

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

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

For reporting on  
**School Year 2008-09**

**MONTANA**



**PART I DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 18, 2009**  
**PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 12, 2010**

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION**  
**WASHINGTON, DC 20202**

## INTRODUCTION

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

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

The *NCLB* Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2008-09 consists of two Parts, Part I and Part II.

## **PART I**

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

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

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

## **PART II**

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

1. The information is needed for Department program performance plans or for other program needs.
2. The information is not available from another source, including program evaluations pending full implementation of required ED Facts 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 2008-09 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, December 18, 2009**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 12, 2010**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2008-09, 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 2008-09 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 2008-09 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

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

		OMB Number: 1810-0614
		Expiration Date: 10/31/2010
<p>Consolidated State Performance Report  For  State Formula Grant Programs  under the  Elementary And Secondary Education Act  as amended by the  No Child Left Behind Act of 2001</p>		
Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2008-09 <input type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2008-09		
Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report: Montana Office of Public Instruction		
Address: PO Box 202501 Helena, MT 59620-2501		
Person to contact about this report:		
Name: Nancy Coopersmith		
Telephone: (406) 444-5541		
Fax: (406) 444-1373		
e-mail: ncoopersmith@mt.gov		
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Denise Juneau, State Superintendent		
Signature _____		Date _____

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT  
PART I**

For reporting on  
**School Year 2008-09**



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 18, 2009  
5PM EST**

**1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT****STANDARDS OF ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT**

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

**1.1.1 Academic Content Standards**

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

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

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

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

Content Standards: Science, Approved by BPE, 2006, Implemented 2008

Content Standards: Mathematics, Approved by BPE, 2009, Anticipated Implementation 2011

Content Standards: Communication Arts (Reading), Anticipated Approval 2010, Anticipated Implementation 2012

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

**1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts**

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Math standards have been revised and approved. Reading standards are in the approval process. New test blueprints will be developed to match the standards.
---

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



#### 1.1.4 Assessments in Science

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

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

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

If the State's assessments in science required under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* have not been approved through ED's peer review process, respond "State's assessments and academic achievement standards in science not yet approved."

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

No revisions or changes to assessments and/or academic achievement standards taken or planned.

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

**1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS**

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

**1.2.1 Participation of all Students in Mathematics Assessment**

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

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	74,828	73,902	98.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	8,625	8,444	97.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	849	838	98.7
Black, non-Hispanic	776	768	99.0
Hispanic	2,056	2,021	98.3
White, non-Hispanic	62,522	61,831	98.9
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	9,001	8,584	95.4
Limited English proficient ( <i>LEP</i> ) students	2,328	2,249	96.6
Economically disadvantaged students	29,053	28,562	98.3
Migratory students	138	136	98.6
Male	38,610	38,093	98.7
Female	36,218	35,809	98.9
<b>Comments:</b>			

Source – The table above is produced through *EDFacts*. The SEA submits the data in file N/X081 that includes data group 588, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F, and subtotal 1. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

**1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Mathematics Assessment**

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	2,694	31.4
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	5,184	60.4
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	706	8.2
Total	8,584	
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	74,828	73,893	98.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	8,625	8,450	98.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	849	836	98.5
Black, non-Hispanic	776	764	98.4
Hispanic	2,056	2,013	97.9
White, non-Hispanic	62,522	61,830	98.9
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	9,001	8,550	95.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,328	2,242	96.3
Economically disadvantaged students	29,053	28,548	98.3
Migratory students	138	136	98.6
Male	38,610	38,068	98.6
Female	36,218	35,825	98.9
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

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

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	2,749	32.2
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	5,095	59.6
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	706	8.3
Total	8,550	
<b>Comments:</b>		

### 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	32,425	32,029	98.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	3,657	3,563	97.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	348	343	98.6
Black, non-Hispanic	311	310	99.7
Hispanic	842	827	98.2
White, non-Hispanic	27,267	26,986	99.0
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	3,826	3,731	97.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	933	901	96.6
Economically disadvantaged students	11,839	11,635	98.3
Migratory students	55	55	100.0
Male	16,730	16,513	98.7
Female	15,695	15,516	98.9
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

### 1.2.6 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Science Assessment

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	1,321	35.4
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	2,075	55.6
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	335	9.0
Total	3,731	
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

### 1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

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

#### 1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics

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

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

**1.3.1.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 3**

<b>Grade 3</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	10,423	6,984	67.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,305	556	42.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	112	83	74.1
Black, non-Hispanic	115	69	60.0
Hispanic	301	164	54.5
White, non-Hispanic	8,590	6,112	71.2
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	1,267	497	39.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	437	127	29.1
Economically disadvantaged students	4,552	2,498	54.9
Migratory students	22	15	68.2
Male	5,384	3,639	67.6
Female	5,039	3,345	66.4
<b>Comments:</b>			

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

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

<b>Grade 3</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	10,423	8,766	84.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,305	879	67.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	112	93	83.0
Black, non-Hispanic	115	88	76.5
Hispanic	301	236	78.4
White, non-Hispanic	8,590	7,470	87.0
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	1,244	716	57.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	437	205	46.9
Economically disadvantaged students	4,552	3,457	75.9
Migratory students	22	16	72.7
Male	5,384	4,430	82.3
Female	5,039	4,336	86.0
<b>Comments:</b>			

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

**1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 3**

<b>Grade 3</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	0	0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	0	0	0.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.0
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	0	0	0.0
Female	0	0	0.0
<b>Comments:</b>			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

**1.3.1.2 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 4**

<b>Grade 4</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	10,620	7,084	66.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,348	563	41.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	113	90	79.6
Black, non-Hispanic	134	83	61.9
Hispanic	310	175	56.4
White, non-Hispanic	8,715	6,173	70.8
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	1,277	483	37.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	393	91	23.2
Economically disadvantaged students	4,538	2,476	54.6
Migratory students	17	10	58.8
Male	5,527	3,710	67.1
Female	5,093	3,374	66.2
<b>Comments:</b> Changing and moving student populations affect the outcome of the migratory students.			

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

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

<b>Grade 4</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	10,620	8,601	81.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,348	774	57.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	113	98	86.7
Black, non-Hispanic	134	101	75.4
Hispanic	310	233	75.2
White, non-Hispanic	8,715	7,395	84.8
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	1,248	635	50.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	393	146	37.2
Economically disadvantaged students	4,538	3,226	71.1
Migratory students	17	11	64.7
Male	5,527	4,328	78.3
Female	5,093	4,273	83.9
<b>Comments:</b> Changing and moving student populations affect the outcome of the migratory students.			

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.



**1.3.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 4**

<b>Grade 4</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	10,620	6,992	65.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,348	493	36.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	113	83	73.4
Black, non-Hispanic	134	76	56.7
Hispanic	310	162	52.3
White, non-Hispanic	8,715	6,178	70.9
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	1,292	569	44.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	393	72	18.3
Economically disadvantaged students	4,538	2,390	52.7
Migratory students	17	8	47.1
Male	5,527	3,674	66.5
Female	5,093	3,318	65.2
<b>Comments:</b> Changing and moving student populations affect the outcome of the migratory students.			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

**1.3.1.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 5**

<b>Grade 5</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	10,532	7,042	66.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,223	474	38.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	118	95	80.5
Black, non-Hispanic	124	60	48.4
Hispanic	294	164	55.8
White, non-Hispanic	8,773	6,249	71.2
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	1,262	404	32.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	337	67	19.9
Economically disadvantaged students	4,351	2,379	54.7
Migratory students	23	13	56.5
Male	5,426	3,686	67.9
Female	5,106	3,356	65.7
<b>Comments:</b> Changing and moving student populations affect the outcome of these students.			

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

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

<b>Grade 5</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	10,532	8,818	83.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,223	744	60.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	118	103	87.3
Black, non-Hispanic	124	100	80.6
Hispanic	294	235	79.9
White, non-Hispanic	8,773	7,636	87.0
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	1,235	640	51.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	337	97	28.8
Economically disadvantaged students	4,351	3,247	74.6
Migratory students	23	17	73.9
Male	5,426	4,428	81.6
Female	5,106	4,390	86.0
<b>Comments:</b> Changing and moving student populations affect the outcome of these students.			

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

**1.3.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 5**

<b>Grade 5</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	0	0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	0	0	0.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.0
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	0	0	0.0
Female	0	0	0.0
<b>Comments:</b>			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

**1.3.1.4 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 6**

<b>Grade 6</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	10,596	6,830	64.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,237	476	38.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	117	89	76.1
Black, non-Hispanic	131	66	50.4
Hispanic	309	153	49.5
White, non-Hispanic	8,802	6,046	68.7
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	1,236	309	25.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	335	53	15.8
Economically disadvantaged students	4,164	2,041	49.0
Migratory students	21	10	47.6
Male	5,469	3,522	64.4
Female	5,127	3,308	64.5
<b>Comments:</b> Changing and moving student populations affect the outcome of these students.			

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

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

<b>Grade 6</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	10,596	8,950	84.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,237	774	62.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	117	98	83.8
Black, non-Hispanic	131	107	81.7
Hispanic	309	235	76.0
White, non-Hispanic	8,802	7,736	87.9
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	1,247	615	49.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	335	108	32.2
Economically disadvantaged students	4,164	3,084	74.1
Migratory students	21	15	71.4
Male	5,469	4,452	81.4
Female	5,127	4,498	87.7
<b>Comments:</b> Changing and moving student populations affect the outcome of these students.			

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

**1.3.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 6**

<b>Grade 6</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	0	0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	0	0	0.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.0
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	0	0	0.0
Female	0	0	0.0
<b>Comments:</b>			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

**1.3.1.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 7**

<b>Grade 7</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	10,853	7,151	65.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,203	453	37.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	154	122	79.2
Black, non-Hispanic	95	47	49.5
Hispanic	310	166	53.6
White, non-Hispanic	9,091	6,363	70.0
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	1,184	302	25.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	286	52	18.2
Economically disadvantaged students	4,147	2,109	50.9
Migratory students	17	10	58.8
Male	5,601	3,721	66.4
Female	5,252	3,430	65.3
<b>Comments:</b> Changing and moving student populations affect the outcome of these students.			

