Math and in Reading divided by the total number of students with disabilities in the grades assessed.

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

Note: This table was formerly Section 1.2.2.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

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

1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics

In the format of the table below, provide the number of students who completed the State *NCLB* 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 were tested using regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments.

The student group "limited English proficient students (LEP)" does not include recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months; and does not include monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students.

1.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts

This section is similar to 1.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State's *NCLB* reading/language arts assessment.

1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	10362	7014	67.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	1233	536	43.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	113	91	80.5
Black, non-Hispanic	119	63	52.9
Hispanic	264	150	56.8
White, non-Hispanic	8633	6174	71.5
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	1267	517	40.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	496	164	33.1
Economically disadvantaged students	4231	2431	57.5
Migratory students	12	8	66.7
Male	5333	3644	68.3
Female	5029	3370	67.0
Comments: Percent change is due to small numbers of students and different cohorts from year to year. The EDEN files will be resubmitted to reflect the corrected data for Mathematics and Reading.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

Grade 3	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	10361	8662	83.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	1233	791	64.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	112	99	88.4
Black, non-Hispanic	118	91	77.1
Hispanic	261	209	80.1
White, non-Hispanic	8637	7472	86.5
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	1270	710	55.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	491	241	49.1
Economically disadvantaged students	4231	3226	76.2
Migratory students	12	11	91.7
Male	5334	4330	81.2
Female	5027	4332	86.2
Comments: Percent change is due to small numbers of students and different cohorts from year to year. The EDEN files will be resubmitted to reflect the corrected data for Mathematics and Reading.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	10312	6973	67.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	1209	529	43.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	111	83	74.8
Black, non-Hispanic	120	66	55.0
Hispanic	297	173	58.3
White, non-Hispanic	8575	6122	71.4
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	1292	471	36.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	440	141	32.0
Economically disadvantaged students	4139	2265	54.7
Migratory students	30	14	46.7
Male	5360	3646	68.0
Female	4952	3327	67.2
Comments: Percent change is due to small numbers of students and different cohorts from year to year. The EDEN files will be resubmitted to reflect the corrected data for Mathematics and Reading.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

Grade 4	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	10306	8239	79.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	1212	733	60.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	109	86	78.9
Black, non-Hispanic	120	95	79.2
Hispanic	297	213	71.7
White, non-Hispanic	8568	7112	83.0
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	1293	623	48.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	440	167	38.0
Economically disadvantaged students	4141	2886	69.7
Migratory students	30	16	53.3
Male	5359	4177	77.9
Female	4947	4062	82.1
Comments: Percent change is due to small numbers of students and different cohorts from year to year. The EDEN files will be resubmitted to reflect the corrected data for Mathematics and Reading.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	10581	7088	67.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	1185	495	41.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	141	108	76.6
Black, non-Hispanic	105	55	52.4
Hispanic	289	163	56.4
White, non-Hispanic	8861	6267	70.7
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	1311	403	30.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	394	114	28.9
Economically disadvantaged students	4085	2208	54.1
Migratory students	31	21	67.7
Male	5433	3675	67.6
Female	5148	3413	66.3
Comments: Percent change is due to small numbers of students and different cohorts from year to year. The EDEN files will be resubmitted to reflect the corrected data for Mathematics and Reading.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

Grade 5	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	10587	8585	81.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	1189	699	58.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	140	123	87.9
Black, non-Hispanic	105	80	76.2
Hispanic	286	208	72.7
White, non-Hispanic	8858	7475	84.4
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	1311	580	44.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	394	155	39.3
Economically disadvantaged students	4085	2867	70.2
Migratory students	31	25	80.7
Male	5430	4295	79.1
Female	5148	4290	83.3
Comments: Percent change is due to small numbers of students and different cohorts from year to year. The EDEN files will be resubmitted to reflect the corrected data for Mathematics and Reading.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	10661	6789	63.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	1164	445	38.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	134	92	68.7
Black, non-Hispanic	93	47	50.5
Hispanic	248	137	55.2
White, non-Hispanic	9022	6068	67.3
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	1291	328	25.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	430	97	22.6
Economically disadvantaged students	4000	2000	50.0
Migratory students	26	17	65.4
Male	5515	3591	65.1
Female	5146	3198	62.1
Comments: Percent change is due to small numbers of students and different cohorts from year to year. The EDEN files will be resubmitted to reflect the corrected data for Mathematics and Reading.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

Grade 6	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	10657	8857	83.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	1168	702	60.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	134	118	88.1
Black, non-Hispanic	92	75	81.5
Hispanic	245	186	75.9
White, non-Hispanic	9018	7776	86.2
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	1289	600	46.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	428	169	39.5
Economically disadvantaged students	3997	2881	72.1
Migratory students	26	21	80.8
Male	5510	4479	81.3
Female	5147	4378	85.1
Comments: Percent change is due to small numbers of students and different cohorts from year to year. The EDEN files will be resubmitted to reflect the corrected data for Mathematics and Reading.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.3.9 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	11072	7147	64.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	1203	435	36.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	136	103	75.7
Black, non-Hispanic	123	66	53.7
Hispanic	265	153	57.7
White, non-Hispanic	9345	6390	68.4
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	1399	319	22.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	485	94	19.4
Economically disadvantaged students	4107	2040	49.7
Migratory students	34	21	61.8
Male	5728	3670	64.1
Female	5344	3477	65.1
Comments: Percent change is due to small numbers of students and different cohorts from year to year. The EDEN files will be resubmitted to reflect the corrected data for Mathematics and Reading.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

Grade 7	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	11057	9256	83.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	1202	727	60.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	134	122	91.0
Black, non-Hispanic	122	96	78.7
Hispanic	263	206	78.3
White, non-Hispanic	9336	8105	86.8
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	1394	611	43.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	476	190	39.9
Economically disadvantaged students	4097	2985	72.9
Migratory students	33	27	81.8
Male	5718	4609	80.6
Female	5339	4647	87.0
Comments: Percent change is due to small numbers of students and different cohorts from year to year. The EDEN files will be resubmitted to reflect the corrected data for Mathematics and Reading.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.3.11 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	11221	6672	59.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	1231	355	28.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	105	69	65.7
Black, non-Hispanic	82	47	57.3
Hispanic	250	135	54.0
White, non-Hispanic	9553	6066	63.5
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	1439	224	15.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	505	54	10.7
Economically disadvantaged students	3922	1679	42.8
Migratory students	20	9	45.0
Male	5783	3434	59.4
Female	5438	3238	59.5
Comments: Percent change is due to small numbers of students and different cohorts from year to year. The EDEN files will be resubmitted to reflect the corrected data for Mathematics and Reading.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

Grade 8	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	11207	8833	78.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	1228	640	52.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	104	90	86.5
Black, non-Hispanic	81	69	85.2
Hispanic	246	187	76.0
White, non-Hispanic	9548	7847	82.2
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	1433	500	34.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	495	141	28.5
Economically disadvantaged students	3911	2590	66.2
Migratory students	18	12	66.7
Male	5776	4272	74.0
Female	5431	4561	84.0
Comments: Percent change is due to small numbers of students and different cohorts from year to year. The EDEN files will be resubmitted to reflect the corrected data for Mathematics and Reading.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.3.13 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - High School

High School	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	11373	6224	54.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	1083	271	25.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	146	92	63.0
Black, non-Hispanic	78	29	37.2
Hispanic	223	92	41.3
White, non-Hispanic	9842	5739	58.3
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	1224	195	15.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	393	46	11.7
Economically disadvantaged students	3081	1182	38.4
Migratory students	21	11	52.4
Male	5821	3218	55.3
Female	5552	3006	54.1
Comments: Percent change is due to small numbers of students and different cohorts from year to year. The EDEN files will be resubmitted to reflect the corrected data for Mathematics and Reading.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

High School	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	11302	8861	78.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	1069	578	54.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	145	107	73.8
Black, non-Hispanic	77	54	70.1
Hispanic	219	155	70.8
White, non-Hispanic	9791	7966	81.4
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	1206	438	36.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	389	114	29.3
Economically disadvantaged students	3054	1949	63.8
Migratory students	21	13	61.9
Male	5791	4266	73.7
Female	5511	4595	83.4
Comments: Percent change is due to small numbers of students and different cohorts from year to year. The EDEN files will be resubmitted to reflect the corrected data for Mathematics and Reading.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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 and the total number of those schools and districts that made AYP based on data for the SY 2006-07 school year. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	# That Made AYP in SY 2006-07	Percentage That Made AYP in SY 2006-07
Schools	825	742	89.9
Districts	425	363	85.4
Comments:			

Source – The table above is produced through ED*Facts*. The SEA submits the data in N/X103 for data group 32.

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 2006-07 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 2006-07	Percentage of Title I Schools That Made AYP in SY 2006-07
All Title I schools	658	585	88.9
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	174	124	71.3
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	484	461	95.2
Comments:			

Source – The table above is produced through ED*Facts*. The SEA submits the data in N/X101 for data group 22 and N/X103 for data group 32.

Note: New for the SY 2006-07 CSPR is the data collection requirement to report for public schools and to include data for schoolwide (SWP) and targeted assistance (TAS) Title I Schools.

