

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

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

**For reporting on  
School Year 2010-11**

**MONTANA**



**PART I DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 16, 2011  
PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 2012**

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

## INTRODUCTION

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

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

The *ESEA* Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2010-11 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 2010-11 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, December 16, 2011**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 17, 2012**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2010-11, 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 2010-11 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 2010-11 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).



**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT  
PART I**

For reporting on  
**School Year 2010-11**



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 16, 2011  
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, Implemented 2011

Content Standards: Communication Arts (Reading), Approved 2010, Implemented 2011

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

### 1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts and Science

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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.



### 1.1.3 Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities

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

For funds your State had available under *ESEA* section 6111 (Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities) during SY 2010-11, estimate what percentage of the funds your State used for the following (round to the nearest ten percent).

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

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

For funds your State had available under *ESEA* section 6111 (Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities) during SY 2010-11 that were used for purposes other than the costs of the development of the State assessments and standards required by section 1111(b), for what purposes did your State use the funds? (Enter "yes" for all that apply and "no" for all that do not apply).

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

## 1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

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

Note: States are not required to report these data by the seven (7) racial/ethnic groups; instead, they are required to report these data by the major racial and ethnic groups that are identified in their Accountability Workbooks. The charts below display racial/ethnic data that has been mapped back from the major racial and ethnic groups identified in their workbooks, to the 7 racial/ethnic groups to allow for the examination of data across states.

### 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	74,243	73,599	99.1
American Indian or Alaskan Native	9,078	8,956	98.7
Asian	719	716	99.6
Black or African American	914	900	98.5
Hispanic or Latino	2,607	2,578	98.9
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	234	232	99.1
White	60,691	60,217	99.2
Two or more races	0	0	
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	8,915	8,602	96.5
Limited English proficient ( <i>LEP</i> ) students	1,666	1,640	98.4
Economically disadvantaged students	32,541	32,163	98.8
Migratory students	156	156	100.0
Male	38,324	37,970	99.1
Female	35,919	35,629	99.2
<b>Comments:</b>			

### 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	2,808	32.6
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	5,096	59.2
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	698	8.1
Total	8,602	
<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	74,247	73,595	99.1
American Indian or Alaskan Native	9,078	8,922	98.3
Asian	719	710	98.7
Black or African American	914	897	98.1
Hispanic or Latino	2,607	2,580	99.0
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	234	231	98.7
White	60,695	60,255	99.3
Two or more races	0	0	
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	8,915	8,585	96.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,666	1,615	96.9
Economically disadvantaged students	32,541	32,137	98.8
Migratory students	156	154	98.7
Male	38,327	37,946	99.0
Female	35,920	35,649	99.2

**Comments:** Montana used the permitted values that best align with the major racial and ethnic subgroups used to determine AYP as outlined in the State Accountability Plan. Montana did not use multi-racial for the 2010-2011 AYP determinations; therefore, we did not include it in our reporting.

### 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.

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	2,842	33.1
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	5,045	58.8
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	698	8.1
LEP < 12 months, took ELP	0	
Total	8,585	

**Comments:**

### 1.2.5 Participation of All Students in the Science Assessment

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	31,706	31,462	99.2
American Indian or Alaskan Native	3,680	3,617	98.3
Asian	325	325	100.0
Black or African American	385	383	99.5
Hispanic or Latino	1,099	1,094	99.5
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	102	101	99.0
White	26,115	25,942	99.3
Two or more races	0	0	
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	3,724	3,662	98.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	622	607	97.6
Economically disadvantaged students	13,050	12,913	99.0
Migratory students	56	56	100.0
Male	16,327	16,185	99.1
Female	15,379	15,277	99.3
<b>Comments:</b> Montana used the permitted values that best align with the major racial and ethnic subgroups used to determine AYP as outlined in the State Accountability Plan. Montana did not use multi-racial for the 2010-2011 AYP determinations; therefore, we did not include it in our reporting.			