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

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

<b>Grade 7</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	10,853	8,980	82.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,203	732	60.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	154	136	88.3
Black, non-Hispanic	95	73	76.8
Hispanic	310	231	74.5
White, non-Hispanic	9,091	7,808	85.9
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	1,201	531	44.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	286	101	35.3
Economically disadvantaged students	4,147	2,983	71.9
Migratory students	17	15	88.2
Male	5,601	4,438	79.2
Female	5,252	4,542	86.5
<b>Comments:</b> Changing and moving student populations affect the outcome of these students.			

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

**1.3.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 7**

<b>Grade 7</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	0	0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	0	0	0.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.0
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	0	0	0.0
Female	0	0	0.0
<b>Comments:</b>			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

**1.3.1.6 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 8**

<b>Grade 8</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	10,852	6,551	60.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,203	375	31.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	133	94	70.7
Black, non-Hispanic	98	51	52.0
Hispanic	277	144	52.0
White, non-Hispanic	9,141	5,887	64.4
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	1,225	244	19.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	287	44	15.3
Economically disadvantaged students	3,994	1,774	44.4
Migratory students	23	15	65.2
Male	5,576	3,381	60.6
Female	5,276	3,170	60.1
<b>Comments:</b> Changing and moving student populations affect the outcome of these students.			

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

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

<b>Grade 8</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	10,852	8,771	80.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,203	702	58.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	133	109	82.0
Black, non-Hispanic	98	79	80.6
Hispanic	277	195	70.4
White, non-Hispanic	9,141	7,686	84.1
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	1,237	516	41.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	287	79	27.5
Economically disadvantaged students	3,994	2,752	68.9
Migratory students	23	18	78.3
Male	5,576	4,283	76.8
Female	5,276	4,488	85.1
<b>Comments:</b> Changing and moving student populations affect the outcome of these students.			

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.



**1.3.3.6 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 8**

<b>Grade 8</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	10,852	6,500	59.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,203	329	27.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	133	90	67.7
Black, non-Hispanic	98	46	46.9
Hispanic	277	133	48.0
White, non-Hispanic	9,141	5,902	64.6
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	1,260	326	25.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	287	32	11.2
Economically disadvantaged students	3,994	1,751	43.8
Migratory students	23	8	34.8
Male	5,576	3,485	62.5
Female	5,276	3,015	57.2
<b>Comments:</b> Changing and moving student populations affect the outcome of these students.			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

**1.3.1.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - High School**

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	10,978	5,924	54.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,106	292	26.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	112	66	58.9
Black, non-Hispanic	79	37	46.8
Hispanic	255	104	40.8
White, non-Hispanic	9,426	5,425	57.6
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	1,133	219	19.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	253	20	7.9
Economically disadvantaged students	3,309	1,270	38.4
Migratory students	15	6	40.0
Male	5,637	3,041	54.0
Female	5,341	2,883	54.0
<b>Comments:</b> Changing and moving student populations affect the outcome of these students.			

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

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

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	10,978	8,494	77.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,106	605	54.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	112	83	74.1
Black, non-Hispanic	79	63	79.8
Hispanic	255	180	70.6
White, non-Hispanic	9,426	7,563	80.2
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	1,138	429	37.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	253	43	17.0
Economically disadvantaged students	3,309	2,141	64.7
Migratory students	15	10	66.7
Male	5,637	4,065	72.1
Female	5,341	4,429	82.9
<b>Comments:</b> Changing and moving student populations affect the outcome of these students.			

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

**1.3.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Science - High School**

<b>High School</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	10,978	4,641	42.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,106	191	17.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	112	42	37.5
Black, non-Hispanic	79	26	32.9
Hispanic	255	67	26.3
White, non-Hispanic	9,426	4,315	45.8
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	1,179	190	16.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	253	9	3.6
Economically disadvantaged students	3,309	910	27.5
Migratory students	15	4	26.7
Male	5,637	2,444	43.4
Female	5,341	2,197	41.1
<b>Comments:</b> Changing and moving student populations affect the outcome of these students.			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

**1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY**

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

**1.4.1 All Schools and Districts Accountability**

In the table below, provide the total number of public elementary and secondary schools and districts in the State, including charters, and the total number of those schools and districts that made AYP based on data for the SY 2008-09. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2008-09	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2008-09
Schools	819	603	73.6
Districts	418	284	67.9
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

**1.4.2 Title I School Accountability**

In the table below, provide the total number of public Title I schools by type and the total number of those schools that made AYP based on data for the SY 2008-09 school year. Include only public Title I schools. Do not include Title I programs operated by local educational agencies in private schools. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2008-09	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2008-09
All Title I schools	630	441	70.0
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	185	85	46.0
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	445	356	80.0
<b>Comments:</b>			

Source – The table above is produced through *EDFacts*. The SEA submits the data in N/X129 for data group 22 and N/X103 for data group 32.

**1.4.3 Accountability of Districts That Received Title I Funds**

In the table below, provide the total number of districts that received Title I funds and the total number of those districts that made AYP based on data for SY 2008-09. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2008-09	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2008-09
311	182	58.5
<b>Comments:</b>		

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk.

**Note:** DG 582 is not collected from the SEA, rather it comes from the Title I funding data.

#### 1.4.4 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

##### 1.4.4.1 List of Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

In the following table, provide a list of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 for the SY 2009-10 based on the data from SY 2008-09. For each school on the list, provide the following:

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

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter school data.

Download template: [Question 1.4.4.1 \(Get MS Excel Viewer\)](#)

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

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

District Name	Nces/CCD Id Code	School Name	NCES/CCD Id Code	Reading/Language Arts		Mathematics		Other Academic Indicator		School Improvement Status for Sy 2009-10	Title I School (Yes/No)	Provided assistance by LEA through 1003(a) (Yes/No)	Provided assistance by LEA through 1003(g) (Yes/No)
				Proficiency Target Met (Yes/No)	Participation Rate Target Met (Yes/No)	Proficiency Target Met (Yes/No)	Participation Rate Target Met (Yes/No)	Academic Indicator Met (Yes/No (elementary/middle schools))	Graduation Rate Met (Yes/No) (high school)				
Dillon Elem	3008910	Mary Innes School	00255	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Improvement Year 1	Yes	No	No
Dillon Elem	3008910	Parkview School	00257	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Improvement Year 1	Yes	No	No
Pryor Elem	3021720	Pryor Elem School	00647	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Corrective Action	Yes	No	No
Pryor Elem	3021720	Pryor 7-8	00930	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Restructuring	Yes	No	No
Plenty Coups H S	3013360	Plenty Coups High School	00398	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Restructuring	Yes	No	No
Hardin Elem	3013310	Hardin Primary	00396	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Restructuring	Yes	No	Yes
Hardin Elem	3013310	Hardin Intermediate	00395	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Restructuring	Yes	No	No
Hardin Elem	3013310	Crow Agency School	00392	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Restructuring	Yes	No	Yes
Hardin Elem	3013310	Hardin Middle School	00394	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Restructuring	Yes	No	No
Hardin H S	3013340	Hardin High School	00397	No	Yes	No	Yes	NA	No	Restructuring	Yes	No	Yes
Lodge Grass Elem	3017010	Lodge Grass School	00533	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Restructuring	Yes	Yes	No
Lodge Grass Elem	3017010	Lodge Grass 7-8	00931	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Restructuring	Yes	No	No
Lodge Grass H S	3017040	Lodge Grass High School	00534	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Restructuring	Yes	Yes	No
Wyola Elem	3028800	Wyola School	00804	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Restructuring	Yes	Yes	No
Harlem Elem	3013395	Harlem Elementary School	00399	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Improvement Year 2	Yes	No	No
Harlem Elem	3013395	Harlem 7-8	00909	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Corrective Action	Yes	No	No
Harlem H S	3013400	Harlem High School	00400	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Improvement Year 1	Yes	No	No
Hays-Lodge Pole K-12 Schls	3013660	Lodge Pole School	00097	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Restructuring Planning	Yes	No	Yes
Hays-Lodge Pole K-12 Schls	3013660	Hays-Lodge Pole High Sch	00413	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Restructuring	Yes	No	Yes
Hays-Lodge Pole K-12 Schls	3013660	Hays-Lodge Pole 7-8	00934	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Restructuring	Yes	No	No
Great Falls Elem	3013040	Longfellow School	00363	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Improvement Year 1	Yes	No	No
Great Falls Elem	3013040	East Middle School	00882	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Corrective Action	Yes	No	No
Great Falls Elem	3013040	North Middle School	00883	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Improvement Year 2	No	No	No
Great Falls H S	3013050	Great Falls High School	00380	No	Yes	No	Yes	NA	No	Corrective Action	Yes	No	No
Great Falls H S	3013050	C M Russell High School	00379	No	Yes	No	Yes	NA	Yes	Improvement Year 2	No	No	No
Miles City Elem	3018410	Washington 7-8	00561	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Improvement Year 2	Yes	No	No
Glendive Elem	3012510	Washington Middle School	00952	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Improvement Year 1	Yes	No	No
Anaconda H S	3002030	Anaconda High School	00015	No	Yes	No	Yes	NA	Yes	Improvement Year 2	Yes	No	No
Flathead H S	3015420	Flathead High School	00470	No	Yes	No	Yes	NA	No	Improvement Year 2	No	No	No
Flathead H S	3015420	Glacier High School	00358	No	Yes	No	Yes	NA	NA	Improvement Year 1	Yes	No	No
Columbia Falls Elem	3007110	Columbia Falls 7-8	00195	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Improvement Year 1	Yes	No	No
Columbia Falls Elem	3007110	Ruder Elementary	00198	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Improvement Year 1	Yes	No	No
Columbia Falls Elem	3007110	Columbia Falls Grade 6	00197	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Improvement Year 1	Yes	No	No
Columbia Falls H S	3007140	Columbia Falls High Schl	00203	No	Yes	No	Yes	NA	No	Improvement Year 2	No	No	No
Kila Elem	3015570	Kila School	00480	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Improvement Year 1	Yes	No	No
Whitefish H S	3027790	Whitefish High School	00775	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	NA	No	Improvement Year 1	Yes	No	No
Bozeman Elem	3004560	Whittier School	00110	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	Improvement Year 1	Yes	No	No
Three Forks Elem	3026160	Three Forks Elem School	00740	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Improvement Year 1	Yes	No	No
Belgrade Elem	3003290	Belgrade Intermediate	00295	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Improvement Year 1	Yes	No	No
Belgrade H S	3003330	Belgrade High School	00046	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	NA	Yes	Improvement Year 1	No	No	No
Browning Elem	3005140	K W Bergan School	00131	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Restructuring	Yes	No	Yes
Browning Elem	3005140	Napi School	00132	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Restructuring	Yes	No	Yes
Browning Elem	3005140	Vina Chattin School	00134	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Restructuring	Yes	No	Yes
Browning Elem	3005140	Browning Middle School	00872	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Restructuring	Yes	No	Yes
Browning H S	3005190	Browning High School	00136	No	Yes	No	Yes	NA	No	Restructuring	Yes	No	Yes
Cut Bank Elem	3000003	Cut Bank 7-8	00234	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Improvement Year 1	Yes	No	No