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 2006-07. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2006-07	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2006-07
347	275	79.3
Comments:		

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X103 that is data group 32 and 582. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly part of Section 1.4.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

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 2007-08 based on the data from SY 2006-07. For each school on the list, provide the following:

- District Name and NCES ID Code
- School Name and NCES ID Code
- Whether the school missed 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 missed 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 missed the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school missed the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2007-08 (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 the school is a Title I school (This column is optional and is used only by States that choose to list all schools in improvement.)

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter School Data.
Download template: Question 1.4.4.1_0607.xls (Get MS Excel Viewer)

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: Identification as Title I school is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

[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.

1.4.4.2 Actions Taken for Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

In the space below, describe the measures being taken to address the achievement problems of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring. Include a discussion of the technical assistance provided by and supported by the State, including a description of the statewide systems of support under *NCLB* (e.g., the number of schools 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 any of the district's schools receive 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 school'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 school's continuous improvement process (and plan). All schools that have been or are currently in corrective action and restructuring (and a few in the second year of improvement) have received a Scholastic Review for a total of 51 schools. All of these schools (except one) are high poverty schools 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 OPI who will spend three to five days per month on-site in schools that are in corrective action or restructuring (and a few in second year of improvement). They will be change facilitators who assist the school principal and staff to implement the recommendations of the SRT. They have received initial two-day training from personnel of the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory which will be followed by four additional 1.5 day trainings and monthly coaches' meetings facilitated by OPI School Support System Specialists. The school visits are beginning in late November for the 2007 - 2008 school year.

Call to Greatness Meetings - There have been three of these conducted by OPI Title I and Indian Education staff for schools that are in or have been in corrective action and restructuring (and a few in second year of improvement) which all have high populations of American Indian students. Each meeting has covered data findings and interactive methods of engaging personnel and school board members from these schools in the continuous improvement process. The most recent meeting featured Dr. Larry Lezotte who spent two days on the Effective Schools Research and some of the tools he offers such as Assembly Required: A Continuous School Improvement System. Each attendee received the book by that title and each school represented received the Implementation Guide for Assembly Required (notebook), Learning for All (a book), and Stepping Up: Leading the Charge to Improve Our Schools (a book). All districts (except one) with such schools for a total of 49 schools were present along with the School Coaches assigned to them.

Resource Members - These are part-time OPI employees who have received training in a specific area of expertise that they can present in training sessions for the staff of the schools in improvement. The topics include: Teacher Mentoring, iAnalyze (a data analysis tool from the state testing contractor, Measured Progress), Curriculum Mapping, and Rubric Development for Assessing Student Work. We hope to add Resource Members with expertise in Response to Intervention (RTI) soon. The School Coaches are to assist their schools in identifying the appropriate trainings and arranging for the Resource Members to conduct the training, working through the School Support System Coordinator at OPI.

Other Resources - Additional materials have been purchased and distributed to corrective action and restructuring schools and a few in second year of improvement (the 51 referenced above) for use in Study Groups. These include Failure is not an Option from the HOPE Foundation. Each school received several books, a DVD set, and a facilitator's guide. School Coaches also received these materials and will assist the schools in using them. OPI has also communicated with the five CSPD Regions (Comprehensive System of Personnel Development funded by Special Education) to make sure that personnel from our schools in improvement, especially those in corrective action and restructuring, are included in trainings offered regionally by these entities. RTI training is one of the topics CSPD regions will be offering.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: The inclusion of the discussion of technical assistance provided by and supported by the State is a new data collection for

the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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 *NCLB* are being implemented.

Corrective Action	# of Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action Is Being Implemented
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	
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	
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	
Comments: Montana data will not be available until February 2008.	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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 *NCLB* are being implemented.

Restructuring Action	# of 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	
Take over the school by the State	
Other major restructuring of the school governance	
Comments: Montana data will not be available until February 2008.	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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 2007-08 based on the data from SY 2006-07. For each district on the list, provide the following:

- District Name and NCES ID Code
- Whether the district missed 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 missed 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 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 2007-08 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: Improvement or Corrective Action[2])
- Whether the district is a district that received Title I funds (This column is optional and is used only by States that choose to list all districts in improvement.)

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter School Data.
Download template: Question 1.4.5.1_0607.xls (Get MS Excel Viewer)

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: Identification of a district as receiving Title I funds is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

[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.

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

In the space below, 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 one in corrective action year one) have received a Scholastic Review for a total of 26 districts. All 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 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 Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory which will be followed by four additional 1.5 day trainings and monthly coaches' meetings facilitated by OPI School Support System Specialists. The on-site visits are beginning in late November for the 2007 - 2008 school year.

Call to Greatness Meetings - There have been three of these conducted by OPI Title I and Indian Education staff for districts that are in or have been in corrective action and have high populations of American Indian students. Each meeting has covered data findings and interactive methods of engaging personnel and school board members from these schools in the continuous improvement process. The most recent meeting featured Dr. Larry Lezotte who spent two days on the Effective Schools Research and some of the tools he offers such as Assembly Required: A Continuous School Improvement System. Each attendee received the book by that title and each school represented received the Implementation Guide for Assembly Required (notebook), Learning for All (a book), and Stepping Up: Leading the Charge to Improve Our Schools (a book). All districts (except one) with such schools for a total of 25 districts were present along with the School Coaches assigned to them.

Resource Members - These are part-time OPI employees who have received training in a specific area of expertise that they can present in training sessions for the staff of the districts in improvement. The topics include: Teacher Mentoring, iAnalyze (a data analysis tool from the state testing contractor, Measured Progress), Curriculum Mapping, and Rubric Development for Assessing Student Work. We hope to add Resource Members with expertise in Response to Intervention (RTI) soon. The School Coaches are to assist their districts in identifying the appropriate trainings and arranging for the Resource Members to conduct the training, working through the School Support System Coordinator at OPI.

Other Resources - Additional materials have been purchased and distributed to corrective action districts (the 26 referenced above) for use in Study Groups. These include Failure is not an Option from the HOPE Foundation. Each district received several books, a DVD set, and a facilitator's guide. School Coaches also received these materials and will assist the districts in using them. OPI has also communicated with the five CSPD Regions (Comprehensive System of Personnel Development funded by Special Education) to make sure that personnel from our districts in improvement, especially those in corrective action are included in trainings offered regionally by these entities. RTI training is one of the topics CSPD regions will be offering.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: The inclusion of the discussion of technical assistance provided by the State is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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 *NCLB* are being implemented.

Corrective Action	# of Districts in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action Is Being Implemented
Implementing a new curriculum based on State standards	0
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	0
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	5
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	0
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	0
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	0
Restructured the district	0
Abolished the district (list the number or districts abolished between the SYs 2005-06 and 2006-07 as a corrective action)	0
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.4.6 Dates of AYP and Identification Determinations

In the table below, provide the dates (MM/DD/YY) when your State provided final school and district AYP and identification for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring to schools and districts based on SY 2006-07 assessments. If applicable, also provide the dates for preliminary determinations provided to schools and districts.

	Districts	Schools
Final AYP and identification determinations	09/04/07	09/04/07
Preliminary school AYP and identification determinations (if applicable)	08/01/07	08/01/07
Comments:		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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 2006-07 data and the results of those appeals.

	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts	3	2
Schools	4	4
Comments:		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2006-07 data was complete	08/24/07

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.4.8 Section 1003(a) Funds

In the space below, describe your State's use of Section 1003(a) of ESEA funds. Specifically, address the following:

- Describe briefly any priorities the State uses in allocating these funds to schools.
- Describe briefly the State's methods for distributing these funds (e.g., formula, competitive, etc.).
- Describe briefly the types of activities supported by the Section 1003(a) funds.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Section 1003(a) funds are allocated for each school in improvement (any phase) according to a formula that assigns points for the number of years a school has been in improvement, whether the LEA is in improvement, percent of students in Novice for reading and math, percent of free and reduced meal participants, and accreditation deficiencies (if any). The minimum amount per school in the formula is $10,000. The formula ensures adherence to the state's priorities for using these funds for schools most in need for the longest period of time.

The activities supported by the Section 1003(a) funds range from additional personnel to assist in reading and math instruction to the purchase of additional computers, software, and other materials, to additional professional development for teachers and other staff.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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.

1.4.9.1.1 Schools Using Public School Choice

In the table below, provide the number of public schools *from which* and *to which* students transferred under the provisions for public school choice in Section 1116 of ESEA.

	# Schools
Title I schools *from which* students transferred for public school choice	0
Public Schools *to which* students transferred for public school choice	0
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly part of section 1.4.5.1 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

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 for public school choice, and the number who transferred under the provisions for public school choice in Section 1116 of ESEA.

Students who are eligible for public school choice includes:
(1) Students currently enrolled in a school identified for improvement
(2) Students who transferred in the current school year under the public school choice provisions of section 1116, and
(3) Students who previously transferred under section 1116 and are continuing to transfer for the current school year under section 1116.