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	1,342	36.6
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	2,000	54.6
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	320	8.7
Total	3,662	
<b>Comments:</b>		

### 1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

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

Note: States are not required to report these data by the seven (7) racial/ethnic groups; instead, they are required to report these data by the major racial and ethnic groups that are identified in their Accountability Workbooks. The charts below display racial/ethnic data that has been mapped back from the major racial and ethnic groups identified in their workbooks, to the 7 racial/ethnic groups to allow for the examination of data across states.

#### 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	10,600	7,428	70.1
American Indian or Alaskan Native	1,463	652	44.6
Asian	102	83	81.4
Black or African American	129	80	62.0
Hispanic or Latino	377	233	61.8
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	37	27	73.0
White	8,492	6,353	74.8
Two or more races	0	0	
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	1,327	577	43.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	312	94	30.1
Economically disadvantaged students	5,243	3,129	59.7
Migratory students	28	13	46.4
Male	5,450	3,882	71.2
Female	5,150	3,546	68.9
<b>Comments:</b>			

**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	10,560	9,029	85.5
American Indian or Alaskan Native	1,454	978	67.3
Asian	102	95	93.1
Black or African American	128	100	78.1
Hispanic or Latino	375	298	79.5
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	37	33	89.2
White	8,464	7,525	88.9
Two or more races	0	0	
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	1,293	785	60.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	307	133	43.3
Economically disadvantaged students	5,210	4,111	78.9
Migratory students	28	22	78.6
Male	5,423	4,530	83.5
Female	5,137	4,499	87.6
<b>Comments:</b>			

**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			
American Indian or Alaskan Native			
Asian			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
<b>Comments:</b> Montana does not collect these data: Science - Grade 3.			



**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	10,649	7,473	70.2
American Indian or Alaskan Native	1,347	597	44.3
Asian	108	88	81.5
Black or African American	152	90	59.2
Hispanic or Latino	410	255	62.2
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	39	29	74.4
White	8,593	6,414	74.6
Two or more races	0	0	
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	1,325	508	38.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	245	67	27.3
Economically disadvantaged students	5,076	3,015	59.4
Migratory students	27	14	51.9
Male	5,428	3,810	70.2
Female	5,221	3,663	70.2
<b>Comments:</b>			

**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	10,621	8,842	83.3
American Indian or Alaskan Native	1,337	798	59.7
Asian	107	91	85.0
Black or African American	152	118	77.6
Hispanic or Latino	409	324	79.2
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	38	28	73.7
White	8,578	7,483	87.2
Two or more races	0	0	
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	1,301	694	53.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	240	95	39.6
Economically disadvantaged students	5,051	3,763	74.5
Migratory students	27	21	77.8
Male	5,406	4,381	81.0
Female	5,215	4,461	85.5
<b>Comments:</b>			

**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	10,680	6,638	62.2
American Indian or Alaskan Native	1,349	401	29.7
Asian	108	78	72.2
Black or African American	153	73	47.7
Hispanic or Latino	413	199	48.2
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	39	18	46.2
White	8,618	5,869	68.1
Two or more races	0	0	
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	1,353	541	40.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	245	35	14.3
Economically disadvantaged students	5,096	2,504	49.1
Migratory students	27	14	51.9
Male	5,442	3,442	63.2
Female	5,238	3,196	61.0
<b>Comments:</b>			

**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	10,461	7,567	72.3
American Indian or Alaskan Native	1,298	628	48.4
Asian	101	80	79.2
Black or African American	126	78	61.9
Hispanic or Latino	383	229	59.8
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	38	26	68.4
White	8,515	6,526	76.6
Two or more races	0	0	
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	1,302	488	37.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	265	67	25.3
Economically disadvantaged students	4,822	2,975	61.7
Migratory students	32	16	50.0
Male	5,438	3,951	72.7
Female	5,023	3,616	72.0
<b>Comments:</b>			

**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	10,427	9,117	87.4
American Indian or Alaskan Native	1,278	878	68.7
Asian	99	84	84.8
Black or African American	122	107	87.7
Hispanic or Latino	382	305	79.8
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	38	34	89.5
White	8,508	7,709	90.6
Two or more races	0	0	
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	1,287	728	56.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	257	105	40.9
Economically disadvantaged students	4,803	3,869	80.6
Migratory students	31	21	67.7
Male	5,414	4,610	85.1
Female	5,013	4,507	89.9
<b>Comments:</b>			

**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			
American Indian or Alaskan Native			
Asian			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
<b>Comments:</b> Montana does not collect these data: Science - Grade 5.			

