

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT:
Parts I and II**

for
STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS
under the
ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT
As amended in 2001

For reporting on
School Year 2016-17

MONTANA



PART I DUE THURSDAY, DECEMBER 14, 2017
PART II DUE THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 2018

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202

INTRODUCTION

Sections 9302 and 9303 of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)*, as amended in 2001 provide to States the option of applying for and reporting on multiple *ESEA* programs through a single consolidated application and report. Although a central, practical purpose of the Consolidated State Application and Report is to reduce "red tape" and burden on States, the Consolidated State Application and Report are also intended to have the important purpose of encouraging the integration of State, local, and *ESEA* programs in comprehensive planning and service delivery and enhancing the likelihood that the State will coordinate planning and service delivery across multiple State and local programs. The combined goal of all educational agencies—State, local, and Federal—is a more coherent, well-integrated educational plan that will result in improved teaching and learning. The Consolidated State Application and Report includes the following *ESEA* programs:

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

The *ESEA* Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2016-17 consists of two Parts, Part I and Part II.

PART I

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

- | **Performance Goal 1:** By SY 2016-17, all students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.
- | **Performance Goal 2:** All limited English proficient students will become proficient in English and reach high academic standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.
- | **Performance Goal 3:** By SY 2005-06, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.
- | **Performance Goal 4:** All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free, and conducive to learning.
- | **Performance Goal 5:** All students will graduate from high school.

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

PART II

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

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

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 2016-17 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Thursday, December 14, 2017**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Thursday, February 15, 2018**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2016-17, 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 2016-17 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 2016-17 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

		OMB Number: 1810-0724
		Expiration Date: 5/31/2018
Consolidated State Performance Report For State Formula Grant Programs under the Elementary And Secondary Education Act as amended in 2001		
Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2016-17 <input type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2016-17		
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: Tim Tharp, Deputy State Superintendent		
Telephone: (406) 444-7325		
Fax: (406) 444-2893		
e-mail: tim.tharp@mt.gov		
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Elsie Arntzen, State Superintendent		
		<u>Wednesday, February 28, 2018, 5:34:22 PM</u>
Signature		Date

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART I**

For reporting on
School Year 2016-17



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 14, 2017
5PM EST**

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

This section requests descriptions of the State's implementation of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)*, as amended, 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

Indicate below whether your state has made or is planning to make revisions to or change the State's academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science since the State's content standards were most recently approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. If yes, indicate specifically in what school year your State implemented or will implement the revisions or changes.

Response	Options
<u>State has revised or changed</u>	No revisions or changes to academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science made or planned.
	State has revised or changed its academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science or is planning to make revisions to or change its academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Indicate below the year these changes were or will be implemented or "Not Applicable" to indicate that changes were not made or will not be made in the subject area.

Acceptable responses are a school year (e.g., 2016-17) or Not Applicable.

Academic Content Standards	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Academic Content Standards	N/A	N/A	SY 2017-18

If the responses above do not fully describe revisions or changes to your State's academic content standards, describe the revisions or changes below.

The response is limited to 1,000 characters.

The Montana Office of Public Instruction did not revise mathematics or reading/language arts standards. Science standards implementation was July 1, 2017.

1.1.1.1 Academic Achievement Standards in Mathematics, Reading/Language Arts and Science

Indicate below whether your state has changed or is planning to change the State's academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science since the State's academic achievement standards were most recently approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. If yes, indicate specifically in what school year your State implemented or will implement the changes.

As applicable, include changes to academic achievement standards based on any assessments (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*.

Response	Options
<u>No Revisions or changes</u>	No revisions or changes to academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science made or planned.
	State has changed its academic achievement standards or is planning to change its academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Indicate below either the school year in which these changes were or will be implemented or "Not Applicable" to indicate that changes were not made or will not be made in the subject area.

Acceptable responses are a school year (e.g., 2016-17) or Not Applicable.

Academic Achievement Standards for	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Regular Assessments in Grades 3-8	N/A	N/A	N/A
Regular Assessments in High School	N/A	N/A	N/A
Alternate Assessments Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards (if applicable)	N/A	N/A	N/A
Alternate Assessments Based on Modified Achievement Standards (if applicable)	N/A	N/A	N/A
Alternate Assessments Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	N/A	N/A	N/A

If the responses above do not fully describe revisions or changes to your State's academic achievement standards, describe the revisions or changes below.

The response is limited to 1,000 characters.

Montana has no comments to offer.

1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics, Reading/Language Arts and Science

Indicate below whether your state has changed or is planning to change the States academic assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts or science since the States academic assessments were most recently approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. If yes, indicate specifically in what school year your State implemented or will implement the changes.

As applicable, include any assessments (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.

Response	Options
<p><u>No Revisions or changes</u></p>	<p>No changes to assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts or science made or planned.</p>
	<p>State has changed or is planning to change its assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Indicate below the year these changes were implemented or "Not Applicable" to indicate that changes were not made or will not be made in the subject area.</p>

Acceptable responses are a school year (e.g., 2016-17) or Not Applicable.

Academic Assessments	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Regular Assessments in Grades 3-8	N/A	N/A	N/A
Regular Assessments in High School	N/A	N/A	N/A
Alternate Assessments Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards (if applicable)	N/A	N/A	N/A
Alternate Assessments Based on Modified Achievement Standards (if applicable)	N/A	N/A	N/A
Alternate Assessments Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	N/A	N/A	N/A

If the responses above do not fully describe revisions or changes to your State's academic achievement standards, describe the revisions or changes below.