	# Students
Eligible for public school choice	9590
Who applied to transfer	0
Who transferred to another school under Title I public school choice provisions	0

Indicate in the table below the categories of students that are included in the count of eligible students.

	Yes/No
1. Enrolled in a school identified for improvement	Yes
2. Transferred in the current school year, only	No
3. Transferred in a prior year and in the current year	No
Comments:	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X010 that includes data groups 579, 574 and 544. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly part of section 1.4.5.1 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

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 in Section 1116 of ESEA.

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

Source – Initially, pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X102 that includes data group 652. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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 options to eligible students due to any of the following reasons:

1. All schools at a grade level 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	32
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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?* An LEA may consider a student as eligible for and participating in Title I public school choice, and may consider costs for transporting that student towards its funds spent on transportation for public school choice, if the student meets the following conditions:

   - Has a "home" or "neighborhood" school (to which the student would have been assigned, in the absence of a 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.[3]

b. *How do States report on public school choice for those LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice (e.g., LEAs in which all schools in a grade level are in school improvement, LEAs that have only a single school at that grade level, or LEAs whose schools are so remote from one another that choice is impracticable)?* For those LEAs, States should count as eligible all students who attend identified Title I schools. States should report that no eligible schools or students were provided the option to transfer and should provide an explanation why choice is not possible within the LEA in the Comment Section.

[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.

1.4.9.2.1 Schools with Students Eligible for Supplemental Educational Services

In the table below, provide the number of Title I schools identified as in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring whose students received supplemental educational services under Section 1116 of ESEA. A Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) section related to supplemental educational services is below the table.

	# Schools
Title I schools whose students received supplemental educational services	5
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly part of section 1.4.5.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

FAQ about supplemental education services

How should a State define the phrase "students who received supplemental educational services"? States should consider students who "received" supplemental educational services as those students who enrolled and participated in some hours of services. States have the discretion to determine the minimum number of hours of participation necessary for a student to have "received" 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	7486
Who applied for supplemental educational services	54
Who received supplemental educational services	48
Comments:	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X102 that includes data groups 578, 575, and 546. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly part of Section 1.4.5.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

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	$ 22992
Comments:	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X102, which includes data group 651. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.5 TEACHER QUALITY

This section collects data on "highly qualified" teachers as the term is defined in Section 9101(23) of the *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 each of the school types listed and the number of those core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified (as the term is defined in section 9101(23) of the *ESEA*) 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. The percentages used for high- and low-poverty schools and the poverty metric used to determine those percentages are reported in 1.5.3.

School Type	# of Core Academic Classes (Total)	# of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	# 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 schools	23523	23387	99.4	136	0.6
Elementary level					
High-poverty schools	1392	1391	99.9	1	0.1
Low-poverty schools	720	719	99.9	1	0.1
All elementary schools	4826	4822	99.9	4	0.1
Secondary level					
High-poverty schools	2499	2467	98.7	32	1.3
Low-poverty schools	6082	6038	99.3	44	0.7
All secondary schools	18697	18565	99.3	132	0.7
Comments:					

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.	No

If the answer above is no, please explain:

Data not available at this time because special education does not use core academic classes to determine highly qualified teacher status.

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.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: The data collection requirement to submit data for core classes taught by teachers who are NOT highly qualified has been added for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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 percent 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. See Question A-14 in the August 3, 2006, Non-Regulatory Guidance for additional information. Report classes in grade 6 though 8 consistent with how teachers have been classified to determine their highly qualified status, regardless 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 were 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 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. The poverty quartile breaks are reported later in this section.

h. *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. The poverty quartile breaks are reported later in this section.

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

In the table 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	50.0
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	
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	50.0
Other (please explain)	
Total	100.0

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

	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)	93.9
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	6.1
Other (please explain)	
Total	100.0
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

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	48.9	16.7
Poverty metric used	Free-reduced lunch.	
Secondary schools	49.1	16.7
Poverty metric used	Free-reduced lunch.	
Comments: Data are the same.		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

a. *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.

b. *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.

Throughout this section:

- "AYP grades" is sometimes used to reference grades used for accountability determinations (grades 3 through 8 and one year of high school)
- "Non-AYP grades" is used to reference grades not used for accountability determinations.

1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs (formerly 1.1. of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, provide the number of Title III subgrantees that use each type of language instruction educational program, as defined in Section 3301(8).

Note: Numbers reflected in 1.6.1 can be duplicative due to subgrantees' use of more than one type of program. The number for each type of program should be equal to or less than the total number of subgrantees in 1.6.4.1.

Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

1. **# Using Program =** Number of subgrantees that reported using a specific type of language instruction educational program. Subgrantees may use multiple programs. **(a.)** If multiple programs are used, count one for each program type used. **(b.)** Consortium is always counted as **one if all members used the same type of program**. If consortium members used different types of programs, count all members using the same type of program as one for each type. Do not count the members of the consortium individually as one, unless each member used a different type of program (e.g., use the same method of counting as one subgrantee using multiple types of programs in **(a.)**)
2. **Type of Program =** Type 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/expert/glossary.html.
3. **Other Language =** Name of the language of instruction, other than English, used in the program.
4. **% Language of Instruction =** Average percentages of English and the other language used as a language of instruction in the program or use the percentage of the most common practice in the State (applies **only** to the first five bilingual program types).
5. **OLOI =** Other Language of Instruction used in the bilingual language instruction educational program.

# Using Program	Type of Program	Other Language	% Language of Instruction	
			English	OLOI
	Dual language			
	Two-way immersion			
	Transitional bilingual			
	Developmental bilingual			
4	Heritage language			7.0
	Sheltered English instruction			
1	Structured English immersion			
12	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)			
4	Content-based ESL			
3	Pull-out ESL			
10	Other (explain)			
Comments: Other (explain): Supplemental Reading Assistance				

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.2 Student Demographic Data

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

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of the 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.	3537
Comments:	

Source – The SEA submits the data in file N/X116 that contains data group 648, category set A.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.2.2 Most Commonly Spoken Languages in the State

In the table below, provide the five most commonly spoken languages, other than English, in the State. The top five languages should be determined by the highest number of students speaking each of those languages listed.

Language	# LEP Students
Blackfeet	1383
Crow	1376
German	602
Dakota	574
Cheyenne	418

For additional significant languages please use comment box.

Comments: Data reflect language of impact. Students may not be active speakers of the language.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly in Section 1.6.3.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.6.3 Student Performance Data

This section collects data on LEP student English language proficiency and LEP academic content performance data (e.g., LEP tested in native language tables and MFLEP/AYP Grades results table).

1.6.3.1 Student English Language Proficiency Testing Status

This section collects data on the number of ALL LEP students and Title III-served LEP students in the State by testing status for English language proficiency.

1.6.3.1.1 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Testing Status

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of ALL LEP students in the State by testing status for English language proficiency. ALL LEP students includes the following students:

- Newly enrolled and continually enrolled LEP students in the State for the year of this report, whether or not they receive services in a Title III language Instruction educational program;
- All students assessed for English language proficiency (ELP) using an annual State English Language proficiency (ELP) assessment as required under Section 1111(b)(7) of the ESEA in the reporting year and who meet the LEP definition in Section 9101 (25).

Table 1.6.3.1.1. Definitions:

- **Tested/State Annual ELP =** Number of LEP students who took the annual State English language proficiency assessment as required under Section 1111(b)(7) of the *ESEA* in this reporting year.
- **Not Tested/State Annual ELP =** Number of LEP students enrolled at the time of testing but did not take the annual State English language proficiency assessment.
- **Subtotal =** Sum of "Tested/State Annual ELP" and "Not Tested/State Annual ELP" (i.e., the number of LEP students enrolled at the time of testing).
- **LEP/One Data Point =** Number of LEP students who took the annual State English language proficiency assessment as required under Section 1111(b)(7) for the first time in this reporting year. Note that "LEP/One Data Point" is a subset of those students reported as Tested on the annual State English Language proficiency assessment.

ALL LEP Testing Status	#
Tested/State annual ELP	6379
Not tested/State annual ELP	695
Subtotal	7074
LEP/One Data Point	6379
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.1.2 Title III Student English Language Proficiency Testing Status

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of Title III-served LEP students in the State by testing status for English language proficiency.

Table 1.6.3.1.2. Definitions:

- **Tested/State Annual ELP =** Number of LEP students in Title III language instruction educational programs who took the annual State English language proficiency assessment.
- **Not Tested/State Annual ELP =** Number of LEP students in Title III language instruction educational programs enrolled at the time of testing but did not take the annual State English language proficiency assessment.
- **Subtotal =** Sum of "Tested/State Annual ELP" and "Not Tested/State Annual ELP" (i.e., the number of LEP students in Title III language instruction educational programs enrolled at the time of testing).
- **LEP/One Data Point =** Number of LEP students in Title III language instructional programs who took the annual State English language proficiency assessment for the first time in this reporting year. Note that "LEP/One Data Point" is a subset of those students reported as Tested on the annual State English Language proficiency assessment.