District Name	Nces/CCD Id Code	School Name	NCES/CCD Id Code	Reading/Language Arts		Mathematics		Other Academic Indicator		School Improvement Status for Sy 2009-10	Title I School (Yes/No)	Provided assistance by LEA through 1003(a) (Yes/No)	Provided assistance by LEA through 1003(g) (Yes/No)
				Proficiency Target Met (Yes/No)	Participation Rate Target Met (Yes/No)	Proficiency Target Met (Yes/No)	Participation Rate Target Met (Yes/No)	Academic Indicator Met (Yes/No (elementary/middle schools))	Graduation Rate Met (Yes/No) (high school)				
Cut Bank Elem	3000003	Cut Bank Elementary	00233	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	Improvement Year 1	Yes	No	No
Box Elder Elem	3004440	Box Elder School	00103	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Improvement Year 2	Yes	Yes	Yes
Havre Elem	3013560	Sunnyside School	00410	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Improvement Year 2	Yes	No	No
Havre Elem	3013560	Highland Park School	00408	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Improvement Year 1	Yes	No	No
Havre Elem	3013560	Lincoln-McKinley School	00409	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Improvement Year 1	Yes	No	No
Havre Elem	3013560	Havre Middle School	00406	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Improvement Year 2	Yes	No	No
Havre H S	3013590	Havre High School	00411	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	NA	Yes	Improvement Year 1	Yes	No	No
Rocky Boy Elem	3022750	Rocky Boy School	00666	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Restructuring	Yes	Yes	No
Rocky Boy Elem	3022750	Rocky Boy 7-8	00986	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Restructuring	Yes	Yes	No
Rocky Boy H S	3028911	Rocky Boy High School	01086	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	NA	Restructuring	Yes	Yes	No
Whitehall Elem	3027810	Whitehall Elementary	00777	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Improvement Year 1	Yes	No	No
Jefferson H S	3015120	Jefferson High School	00461	No	Yes	No	Yes	NA	Yes	Improvement Year 1	Yes	No	No
Arlee Elem	3002220	Arlee Elementary	00019	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Improvement Year 1	Yes	No	No
Arlee Elem	3002220	Arlee 7-8	00900	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Improvement Year 1	Yes	No	No
Polson Elem	3021060	Cherry Valley School	00630	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Improvement Year 1	Yes	No	No
Polson Elem	3021060	Linderman School	00631	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Improvement Year 1	Yes	No	No
Polson H S	3021090	Polson High School	00633	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	NA	Yes	Restructuring Planning	Yes	No	No
St Ignatius K-12 Schools	3006110	St Ignatius Middle School	00994	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Improvement Year 1	Yes	No	No
Ronan Elem	3022790	Pablo Elementary	00667	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	Improvement Year 1	Yes	No	No
Ronan Elem	3022790	K William Harvey Elem	00669	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Improvement Year 1	Yes	No	No
Ronan Elem	3022790	Ronan Middle School	00668	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Improvement Year 1	Yes	No	No
Ronan H S	3022800	Ronan High School	00670	No	Yes	No	Yes	NA	Yes	Improvement Year 1	Yes	No	No
Helena Elem	3000005	Broadwater School	00415	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Improvement Year 1	Yes	No	No
Helena Elem	3000005	Bryant School	00416	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Improvement Year 1	Yes	No	No
Helena Elem	3000005	Jim Darcy School	00505	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Improvement Year 1	No	No	No
Helena Elem	3000005	Rossiter School	00424	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Improvement Year 1	No	No	No
Helena Elem	3000005	Four Georgians School	00419	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Improvement Year 1	No	No	No
Helena Elem	3000005	Helena Middle School	00885	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Corrective Action	Yes	No	No
Helena H S	3013830	Helena High School	00430	No	Yes	No	Yes	NA	No	Corrective Action	Yes	No	No
Helena H S	3013830	Capital High School	00429	No	Yes	No	Yes	NA	Yes	Improvement Year 2	No	No	No
Lincoln K-12 Schools	3016810	Lincoln 7-8	00996	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Improvement Year 1	Yes	No	No
Troy Elem	3026550	W F Morrison School	00748	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Improvement Year 1	Yes	No	No
Troy Elem	3026550	Troy 7-8	00999	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Improvement Year 1	Yes	No	No
Libby K-12 Schools	3016530	Libby High School	00518	No	Yes	No	Yes	NA	No	Improvement Year 1	Yes	No	No
Libby K-12 Schools	3016530	Libby Elementary School	00512	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Improvement Year 1	Yes	No	No
Eureka Elem	3010080	Eureka 7-8	01000	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Improvement Year 1	Yes	No	No
Lincoln County H S	3016770	Lincoln Co High School	00521	No	Yes	No	Yes	NA	Yes	Improvement Year 2	Yes	No	No
Missoula Elem	3018570	Lewis & Clark School	00572	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	Improvement Year 1	Yes	No	No
Missoula Elem	3018570	Lowell School	00574	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Improvement Year 2	Yes	No	No
Missoula Elem	3018570	Porter Middle School	00565	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Improvement Year 2	Yes	No	No
Missoula Elem	3018570	Meadow Hill Middle School	00575	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	Improvement Year 2	No	No	No
Missoula H S	3018540	Hellgate High School	00562	No	Yes	No	Yes	NA	No	Improvement Year 1	Yes	No	No
Missoula H S	3018540	Big Sky High School	00824	No	Yes	No	Yes	NA	Yes	Improvement Year 2	Yes	No	No
Hellgate Elem	3013860	Lower Grade Hellgate	00432	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Improvement Year 1	Yes	No	No
Hellgate Elem	3013860	Hellgate Middle School	01010	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Improvement Year 1	Yes	No	No
Target Range Elem	3025890	Target Range School	00734	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	Improvement Year 1	Yes	No	No