The response is limited to 1,000 characters.

Montana has no comments to offer.

1.1.3 Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities**1.1.3.1 Percentages of Funds Used for Standards and Assessment Development and Other Purposes**

For funds your State had available under *ESEA* section 6111 (Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities) during SY 2016-17, estimate what percentage of the funds your State used for the following (round to the nearest ten percent).

Purpose	Percentage (rounded to the nearest ten percent)
To pay the costs of the development of the State assessments and standards required by Section 1111(b)	30.00
To administer assessments required by Section 1111(b) or to carry out other activities described in section 6111 and other activities related to ensuring that the State's schools and local educational agencies are held accountable for the results	70.00
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. No comment	

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

For funds your State had available under *ESEA* section 6111 (Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities) during SY 2016-17 that were used for purposes other than the costs of the development of the State assessments and standards required by section 1111(b), for what purposes did your State use the funds? (Enter "yes" for all that apply and "no" for all that do not apply).

Purpose	Used for Purpose (yes/no)
Administering assessments required by Section 1111(b)	<u>Yes</u>
Developing challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards and aligned assessments in academic subjects for which standards and assessments are not required by Section 1111(b)	<u>No</u>
Developing or improving assessments of English language proficiency necessary to comply with Section 1111(b)(7)	<u>Yes</u>
Ensuring the continued validity and reliability of State assessments, and/or refining State assessments to ensure their continued alignment with the State's academic content standards and to improve the alignment of curricula and instructional materials	<u>Yes</u>
Developing multiple measures to increase the reliability and validity of State assessment systems	<u>No</u>
Strengthening the capacity of local educational agencies and schools to provide all students the opportunity to increase educational achievement, including carrying out professional development activities aligned with State student academic achievement standards and assessments	<u>Yes</u>
Expanding the range of accommodations available to students with limited English proficiency and students with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) to improve the rates of inclusion of such students, including professional development activities aligned with State academic achievement standards and assessments	<u>Yes</u>
Improving the dissemination of information on student achievement and school performance to parents and the community, including the development of information and reporting systems designed to identify best educational practices based on scientifically based research or to assist in linking records of student achievement, length of enrollment, and graduation over time	<u>Yes</u>
Other	<u>No</u>
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. No comment	

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENT ²

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

Note: States are not required to report these data by the racial/ethnic groups shown in the table below; instead, they are required to report these data by the major racial and ethnic groups that are identified in their Accountability Workbooks. The charts below display racial/ethnic data that have been mapped from the major racial and ethnic groups identified in their workbooks to the racial/ethnic groups shown.

² The "Asian/Pacific Islander" row in the tables below represent either the value reported by the state to the Department of Education for the major racial and ethnic group "Asian/Pacific Islander" or an aggregation of values reported by the state for the major racial and ethnic groups "Asian" and "Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander or Pacific Islander" (and "Filipino" in the case of California). When the values reported in the Asian/Pacific Islander row represent the U. S. Department of Education aggregation of other values reported by the state, the detail for "Asian" and Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander" are also included in the following rows. Disaggregated reporting for assessment participation data is done according to the provisions outlined within each state's Accountability Workbook. Accordingly, not every state uses major racial and ethnic groups which enable detail of Asian American/Pacific Islander (AAPI) populations.

1.2.1 Participation of All Students in Mathematics Assessment

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

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	78,676	76,436	97.15
American Indian or Alaska Native	10,518	9,946	94.56
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,322	1,275	96.44
Asian	999	969	97.00
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	323	306	94.74
Black or African American	1,298	1,254	96.61
Hispanic or Latino	3,593	3,475	96.72
White	61,945	60,486	97.64
Two or more races	0	0	0.00
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	10,263	9,394	91.53
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,889	1,729	91.53
Economically disadvantaged students	36,825	35,399	96.13
Migratory students	230	221	96.09
Male	40,496	39,240	96.90
Female	38,180	37,196	97.42

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The data was verified and is correct. We do not collect data for "two or more races."

1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities (*IDEA*) in Mathematics Assessment

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	4,373	46.55
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	4,285	45.61
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	736	7.83
Total	9,394	////////////////////////////////////

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. No comment

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	78,676	74,664	94.90
American Indian or Alaska Native	10,518	9,484	90.17
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,322	1,246	94.25
Asian	999	952	95.30
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	323	294	91.02
Black or African American	1,298	1,229	94.68
Hispanic or Latino	3,593	3,385	94.21
White	61,945	59,320	95.76
Two or more races	0	0	0.00
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	10,263	8,187	79.77
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,889	1,606	85.02
Economically disadvantaged students	36,825	34,143	92.72
Migratory students	230	211	91.74
Male	40,496	38,145	94.19
Female	38,180	36,519	95.65

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Data was verified and is correct. There were state-wide guidance issues with the read aloud accommodation that reduced participation. We do not collect data for "two or more races."

1.2.3.1 Recently Arrived LEP Students Taking ELP Assessments in Lieu of Reading/Language Arts Assessments

In the table below, provide the number of recently arrived LEP students (as defined in 34 C.F.R. Part 200.6(b)(4)) included in the participation counts in 1.2.3 who took an assessment of English language proficiency in lieu of the State's reading/language arts assessment, as permitted under 34 C.F.R. Part 200.20.