Title III LEP Testing Status	#
Tested/State annual ELP	2874
Not tested/State annual ELP	665
Subtotal	3539
LEP/One Data Point	2874
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.2 Student English Language Proficiency Results

This section collects data on the results from the annual State English language proficiency assessment(s) for LEP students. Before completing Table 1.6.3.2.2 or 1.6.3.2.3, please indicate your State's use of the flexibility to apply annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) to all LEP students.

1.6.3.2.1 Application of Title III English Language Proficiency Annual Assessment and AMAOs (formerly 1.6.8 of the Title III Biennial Collection, reformatted)

In the table below, indicate the State application of the following:

State applied the Title III English language proficiency annual assessment to all LEP students in LEAs receiving Title III funds.	Yes
State applied the annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) to ALL LEP students in LEAs receiving Title III funds.	No
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.2.2 All LEP English Language Proficiency Results

Please report information in this section **ONLY** if the State checked "Yes" in section 1.6.3.2.1 (row 2), that annual measurable achievement objectives are applied to all LEP students in LEAs receiving Title III funds.

Report the results from the annual State English language proficiency assessment(s) for ALL LEP students in grades K through 12.

Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:

1. **Making Progress =** Number of LEP students who met the definition of "Making Progress" as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
2. **No Progress =** Number of LEP students who did not meet the State definition of "Making Progress."
3. **ELP Attainment =** Number of LEP students who attained English language proficiency as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
4. **Target =** AMAO target for the year as established by the State and submitted to OELA in the CSA (September 2003 submission), or as amended, for each of "Making Progress" and "Attainment" of ELP.
5. **Results =** Number and percent of LEP students who met the State definition of "Making Progress" and the definition of "Attainment" of English language proficiency.
6. **Met/Y =** Met the annual target, "Met/N" = did not meet annual target. This cell will be automatically populated, based on the Target % and the Results %.

	Target	Results		Met
	%	#	%	Y/N
Making progress				
No progress				
ELP attainment				
Comments: AMAOs have not been established.				

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

If a State does not count "ELP attainment" students as also "Making Progress", the number for "No Progress" should be the "Subtotal" in 1.6.3.1.1 minus the number "Making Progress" and "Attainment." If a State counts "ELP attainment" students as also "Making Progress", the number for "No Progress" should be the "Subtotal" in 1.6.3.1.1 minus "Making Progress".

1.6.3.2.3 Title III LEP English Language Proficiency Results

Please report information in this section **ONLY** if the State checked "No" in section in 1.6.3.2.1 (row 2), reporting that annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) are applied to LEP students served by Title III.

In the table below, provide the results from the annual State English language proficiency assessment for Title III LEP students who participated in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12.

Table 1.6.3.2.3 Definitions:

1. **Making Progress =** Number of Title III LEP students who met the definition of "Making Progress" as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
2. **No Progress =** Number of Title III LEP students who did not meet the State definition of "Making Progress."
3. **ELP Attainment =** Number of Title III LEP students who attained English language proficiency as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
4. **Target =** AMAO target for the year as established by the State and submitted to OELA in the CSA (September 2003 submission), or as amended, for each of "Making Progress" and "Attainment" of ELP.
5. **Results =** Number and percent of Title III LEP students who met the State definition of "Making Progress" and the definition of "Attainment" of English language proficiency.
6. **Met/Y =** Met the annual target, "Met/N" **=** did not meet annual target. This cell will be automatically populated, based on the Target % and the Results %.

	Target	**Results**		**Met**
	%	**#**	**%**	**Yes/No**
Making progress				
No progress				
ELP attainment				
Comments: AMAOs have not been established.				

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

If a State does not count "ELP attainment" students as also "Making Progress", the number for "No Progress" should be the "Subtotal" in 1.6.3.1.2 minus the number "Making Progress" and "Attainment." If a State counts "ELP attainment" students as also "Making Progress", the number for "No Progress" should be the "Subtotal" in 1.6.3.1.2 minus "Making Progress".

1.6.3.4 LEP Subgroup Academic Content Assessment Results (formerly 3.2.3/MFLEP of the Title III Biennial Collection)

This section collects data on the academic content assessment results for LEP students.

1.6.3.4.1 LEP Subgroup Flexibility

In the table below, report whether the State exercises the LEP flexibility afforded States through the new regulation for monitored former LEP (MFLEP), in AYP determination.

MFLEP	No
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.4.3 Status of Monitored Former LEP Students (MFLEP) (formerly 3.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection, modified)

In the table below, report the unduplicated count of MFLEP students in K-12 for each of the two years monitored during the SY 2006-07, which includes both MFLEP students in AYP grades and in non-AYP grades in row 1 and MFLEP students only in AYP grades in row 2.

Table 1.6.3.4.3 Definitions:

1. **Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) includes:**
   - Students that have transitioned into classrooms that are not designed for LEP students;
   - Students that are no longer receiving LEP services; and who are being monitored for academic content achievement for 2 years after transition.
2. **Total MFLEP =** State aggregated number of all MFLEP students in grades K through 12.
3. **MFLEP/AYP Grades =** State aggregated number of MFLEP students in grades used for accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school). These students may be included in the LEP subgroup AYP calculations.

	#
Total MFLEP	212
MFLEP/AYP grades	187
Comments:	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X126, which contains data group 668, category set A. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.4.4 LEP Students in Non-AYP Grades (formerly 2.3 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the total number of LEP students in grade ranges that were not tested for AYP in SY 2006-07.

Table 1.6.3.4.4 Definitions:

1. **LEP K-2 =** All LEP students in these grades. Do not include pre-K students.
2. **LEP HS/Non-AYP =** High school students (grades 9 through 12 or 10 through 12 [State specific]) who are in the high school grades that are not tested for AYP in the State (e.g., if the State tested grade 10 for AYP, then the State should provide the aggregated number of LEP students in grades 9, 11 and 12).
3. **LEP Other Grades =** Number of LEP students enrolled in public schools but not in grades K through 12. Students in non-graded grades or grade spans. Do not report LEP students in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school) in this row.

Grade	#
LEP K-2	1784
LEP HS/Non-AYP	1554
LEP other grades	13
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments

This section collects data on LEP students assessed in their native language.

1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language (formerly 2.4.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

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

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

* If "No", proceed to 1.6.3.6.

1.6.3.5.2 Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given (formerly 2.4.2 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the language(s) in which native language assessments are given at each grade used for NCLB accountability determinations for mathematics.

Grade	Language
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
HS	
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.5.3 Native Language of Reading/Language Arts Tests Given (formerly 2.4.2 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the language(s) in which native language assessments are given at each grade used for NCLB accountability determinations for reading/language arts.

Grade	Language
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
HS	
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.5.4 Native Language Version of State *NCLB* Mathematics Assessment Results (formerly 2.4.3 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the number of LEP students who took a mathematics assessment in their native language across all grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school).

Table 1.6.3.5.4 Definitions:

1. **# Tested =** Number of LEP students in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school) who took the native language version of the mathematics assessment.
2. **# At or Above Proficient =** Number of students tested through the native language version of the mathematics assessment who scored at or above proficient.
3. **% Results =** Automatically calculated based on the number who scored at or above proficient divided by the number tested.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results
Comments:		

Source – Initially pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X049 that is data group 272, category set A. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.5.5 Native Language Version of State *NCLB* Reading/Language Arts Assessment Results (formerly 2.4.3 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the number of LEP students who took a reading/language arts assessment in their native language across all grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school).

Table 1.6.3.5.5 Definitions:

1. **# Tested =** Number of LEP students in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school) who took the native language version of the reading/language arts assessment.
2. **# At or Above Proficient =** Number of students tested through the native language version of the reading/language arts assessment who scored at or above proficient.
3. **% Results =** Automatically calculated based on the number who scored at or above proficient divided by the number tested.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results
Comments:		

Source – Initially pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X049 that is data group 272, category set A. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP Students

This section collects data on the performance of former LEP students.

1.6.3.6.1 Title III Served MFLEP Students by Year Monitored (formerly 3.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

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.

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
212		212
Comments: Student data system was established in 2006.		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.6.2 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students in AYP Grades Results for Mathematics (formerly 3.2 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the number of monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students who took the annual mathematics assessment.

Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:

1. **# Tested =** State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in mathematics for AYP.
2. **# At or Above Proficient =** State-aggregated number of MFLELP 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. This will be automatically calculated.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
71	32	45.1	

The number tested should be the same or near the total in 1.6.3.4.3 row 2, if not explain the difference in the comment box below.

Comments: These figures refelect former LEP students served in Title III.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.6.3 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students in AYP Grades Results for Reading/Language Arts (formerly 3.2 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, provide the number of monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students who took the annual reading/language arts assessment.

Table 1.6.3.6.3 Definitions:

1. **# Tested =** State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in reading/language arts for AYP.
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
71	47	66.2	

The number tested should be the same or near the total in 1.6.3.4.3 row 2, if not explain the difference in the comment box below.

Comments: These figures reflect former LEP students served in Title III.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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 (formerly 4.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the number of Title III subgrantees meeting the criteria described in the table. Use the same method of counting consortia as in 1.6.1 (consortia regardless of number of members is only counted as one). 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. The total of the # met all three AMAOs + # met 2 AMAOs only + # Met one AMAO + # Met zero AMAOs=total # of subgrantees for the year.