District Name	Nces/CCD Id Code	School Name	NCES/CCD Id Code	Reading/Language Arts		Mathematics		Other Academic Indicator		School Improvement Status for Sy 2009-10	Title I School (Yes/No)	Provided assistance by LEA through 1003(a) (Yes/No)	Provided assistance by LEA through 1003(g) (Yes/No)
				Proficiency Target Met (Yes/No)	Participation Rate Target Met (Yes/No)	Proficiency Target Met (Yes/No)	Participation Rate Target Met (Yes/No)	Academic Indicator Met (Yes/No (elementary/middle schools))	Graduation Rate Met (Yes/No) (high school)				
Livingston Elem	3016880	Sleeping Giant Middle Sch	01021	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Improvement Year 1	Yes	No	No
Dodson Elem	3009090	Dodson School	00260	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Corrective Action	Yes	No	No
Heart Butte K-12 Schools	3000099	Heart Butte Elementary	00414	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Improvement Year 1	Yes	No	No
Heart Butte K-12 Schools	3000099	Heart Butte High School	00924	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Restructuring	Yes	Yes	No
Heart Butte K-12 Schools	3000099	Heart Butte 7-8	01031	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Restructuring	Yes	No	No
Deer Lodge Elem	3008670	E F Duvall 7-8	00246	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Improvement Year 1	Yes	No	No
Corvallis K-12 Schools	3007410	Corvallis High School	00215	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	NA	Yes	Improvement Year 1	Yes	No	No
Stevensville Elem	3025020	Stevensville 7-8	00718	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	Improvement Year 1	Yes	No	No
Stevensville H S	3025050	Stevensville High School	00720	No	Yes	No	Yes	NA	Yes	Improvement Year 1	Yes	No	No
Hamilton K-12 Schools	3013260	Washington School	00387	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Improvement Year 1	Yes	No	No
Hamilton K-12 Schools	3013260	Hamilton High School	00389	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	NA	Yes	Improvement Year 1	No	No	No
Hamilton K-12 Schools	3013260	Daly School	00384	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Improvement Year 1	Yes	No	No
Florence-Carlton K-12 Schls	3011100	Florence-Carlton HS	00301	No	Yes	No	Yes	NA	Yes	Improvement Year 1	Yes	No	No
Fairview Elem	3010210	Fairview School	00282	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Improvement Year 1	Yes	No	No
Poplar Elem	3021240	Poplar 5-6 School	01044	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Restructuring	Yes	No	No
Poplar Elem	3021240	Poplar School	00637	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Restructuring	Yes	No	Yes
Poplar Elem	3021240	Poplar 7-8	00636	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Restructuring	Yes	No	No
Poplar H S	3021270	Poplar High School	00638	No	Yes	No	Yes	NA	No	Restructuring	Yes	No	Yes
Wolf Point Elem	3028590	Southside School	00797	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Restructuring	Yes	No	Yes
Wolf Point Elem	3028590	Northside School	00796	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Restructuring	Yes	No	Yes
Wolf Point Elem	3028590	Wolf Point 7-8	00798	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Restructuring	Yes	No	Yes
Wolf Point H S	3028620	Wolf Point High School	00799	No	Yes	No	Yes	NA	No	Restructuring	Yes	No	Yes
Brockton Elem	3005010	Barbara Gilligan School	00124	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Improvement Year 1	Yes	No	No
Brockton Elem	3005010	Barbara Gilligan 7-8	01046	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Restructuring	Yes	No	Yes
Brockton H S	3005040	Brockton High School	00125	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Restructuring	Yes	No	Yes
Forsyth Elem	3011160	Forsyth Elementary School	00303	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Improvement Year 1	Yes	No	No
Forsyth H S	3011190	Forsyth High School	00304	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	NA	Yes	Improvement Year 1	Yes	No	No
Lame Deer Elem	3016050	Lame Deer School	00494	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Restructuring	Yes	Yes	No
Lame Deer Elem	3016050	Lame Deer 7-8	01049	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Restructuring	Yes	Yes	No
Lame Deer H S	3000095	Lame Deer High School	00137	No	Yes	No	Yes	NA	Yes	Restructuring	Yes	Yes	No
Colstrip Elem	3007050	Pine Butte Elementary Sch	00873	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Improvement Year 1	Yes	No	No
Ashland Elem	3000008	Ashland School	00023	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Restructuring Planning	Yes	No	No
Ashland Elem	3000008	Ashland 7-8	01051	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Improvement Year 2	Yes	No	No
Thompson Falls Elem	3026070	Thompson Falls Elem Schl	00737	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Improvement Year 1	Yes	No	No
Thompson Falls Elem	3026070	Thompson Falls 7-8	01052	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	Improvement Year 1	Yes	No	No
Butte Elem	3005280	Whittier School	00153	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Improvement Year 1	No	No	No
Butte Elem	3005280	East Middle School	00905	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Restructuring	Yes	No	No
Butte Elem	3005280	West Elementary School	00906	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Improvement Year 1	Yes	No	No
Butte H S	3005310	Butte High School	00156	No	Yes	No	Yes	NA	No	Improvement Year 2	Yes	No	No
Shelby H S	3023910	Shelby High School	00694	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	NA	Yes	Improvement Year 1	Yes	No	No
Frazer Elem	3011420	Frazer Elementary	00310	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Restructuring	Yes	Yes	No
Frazer Elem	3011420	Frazer 7-8	01072	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Restructuring	Yes	Yes	No
Frazer H S	3011460	Frazer High School	00311	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Restructuring	Yes	Yes	No
Billings Elem	3003870	Burlington School	00065	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	Improvement Year 1	Yes	No	No
Billings Elem	3003870	McKinley School	00072	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Improvement Year 1	Yes	No	No
Billings Elem	3003870	Orchard School	00077	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Improvement Year 1	Yes	No	No



District Name	Nces/CCD Id Code	School Name	NCES/CCD Id Code	Reading/Language Arts		Mathematics		Other Academic Indicator		School Improvement Status for Sy 2009-10	Title I School (Yes/No)	Provided assistance by LEA through 1003(a) (Yes/No)	Provided assistance by LEA through 1003(g) (Yes/No)
				Proficiency Target Met (Yes/No)	Participation Rate Target Met (Yes/No)	Proficiency Target Met (Yes/No)	Participation Rate Target Met (Yes/No)	Academic Indicator Met (Yes/No (elementary/middle schools))	Graduation Rate Met (Yes/No) (high school)				
Billings Elem	3003870	Newman School	00075	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Improvement Year 1	Yes	No	No
Billings Elem	3003870	Ponderosa School	00079	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Improvement Year 1	Yes	No	No
Billings Elem	3003870	Beartooth School	01092	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Improvement Year 1	Yes	No	No
Billings Elem	3003870	Lewis & Clark 7-8	00870	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Improvement Year 1	Yes	No	No
Billings Elem	3003870	Riverside 7-8	00903	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Restructuring Planning	Yes	No	No
Billings H S	3003900	Billings Sr High School	00090	No	Yes	No	Yes	NA	Yes	Improvement Year 2	Yes	No	No
Billings H S	3003900	Billings West High School	00091	No	Yes	No	Yes	NA	Yes	Improvement Year 1	No	No	No
Billings H S	3003900	Skyview High School	00871	No	Yes	No	Yes	NA	Yes	Improvement Year 1	No	No	No
Lockwood Elem	3016950	Lockwood Middle School	00912	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Improvement Year 1	Yes	No	No
Laurel Elem	3016200	Fred W Graff School	00497	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Improvement Year 1	Yes	No	No
Laurel Elem	3016200	West School	00499	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Improvement Year 1	Yes	No	No

**1.4.4.3 Corrective Action**

In the table below, for schools in corrective action, provide the number of schools for which the listed corrective actions under *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2008-09 (based on SY 2007-08 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

<b>Corrective Action</b>	<b># of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2008-09</b>
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	5
Extension of the school year or school day	
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	
Replacement of the principal	
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	5
<b>Comments:</b>	

**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 2008-09 (based on SY 2007-08 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

<b>Restructuring Action</b>	<b># of Title I Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented</b>
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	
Reopening the school as a public charter school	
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	
Take over the school by the State	
Other major restructuring of the school governance	40
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

## 1.4.5 Districts That Received Title I Funds Identified for Improvement

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

In the following table, provide a list of districts that received Title I funds and were identified for improvement or corrective action under Section 1116 for the SY 2009-10 based on the data from SY 2008-09. For each district on the list, provide the following:

- District Name
- District NCES ID Code
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the district met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2009-10 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: Improvement or Corrective Action<sup>2</sup>)
- Whether the district is a district that received Title I funds. Indicate "Yes" if the district received Title I funds and "No" if the district did not receive Title I funds. (**This column must be completed by States that choose to list all districts or all districts in improvement.** This column is optional for States that list only districts in improvement that receive Title I funds.)

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter district data.

Download template: [Question 1.4.5.1 \(Get MS Excel Viewer\)](#)

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

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

District Name	Nces/CCD Id Code	Reading/Language Arts		Mathematics		Other Academic Indicator		School Improvement Status for Sy 2009-10	Title I District (Yes/No)
		Proficiency Target Met (Yes/No)	Participation Rate Target Met (Yes/No)	Proficiency Target Met (Yes/No)	Participation Rate Target Met (Yes/No)	Academic Indicator Met (Yes/No) (elementary/middle schools)	Graduation Rate Met (Yes/No) (high school)		
Anaconda Elem	3002010	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	ImYr1	Yes
Anaconda H S	3002030	No	Yes	No	Yes	NA	Yes	ImYr2	Yes
Arlee Elem	3002220	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	ImYr1	Yes
Ashland Elem	3000008	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	CYr4	Yes
Belgrade H S	3003330	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	NA	Yes	ImYr1	No
Billings Elem	3003870	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	CYr3	Yes
Billings H S	3003900	No	Yes	No	Yes	NA	Yes	CYr3	Yes
Box Elder Elem	3004440	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	CYr7	Yes
Bozeman Elem	3004560	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	ImYr1	Yes
Brockton H S	3005040	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	CYr8	Yes
Browning Elem	3005140	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	CYr8	Yes
Browning H S	3005190	No	Yes	No	Yes	NA	No	CYr8	Yes
Butte Elem	3005280	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	CYr3	Yes
Butte H S	3005310	No	Yes	No	Yes	NA	No	ImYr2	Yes
Colstrip Elem	3007050	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	ImYr1	Yes
Columbia Falls Elem	3007110	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	CYr1	Yes
Columbia Falls H S	3007140	No	Yes	No	Yes	NA	No	ImYr2	No
Corvallis K-12 Schools	3007410	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	HImYr1	Yes
Culbertson Elem	3007830	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	CYr1	Yes
Cut Bank Elem	3000003	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	ImYr2	Yes
Darby K-12 Schools	3008280	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	ImYr1	Yes
Deer Lodge Elem	3008670	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	ImYr2	Yes
DeSmet Elem	3008880	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	HImYr1	Yes
Dillon Elem	3008910	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	ImYr1	Yes
Dodson Elem	3009090	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	CYr1	Yes
Schools	3000102	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	ImYr2	Yes
East Helena Elem	3009560	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	ImYr1	Yes
Eureka Elem	3010080	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	ImYr1	Yes
Evergreen Elem	3010920	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	ImYr1	Yes
Fairview Elem	3010210	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	ImYr1	Yes
Flathead H S	3015420	No	Yes	No	Yes	NA	No	ImYr2	Yes
Forsyth Elem	3011160	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	ImYr1	Yes
Forsyth H S	3011190	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	NA	Yes	ImYr1	Yes