Recently Arrived LEP Students	#
Recently arrived LEP students who took an assessment of English language proficiency in lieu of the State's reading/language arts assessment	6

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

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

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

Note: For this question only, report on students with disabilities (IDEA) who are also LEP students in the U.S. less than 12 months who took the ELP in lieu of the statewide reading/language arts assessment.

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	5,376	65.67
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	2,085	25.47
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	726	8.87
LEP < 12 months, took ELP	0	0.00
Total	8,187	//////

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. No comment

1.2.5 Participation of All Students in the Science Assessment

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	33,252	32,487	97.70
American Indian or Alaska Native	4,224	4,001	94.72
Asian or Pacific Islander	559	551	98.57
Asian	419	416	99.28
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	140	135	96.43
Black or African American	516	500	96.90
Hispanic or Latino	1,505	1,460	97.01
White	26,448	25,975	98.21
Two or more races	0	0	0.00
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	4,256	4,062	95.44
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	733	680	92.77
Economically disadvantaged students	14,644	14,188	96.89
Migratory students	99	97	97.98
Male	17,129	16,714	97.58
Female	16,123	15,773	97.83

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The data was verified and is correct. Montana does not collect data for "two or more races."

1.2.6 Participation of Students with Disabilities (IDEA) in Science Assessment

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	1,916	47.17
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	1,814	44.66
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	332	8.17
Total	4,062	////////////////////////////////////

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The data was verified and is correct.

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT³

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

Note: States are not required to report these data by the racial/ethnic groups shown in the table below; instead, they are required to report these data by the major racial and ethnic groups that are identified in their Accountability Workbooks. The charts below display racial/ethnic data that have been mapped from the major racial and ethnic groups identified in their workbooks to the racial/ethnic groups shown.

1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics

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

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

1.3.2 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 States reading/language arts assessment, and the difference noted in the paragraph below.

The student group "limited English proficient (LEP) students" does not include recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months and who took an assessment of English language proficiency in lieu of the States reading/language arts assessment. Do not include former LEP students.

1.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science

This section is similar to 1.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the States science assessment administered at least once in each of the following grade spans: 3 through 5, 6 through 9, and 10 through 12.

Limited English Proficient (LEP) students include recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months. Do not include former LEP students.

³ The "Asian/Pacific Islander" row in the tables below represent either the value reported by the state to the Department of Education for the major racial and ethnic group "Asian/Pacific Islander" or an aggregation of values reported by the state for the major racial and ethnic groups "Asian" and "Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander or Pacific Islander" (and "Filipino" in the case of California). When the values reported in the Asian/Pacific Islander row represent the U. S. Department of Education aggregation of other values reported by the state, the detail for "Asian" and Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander" are also included in the following rows. Disaggregated reporting for assessment participation data is done according to the provisions outlined within each state's Accountability Workbook. Accordingly, not every state uses major racial and ethnic groups which enable detail of Asian American/Pacific Islander (AAPI) populations.

1.3.1.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	11,792	5,614	47.61
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,682	388	23.07
Asian or Pacific Islander	206	118	57.28
<i>Asian</i>	160	96	60.00
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	46	22	47.83
Black or African American	230	79	34.35
Hispanic or Latino	530	195	36.79
White	9,144	4,834	52.87
Two or more races	0	0	0.00
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,476	337	22.83
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	406	42	10.34
Economically disadvantaged students	6,079	2,180	35.86
Migratory students	34	11	32.35
Male	6,027	2,916	48.38
Female	5,765	2,698	46.80

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Montana's data for IDEA increased by 8-10% due to increased QA. Other numbers are within routine variation. Montana does not collect data for "two or more races."

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

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	11,173	5,475	49.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,511	360	23.83
Asian or Pacific Islander	198	104	52.53
<i>Asian</i>	155	89	57.42
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	43	15	34.88
Black or African American	222	77	34.68
Hispanic or Latino	504	195	38.69
White	8,738	4,739	54.23
Two or more races	0	0	0.00
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,078	273	25.32
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	351	30	8.55
Economically disadvantaged students	5,655	2,130	37.67
Migratory students	32	9	28.12
Male	5,647	2,539	44.96
Female	5,526	2,936	53.13

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Montana's data for IDEA increased by 8-10% due to increased QA. Other numbers are within routine variation. There were state-wide guidance issues with the read aloud accommodation that reduced participation. Montana does not collect data for "two or more races."

1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
<i>Asian</i>			
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Montana does not collect data for achievement in science for Grade 3. Montana provides science assessments for Grades 4, 8, and 10 only.

1.3.1.2 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	11,460	5,116	44.64
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,530	304	19.87
Asian or Pacific Islander	191	101	52.88
<i>Asian</i>	142	80	56.34
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	49	21	42.86
Black or African American	181	50	27.62
Hispanic or Latino	568	203	35.74
White	8,990	4,458	49.59
Two or more races	0	0	0.00
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,406	268	19.06
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	336	18	5.36
Economically disadvantaged students	5,775	1,853	32.09
Migratory students	34	10	29.41
Male	5,904	2,718	46.04
Female	5,556	2,398	43.16

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Montana's data for IDEA increased by 8-10% due to increased QA. Other numbers are within routine variation. Montana does not collect data for "two or more races."