Note: Do not include number of subgrants made under Section 3114(d)(1) reserved funds 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	15
Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	0
Number of subgrantees that met only 2 AMAOs	0
Number of subgrantees that met AMAOs of Making Progress and ELP Attainment	0
Number of subgrantees that met AMAOs of Making Progress and AYP	0
Number of subgrantees that met AMAOs of ELP Attainment and AYP	0
Number of subgrantees that met only 1 AMAO	0
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO of Making Progress	0
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO of Attainment of ELP	0
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO AYP	4
Number of subgrantees that did not meet any AMAOs	0
Number of subgrantees that did not meet AMAOs for two consecutive years	0
Number of subgrantees with an improvement plan for not meeting Title III AMAOs	0
Number of subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (beginning in SY 2007-08)	0
Comments: AMAOs have not been established.	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly in section 1.6.10 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.6.4.2 State Accountability (formerly 4.2 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

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.

State met all three Title III AMAOs	No
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly in Section 1.6.10 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.6.4.3 Termination of Title III Language Instruction Educational Programs (formerly 6.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

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

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students (formerly 5.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

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 the State and 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 in 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 LIEPs under Sections 3114(a) & 3115(a) ONLY.
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 LIEP subgrants made under Sections 3114(a) & 3115(a) that have immigrant students enrolled in them.

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants
365	92	7

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

Comments:

Source – Initially, the first column of the table is pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X045 that contains data group 519, grand total. The second and third columns are manual entry by the SEA.

Note: This table was formerly in section 1.6.4 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.6.5.2 Distribution of Immigrant Funds (formerly 5.3 of the Title III Biennial Collection, reformatted)

In the table below, report how the State distributes the funds reserved for the education of immigrant children and youth to subgrantees.

Subgrant award cycle			
Annual	No	Multi-year	Yes
Type of subgrant awarded			
Competitive	No	Formula	Yes

If the State checked more than one item in each category, explain in the comment box.

Comments:

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development

This section collects data on teachers in Title III language instruction education programs.

1.6.6.1 Teacher Information (formerly 7.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection, modified)

In the table below, report the number of teachers who are working in the Title III language instruction educational programs as defined in Section 3301(8) and reported in table 1.6.1 (Types of language instruction educational programs).

Note: Section 3301(8) – The term 'Language instruction educational program' means an instruction course – (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 and a second language.

	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	24
Number of certified/licensed/endorsed ESL/BE teachers in the state currently working with LEP students (e.g., ESL/BE teachers for ALL LEP students), if the State has such requirements. Or number of teachers with professional development points or course work in ESL/BE, if the State does not require such certification/licensure/endorsement.	5
Estimate number of **additional** certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	10

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

Comments:

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

* 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 (PD) Activities of Subgrantees Related to the Teaching and Learning of LEP Students
(formerly 7.4 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, provide the number of professional development activities that specifically address only the teaching of LEP students or are related to the learning of LEP students. These professional development activities must meet the requirements of the Title III subgrantee required activities.

Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:

1. **Types of Professional Development Activity =** Subgrantee activities for professional development 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 (PD) activities reported.
4. **Total =** Number of all participants in PD activities.

Type of Professional Development Activity	# Subgrantees	
Instructional strategies for LEP students	15	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students		
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students		
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards		
Subject matter knowledge for teachers		
Other (Explain in comment box)		
Participant Information	**# Subgrantees**	**# Participants**
PD provided to content classroom teachers	15	
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	15	
PD provided to principals		
PD provided to administrators/other than principals		
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	5	
PD provided to community-based organization personnel		
Total		
Comments: Type of Professional Development Activity - Category - Other: Participant numbers unavailable.		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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 2006-07 funds July 1, 2006, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2006, for SY 2006-07 programs. Then the "# of days/$$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/$$ Distribution
07/07/06	08/28/06	52
Comments:		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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 time of distribution is reasonable and is now coordinated through the electronic grants (E-Grants) system of the SEA.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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	0
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

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 2005-06). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	84.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	64.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	93.2
Black, non-Hispanic	86.3
Hispanic	75.9
White, non-Hispanic	87.2
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	
Limited English proficient	
Economically disadvantaged	
Migratory students	
Male	83.6
Female	85.9
Comments: Percent change is due to small numbers of students and different cohorts from year to year.	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X041 that is data group 563, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

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.

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 2005-06). Below the table is an FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Dropout Rate
All Students	2.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	5.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	0.7
Black, non-Hispanic	4.0
Hispanic	3.5
White, non-Hispanic	2.1
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	
Limited English proficient	
Economically disadvantaged	
Migratory students	
Male	2.7
Female	2.3
Comments: Percent change is due to small numbers of students and different cohorts from year to year.	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

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	324	198
LEAs with subgrants	5	5
Total	329	203
Comments:		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly Section 1.9.1.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

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)	0	66
K	100	63
1	120	76
2	115	66
3	130	65
4	140	61
5	150	45
6	125	47
7	120	55
8	115	45
9	100	34
10	100	32
11	80	25
12	70	21
Ungraded	5	31
Total	1470	732
Comments:		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly section 1.9.1.3 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

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	693	295
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	471	253
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	156	98
Hotels/Motels	150	86
Total	1470	732
Comments:		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly section 1.9.1.4 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

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)	66
K	63
1	76
2	66
3	65
4	61
5	45
6	47
7	55
8	45
9	34
10	32
11	25
12	21
Ungraded	31
Total	732
Comments:	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X043 that is data group 560, category set A. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

1.9.2.2 Subpopulations 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	49
Migratory children/youth	43
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	85
Limit English proficient students	42
Comments:	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X043 that is data group 560, category sets B, C, D, and E. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly Sections 1.9.2.3, 1.9.2.4, and 1.9.2.5 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. For the SY 2006-07 CSPR, the data collection has been changed to show the total number of students served.

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
1. Tutoring or other instructional support	3
2. Expedited evaluations	2
3. Staff professional development and awareness	5
4. Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	4
5. Transportation	3
6. Early childhood programs	1
7. Assistance with participation in school programs	5
8. Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	3
9. Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	5
10. Parent education related to rights and resources for children	3
11. Coordination between schools and agencies	5
12. Counseling	3
13. Addressing needs related to domestic violence	3
14. Clothing to meet a school requirement	0
15. School supplies	3
16. Referral to other programs and services	5
17. Emergency assistance related to school attendance	3
18. Other (optional)	0
19. Other (optional)	0
20. Other (optional)	0
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly Section 1.9.2.6 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

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
1. Eligibility for homeless services	0
2. School Selection	2
3. Transportation	0
4. School records	0
5. Immunizations	1
6. Other medical records	1
7. Other Barriers	1
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly Section 1.9.2.7 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. Immunizations and Other Medical Records have been changed to two separate data collections for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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 *NCLB* 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 *NCLB*.

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Reading Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	52	47
4	48	45
5	38	32
6	39	37
7	41	40
8	41	39
High School	28	23
Comments: Montana does not collect these data in EDEN at this time.		

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category set G. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly part of section 1.9.2.9 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. Grades 9 through 12 have been changed to High School for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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 *NCLB* mathematics assessment.

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Mathematics Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	52	42
4	48	37
5	38	32
6	39	28
7	40	31
8	41	39
High School	25	24
Comments: Montana does not collect these data in EDEN at this time.		

Source – Similar to 1.9.2.5.1 but the file specification is N/X075 that is data group 583, category set G.

Note: This table was formerly part of section 1.9.2.9 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. Grades 9 through 12 have been changed to High School for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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, 2006 through August 31, 2007. 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 in Section 1.10.3.4 *Quality Control Processes.*

Please note that 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:

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.

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, 2006 through August 31, 2007. 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)	140
K	71
1	86
2	63
3	73
4	93
5	88
6	94
7	92
8	72
9	105
10	82
11	74
12	27
Ungraded	7
Out-of-school	17
Total	1184
Comments:	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X121 that is data group 634, Subtotal 1. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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%.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Category 1 Child Count is less than 10% greater than last year's Category 1 Child Count. (6% increase)

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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, 2006 through August 31, 2007. 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)	132
K	62
1	68
2	52
3	58
4	76
5	70
6	80
7	77
8	58
9	88
10	74
11	63
12	8
Ungraded	5
Out-of-school	8
Total	979
Comments:	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X122 that is data group 635, Subtotal 1. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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%.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Category 2 Child Count is less than 10% greater than last year's Category 2 Child Count.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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 (2005-06); it was used for both the Category 1 and Category 2 Child Count for the 2006-07 submission.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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.

Core eligibility, family history and demographic data are collected throughout the state by a cadre of temporary and/or part-time, highly trained local identification and recruitment specialists; additionally, full-time, statewide recruitment is provided by Rural Employment Opportunities, Inc. (REO) staff funded by the SEA who collect update and maintain these data during off-season times and/or in non-project areas between September 1 and August 31 of the eligibility period in coordination and consultation with the state Migrant Education Director and Data Management Specialist. These recruiters provide a foundation for the SEA's overall Identification and Recruitment process by finding, identifying and enrolling migrant children; confirming their eligibility; maintaining accurate data for unique identification, residency and enrollment, and conducting a variety of electronic and manual data checks. The SEA has also adopted a system of reinterviewing families on a random basis to ensure that eligibility determinations which have been made are accurate and in full compliance with the Statute and Non-Regulatory Guidance. These re-interviews are performed by trained temporary staff who have not been involved in the original eligibility determinations.