District Name	Nces/CCD Id Code	Reading/Language Arts		Mathematics		Other Academic Indicator		School Improvement Status for Sy 2009-10	Title I District (Yes/No)
		Proficiency Target Met (Yes/No)	Participation Rate Target Met (Yes/No)	Proficiency Target Met (Yes/No)	Participation Rate Target Met (Yes/No)	Academic Indicator Met (Yes/No (elementary/middle schools))	Graduation Rate Met (Yes/No) (high school)		
Frazer Elem	3011420	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	CYr7	Yes
Frazer H S	3011460	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	CYr8	Yes
Glasgow K-12 Schools	3012420	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	ImYr1	Yes
Glendive Elem	3012510	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	ImYr1	Yes
Great Falls Elem	3013040	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	CYr3	Yes
Great Falls H S	3013050	No	Yes	No	Yes	NA	No	CYr1	Yes
Hamilton K-12 Schools	3013260	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	CYr1	Yes
Hardin Elem	3013310	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	CYr4	Yes
Hardin H S	3013340	No	Yes	No	Yes	NA	No	CYr4	Yes
Harlem Elem	3013395	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	CYr7	Yes
Harlem H S	3013400	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	ImYr1	Yes
Havre Elem	3013560	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	CYr3	Yes
Havre H S	3013590	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	NA	Yes	ImYr1	Yes
Schls	3013660	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	CYr8	Yes
Heart Butte K-12 Schools	3000099	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	CYr8	Yes
Helena Elem	3000005	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	CYr3	Yes
Helena H S	3013830	No	Yes	No	Yes	NA	No	CYr1	Yes
Hellgate Elem	3013860	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	ImYr1	Yes
Hot Springs Elem	3014610	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	ImYr1	Yes
Schools	3014700	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	ImYr1	Yes
Jefferson H S	3015120	No	Yes	No	Yes	NA	Yes	ImYr1	Yes
Kila Elem	3015570	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	ImYr1	Yes
Lame Deer Elem	3016050	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	CYr7	Yes
Lame Deer H S	3000095	No	Yes	No	Yes	NA	Yes	CYr7	Yes
Laurel Elem	3016200	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	CYr3	Yes
Lewistown Elem	3016490	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	ImYr1	Yes
Libby K-12 Schools	3016530	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	ImYr1	Yes
Lincoln County H S	3016770	No	Yes	No	Yes	NA	Yes	ImYr2	Yes
Lincoln K-12 Schools	3016810	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	ImYr1	Yes
Lockwood Elem	3016950	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	ImYr1	Yes
Lodge Grass Elem	3017010	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	CYr8	Yes
Lodge Grass H S	3017040	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	CYr7	Yes
Lolo Elem	3017130	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	HImYr1	Yes
Lone Rock Elem	3017190	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	ImYr1	Yes
Miles City Elem	3018410	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	ImYr2	Yes

District Name	Nces/CCD Id Code	Reading/Language Arts		Mathematics		Other Academic Indicator		School Improvement Status for Sy 2009-10	Title I District (Yes/No)
		Proficiency Target Met (Yes/No)	Participation Rate Target Met (Yes/No)	Proficiency Target Met (Yes/No)	Participation Rate Target Met (Yes/No)	Academic Indicator Met (Yes/No (elementary/middle schools))	Graduation Rate Met (Yes/No) (high school)		
Missoula Elem	3018570	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	CYr3	Yes
Missoula H S	3018540	No	Yes	No	Yes	NA	Yes	CYr3	Yes
Nashua K-12 Schools	3019170	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	ImYr1	Yes
Noxon Elem	3000090	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	ImYr1	Yes
Plenty Coups H S	3013360	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	CYr8	Yes
Polson Elem	3021060	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	CYr2	Yes
Polson H S	3021090	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	NA	Yes	CYr2	Yes
Poplar Elem	3021240	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	CYr8	Yes
Poplar H S	3021270	No	Yes	No	Yes	NA	No	CYr7	Yes
Pryor Elem	3021720	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	CYr7	Yes
Rocky Boy Elem	3022750	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	CYr8	Yes
Rocky Boy H S	3028911	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	NA	HCYr7	Yes
Ronan Elem	3022790	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	ImYr2	Yes
Ronan H S	3022800	No	Yes	No	Yes	NA	Yes	ImYr1	Yes
Roundup Elem	3023040	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	ImYr1	Yes
Shelby Elem	3023900	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	ImYr2	Yes
Shelby H S	3023910	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	NA	Yes	HImYr1	Yes
Shepherd Elem	3023940	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	ImYr1	Yes
Smith Valley Elem	3002850	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	ImYr1	Yes
St Ignatius K-12 Schools	3006110	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	ImYr1	Yes
Stevensville H S	3025050	No	Yes	No	Yes	NA	Yes	ImYr1	Yes
Superior K-12 Schools	3025470	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	ImYr1	Yes
Target Range Elem	3025890	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	ImYr1	Yes
Three Forks Elem	3026160	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	ImYr1	Yes
Townsend K-12 Schools	3004980	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	ImYr1	Yes
Troy Elem	3026550	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	ImYr1	Yes
West Yellowstone K-12	3027630	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	ImYr1	Yes
Whitefish H S	3027790	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	NA	No	ImYr1	Yes
Whitehall Elem	3027810	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	ImYr1	Yes
Wolf Point Elem	3028590	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	CYr4	Yes
Wolf Point H S	3028620	No	Yes	No	Yes	NA	No	CYr3	Yes
Wyola Elem	3028800	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	CYr7	Yes

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

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

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

Call to Greatness Meetings - There have been four of these conducted by the OPI Title I and Indian Education staff for districts that are in or have been in corrective action and have high populations of American Indian students. Each meeting has covered data findings and interactive methods of engaging personnel and school board members from these schools in the continuous improvement process. Last year's meeting featured Dr. Larry Lezotte who spent two days on the Effective Schools Research and some of the tools he offers such as Assembly Required: A Continuous School Improvement System. Each attendee received the book by that title and each school represented received the Implementation Guide for Assembly Required (notebook), Learning for All (a book), and Stepping Up: Leading the Charge to Improve Our Schools (a book). All districts (except one) with such schools for a total of 30 districts were present along with the School Coaches assigned to them. The most recent event was a series of regional meetings/trainings for Administrators and Board members focusing on Effective Leadership.

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

**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 2008-09 (based on SY 2007-08 assessments under Section 1111 of ESEA).

<b>Corrective Action</b>	<b># of Districts receiving Title I funds in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2008-09</b>
Implementing a new curriculum based on State standards	30
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	6
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	
Restructured the district	
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2007-08 and beginning of SY 2008-09 as a corrective action)	
<b>Comments:</b>	

**1.4.7 Appeal of AYP and Identification Determinations**

In the table below, provide the number of districts and schools that appealed their AYP designations based on SY 2008-09 data and the results of those appeals.

	<b># Appealed Their AYP Designations</b>	<b># Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation</b>
Districts	7	1
Schools	4	2
<b>Comments:</b>		

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2008-09 data was complete	08/31/09
---	----------



### 1.4.8 School Improvement Status

In the section below, "Schools in Improvement" means Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of *ESEA* for SY 2008-09.

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

The table below pertains only to schools that received assistance through section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2008-09.

*Instructions for States that during SY 2008-09 administered assessments required under section 1116 of ESEA after fall 2008 (i.e., non fall-testing states):*

- In the **SY 2008-09 column**, provide the total number and percentage of students in schools receiving School Improvement funds in SY 2008-09 who were:
  - Proficient in mathematics as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* that were administered in SY 2008-09.
  - Proficient in reading/language arts as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* in SY 2008-09.
  - In SY 2007-08 column, provide the requested data for the same schools whose student proficiency data are reported for SY 2008-09.

*States that in SY 2008-09 administered assessments required under section 1116 of ESEA during fall 2008 (i.e., fall-testing states):*

- In the **SY 2008-09 column**, provide the total number and percentage of students in schools receiving School Improvement funds in SY 2008-09 who were:
  - Proficient in mathematics as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* that were administered in fall 2009.
  - Proficient in reading/language arts as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* that were administered in fall 2009.
  - In the **SY 2007-08 column**, provide the requested data for the same schools whose student proficiency data are reported in the SY 2008-09 column.

Category	SY 2008-09	SY 2007-08
Total number of students who completed the <b>mathematics</b> assessment and for whom proficiency level was assigned and were enrolled in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09	2,685	2,708
Total number of students who were proficient or above in <b>mathematics</b> in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09	719	701
Percentage of students who were proficient or above in <b>mathematics</b> in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09	26.8	25.9
Total number of students who completed the <b>reading/language arts</b> assessment and for whom proficiency level was assigned and were enrolled in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09	2,685	2,708
Total number of students who were proficient or above in <b>reading/language arts</b> in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09	1,328	1,319
Percentage of students who were proficient in <b>reading/language arts</b> in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09	49.5	48.7
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

#### 1.4.8.2 School Improvement Status and School Improvement Assistance

In the table below, indicate the number of schools receiving assistance through section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2008-09 that:

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

Category	# of Schools
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2008-09 that <b>made adequate yearly progress</b> based on testing in SY 2008-09	1
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2008-09 that <b>exited improvement status</b> based on testing in SY 2008-09	0
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2008-09 that <b>did not make adequate yearly progress</b> based on testing in SY 2008-09	31
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

**1.4.8.3 Effective School Improvement Strategies**

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

For fall-testing States, responses for this item would be based on assessments administered in fall 2009. For all other States the responses would be based on assessments administered during SY 2008-09.

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

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

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

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



**1.4.8.4 Sharing of Effective Strategies**

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

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Effective strategies have been shared in the Call to Greatness sessions for identified schools and districts. School coaches share effective strategies in their regional meetings and periodic trainings and then pass those on to their individual school personnel during on-site coaching visits (3-5 per month).

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

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

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2008 (SY 2008-09) Title I, Part A allocation that the SEA reserved in accordance with Section 1003(a) of *ESEA* and §200.100(a) of ED's regulations governing the reservation of funds for school improvement under Section 1003(a) of *ESEA*: 4.0 %

**Comments:**

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

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

For SY 2008-09 there is no need to upload a spreadsheet to answer this question in the CSPR.