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

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	10,793	5,328	49.37
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,357	321	23.66
Asian or Pacific Islander	180	101	56.11
<i>Asian</i>	133	81	60.90
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	47	20	42.55
Black or African American	169	64	37.87
Hispanic or Latino	532	224	42.11
White	8,555	4,618	53.98
Two or more races	0	0	0.00
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	984	250	25.41
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	288	17	5.90
Economically disadvantaged students	5,300	1,964	37.06
Migratory students	29	10	34.48
Male	5,496	2,522	45.89
Female	5,297	2,806	52.97

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Montana's data for IDEA increased by 8-10% due to increased QA. Other numbers are within routine variation. There were state-wide guidance issues with the read aloud accommodation that reduced participation. Montana does not collect data for "two or more races."

1.3.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	11,557	8,247	71.36
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,555	656	42.19
Asian or Pacific Islander	196	141	71.94
<i>Asian</i>	143	107	74.83
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	53	34	64.15
Black or African American	187	103	55.08
Hispanic or Latino	571	376	65.85
White	9,048	6,971	77.04
Two or more races	0	0	0.00
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,504	717	47.67
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	348	68	19.54
Economically disadvantaged students	5,859	3,533	60.30
Migratory students	34	19	55.88
Male	5,978	4,356	72.87
Female	5,579	3,891	69.74

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Montana's data for IDEA increased by 8-10% due to increased QA. Other numbers are within routine variation. Montana does not collect data for "two or more races."

1.3.1.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	11,455	4,596	40.12
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,557	265	17.02
Asian or Pacific Islander	190	97	51.05
<i>Asian</i>	140	75	53.57
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	50	22	44.00
Black or African American	212	57	26.89
Hispanic or Latino	522	139	26.63
White	8,974	4,038	45.00
Two or more races	0	0	0.00
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,436	213	14.83
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	253	24	9.49
Economically disadvantaged students	5,697	1,634	28.68
Migratory students	33	9	27.27
Male	5,895	2,468	41.87
Female	5,560	2,128	38.27

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Montana's data for IDEA increased by 8-10% due to increased QA. Other numbers are within routine variation. Montana does not collect data for "two or more races."

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

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	10,893	5,849	53.70
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,424	384	26.97
Asian or Pacific Islander	176	113	64.20
<i>Asian</i>	134	90	67.16
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	42	23	54.76
Black or African American	205	91	44.39
Hispanic or Latino	496	195	39.31
White	8,592	5,066	58.96
Two or more races	0	0	0.00
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,036	225	21.72
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	223	21	9.42
Economically disadvantaged students	5,301	2,139	40.35
Migratory students	27	10	37.04
Male	5,550	2,674	48.18
Female	5,343	3,175	59.42

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Montana's data for IDEA increased by 8-10% due to increased QA. Other numbers are within routine variation. There were state-wide guidance issues with the read aloud accommodation that reduced participation. Montana does not collect data for "two or more races."

1.3.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
<i>Asian</i>			
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Montana does not collect data for science assessment for Grade 5. Montana provides science assessments for Grades 4,8, and 10 only.			

1.3.1.4 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	10,953	4,146	37.85
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,501	268	17.85
Asian or Pacific Islander	183	104	56.83
<i>Asian</i>	143	90	62.94
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	40	14	35.00
Black or African American	183	39	21.31
Hispanic or Latino	536	137	25.56
White	8,550	3,598	42.08
Two or more races	0	0	0.00
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,479	167	11.29
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	219	16	7.31
Economically disadvantaged students	5,290	1,402	26.50
Migratory students	29	8	27.59
Male	5,598	2,069	36.96
Female	5,355	2,077	38.79

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Montana's data for IDEA increased by 8-10% due to increased QA. Other numbers are within routine variation. Montana does not collect data for "two or more races."

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

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	10,982	5,325	48.49
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,499	366	24.42
Asian or Pacific Islander	183	124	67.76
<i>Asian</i>	143	102	71.33
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	40	22	55.00
Black or African American	182	60	32.97
Hispanic or Latino	538	218	40.52
White	8,580	4,557	53.11
Two or more races	0	0	0.00
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,482	209	14.10
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	219	15	6.85
Economically disadvantaged students	5,300	1,901	35.87
Migratory students	30	9	30.00
Male	5,611	2,311	41.19
Female	5,371	3,014	56.12

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. There were state-wide guidance issues with the read aloud accommodation that reduced participation. Montana does not collect data for "two or more races."

1.3.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
<i>Asian</i>			
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Montana does not collect data for science assessment for Grade 6. Montana provides science assessments for Grades 4, 8, and 10 only.			

1.3.1.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	10,956	4,400	40.16
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,462	213	14.57
Asian or Pacific Islander	179	101	56.42
<i>Asian</i>	129	81	62.79
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	50	20	40.00
Black or African American	166	43	25.90
Hispanic or Latino	484	135	27.89
White	8,665	3,908	45.10
Two or more races	0	0	0.00
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,401	150	10.71
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	249	8	3.21
Economically disadvantaged students	4,982	1,307	26.23
Migratory students	28	4	14.29
Male	5,591	2,235	39.97
Female	5,365	2,165	40.35

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Montana's data for IDEA increased by 8-10% due to increased QA. Other numbers are within routine variation. Montana does not collect data for "two or more races."

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

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	10,985	5,798	52.78
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,472	345	23.44
Asian or Pacific Islander	181	120	66.30
<i>Asian</i>	131	90	68.70
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	50	30	60.00
Black or African American	167	63	37.72
Hispanic or Latino	482	212	43.98
White	8,683	5,058	58.25
Two or more races	0	0	0.00
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,412	210	14.87
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	253	12	4.74
Economically disadvantaged students	5,000	1,932	38.64
Migratory students	30	9	30.00
Male	5,607	2,547	45.43
Female	5,378	3,251	60.45

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Montana's data for IDEA increased by 8-10% due to increased QA. Other numbers are within routine variation. There were state-wide guidance issues with the read aloud accommodation that reduced participation. Montana does not collect data for "two or more races."