After intensive and ongoing training, recruiters use a standardized interview format to complete a Certificate of Eligibility (COE) for each qualifying family, recording the name, birth date, birthplace, race, grade, gender and other demographic and extensive eligibility information for each child and family. After review at the Local Operating Agency (LOA) by the site director, the original of the COE is sent to the state MEP office in Helena, Montana for review and verification by the state Migrant Data Specialist and the state Migrant Director. Copies are kept on file in local project areas and given as well to the family at the time of their withdrawal from school when possible. The COE serves another purpose beyond documentation of eligibility for every child determined to qualify for the MEP in Montana by providing the mechanism for data entry into the comprehensive database called the New Generation System. 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. NGS also provides each student with a unique identification number, pertinent school history, academic information and/or supportive service(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, because of the large number of children currently migrating from Washington to Montana during the summer months the State Migrant Data Specialist receives yearly training in Washington regarding the Migrant Student Data and Recruitment (MSDR) system which is used in Washington state and which is no longer a part of the NGS consortium. Educational and health data for the nearly 600 students from Washington state were entered into the MSDR system in order to comply with the mandate for timely record transfer and to facilitate identification and recruitment of these students in that state. For the few remaining states from which Montana receives migrant students and which are outside of the NGS consortium records are faxed/sent to the succeeding schools when that information is known. In addition to electronic transfer, families are given hard copy withdrawal forms which indicate the nature and extent of educational and health services provided by the Montana MEP.

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, birth date 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 on-going basis; these reports are disseminated to the LOAs for cross-checking 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. 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 cross-checked 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 cross-checking purposes and the newly initiated CNAPS (see description below) system provides yet another review of data at the SEA level. 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 telephone. 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 cross-checked 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 cross checking is performed manually at the SEA where the data specialist and the migrant director compare reports generated by both 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.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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 COE serves another purpose beyond documentation of eligibility for every child determined to qualify for the MEP in Montana by providing the mechanism for data entry into the comprehensive database called the New Generation System. 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 service(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 because of the large numbers of children currently migrating from Washington to Montana during the summer months the state Migrant Data Specialist receives yearly training in Washington regarding the Migrant Student Data and Recruitment (MSDR) system which is used in Washington State and which is no longer a part of the NGS consortium. Educational and health data for the nearly 600 students from Washington state were entered into the MSDR system in order to comply with the mandate for timely record transfer and to facilitate identification and recruitment of these students in that state. For the few remaining states from which Montana receives migrant students and which are outside of the NGS consortium records are faxed/sent to the succeeding schools when that information is known. In addition to electronic transfer families are given hard copy withdrawal forms which indicate the nature and extent of educational and health services provided by the Montana Migrant Education Program.

<u>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.</u>

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 through the collection of the core eligibility family history and demographic data collected by trained recruiters through a direct family interview and documented on a Certificate of Eligibility (COE). Data then are entered into the NGS database by trained data entry personnel and reviewed by local and state administrators.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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; and
- 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 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 birth date 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 cross-checked 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 twelve-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 2006-07 school year option YR1 = 2006 and YR2 = 2007. 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 2006-07 YR3 = 2003. The data for the count is retrieved by 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.

Birth Date 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 birth date or enrollment is less than birth date and withdrawal date is greater than birth date or residency verification date between 9/1/YR1 and 8/31/YR2 and greater than birth date.

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.

Birth Date 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 birth date or enrollment is less than birth date and withdrawal date is greater than birth date or residency verification date between 9/1/YR1 and 8/31/YR2 and greater than birth date.

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.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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 PL 107-110 Part C 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 birth date 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 on-going 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 cross-checked 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 cross checking purposes and the newly initiated CNAPS (see description below) system provides yet another review of data at the SEA level. 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 cross checked 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 cross checking is performed manually at the SEA where the data specialist and the migrant director compare reports generated by both 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 program functions through a Web-based system called CNAPS created by a Montana MEP staff person. The CNAPS data collection Web site serves as a centralized customizable location for the Montana Migrant Education Program to collect aggregate and report information needs and priority for services which might not be reflected in NGS. Specifically the system: provides a place to record a wide range of student specific needs assessment factors for each project which has been given a subgrant by the OPI MEP as detailed in the Montana MEP Consolidated Application and in compliance with the prioritization point system as outlined in the State's Service Delivery Plan; allows users to differentiate between regular and summer term students; allows users to upload files containing the student lists from NGS or Washington state system; analyzes data for MEP state office as per the SEA subgranting formula; and conforms to usability standards.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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.

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 that on a random basis each year one LOA's COE's and interview protocols would be selected for scrutiny. The number of COEs selected for re-interviewing will depend upon the number of children in the project and the type of mobility patterns that the families conform to. Following is a summary report which presents an overview of the process used by the Montana MEP through its year-round Identification and Recruitment agency Rural Employment and Opportunities Inc. (a nonprofit sub grantee). On file at the SEA but not included in this report are all the attachments including the re-interview sample lists and interviewer notes.

TIMELINE

The interviews were conducted in Dillon on October 26 and 27 2006.

SAMPLE Selection

The Montana MEP requested that REO conduct interviews with parents of 10% (or no fewer than three) of the students identified in 2005-2006

22 children reported by the Dillon LOA in its 2005-2006 child count were included in the re-interview pool listed on a master table and assigned a unique re-interview identification number. Other relevant data such as the student's MEP identification number date of birth and enrollment site were also included on the master table. Before selecting a random sample three children from one family were removed from the pool and the master table because this family had been selected for re-interview in 2005.

The students remaining on the master list were ordered via Excel's random number generator. The desired number of re-interviews for Dillon was 3 since 10% of the remaining 19 students provided too small a sample for the purposes of the re-interviewing. Four students were chosen in order to give interviewers an alternate in case a family were to refuse or were unable to give an interview. Every fourth student in the random order was chosen for re-interview.

PROCEDURES

A staff member of REO was assigned the task of conducting the re-interviews. He was provided with training and conducted interviews using standard interview procedures and forms. The interviews were conducted in person with one or more of the available parents. The results of each re-interview were recorded on a standard re-interview form including one attempted interview in which the father declined. The interviewer provided supplemental notes to report extended comments of the parent or guardian or to report observations. Copies of these forms and the supplemental notes are attached.

RESULTS

Number of interviews attempted: 4

Number of interviews completed: 3

Number of questioned eligibility determinations: 1

SUMMARY OF PROBLEMS UNCOVERED

The eligibility for MEP services of one of the three families re-interviewed seemed questionable based on that family's responses to the interviewer's questions. The eligibility determination affecting two children was based on the father's irrigation work on area ranches and the family's annual move from Mexico to Dillon. However in the re-interview the father described his ranch work as "permanent" and their time spent in Mexico as "vacation" which would not qualify the family for services. After further scrutiny and follow-up questions conducted by the SEA it was decided that the eligibility determination for these two children was not valid even though the worker was not employed on a 12 month basis at the ranch and that the children moved with the worker to Mexico and back to Dillon Montana.

Because the words "vacation" and "permanent" were used by the worker an exact following of the regulations was adhered to in order to provide an absolute standard for the recruiter and the children were summarily removed from the child count and from the Migrant Education Program in which they were participating. Further training was then conducted for the recruiter in this project site (this recruiter was new to the MEP program during the 2006 program year) on two different occasions. A full report including attachments and re-interviewer's notes are available at the SEA.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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 attend 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 service(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. Additional data checks are performed when data is entered into the CNAPS AIM and ACCESS systems as described in the previous section.

No consolidation of data occurs.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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 on-going 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 cross checking 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 on-going basis to cross-check accuracy of data entry. Such reports may include Unique Student Number COE/family and age/grade reports to spot check accuracy of data. In addition further veracity is assured by the re-checking of all data entered into NGS when it is uploaded into the CNAPS system; data is also scrutinized before its entry into the state student identification system AIM.