**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	10,606	7,089	66.8
American Indian or Alaskan Native	1,341	536	40.0
Asian	96	75	78.1
Black or African American	147	88	59.9
Hispanic or Latino	368	201	54.6
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	28	22	78.6
White	8,626	6,167	71.5
Two or more races	0	0	
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	1,206	342	28.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	225	42	18.7
Economically disadvantaged students	4,722	2,566	54.3
Migratory students	23	15	65.2
Male	5,513	3,709	67.3
Female	5,093	3,380	66.4
<b>Comments:</b>			

**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	10,622	9,300	87.6
American Indian or Alaskan Native	1,341	909	67.8
Asian	94	87	92.6
Black or African American	147	126	85.7
Hispanic or Latino	368	307	83.4
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	28	27	96.4
White	8,644	7,844	90.7
Two or more races	0	0	
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	1,204	654	54.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	221	86	38.9
Economically disadvantaged students	4,732	3,780	79.9
Migratory students	22	19	86.4
Male	5,519	4,696	85.1
Female	5,103	4,604	90.2
<b>Comments:</b>			

**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			
American Indian or Alaskan Native			
Asian			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
<b>Comments:</b> Montana does not collect these data: Science - Grade 6.			

**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	10,569	7,372	69.8
American Indian or Alaskan Native	1,233	499	40.5
Asian	93	72	77.4
Black or African American	118	69	58.5
Hispanic or Latino	364	212	58.2
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	28	24	85.7
White	8,733	6,496	74.4
Two or more races	0	0	
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	1,208	353	29.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	229	36	15.7
Economically disadvantaged students	4,519	2,577	57.0
Migratory students	17	11	64.7
Male	5,442	3,740	68.7
Female	5,127	3,632	70.8
<b>Comments:</b>			

**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	10,579	9,101	86.0
American Indian or Alaskan Native	1,235	778	63.0
Asian	92	82	89.1
Black or African American	118	96	81.4
Hispanic or Latino	366	302	82.5
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	28	28	100.0
White	8,740	7,815	89.4
Two or more races	0	0	
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	1,218	617	50.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	227	44	19.4
Economically disadvantaged students	4,524	3,500	77.4
Migratory students	17	13	76.5
Male	5,446	4,513	82.9
Female	5,133	4,588	89.4
<b>Comments:</b>			

**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			
American Indian or Alaskan Native			
Asian			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
<b>Comments:</b> Montana does not collect these data: Science - Grade 7.			



**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	10,534	6,958	66.1
American Indian or Alaskan Native	1,223	478	39.1
Asian	105	82	78.1
Black or African American	138	67	48.6
Hispanic or Latino	369	197	53.4
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	31	18	58.1
White	8,668	6,116	70.6
Two or more races	0	0	
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	1,189	287	24.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	229	37	16.2
Economically disadvantaged students	4,345	2,257	51.9
Migratory students	14	7	50.0
Male	5,435	3,550	65.3
Female	5,099	3,408	66.8
<b>Comments:</b>			

**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	10,589	8,952	84.5
American Indian or Alaskan Native	1,224	786	64.2
Asian	106	94	88.7
Black or African American	140	107	76.4
Hispanic or Latino	371	292	78.7
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	31	25	80.6
White	8,717	7,648	87.7
Two or more races	0	0	
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	1,221	553	45.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	229	64	27.9
Economically disadvantaged students	4,374	3,285	75.1
Migratory students	14	12	85.7
Male	5,462	4,404	80.6
Female	5,127	4,548	88.7
<b>Comments:</b>			

**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	10,586	6,857	64.8
American Indian or Alaskan Native	1,221	405	33.2
Asian	106	78	73.6
Black or African American	140	70	50.0
Hispanic or Latino	371	188	50.7
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	31	20	64.5
White	8,717	6,096	69.9
Two or more races	0	0	
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	1,234	346	28.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	228	20	8.8
Economically disadvantaged students	4,373	2,158	49.3
Migratory students	14	4	28.6
Male	5,467	3,502	64.1
Female	5,119	3,355	65.5
<b>Comments:</b>			