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

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

Section 1003(g)(8) of *ESEA* allows States to reserve up to five percent of Section 1003(g) funds for administration and to meet the evaluation and technical assistance requirements for this program. In the space below, identify and describe the specific Section 1003(g) evaluation and technical assistance activities that your State conducted during SY 2008-09.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

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

In the space below, describe actions (if any) taken by your State in SY 2008-09 that were supported by **funds other than Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) funds** to address the achievement problems of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of *ESEA*.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Indian Education Achievement funds, appropriated by the state Legislature in the 2007 session, have been used to support the Call to Greatness meetings and to pilot promising instructional strategies in several schools in either corrective action or restructuring.
--

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



### 1.4.9 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

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

#### 1.4.9.1 Public School Choice

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

##### 1.4.9.1.2 Public School Choice – Students

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

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

The number of students who applied to transfer should include:

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

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

	<b># Students</b>
Eligible for public school choice	22,668
Applied to transfer	7
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	7

**1.4.9.1.3 Funds Spent on Public School Choice**

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

	<b>Amount</b>
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$ 0

**1.4.9.1.4 Availability of Public School Choice Options**

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

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

	<b># LEAs</b>
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	41

**FAQs about public school choice:**

- a. How should States report data on Title I public school choice for those LEAs that have open enrollment and other choice programs? For those LEAs that implement open enrollment or other school choice programs in addition to public school choice under Section 1116 of ESEA, the State may consider a student as having applied to transfer if the student meets the following:
- Has a "home" or "neighborhood" school (to which the student would have been assigned, in the absence of a school choice program) that receives Title I funds and has been identified, under the statute, as in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring; and
  - Has elected to enroll, at some point since July 1, 2002 (the effective date of the Title I choice provisions), and after the home school has been identified as in need of improvement, in a school that has not been so identified and is attending that school; and
  - Is using district transportation services to attend such a school.

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

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

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

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

**1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services**

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

**1.4.9.2.2 Supplemental Educational Services – Students**

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

	<b># Students</b>
Eligible for supplemental educational services	9,365
Applied for supplemental educational services	73
Received supplemental educational services	73
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk.

**1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services**

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

	<b>Amount</b>
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$ 197,980
<b>Comments:</b>	

**1.5 TEACHER QUALITY**

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

**1.5.1 Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified**

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

School Type	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are <u>NOT</u> Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are <u>NOT</u> Highly Qualified
All classes	20,933	20,652	98.7	281	1.3
All elementary classes	7,902	7,863	99.5	39	0.5
All secondary classes	13,031	12,789	98.1	242	1.9
Montana defines grades K-8 as elementary and grades 9-12 as secondary. The paper survey conducted in the spring 2008 was inconclusive. The data collection process has been revised to insure accuracy for school year 2009-10.					

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

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

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

Special Education teachers teaching core academic classes.
--

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

**FAQs about highly qualified teachers and core academic subjects:**

- a. *What are the core academic subjects?* English, reading/language arts, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, and geography [Title IX, Section 9101(11)]. While the statute includes the arts in the core academic subjects, it does not specify which of the arts are core academic subjects; therefore, States must make this determination.
- b. *How is a teacher defined?* An individual who provides instruction in the core academic areas to kindergarten, grades 1 through 12, or ungraded classes, or individuals who teach in an environment other than a classroom setting (and who maintain daily student attendance records) [from NCES, CCD, 2001-02]
- c. *How is a class defined?* A class is a setting in which organized instruction of core academic course content is provided to one or more students (including cross-age groupings) for a given period of time. (A course may be offered to more than one class.) Instruction, provided by one or more teachers or other staff members, may be delivered in person or via a different medium. Classes that share space should be considered as separate classes if they function as separate units for more than 50% of the time [from NCES Non-fiscal Data Handbook for Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education, 2003].
- d. *Should 6th-, 7th-, and 8th-grade classes be reported in the elementary or the secondary category?* States are responsible for determining whether the content taught at the middle school level meets the competency requirements for elementary or secondary instruction. Report classes in grade 6 through 8 consistent with how teachers have been classified to determine their highly qualified status, regardless of whether their schools are configured as elementary or middle schools.
- e. *How should States count teachers (including specialists or resource teachers) in elementary classes?* States that count self-contained classrooms as one class should, to avoid over-representation, also count subject-area specialists (e.g., mathematics or music teachers) or resource teachers as teaching one class. On the other hand, States using a departmentalized approach to instruction where a self-contained classroom is counted multiple times (once for each subject taught) should also count subject-area specialists or resource teachers as teaching multiple classes.
- f. *How should States count teachers in self-contained multiple-subject secondary classes?* Each core academic subject taught for which students are receiving credit toward graduation should be counted in the numerator and the denominator. For example, if the same teacher teaches English, calculus, history, and science in a self-contained classroom, count these as four classes in the denominator. If the teacher is Highly Qualified to teach English and history, he/she would be counted as Highly Qualified in two of the four subjects in the numerator.
- g. *What is the reporting period?* The reporting period is the school year. The count of classes must include all semesters, quarters, or terms of the school year. For example, if core academic classes are held in summer sessions, those classes should be included in the count of core academic classes. A state determines into which school year classes fall.

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

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

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

	Percentage
Elementary School Classes	
Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	0.0
Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	26.0
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	74.0
Other (please explain in comment box below)	
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

	Percentage
Secondary School Classes	
Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	85.0
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	3.0
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	12.0
Other (please explain in comment box below)	
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

### 1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

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

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

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

School Type	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified
<b>Elementary Schools</b>			
High Poverty Elementary Schools	1,798	1,785	99.3
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	1,039	1,036	99.7
<b>Secondary Schools</b>			
High Poverty secondary Schools	1,753	1,667	95.1
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	4,942	4,921	99.6

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

	High-Poverty Schools (more than what %)	Low-Poverty Schools (less than what %)
Elementary schools	55.9	22.2
Poverty metric used	Free-Reduced Meals	
Secondary schools	45.5	22.3
Poverty metric used	Free-Reduced Meals	

#### FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

- What is a "high-poverty school"?* Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "high-poverty" schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State.
- What is a "low-poverty school"?* Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "low-poverty" schools as schools in the bottom quartile of poverty in the State.
- How are the poverty quartiles determined?* Separately rank order elementary and secondary schools from highest to lowest on your percentage poverty measure. Divide the list into four equal groups. Schools in the first (highest group) are high-poverty schools. Schools in the last group (lowest group) are the low-poverty schools. Generally, States use the percentage of students who qualify for the free or reduced-price lunch program for this calculation.
- Since the poverty data are collected at the school and not classroom level, how do we classify schools as either elementary or secondary for this purpose?* States may include as elementary schools all schools that serve children in grades K through 5 (including K through 8 or K through 12 schools) and would therefore include as secondary schools those that exclusively serve children in grades 6 and higher.

**1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS**

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

**1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs**

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

**Table 1.6.1 Definitions:**

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other: Supplemental Reading Instruction



## 1.6.2 Student Demographic Data

### 1.6.2.1 Number of ALL LEP Students in the State

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

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

Number of ALL LEP students in the State	5,274
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

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

	#
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	2,145
<b>Comments:</b> Please see 1.6.3.2.1 Local school districts can update Montana's student data system AIM on an ongoing basis at any time. The figure of 2,145 reflects the AIM count of LEP students approximately 4-6 weeks before the ELP assessment testing window. It is common practice for districts to carefully review the status of LEP students as the ELP testing window approaches. Districts may have determined that students previously identified as LEP had become proficient, and some students may not have been able to complete the assessment for various reasons.	

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

### 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
North American Indian	224
German	204
Spanish; Castilian	140
Russian	69
Chinese	16

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

These figures indicate language of impact but do not necessarily indicate that students are fluent speakers of the language. The total for North American Indian languages that includes identified tribal languages is 3,666.

**1.6.3 Student Performance Data**

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

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

In the table below, please provide the number of ALL LEP students tested on annual State English language proficiency assessment (as defined in 1.6.2.1).

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	3,871
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	1,404
Total	5,275
<b>Comments:</b> The figure of 5,274 is derived from an October 2008 count date. Local districts can change/update their student data files anytime during the year.	

**1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results**

	#
Number proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	2,819
Percent proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	72.8
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

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

	<b>#</b>
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	1,761
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	212
Total	1,973
<b>Comments:</b> See 1.6.2.2	
Local school districts can update Montana's student data system AIM on an ongoing basis at any time. The figure of 2,145 reflects the AIM count of LEP students approximately 4-6 weeks before the ELP assessment testing window. It is common practice for districts to carefully review the status of LEP students as the ELP testing window approaches. Districts may have determined that students previously identified as LEP had become proficient, and some students may not have been able to complete the assessment for various reasons.	
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 these students in establishing AMAO1/making progress target and did not include them in the calculations for AMAO1/making progress(# and % making progress).	
	<b>#</b>
Number of Title III LEP with one data point whose progress can not be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO1.	502

**1.6.3.2.2**

**Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:**

- Annual Measureable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs)** = State targets for the percent of students making progress and attaining proficiency.
- Making Progress** = Number of Title III LEP students that met the definition of Making Progress as defined by the State and submitted to ED in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
- ELP Attainment** = Number of Title III LEP students that meet the State defined English language proficiency submitted to ED in the State Consolidated 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 State targets for the number and percentage of States making progress and attaining English proficiency for this reporting period. Additionally, provide the results from the annual State English language proficiency assessment for Title III-served LEP students who participated in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12. If your State uses cohorts, provide us with the range of targets, (i.e., indicate the lowest target among the cohorts, e.g., 10% and the highest target among a cohort, e.g., 70%).