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.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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 on-going 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.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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 this child count or underlying determinations as has been respectfully and truthfully submitted in this report.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
1			Area(s) in which school missed AYP							
2			Reading/Language Arts		Mathematics		Other Academic Indicator			
3 4	District Name & NCES/CCD ID Code	School Name & NCES/CCD ID Code	Proficiency Target	Participation Rate Target Met (Y/N)	Proficiency Target	Participation Rate Target Met (Y/N)	Academic Indicator (elementary/ middle schools)	Graduation Rate (high school)	School Improvement Status for SY 2007-08	Title I School (Yes/No)
5 6										
7	Anaconda H S NCES 3002030	Anaconda High School NCES 00015	Y	Y	N	Y	NA	Y	Yr1	Yes
8	Ashland Elem NCES 3000008	Ashland 7-8 NCES 01051	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	ImYr1	Yes
9	Ashland Elem NCES 3000008	Ashland School NCES 00023	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	NA	ImYr2	Yes
10	Billings Elem NCES 3003870	Castle Rock 7-8 NCES 00869	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	NA	ImYr1	No
11	Billings H S NCES 3003900	Billings Sr High School NCES 00090	N	Y	N	Y	NA	Y	Yr1	Yes
12	Boulder Elem NCES 3004380	Boulder 7-8 NCES 00989	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	NA	Yr1	Yes
13	Box Elder Elem NCES 3004440	Box Elder School NCES 00103	N	Y	N	Y	Y	NA	Yr1	Yes
14	Brockton Elem NCES 3005010	Barbara Gilligan 7-8 NCES 01046	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	RYr4	Yes
15	Brockton H S NCES 3005040	Brockton High School NCES 00125	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	RYr5	Yes
16	Browning Elem NCES 3005140	Browning Middle School NCES 00872	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	NA	RYr5	Yes
17	Browning Elem NCES 3005140	K W Bergan School NCES 00131	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	RYr5	Yes
18	Browning Elem NCES 3005140	Napi School NCES 00132	N	Y	N	Y	Y	NA	RYr5	Yes
19	Browning Elem NCES 3005140	Vina Chattin School NCES 00134	N	Y	N	Y	Y	NA	RYr5	Yes
20	Browning H S NCES 3005190	Browning High School NCES 00136	N	N	N	N	NA	Y	RYr5	Yes
21	Butte Elem NCES 3005280	East Middle School NCES 00905	N	Y	N	Y	Y	NA	CYr1	Yes
22	Butte H S NCES 3005310	Butte High School NCES 00156	N	Y	Y	Y	NA	Y	Yr1	Yes
23	Columbia Falls H S NCES 3007140	Columbia Falls High Schl NCES 00203	Y	Y	Y	Y	NA	N	Yr1	Yes
24	Dodson Elem NCES 3009090	Dodson 7-8 NCES 01028	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Yr1	Yes
25	Dodson Elem NCES 3009090	Dodson School NCES 00260	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	ImYr1	Yes
26	Dodson H S NCES 3009120	Dodson High School NCES 00261	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Yr1	Yes
27	Flathead H S NCES 3015420	Flathead High School NCES 00470	Y	N	Y	Y	NA	Y	Yr1	Yes
28	Flathead H S NCES 3015420	Kalispell Jr High School 9th NCES 00476	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Yr1	No
29	Frazer Elem NCES 3011420	Frazer 7-8 NCES 01072	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	RYr5	Yes
30	Frazer Elem NCES 3011420	Frazer Elementary NCES 00310	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	RYr4	Yes
31	Frazer H S NCES 3011460	Frazer High School NCES 00311	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	RYr5	Yes
32	Glasgow K-12 Schools NCES 3012420	Glasgow 4-6 School NCES 01071	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	NA	Yr1	Yes
33	Great Falls Elem NCES 3013040	East Middle School NCES 00882	N	Y	N	Y	Y	NA	ImYr1	Yes
34	Great Falls Elem NCES 3013040	Longfellow School NCES 00363	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	NA	Yr1	Yes
35	Great Falls Elem NCES 3013040	North Middle School NCES 00883	N	Y	N	Y	Y	NA	Yr1	No
36	Great Falls H S NCES 3013050	C M Russell High School NCES 00379	N	Y	Y	Y	NA	Y	Yr1	No
37	Great Falls H S NCES 3013050	Great Falls High School NCES 00380	Y	Y	N	Y	NA	N	ImYr1	Yes
38	Hardin Elem NCES 3013310	Crow Agency School NCES 00392	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	NA	RYr5	Yes
39	Hardin Elem NCES 3013310	Hardin Intermediate NCES 00395	N	Y	N	Y	Y	NA	CYr1	Yes
40	Hardin Elem NCES 3013310	Hardin Middle School NCES 00394	N	Y	N	Y	Y	NA	RYr1	Yes
41	Hardin Elem NCES 3013310	Hardin Primary NCES 00396	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	CYr1	Yes

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
42	Hardin H S NCES 3013340	Hardin High School NCES 00397	N	Y	N	Y	NA	N	RYr1	Yes
43	Harlem Elem NCES 3013395	Harlem 7-8 NCES 00909	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	NA	ImYr2	Yes
44	Harlem Elem NCES 3013395	Harlem Elementary School NCES 00399	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	NA	ImYr1	Yes
45	Harlowton Elem NCES 3013440	Hillcrest School NCES 00401	N	Y	N	Y	Y	NA	Yr1	Yes
46	Havre Elem NCES 3013560	Havre Middle School NCES 00406	N	Y	N	Y	Y	NA	Yr1	Yes
47	Havre Elem NCES 3013560	Sunnyside School NCES 00410	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	NA	Yr1	Yes
48	3013660	Hays-Lodge Pole High Sch NCES 00413	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	RYr5	Yes
49	Heart Butte K-12 Schools NCES 3000099	Heart Butte 7-8 NCES 01031	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	RYr5	Yes
50	Heart Butte K-12 Schools NCES 3000099	Heart Butte High School NCES 00924	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	RYr5	Yes
51	Helena Elem NCES 3000005	C R Anderson Middle Schl NCES 00886	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	NA	ImYr1	No
52	Helena Elem NCES 3000005	Helena Middle School NCES 00885	N	Y	N	Y	Y	NA	ImYr1	No
53	Helena H S NCES 3013830	Capital High School NCES 00429	N	Y	N	Y	NA	Y	Yr1	No
54	Helena H S NCES 3013830	Helena High School NCES 00430	N	N	N	Y	NA	Y	ImYr1	Yes
55	Kalispell Elem NCES 3015450	Kalispell Jr High School 8th NCES 00086	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	NA	Yr1	Yes
56	Kalispell Elem NCES 3015450	Russell School NCES 00475	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	NA	Yr1	Yes
57	Lame Deer Elem NCES 3016050	Lame Deer 7-8 NCES 01049	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	NA	RYr5	Yes
58	Lame Deer Elem NCES 3016050	Lame Deer School NCES 00494	N	N	N	N	Y	NA	RYr5	Yes
59	Lame Deer H S NCES 3000095	Lame Deer High School NCES 00137	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	RYr4	Yes
60	Libby K-12 Schools NCES 3016530	Libby High School NCES 00518	Y	Y	Y	Y	NA	N	Yr1	Yes
61	Lincoln County H S NCES 3016770	Lincoln Co High School NCES 00521	Y	Y	N	Y	NA	Y	Yr1	Yes
62	Lodge Grass Elem NCES 3017010	Lodge Grass 7-8 NCES 00931	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	NA	RYr5	Yes
63	Lodge Grass Elem NCES 3017010	Lodge Grass School NCES 00533	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	NA	RYr5	Yes
64	Lodge Grass H S NCES 3017040	Lodge Grass High School NCES 00534	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	RYr4	Yes
65	Lolo Elem NCES 3017130	Lolo Middle School NCES 00821	N	Y	N	Y	Y	NA	Yr1	Yes
66	Miles City Elem NCES 3018410	Washington 7-8 NCES 00561	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	NA	Yr1	Yes
67	Missoula Elem NCES 3018570	Lowell School NCES 00574	N	Y	N	Y	Y	NA	Yr1	Yes
68	Missoula Elem NCES 3018570	Meadow Hill Middle School NCES 00575	N	Y	N	Y	Y	NA	ImYr1	No
69	Missoula Elem NCES 3018570	Porter Middle School NCES 00565	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	NA	ImYr1	Yes
70	Missoula H S NCES 3018540	Big Sky High School NCES 00824	N	N	N	N	NA	Y	Yr1	Yes
71	Mountain View Elem NCES 3000004	Mountain View Elementary NCES 00899	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Yr1	No
72	Plains H S NCES 3020850	Plains High School NCES 00623	Y	Y	Y	Y	NA	N	Yr1	Yes
73	Plenty Coups H S NCES 3013360	Plenty Coups High School NCES 00398	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	RYr5	Yes
74	Poplar Elem NCES 3021240	Poplar 5-6 School NCES 01044	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	NA	RYr5	Yes
75	Poplar Elem NCES 3021240	Poplar 7-8 NCES 00636	N	Y	N	Y	Y	NA	RYr5	Yes
76	Poplar Elem NCES 3021240	Poplar School NCES 00637	N	Y	N	Y	Y	NA	CYr1	Yes
77	Pryor Elem NCES 3021720	Pryor 7-8 NCES 00930	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	RYr4	Yes
78	Pryor Elem NCES 3021720	Pryor Elem School NCES 00647	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	ImYr1	Yes
79	Rocky Boy Elem NCES 3022750	Rocky Boy 7-8 NCES 00986	N	Y	N	Y	Y	NA	RYr4	Yes
80	Rocky Boy H S NCES 3028911	Rocky Boy High School NCES 01086	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	RYr5	Yes
81	Ronan Elem NCES 3022790	K William Harvey Elem NCES 00669	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	NA	Yr1	Yes
82	Shelby H S NCES 3023910	Shelby High School NCES 00694	Y	Y	N	Y	NA	Y	Yr1	Yes
83	Sylvanite Elem NCES 3025800	Sylvanite School NCES 00733	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Yr1	No
84	Townsend K-12 Schools NCES 3004980	Townsend 7-8 NCES 00935	Y	N	Y	N	Y	NA	Yr1	Yes