1.3.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
<i>Asian</i>			
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Montana does not collect data for science assessment for Grade 7. Montana provides science assessments for Grades 4, 8, and 10 only.			

1.3.1.6 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	10,683	3,854	36.08
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,335	180	13.48
Asian or Pacific Islander	186	81	43.55
<i>Asian</i>	142	67	47.18
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	44	14	31.82
Black or African American	165	26	15.76
Hispanic or Latino	476	126	26.47
White	8,521	3,441	40.38
Two or more races	0	0	0.00
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,353	118	8.72
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	203	6	2.96
Economically disadvantaged students	4,755	1,134	23.85
Migratory students	39	9	23.08
Male	5,503	1,866	33.91
Female	5,180	1,988	38.38

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Montana's data for IDEA increased by 8-10% due to increased QA. Other numbers are within routine variation. Montana does not collect data for "two or more races."

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

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	10,698	5,133	47.98
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,341	305	22.74
Asian or Pacific Islander	188	110	58.51
<i>Asian</i>	143	91	63.64
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	45	19	42.22
Black or African American	165	57	34.55
Hispanic or Latino	474	183	38.61
White	8,530	4,478	52.50
Two or more races	0	0	0.00
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,351	170	12.58
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	207	7	3.38
Economically disadvantaged students	4,764	1,702	35.73
Migratory students	39	16	41.03
Male	5,510	2,159	39.18
Female	5,188	2,974	57.32

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. There were state-wide guidance issues with the read aloud accommodation that reduced participation. Montana does not collect data for "two or more races."

1.3.3.6 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	10,740	7,186	66.91
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,355	497	36.68
Asian or Pacific Islander	187	141	75.40
<i>Asian</i>	142	113	79.58
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	45	28	62.22
Black or African American	160	80	50.00
Hispanic or Latino	480	260	54.17
White	8,558	6,208	72.54
Two or more races	0	0	0.00
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,368	451	32.97
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	214	21	9.81
Economically disadvantaged students	4,797	2,593	54.05
Migratory students	40	20	50.00
Male	5,535	3,679	66.47
Female	5,205	3,507	67.38

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Montana's data for IDEA increased by 8-10% due to increased QA. Other numbers are within routine variation. Montana does not collect data for "two or more races."

1.3.1.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - High School

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	9,137	3,059	33.48
American Indian or Alaska Native	879	117	13.31
Asian or Pacific Islander	140	67	47.86
<i>Asian</i>	113	58	51.33
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	27	9	33.33
Black or African American	117	21	17.95
Hispanic or Latino	359	74	20.61
White	7,642	2,780	36.38
Two or more races	0	0	0.00
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	843	71	8.42
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	63	0	0.00
Economically disadvantaged students	2,821	550	19.50
Migratory students	24	7	29.17
Male	4,722	1,659	35.13
Female	4,415	1,400	31.71

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Last year, Montana did not report proficiency data except for students taking the alternate assessment in high school. Montana does not collect data for "two or more races."

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

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	9,138	4,485	49.08
American Indian or Alaska Native	880	204	23.18
Asian or Pacific Islander	140	83	59.29
<i>Asian</i>	113	70	61.95
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	27	13	48.15
Black or African American	117	45	38.46
Hispanic or Latino	359	130	36.21
White	7,642	4,023	52.64
Two or more races	0	0	0.00
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	844	119	14.10
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	63	2	3.17
Economically disadvantaged students	2,821	912	32.33
Migratory students	24	7	29.17
Male	4,723	2,018	42.73
Female	4,415	2,467	55.88

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Last year, Montana did not report proficiency data except for students taking the alternate assessment in high school. There were state-wide guidance issues with the read aloud accommodation that reduced participation. Montana does not collect data for "two or more races."

1.3.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Science - High School

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	10,201	4,697	46.04
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,093	189	17.29
Asian or Pacific Islander	168	86	51.19
<i>Asian</i>	131	74	56.49
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	37	12	32.43
Black or African American	155	39	25.16
Hispanic or Latino	410	136	33.17
White	8,375	4,247	50.71
Two or more races	0	0	0.00
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,200	195	16.25
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	118	1	0.85
Economically disadvantaged students	3,538	1,036	29.28
Migratory students	23	14	60.87
Male	5,207	2,490	47.82
Female	4,994	2,207	44.19

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Montana's data for IDEA increased by 8-10% due to increased QA. Other numbers are within routine variation. Montana does not collect data for "two or more races."

1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY

This section collects data on accountability.

1.4.4.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for schools in corrective action, provide the number of schools for which the listed corrective actions under *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2016-17 (based on SY 2015-16 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2016-17
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	29
Extension of the school year or school day	
Replacement of staff members, not including the principal, 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: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. no comment	

1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2

In the table below, for schools in restructuring – year 2 (implementation year), provide the number of schools for which the listed restructuring actions under *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2016-17 (based on SY 2015-16 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Restructuring Action	# of Title I Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	
Reopening the school as a public charter school	
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	
Takeover the school by the State	
Other major restructuring of the school governance	20
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. no comment	

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Curriculum is based on Montana Common Core Standards.