	Results		Targets	
	#	%	#	%
Making progress	323	20.7	630	50.00
ELP attainment	412	26.4	468	30.00
<b>Comments:</b>				

**1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments**

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

**1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language**

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

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

**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
<b>Comments:</b>

**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
<b>Comments:</b>

**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
<b>Comments:</b>

**1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students**

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

**1.6.3.6.1 Title III Served MFLEP Students by Year Monitored**

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

Monitored Former LEP students include:

- Students who have transitioned out of a language instruction educational program funded by Title III into classrooms that are not tailored for LEP students.
- 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
238	21	259
<b>Comments:</b>		

**1.6.3.6.2** In the table below, report the number of MFLEP students who took the annual mathematics assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned into classrooms not designed for LEP students and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

**Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:**

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
152	50	32.9	102
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

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 into classrooms not designed for LEP students and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

**Table 1.6.3.6.3 Definitions:**

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
152	91	59.9	61
<b>Comments:</b>			

**1.6.3.6.4 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Science**

In the table below, report results for monitored former LEP students who took the annual science assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned into classrooms not designed for LEP students and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

**Table 1.6.3.6.4 Definitions:**

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
76	17	22.4	59
<b>Comments:</b>			

### 1.6.4 Title III Subgrantees

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

#### 1.6.4.1 Title III Subgrantee Performance

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

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

	#
# - Total number of subgrantees for the year	74
# - Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	0
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	11
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	5
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	11
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	16
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2007-08 and 2008-09)	7
# - Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2008-09 for not meeting Title III AMAOs	0
# - Number of subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2005-06, 2006-07, 2007-08, and 2008-09)	0
<b>Comments:</b> 2008-09 is the second year that all three AMAOs have been determined.	
One subgrantee is Nonpublic therefore is served by a public subgrantee. Three subgrantees had no LEP students enrolled at the time of the ELP assessment window. Twenty-seven subgrantees did not have students served by Title III who had received services for 1-3 years and who scored as proficient for the AMAO 2 determination.	

#### 1.6.4.2 State Accountability

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

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

State met <u>all</u> three Title III AMAOs	<u>No</u>
<b>Comments:</b>	

#### 1.6.4.3 Termination of Title III Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

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



### 1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students

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

#### 1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students

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

##### **Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:**

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

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants
189	120	4

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.

Source – Initially populated from ED*Facts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED*Facts* Data Crosswalk.

**1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development**

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

**1.6.6.1 Teacher Information**

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

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

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

	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	100
Estimate number of <b>additional</b> certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	14

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

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

**Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:**

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

Type of Professional Development Activity	# Subgrantees	
Instructional strategies for LEP students	6	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	6	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	2	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	7	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers		
Other (Explain in comment box)		
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	6	104
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	4	20
PD provided to principals	3	9
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	3	6
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	5	42
PD provided to community based organization personnel	1	2
Total		183

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

### 1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities

This section collects data on State grant activities.

#### 1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process

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

##### Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:

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

Example: State received SY 2008-09 funds July 1, 2008, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2008, for SY 2008-09 programs. Then the "# of days/\$\$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
07/07/08	07/25/08	18
<b>Comments:</b>		

#### 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.

The goal is to have the E-grant application available in June for submittal by July 1. Last year we experienced some technical difficulties with the system.
--

**1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS**

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

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

**1.8 GRADUATION RATES AND DROPOUT RATES**

This section collects graduation and dropout rates.

**1.8.1 Graduation Rates**

In the table below, provide the graduation rates calculated using the methodology that was approved as part of the State's accountability plan for the **previous school year** (SY 2007-08). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	82.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	62.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	88.8
Black, non-Hispanic	73.5
Hispanic	70.1
White, non-Hispanic	85.5
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	77.0
Limited English proficient	66.9
Economically disadvantaged	75.9
Migratory students	0.0
Male	80.5
Female	84.7
<b>Comments:</b> Montana needs four years of data to calculate those subgroups. Montana does not have four years of data.	

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

**FAQs on graduation rates:**

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Montana needs four years of data to calculate those subgroups. Montana does not have four years of data.
--

### 1.8.2 Dropout Rates

In the table below, provide the dropout rates calculated using the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's (NCES) Common Core of Data (CCD) for the **previous school year** (SY 2007-08). Below the table is a FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Dropout Rate
All Students	3.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	8.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	2.6
Black, non-Hispanic	3.7
Hispanic	4.4
White, non-Hispanic	3.1
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	
Limited English proficient	
Economically disadvantaged	
Migratory students	
Male	3.9
Female	3.4
<b>Comments:</b> Information for Children with Disabilities, Limited English Proficient, Economically Disadvantaged, and Migratory students is not available at this time.	

#### FAQ on dropout rates:

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

**1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS PROGRAM**

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

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

	#	# LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	416	30
LEAs with subgrants	5	5
Total	421	35
<b>Comments:</b>		



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

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

**1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youths**

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

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b># of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants</b>	<b># of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	2	88
K	36	79
1	47	79
2	44	82
3	35	77
4	37	83
5	29	61
6	39	71
7	18	73
8	24	43
9	23	48
10	21	33
11	23	30
12	43	40
Ungraded	0	0
Total	421	887
<b>Comments:</b>		

**1.9.1.2 Primary Nighttime Residence of Homeless Children and Youths**

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

	<b># of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants</b>	<b># of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants</b>
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	91	425
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	272	309
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	16	20
Hotels/Motels	42	133
Total	421	887
<b>Comments:</b>		

## 1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

### 1.9.2.1 Homeless Children and Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

Age/Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	88
K	79
1	79
2	82
3	77
4	83
5	61
6	71
7	73
8	43
9	48
10	33
11	30
12	40
Ungraded	0
Total	887
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk.

### 1.9.2.2 Subgroups of Homeless Students Served

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

	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied youth	70
Migratory children/youth	1
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	42
Limited English proficient students	16
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk.

**1.9.2.3 Educational Support Services Provided by Subgrantees**

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

	<b># McKinney-Vento Subgrantees That Offer</b>
Tutoring or other instructional support	5
Expedited evaluations	2
Staff professional development and awareness	2
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	2
Transportation	4
Early childhood programs	1
Assistance with participation in school programs	3
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	2
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	3
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	2
Coordination between schools and agencies	5
Counseling	3
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	2
Clothing to meet a school requirement	4
School supplies	5
Referral to other programs and services	4
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	3
Other (optional – in comment box below)	0
Other (optional – in comment box below)	0
Other (optional – in comment box below)	0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

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

**1.9.2.4 Barriers To The Education Of Homeless Children And Youth**

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

	<b># Subgrantees Reporting</b>
Eligibility for homeless services	1
School Selection	2
Transportation	3
School records	2
Immunizations	1
Other medical records	0
Other Barriers – in comment box below	2

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Number 1. Tuition issues when unaccompanied youths' parents are out of area. Number 2. One district continues to face questions of guardianship.
---

### 1.9.2.5 Academic Progress of Homeless Students

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

#### 1.9.2.5.1 Reading Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Reading Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	35	20
4	45	24
5	38	21
6	35	23
7	45	31
8	25	12
High School	12	6
<b>Comments:</b>		

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk.

#### 1.9.2.5.2 Mathematics Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Mathematics Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	35	15
4	45	21
5	38	16
6	35	13
7	45	16
8	25	8
High School	12	2
<b>Comments:</b>		

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk.

## 1.10 MIGRANT CHILD COUNTS

This section collects the Title I, Part C, Migrant Education Program (MEP) child counts which States are required to provide and may be used to determine the annual State allocations under Title I, Part C. The child counts should reflect the reporting period of September 1, 2008 through August 31, 2009. This section also collects a report on the procedures used by States to produce true, accurate, and valid child counts.

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

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

### FAQs on Child Count:

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

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

**1.10.1 Category 1 Child Count**

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number by age/grade of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, resided in your State for one or more days during the reporting period of September 1, 2008 through August 31, 2009. This figure includes all eligible migrant children who may or may not have participated in MEP services. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

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

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can be Counted for Funding Purposes</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	86
K	59
1	60
2	64
3	76
4	68
5	61
6	68
7	66
8	73
9	90
10	52
11	73
12	17
Ungraded	1
Out-of-school	28
Total	942

**Comments:**

Source – Initially populated from ED*Facts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED*Facts* Data Crosswalk.

**1.10.1.1 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases**

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Category 1 Child Count represents a 15.9% decrease in migrant children identified in the 2007-08 Category Child Count. There were 179 fewer children identified in the 2008-09 Child Count. This is primarily due to the use of genetic beet seed which eliminated the use of traditional manual hoeing and thinning. As a result, migrant laborers were not hired for the first time in one of our largest project locations where usually more than 150 children are identified and served.

**1.10.2 Category 2 Child Count**

In the table below, enter by age/grade the unduplicated statewide number of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, were served for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods that occurred within the reporting period of September 1, 2008 through August 31, 2009. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. Count a child who moved to different schools within the State and who was served in both traditional summer and year-round school intersession programs only once. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

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

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	77
K	41
1	46
2	47
3	59
4	55
5	47
6	54
7	53
8	60
9	74
10	45
11	60
12	3
Ungraded	1
Out-of-school	27
Total	749
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Initially populated from ED*Facts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED*Facts* Data Crosswalk.



**1.10.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases**

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Category 2 Child Count represents a 21% drop in the number of children identified and served during the summer session. Again, this is primarily a result of the use of genetic seed which produces a sugar beet which eliminates the need for traditional manual hoeing and thinning. The largest project site in eastern Montana which usually serves well over 150 children, served only 20 children during the 2009 summer session. Fewer children were also identified and served in all other project areas where weather and smaller crop yields lessened the need for migrant labor.

### 1.10.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures

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

#### 1.10.3.1 Student Information System

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The state of Montana utilizes the New Generation System (NGS) as its primary source of Child Count data compilation. NGS was the primary source used for the previous year Child Count (2007-08); it was used for both the Category 1 and Category 2 Child Count for the 2008-09 submission.