**1.3.1.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - 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	10,180	6,064	59.6
American Indian or Alaskan Native	1,051	312	29.7
Asian	111	79	71.2
Black or African American	90	41	45.6
Hispanic or Latino	307	161	52.4
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	31	15	48.4
White	8,590	5,456	63.5
Two or more races	0	0	
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	1,045	211	20.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	135	14	10.4
Economically disadvantaged students	3,436	1,480	43.1
Migratory students	15	11	73.3
Male	5,264	3,213	61.0
Female	4,916	2,851	58.0
<b>Comments:</b>			

**1.3.2.7 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - 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	10,197	8,444	82.8
American Indian or Alaskan Native	1,053	652	61.9
Asian	110	90	81.8
Black or African American	90	72	80.0
Hispanic or Latino	309	241	78.0
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	31	22	71.0
White	8,604	7,367	85.6
Two or more races	0	0	
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	1,061	455	42.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	134	25	18.7
Economically disadvantaged students	3,443	2,463	71.5
Migratory students	15	13	86.7
Male	5,276	4,167	79.0
Female	4,921	4,277	86.9
<b>Comments:</b>			

**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	10,196	4,860	47.7
American Indian or Alaskan Native	1,047	185	17.7
Asian	111	67	60.4
Black or African American	90	33	36.7
Hispanic or Latino	310	105	33.9
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	31	13	41.9
White	8,607	4,457	51.8
Two or more races	0	0	
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	1,075	190	17.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	134	5	3.7
Economically disadvantaged students	3,444	1,093	31.7
Migratory students	15	7	46.7
Male	5,276	2,639	50.0
Female	4,920	2,221	45.1
<b>Comments:</b>			

**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 SY 2010-11. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2010-11	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2010-11
Schools	821	593	72.2
Districts	417	286	68.6
<b>Comments:</b>			

**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 SY 2010-11 . 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 2010-11	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2010-11
All Title I schools	672	471	70.1
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	230	114	49.6
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	442	357	80.8
<b>Comments:</b>			

**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 2010-11. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds in SY 2010-11	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2010-11	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2010-11
351	224	63.8
<b>Comments:</b> Montana began using an alternate allocation formula in SY 2010-11 (as approved by the U.S. Department of Education). This resulted in more LEAs receiving allocations than did previously.		

## 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 2011-12 based on the data from SY 2010-11. 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 2011-12 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: School Improvement - Year 1, School Improvement - Year 2, Corrective Action, Restructuring Year 1 (planning), or Restructuring Year 2 (implementing)<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 \(Get MS Excel Viewer\)](#).

<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/guid/schoolimprovementguid.doc>.