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Achievement problems of districts identified for improvement or corrective action were addressed through the Montana Office of Public Instruction (OPI) School Support Unit and the Instructional Innovations Units. Two unit directors, four instructional specialists, and two coordinators worked collaboratively with superintendents, principals, teachers, and support staff to design and implement a systems approach to school improvement that is grounded in evidence for successful schools. The Montana Literacy Plan and the Montana Mathematics Plan were used as frameworks and utilized the seven components: (1) Instructional Leadership, (2) Standards, (3) Instruction and Intervention, (4) Assessment and Data-based Decision Making, (5) Professional Development, (6) System-wide Commitment, and (7) Community and Family Involvement in a Continuous Improvement Cycle. The cycle to assess current status, develop and implement a plan, monitor the effectiveness of the plan, and revise and refine the plan based on the data allowed the OPI instructional specialists and national consultants to meet the schools where they were and develop action plans to achieve necessary steps to accomplish the goals set by the School Leadership Team (SLT). The SLT met monthly to look at data and revise the action plan while determining what is needed for effective teaching and learning and to move the achievement needle.

1.4.5.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for districts in corrective action, provide the number of districts in corrective action in which the listed corrective actions under *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2016-17 (based on SY 2015-16 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Corrective Action	# of Districts receiving Title I funds in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2016-17
Implemented a new curriculum based on State standards	100
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	0
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	0
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 of districts abolished between the end of SY 2015-16 and beginning of SY 2016-17 as a corrective action)	0
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. No comment	

1.4.8 Sections 1003(a) and (g) School Improvement Funds

In the section below, "schools in improvement" refers to Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of *ESEA*.

1.4.8.5 Use of Sections 1003(a) and (g) School Improvement Funds.**1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations**

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2016 (SY 2016-17) Title I, Part A allocation that the SEA reserved in accordance with Section 1003(a) of *ESEA* and §200.100(a) of ED's regulations governing the reservation of funds for school improvement under Section 1003(a) of *ESEA*: 4.00 %

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. No comment

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

The data for this question are reported through *EDFacts* files and compiled in the EDEN012 "Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Allocations to LEAs and Schools" report in the *EDFacts* Reporting System (ERS). The *EDFacts* files and data groups used in this report are listed in the CSPR Crosswalk. The CSPR Data Key contains more detailed information on how the data are populated into the report.

Before certifying Part I of the CSPR, a state user must run the EDEN012 report in ERS and verify that the state's data are correct. The final, certified data from this report will be made publicly available alongside the state's certified CSPR PDF.

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

Section 1003(g)(8) of *ESEA* allows States to reserve up to five percent of Section 1003(g) funds for administration and to meet the evaluation and technical assistance requirements for this program. In the space below, identify and describe the specific Section 1003(g) evaluation and technical assistance activities that your State conducted during SY 2016-17.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The evaluation and technical assistant activities that Montana conducted during the SY 2016-17 were are follows.
Reviewing applications, design and implementation of a continuous improvement cycle, and using data to determine teaching and learning needs to ensure districts were expending funds according to their stated improvement goals and action plans. Monthly onsite monitoring from Montana Office of Public Instruction instructional specialists and national consultants provided additional support to improve instructional strategies and improve achievement.
Monitoring visits will include the use of the Comprehensive Needs Assessment results leading to an action plan that has steps to achieve the goals using the continuous improvement cycle: (1) assess needs, (2) select relevant evidence-based interventions, (4) create a plan for implementation, (4) implement and monitor the plan, and (5) reflect and revise the plan.

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

In the space below, describe actions (if any) taken by your State in SY 2016-17 that were supported by **funds other than Sections 1003(a) and 1003(g) funds** to address the achievement problems of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Sections 1116 of *ESEA*.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

None.

1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

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

1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational program

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

Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

1. **Types of Programs** = Types of programs described in the subgrantee's local plan (as submitted to the State or as implemented) that is closest to the descriptions in http://www.ncela.us/files/rcd/BE021775/Glossary_of_Terms.pdf.
2. **Other Language** = Name of the language of instruction, other than English, used in the programs.

Check Types of Programs	Type of Program	Other Language
<u>No</u>	Dual language	
<u>Yes</u>	Two-way immersion	Blackfeet, Crow
<u>No</u>	Transitional bilingual	
<u>No</u>	Developmental bilingual	
<u>Yes</u>	Heritage language	Crow, Blackfeet, Chippewa, or Cree
<u>No</u>	Sheltered English instruction	////////////////////////////////////
<u>No</u>	Structured English immersion	////////////////////////////////////
<u>No</u>	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)	////////////////////////////////////
<u>No</u>	Content-based ESL	////////////////////////////////////
<u>No</u>	Pull-out ESL	////////////////////////////////////
<u>No</u>	Other (explain in comment box below)	////////////////////////////////////

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Montana began two-way immersion in 2015-16, but it was omitted in error last year.

1.6.2 Student Demographic Data

1.6.2.1 Number of ALL LEP Students in the State

In the table below, provide the October 1 count of ALL LEP students in the State who meet the LEP definition under Section 9101(25).

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

Number of ALL LEP students in the State	2,915
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. No comment	

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

In the table below, provide the October 1 count of LEP students in the State who received services in Title III language instructional education programs.