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
85	Wolf Point Elem NCES 3028590	Northside School NCES 00796	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	NA	RYr2	Yes
86	Wolf Point Elem NCES 3028590	Southside School NCES 00797	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	NA	CYr1	Yes
87	Wolf Point Elem NCES 3028590	Wolf Point 7-8 NCES 00798	N	Y	N	Y	Y	NA	RYr1	Yes
88	Wolf Point H S NCES 3028620	Wolf Point High School NCES 00799	N	Y	N	Y	NA	N	CYr1	Yes
89	Wyola Elem NCES 3028800	Wyola School NCES 00804	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	RYr5	Yes
90										
91	**School Improvement Status**	**AYP Status Description**								
92	Yr1	1st Year did not make AYP (Watch List)								
93	CYr1	Identified for Corrective Action								
94	CYr2	2nd Year Identified for Corrective Action								
95	CYr3	3rd Year Identified for Corrective Action								
96	CYr4	4th Year Identified for Corrective Action								
97	CYr5	5th Year Identified for Corrective Action								
98	CYr6	6th Year Identified for Corrective Action								
99	ImYr1	1st Year Identified for Improvement								
100	ImYr2	2nd Year Identified for Improvement								
101	ImYr3	3rd Year Identified for Improvement								
102	ImYr4	4th Year Identified for Improvement								
103	ImYr5	5th Year Identified for Improvement								
104	RYr1	1st Year Identified for Restructuring								
105	RYr2	2nd Year Identified for Restructuring								
106	RYr3	3rd Year Identified for Restructuring								
107	RYr4	4th Year Identified for Restructuring								
108	RYr5	5th Year Identified for Restructuring								

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
1	District Name & NCES/CCD ID Code	**Area(s) in Which District Missed AYP**						District Improvement Status for SY 2006-07	District Receiving Title I Funds (Y/N)
2		Reading/Language Arts		Mathematics		Other Academic Indicator			
3		Proficiency Target	Participation Rate Target Met (Y/N)	Proficiency Target	Participation Rate Target Met (Y/N)	Academic Indicator (elementary/ middle schools)	Graduation Rate (high school)		
4									
5									
6									
7	Anaconda H S NCES 3002030	Y	Y	N	Y	NA	Y	Yr1	Y
8	Ashland Elem NCES 3000008	N	Y	N	Y	Y	NA	CYr2	Y
9	Billings Elem NCES 3003870	N	Y	N	Y	Y	NA	CYr1	Y
10	Billings H S NCES 3003900	N	Y	N	Y	NA	Y	CYr1	Y
11	Bonner Elem NCES 3004260	N	Y	N	Y	Y	NA	Yr1	Y
12	Box Elder Elem NCES 3004440	N	Y	N	Y	Y	NA	CYr5	Y
13	Brockton Elem NCES 3005010	N	Y	N	N	Y	NA	CYr5	Y
14	Brockton H S NCES 3005040	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	CYr6	Y
15	Browning Elem NCES 3005140	N	Y	N	Y	Y	NA	CYr6	Y
16	Browning H S NCES 3005190	N	N	N	N	NA	Y	CYr6	Y
17	Butte Elem NCES 3005280	N	Y	N	Y	Y	NA	CYr1	Y
18	Butte H S NCES 3005310	N	Y	Y	Y	NA	Y	Yr1	Y
19	Centerville Elem NCES 3025130	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	NA	Yr1	Y
20	Columbia Falls Elem NCES 3007110	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	NA	ImYr1	Y
21	Columbia Falls H S NCES 3007140	Y	Y	Y	Y	NA	N	Yr1	Y
22	Corvallis K-12 Schools NCES 3007410	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Yr1	Y
23	Culbertson Elem NCES 3007830	N	Y	N	Y	Y	NA	ImYr1	Y
24	Cut Bank Elem NCES 3000003	N	Y	N	Y	Y	NA	Yr1	Y
25	Deer Lodge Elem NCES 3008670	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	NA	ImYr1	Y
26	DeSmet Elem NCES 3008880	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	NA	Yr1	Y
27	Dodson Elem NCES 3009090	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	ImYr1	Y
28	Dodson H S NCES 3009120	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Yr1	Y
29	Dutton/Brady K-12 Schools NCES 3000102	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	NA	ImYr1	Y
30	Flathead H S NCES 3015420	Y	N	Y	Y	NA	Y	Yr1	Y
31	Frazer Elem NCES 3011420	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	NA	CYr6	Y
32	Frazer H S NCES 3011460	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	CYr6	Y
33	Great Falls Elem NCES 3013040	N	Y	N	Y	Y	NA	CYr1	Y

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
34	Great Falls H S NCES 3013050	N	Y	N	Y	NA	Y	ImYr1	Y
35	Hamilton K-12 Schools NCES 3013260	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	ImYr1	Y
36	Hardin Elem NCES 3013310	N	Y	N	Y	Y	NA	CYr2	Y
37	Hardin H S NCES 3013340	N	Y	N	Y	NA	N	CYr2	Y
38	Harlem Elem NCES 3013395	N	Y	N	Y	Y	NA	CYr5	Y
39	Harlowton Elem NCES 3013440	N	Y	N	Y	Y	NA	Yr1	Y
40	Havre Elem NCES 3013560	N	Y	N	Y	Y	NA	CYr1	Y
41	Hays-Lodge Pole K-12 Schls NCES 3013660	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	CYr6	Y
42	Heart Butte K-12 Schools NCES 3000099	N	Y	N	Y	Y	NA	CYr6	Y
43	Helena Elem NCES 3000005	N	Y	N	Y	Y	NA	CYr1	Y
44	Helena H S NCES 3013830	N	N	N	Y	NA	Y	ImYr1	Y
45	Lame Deer Elem NCES 3016050	N	N	N	N	Y	NA	CYr5	Y
46	Lame Deer H S NCES 3000095	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	CYr5	Y
47	Laurel Elem NCES 3016200	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	NA	CYr1	Y
48	Libby K-12 Schools NCES 3016530	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Yr1	Y
49	Lincoln County H S NCES 3016770	Y	Y	N	Y	NA	Y	Yr1	Y
50	Lodge Grass Elem NCES 3017010	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	NA	CYr6	Y
51	Lodge Grass H S NCES 3017040	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	CYr5	Y
52	Lolo Elem NCES 3017130	N	Y	N	Y	Y	NA	Yr1	Y
53	Miles City Elem NCES 3018410	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	NA	Yr1	Y
54	Missoula Elem NCES 3018570	N	Y	N	Y	Y	NA	CYr1	Y
55	Missoula H S NCES 3018540	N	N	N	N	NA	Y	CYr1	Y
56	Mountain View Elem NCES 3000004	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Yr1	N
57	Plains H S NCES 3020850	Y	Y	Y	Y	NA	N	Yr1	Y
58	Plenty Coups H S NCES 3013360	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	CYr6	Y
59	Poplar Elem NCES 3021240	N	Y	N	Y	Y	NA	CYr6	Y
60	Pryor Elem NCES 3021720	N	Y	N	Y	N	NA	CYr5	Y
61	Rocky Boy Elem NCES 3022750	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	NA	CYr6	Y
62	Rocky Boy H S NCES 3028911	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	CYr6	Y
63	Ronan Elem NCES 3022790	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	NA	Yr1	Y
64	Shelby Elem NCES 3023900	N	Y	N	Y	Y	NA	ImYr1	Y
65	Shelby H S NCES 3023910	N	Y	N	Y	NA	Y	Yr1	Y
66	Sylvanite Elem NCES 3025800	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Yr1	N
67	Wolf Point Elem NCES 3028590	N	Y	N	Y	Y	NA	CYr2	Y
68	Wolf Point H S NCES 3028620	N	Y	N	Y	NA	N	CYr1	Y
69									
70									

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
71	**District Improvement Status**	**AYP Status Description**							
72	Yr1	1st Year did not make AYP (Watch List)							
73	CYr1	Identified for Corrective Action							
74	CYr2	2nd Year Identified for Corrective Action							
75	CYr3	3rd Year Identified for Corrective Action							
76	CYr4	4th Year Identified for Corrective Action							
77	CYr5	5th Year Identified for Corrective Action							
78	CYr6	6th Year Identified for Corrective Action							
79	ImYr1	1st Year Identified for Improvement							
80	ImYr2	2nd Year Identified for Improvement							
81	ImYr3	3rd Year Identified for Improvement							
82	ImYr4	4th Year Identified for Improvement							
83	ImYr5	5th Year Identified for Improvement							
84	RYr1	1st Year Identified for Restructuring							
85	RYr2	2nd Year Identified for Restructuring							
86	RYr3	3rd Year Identified for Restructuring							
87	RYr4	4th Year Identified for Restructuring							
88	RYr5	5th Year Identified for Restructuring							