**1.10.3.2 Data Collection and Management Procedures**

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The data for the Category 2 count were collected and maintained in the same manner that the data for the Category 1 count were collected and maintained. That is, core eligibility, family history and demographic data is collected by trained recruiters through a direct family interview and documented on a Certificate of Eligibility (COE) which complies with all of the National COE requirements. Data is collected throughout the reporting period between September 1 of 2008 and August 31 of 2009. Data are then entered into the NGS database by trained data entry personnel and reviewed by local and state data administrators. Project Sites also use NGS to run data checks and various reports throughout the reporting period prior to submitting final data to the SEA. The data are organized within NGS to reflect all eligibility information required by statute and obtained during the interview which has been documented on the COE.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The SEA sponsors annual NGS data entry training which is required before any staff can obtain a password to the NGS system. On-going training for state level staff is also conducted each year. Trained project directors and data entry personnel then input core eligibility, demographic, health and education data into the New Generation System. Academic and Health data are updated as they become available and students are enrolled and withdrawn from the NGS system as they arrive or depart from a particular location. NGS is a student specific database, which organizes all of the pertinent student data based on the COE and other academic and or supportive data available. For example, a student withdrawal record includes all information regarding credits, supplemental services, PFS, status and other requirements of the ESEA Title 1 Part C MEP. Prior to inputting any data collected on the COE at the local level, the COE must have been validated at the local level by a project administrator and finally at the state level by SEA staff.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

### 1.10.3.3 Methods Used To Count Children

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The NGS query is programmed to count a student only once statewide in the Category 1 and Category 2 counts. In order to avoid duplication and to assure correct student identification, NGS creates a unique student identification (USID) number for each new student entered into the NGS centralized database. Before a new student record can be created, the system checks for duplication based on the student's last name or similar last name by using a system-generated "wild card" prompt. The wild card prompt allows data entry personnel to check potential duplicate students by displaying students that have a range of similar information. Potential duplicates are then checked against additional fields such as first name, birthdate and parents' names. Any matches generate further review which is conducted by the Data Review Team at the SEA. Once the data have been entered at the local and/or state level, they are crosschecked against paper copies of the COE by trained local personnel, and then, once again, at the SEA.

A child may not be enrolled in NGS without inputting a qualifying activity. The information in NGS is verified at the local and state levels to ensure that it matches the paper COE. The activity is validated according to the state's quality control processes.

NGS selects students for the unique student count based upon the enrollment period and federal eligibility criteria. This report counts each student once, based upon a unique USID, even if the student has multiple enrollment records within the reporting time period.

#### Selection Criteria

Below is a list of selection criteria used to create the unique student count:

- Regular and summer enrollments containing an enrollment and withdrawal date are included if the student was enrolled for at least one day during the reporting period.
- The student has a residency verification date within the school year.
- The student is between 3 years and 21 years 11 months old for at least one day during the reporting period.
- The student's most recent qualifying arrival date must be less than 36 months from the beginning of the reporting period.
- If the enrollment record has a termination date, the student must not be terminated prior to the beginning of the reporting period. Students who have graduated high school are NOT given new enrollments in NGS.
- For twelve-month counts, any type of eligible enrollment is counted.
- For the summer/intersession (Category 2) counts, the report includes enrollments with a summer or intersession type of enrollment.

Below is an example of the criteria used to gather the data from the database. For these examples, the YR1 and YR2 are used to represent the school year selection. For example, for the 2008-2009 school year option, YR1=2008 and YR2=2009. For the QAD criteria, YR3 represents a date three years prior to the school year date. In order for a student to be eligible for this count, he/she must have made a move within three years. For example, if we are using the school year 2008-2009, YR3=2005. The data for the count is retrieved using the following criteria:

#### Enrollment Date Information:

- o The Withdrawal Date is between 9/1/YR1 and 8/31/YR2 OR
- o The Enrollment Date is between 9/1/YR1 and 8/31/YR2 OR
- o The Residency Verification date is between 9/1/YR1 and 8/31/YR2
- The Termination Reason does not equal 'G' (Graduated), 'E' (GED) or 'D' (Deceased) and the Termination Date is greater than 8/31/YR1.
- The QAD greater than or equal to 9/1/YR3.

#### Birthdate Information:

- o The student must be between 3 and 21 years 11 months old to be counted.
- o If the student turns three during the school year and the enrollment date is greater than birthdate or enrollment is less than birthdate and withdrawal date is greater than birthdate or residency verification date between 9/1/YR1 and 8/31/YR2 and greater than birthdate.
- The Maximum History Id or most current History Id for students meeting above criteria is used.

#### Criteria for Selecting the Summer Session Students:

- The students are selected by the State, Region or District.
- Enrollment Date Information:
  - o The Enrollment Date is NOT null (no data entered) and Enrollment Type is equal to "I" (intersession) and the difference between the QAD and Enrollment Date is less than or equal to three years and Enrollment Date is between 9/1/YR1 and 8/31/YR2; OR
  - o The Enrollment Type is equal to 'S' (Summer) and the QAD is greater than 5/14/YR3 and the Enrollment Date is between 5/15/YR2 and 8/31/YR2.

• The child must have an instructional or supplemental service.

• The Termination Reason does not equal 'G' (Graduated), 'E' (GED) or 'D' (Deceased) and the Termination Date is greater than 8/31/YR2.

#### Birthdate Information:

- o The student must be between 3 and 21 years 11 months old to be counted.
- o If the student turns three during the school year and the enrollment date is greater than birthdate or enrollment is less than birthdate and withdrawal date is greater than birthdate or residency verification date between 9/1/YR1 and 8/31/YR2 and greater than birthdate.
- The Maximum History Id or most current History Id for students meeting above criteria is used.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

### 1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The accuracy and completeness of the COEs are verified through a quality control process that includes an intensive review and training based on the eligibility section in Pub. Law 107-110 Part C, current regulations and the Draft Non-Regulatory Guidance. The process, which is detailed elsewhere in this report as well, begins with thorough training of local site directors and recruiters who are given periodic updating on statutory or regulatory changes. Each COE is checked at the local and state offices by trained staff to assure that the information provided clearly indicated that the reported children are eligible. COEs with insufficient or inaccurate data are sent back to the local recruiter for clarification. As mentioned above, trained NGS data entry specialists enter data at the local operating agency level (LOA) once it has been verified as accurate.

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

#### TIMELINE

The interviews were conducted in Washington state following the migration of families from the Flathead Valley Montana region in August of 2008.

#### SAMPLE Selection

Trained interviewers in Washington state, using the Montana COE, re-interviewed over 100 families who had traveled back to Washington and enrolled in schools and projects there.

#### PROCEDURES

The interviews were conducted in person by bilingual Washington state recruiters and/or school/project personnel with one or more of the available parents. The results of these re-interviews were shared in writing and by phone with the Montana State Director by the

Washington state MSDR Director Mr. Lee Campos. Only one anomaly, resulting in two mis-identified children, was found as detailed below:

A former relative of a particular family included her former nephew and niece as part of her current family traveling with her to Montana. During the time of the interview, she gave their names to the recruiter and indicated that they were with her, but at another location. The recruiter believed her and wrote their names down on the COE. It was reported by the children's mother that these children did not travel to Montana with this person. The students were immediately removed from the NGS database and excluded from the Category 1 count. We are now requiring that recruiters verify all children's residency by actually seeing the children present either during or after the interview takes place.

In the space below, respond to the following question: Throughout the year, what steps are taken by staff to check that child count data are inputted and updated accurately (and—for systems that merge data—consolidated accurately)?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Montana MEP has very comprehensive identification and recruitment procedures as well as NGS guidelines that are followed by all migrant-funded staff throughout the year. Recruiters, NGS data entry specialists and other migrant-funded staff throughout the state undergo extensive training every year on NGS and eligibility as outlined in the Montana Manual for the Identification and Recruitment of Migrant Students and the NGS Implementation Guidelines for Local Operating Agencies. An Identification and Recruitment workshop is held at the state conference each year and for any new hires throughout the year. All NGS data specialists attend at least one training per year, including training on timely data entry and accuracy. In many LOAs, site directors directly oversee all data entry operations. Montana staff attends the NGS Academy in Texas in conjunction with the Annual Migrant Education Conference. This year, the SEA data manager and professional development specialist attended the Washington State Institute on the MSDR system. A Data Academy targets new data specialists for intensive hands-on sessions and data specialists with at least one-year's experience for advanced sessions on reporting and data manipulation.

At all project areas with significant numbers of eligible children, data is entered into NGS by trained data entry specialists; for those with fewer than 30 children, data is entered by the state Migrant Data Specialist who works closely with the state recruiter regarding these children and all others. NGS provides discrete and aggregate data on individual identification, age, residency dates, qualifying move dates, and other information pertinent to defining terms of eligibility. NGS also provides each student with a unique identification number, pertinent school history, academic information and/or supportive services(s) information. These NGS electronic records are then transmitted via the Internet to the succeeding school districts within the NGS consortium for use with placement, credit accrual, testing, and/or health information. Additionally data checks are performed when data is entered into AIM (state student information system) and re-checked using the Performance Report ACCESS Program created in-house. No consolidation of data occurs.

Additionally, during the 2008-09 reporting period, a new ID and R manual was completed which conforms with new regulations and procedures in NGS and MSIX. This manual is distributed among project sites and used during ID and R training. An NGS manual is also available for all project sites.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The state MEP verifies that the children included in the two child counts meet the eligibility criteria (i.e., that they were migrant children as defined in 34 CFR 200.40) through on-going verifications of district certificates of eligibility (COEs) by the eight local operating agencies, identification and recruitment (ID&R) training and guidelines, New Generation System (NGS) training and guidelines, data verification through various NGS reports and the crosschecking of the NGS reports for accuracy with locally submitted performance reports and actual COEs. Finally, the Montana MEP runs multiple system-generated, as well as customized statewide queries off NGS, on an on-going basis to crosscheck accuracy of data entry. Data verification checks and reports available through the NGS itself may include a Unique Student Number, COE/family and age/grade reports that spot check accuracy of data. In addition, further veracity is assured by the re-checking of all data entered into NGS when it is uploaded into the Performance Report ACCESS program. Data are also scrutinized before their entry into the state student identification system, AIM, by the SEA MEP Data Entry Specialist as described above, a person who is annually trained in both the AIM and NGS and MSDR systems.

These three methodologies help to ensure the veracity and validity of the data submitted and are complemented by the Montana MEP's mission to provide the highest level of training possible to all recruiters, data entry personnel and other migrant-funded staff so that errors of commission or omission are eliminated. It is the fundamental belief of the Montana MEP that only eligible migrant students who meet all aspects of the statutory definition should ever be identified as such and that any variation in this policy will not be tolerated.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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