LEP Students Receiving Services	#
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	2,623
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. No comment	

1.6.2.3 Most Commonly Spoken Languages in the State

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

Language	# LEP Students
German	323
Spanish; Castilian	218
North American Indian	51
Chinese	38
Uncoded languages	38

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

<p>CSPR I reopening comment:</p> <p>Schools are given a list of 36 options from which to choose in order to select a language. If the language does not exist in the 36 options then they are to select Uncoded Languages.</p>
--

1.6.3 Student Performance Data

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

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

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

All LEP Testing	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	2,868
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	403
Total	3,271
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. CSPR I reopening comment: The number of students that test and number of students that qualify for the program are different due to the timing of the data. Testing occurs in December and January. Our count date is the first Monday in October and our data is accurate as of that date. Due to the time difference in the different data sets, there are several reasons for the variance in numbers. Some students are marked as proficient and exit the LEP program by January's testing time, so they are not required to test. Other students move to another school district or out of the state. In an attempt to track students, Montana asks schools to submit a form that designates why a student did not test.	

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

All LEP Results	#
Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	39
Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	1.36
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. no comment	

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

In the table below, provide the number of Title III LEP students tested and not tested on annual State English language proficiency assessment.

Title III LEP Testing		#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment		2,620
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment		326
Total		2,946
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. CSPR I reopening comment: The number of students that test and number of students that qualify for the program are different due to the timing of the data. Testing occurs in December and January. Our count date is the first Monday in October and our data is accurate as of that date. Due to the time difference in the different data sets, there are several reasons for the variance in numbers. Some students are marked as proficient and exit the LEP program by January's testing time, so they are not required to test. Other students move to another school district or out of the state. In an attempt to track students, Montana asks schools to submit a form that designates why a student did not test.		

In the table below, provide the number of Title III students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time and whose progress cannot be determined. Report this number ONLY if the State did not include them in the calculations for making progress (# and % making progress).

Title III First Time Tested		#
Number of Title III students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time whose progress cannot be determined.		526

1.6.3.2.2 Title III LEP English Language Proficiency Results

This section collects information on Title III LEP students' development of English and attainment of English proficiency.

Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:

- Making Progress** = Number and percent of Title III LEP students that met the definition of "Making Progress" as defined by the State and submitted to ED in the Consolidated State Application (CSA), or as amended.
- Attained Proficiency** = Number and percent of Title III LEP students that met the State definition of "Attainment" of English language proficiency submitted to ED in the Consolidated State Application (CSA), or as amended.
- Results** = Number and percent of Title III LEP students that met the State definition of "Making Progress" and the number and percent that met the State definition of "Attainment" of English language proficiency.

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

Title III Results	Results #	Results %
Making progress	205	9.79
Attained proficiency	30	1.15
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. CSPR I reopening comment: The English language proficiency test that Montana administers statewide underwent a new standard setting process during 2016-2017. The standard setting process made it more difficult to test as proficient and that led to less students achieving this status. The standard setting process changed the proficiency levels that were given to each student. A student that scored a particular scale score during the 2015-2016 test would have received a lower proficiency level in 2016-2017 for the same score. Since Montana's progress determination is based on proficiency levels, this led to less students showing progress.		

1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments

This section collects data on LEP students assessed in their native language (Section 1111(b)(6)).

1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language

In the table below, check "Yes" if the specified assessment is used.

Native Language Testing	Yes/No
State offers the State reading/language arts content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
State offers the State mathematics content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
State offers the State science content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. No comment	

1.6.3.5.2 Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given

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

Language(s)
None
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Montana does not offer native language tests. All tests are in English.

1.6.3.5.3 Native Language of Reading/Language Arts Tests Given

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

Language(s)
None
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Montana does not offer native language tests. All tests are in English.

1.6.3.5.4 Native Language of Science Tests Given

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

Language(s)
None
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Montana does not offer native language tests. All tests are in English.

1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students

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

1.6.3.6.1 Title III Served MFLEP Students by Year Monitored

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

Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) students include:

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

Table 1.6.3.6.1 Definitions:

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

# Year One	# Year Two	Total
241	264	505
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. CSPR I reopening comment: During the 2015-2016 school year, the English language proficiency test that Montana administers statewide was changed to an online adaptive test. Students did not test as high during the 2015-2016 school year due to this change and that led to less students testing as proficient. Since less students tested as proficient in 2015-2016 that led to less students being in year one of the monitoring process for Former English learners in 2016-2017.		

1.6.3.6.2 MFLEP Students Results for Mathematics

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

Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
396	68	17.17	328
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. no comment			

1.6.3.6.3 MFLEP Students Results for Reading/Language Arts

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

Table 1.6.3.6.3 Definitions:

1. **# Tested** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in reading/language arts.
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. This will be automatically calculated.
4. **# Below proficient** = State-aggregated number MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
396	91	22.98	305
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. no comment			

1.6.3.6.4 MFLEP Students Results for Science

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

Table 1.6.3.6.4 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
99	35	35.35	64
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. CSPP I reopening comment: <p>Â During the 2015-2016 school year, the English language proficiency test that Montana administers statewide was changed to an online adaptive test. Students did not test as high during the 2015-2016 school year due to this change and that led to less students testing as proficient. Since less students tested as proficient in 2015-2016 that led to less students being in year one of the monitoring process for former English learners in 2016-2017.</p>			

1.6.4 Title III Subgrantees

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

1.6.4.3 Termination of Title III Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

Termination of Title III Programs	Yes/No
Were any Title III language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> activities terminated for failure to reach program goals?	No
If yes, provide the number of language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> activities for immigrant children and youth terminated.	
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. no comment	

1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students

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

Note: All immigrant students are not LEP students.

1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students

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

Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:

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

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants
86	0	2

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

No comment

1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development

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

1.6.6.1 Teacher Information

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

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

Note: Section 3301(8) – 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 as a second language.

Title III Teachers	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	958
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	50

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

No comment

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

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

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

Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:

1. **Professional Development Topics** = Subgrantee professional development topics required under Title III.
2. **#Subgrantees** = Number of subgrantees who conducted each type of professional development activity. A subgrantee may conduct more than one professional development activity. (Use the same method of counting subgrantees, including consortia, as in 1.6.1 and 1.6.4.1).
3. **Total Number of Participants** = Number of teachers, administrators and other personnel who participated in each type of the professional development activities reported.
4. **Total** = Number of all participants in professional development (PD) activities.

Professional Development (PD) Topics	# Subgrantees
Instructional strategies for LEP students	52
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	45
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	46
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	47
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	48
Other (Explain in comment box)	0

PD Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	30	380
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	47	724
PD provided to principals	40	126
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	23	32
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	31	104
PD provided to community based organization personnel	3	7
Total	//////////	1,373

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Three schools did not complete their report.
--

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 submitted using the MM/DD/YY format.

Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:

1. **Date State Received Allocation** = Annual date the State receives the Title III allocation from U.S. 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 2016-17 funds July 1, 2016, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2016, for SY 2016-17 programs. Then the "# of days/\$\$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
7-1-16	7-1-16	1
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

This does not apply to us as the date Montana received allocations and the date funds were made available to subgrantees is the same.

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/unsafechoice.doc>.

Persistently Dangerous Schools	#
Persistently Dangerous Schools	0
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. No comment	

1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS PROGRAM

This section collects data on homeless children and youth 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 youth and the McKinney-Vento program. The totals will be automatically calculated.

LEAs	#	# LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	381	381
LEAs with subgrants	22	22
Total	403	403

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. In column two, "#LEAs Reporting Data", the total number includes 91 LEAs that do not enroll students.

Part I comment:
Montana is waiting on additional direction from USED regarding the 91 LE's that do not enroll students and do not qualify for federal grant.

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

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

1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youth

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youth 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/Youth Enrolled in Public School in LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youth Enrolled in Public School in LEAs With Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	6	20
K	93	211
1	83	218
2	99	240
3	106	232
4	79	218
5	94	217
6	53	175
7	57	174
8	52	180
9	52	192
10	56	193
11	52	191
12	88	245
Ungraded		
Total	970	2,706

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Montana does not count "ungraded."

1.9.1.2 Primary Nighttime Residence of Homeless Children and Youth

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youth 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.

Primary Nighttime Residence	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs With Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing	34	296
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	783	1,818
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	92	252
Hotels/Motels	61	340
Total	970	2,706

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. No comments

FAQ on reporting homeless students:

When should States use S or STH to report homeless students? The primary nighttime residence of students who are deemed homeless under the awaiting foster care provision should be indicated as "S" for shelters, transitional housing, and awaiting foster care. After a state is no longer permitted to use the awaiting foster care placement designation for students, the primary nighttime residence of students who are in shelters or transitional housing should be coded as "STH". The majority of states may only include children and youth identified as homeless due to their status as awaiting foster care placement if they were identified prior to December 10, 2016. States covered under P.L. 114-95, Section 9105(c) may include children awaiting foster care placement until December 10, 2017. Covered states are those states that have a law that describes or defines the phrase awaiting foster care placement for the purposes of a program under the McKinney-Vento Act.

1.9.1.3 Subgroups of Homeless Students Enrolled

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

Special Population	# Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs With Subgrants
Unaccompanied homeless youth	210	490
Migratory children/youth	3	23
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	214	625
Limited English Proficient (LEP) students	96	180

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. No comment

1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

1.9.2.1 Young Homeless Children Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youth 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/Youth Served by Subgrants
Age Birth Through 2	75
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	84
Total	159
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. No comment	

1.9.3 Academic Achievement of Homeless Students

The following questions collect data on the academic achievement of enrolled homeless children and youth.

1.9.3.1 Reading Assessment

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

Grade	LEAs Without Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	LEAs Without Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs Without Subgrants - % of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs With Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	LEAs With Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs With Subgrants - % of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient
3	46	9	19.57	122	35	28.69
4	35	8	22.86	134	37	27.61
5	44	9	20.45	123	35	28.46
6	18	2	11.11	117	27	23.08
7	28	9	32.14	111	28	25.23
8	25	6	24.00	112	31	27.68
High School	26	12	46.15	90	22	24.44

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. No comment

1.9.3.2 Mathematics Assessment

This section is similar to 1.9.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State mathematics assessment.

Grade	LEAs Without Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	LEAs Without Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs Without Subgrants - % of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs With Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	LEAs With Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs With Subgrants - % of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient
3	55	6	10.91	134	34	25.37
4	37	10	27.03	141	34	24.11
5	47	5	10.64	136	25	18.38
6	18	2	11.11	115	23	20.00
7	27	4	14.81	110	13	11.82
8	25	6	24.00	110	22	20.00
High School	26	4	15.38	90	11	12.22

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. No comment

1.9.3.3 Science Assessment

This section is similar to 1.9.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State science assessment.

Grade	LEAs Without Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	LEAs Without Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs Without Subgrants - % of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs With Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	LEAs With Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs With Subgrants - % of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient
3						
4	38	26	68.42	145	74	51.03
5						
6						
7						
8	24	13	54.17	110	53	48.18
High School	31	12	38.71	115	27	23.48

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Montana only tests Grades 4,8, and 10 for science assessment.