**1.4.4.1 - List of Title I Schools Identified for Improvement**

				Reading/Language Arts		Mathematics		Other Academic Indicators					
District Name	NCES/CCD ID Code	School Name	NCES/CCD ID Code	Proficiency Target Met (Yes/No)	Participation Rate Target Met (Yes/No)	Proficiency Target Met (Yes/No)	Participation Rate Target Met (Yes/No)	Academic Indicator Met (Yes/No) (elementary/middle schools)	Graduation Rate Met (Yes/No) (high school)	School Improvement Status for SY 2011-12	Title I School (Yes/No)	Provided assistance by LEA through 1003(a) (Yes/No)	Provided assistance by LEA through 1003(g) (Yes/No)
Albert	3001860	Alberton	00004							School Improvement - Year 1			
Anaco	3002030	Anaconda	00015							Restructuring Year 1 (planning)			
Arlee	3002220	Arlee	00019							Corrective Action			
Arlee	3002220	Arlee 7-8	00900							School Improvement - Year 2			
Arlee	3002250	Arlee High	00020							School Improvement - Year 1			
Ashla	3000008	Ashland 7-	01051							Corrective Action			
Ashla	3000008	Ashland	00023							Restructuring Year 2			
Belgra	3003290	Belgrade	00295							Corrective Action			
Belgra	3003290	Belgrade	00044							School Improvement - Year 1			
Bigfor	3003840	Bigfork	00058							School Improvement - Year 2			
Billing	3003870	McKinley	00072							Corrective Action			
Billing	3003870	Orchard	00077							Corrective Action			
Billing	3003870	Ponderosa	00079							Corrective Action			
Billing	3003870	Lewis &	00870							Corrective Action			
Billing	3003870	Riverside	00903							Restructuring Year 2			
Billing	3003870	Broadwat	00064							School Improvement - Year 1			
Billing	3003870	Miles	00074							School Improvement - Year 1			
Billing	3003870	Newman	00075							School Improvement - Year 2			
Billing	3003870	Beartooth	01092							School Improvement - Year 2			
Billing	3003900	Billings Sr	00090							Restructuring Year 1 (planning)			
Bonne	3004260	Bonner	00100							School Improvement - Year 1			
Bonne	3004260	Bonner 7-	01012							School Improvement - Year 2			
Box	3004440	Box Elder	00103							Restructuring Year 1 (planning)			
Box	3004500	Box Elder	00104							School Improvement - Year 2			
Boze	3004560	Chief	00112							School Improvement - Year 1			
Boze	3004560	Whittier	00110							School Improvement - Year 2			
Boze	3004590	Bozeman	00113							School Improvement - Year 2			
Brockt	3005010	Barbara	00124							Corrective Action			
Brockt	3005010	Barbara	01046							Restructuring Year 2			
Brockt	3005040	Brockton	00125							Restructuring Year 2			
Brown	3005140	K W	00131							Restructuring Year 2			
Brown	3005140	Vina	00134							Restructuring Year 2			
Brown	3005140	Napi	00132							Restructuring Year 2			
Brown	3005140	Browning	00872							Restructuring Year 2			
Brown	3005140	Babb	00129							School Improvement - Year 1			

Brown	3005140	Browning	001100							School Improvement - Year 1			
Brown	3005190	Browning	00136							Restructuring Year 2			
Butte	3005280	East	00905							Restructuring Year 2			
Butte	3005280	Whittier	00153							School Improvement - Year 2			
Butte	3005280	West	00906							School Improvement - Year 2			
Butte	3005310	Butte High	00156							Restructuring Year 1 (planning)			
Chino	3006260	Meadowla	00181							School Improvement - Year 1			
Colstri	3007050	Pine Butte	00873							School Improvement - Year 2			
Colum	3007110	Columbia	00195							School Improvement - Year 2			
Colum	3007110	Canyon	00200							School Improvement - Year 2			
Colum	3007110	Columbia	00197							School Improvement - Year 2			
Colum	3007140	Columbia	00203							Corrective Action			
Corval	3007410	Corvallis	00215							School Improvement - Year 2			
Custer	3007930	Custer Co	00226							School Improvement - Year 1			
Cut	3000003	Cut Bank	00233							Corrective Action			
DeSm	3008880	DeSmet	00254							School Improvement - Year 1			
Dodso	3009120	Dodson	00261							School Improvement - Year 1			
Dodso	3009120	Dodson 7-	01028							School Improvement - Year 1			
East	3009510	East	00267							School Improvement - Year 1			
Flathe	3015420	Glacier	00358							School Improvement - Year 2			
Forsyt	3011160	Forsyth 7-	00302							School Improvement - Year 1			
Forsyt	3011190	Forsyth	00304							Corrective Action			
Frazer	3011420	Frazer	00310							Restructuring Year 2			
Frazer	3011420	Frazer 7-8	01072							Restructuring Year 2			
Frazer	3011460	Frazer	00311							Restructuring Year 2			
Frenc	3011520	Frenchtow	00312							School Improvement - Year 1			
Gildfo	3012350	Gildford	00336							School Improvement - Year 1			
Glendi	3012510	Washingt	00952							Corrective Action			
Glendi	3012510	Jefferson	00344							School Improvement - Year 1			
Great	3013040	Longfello	00363							Corrective Action			
Great	3013040	East	00882							Restructuring Year 2			
Great	3013040	Chier	00357							School Improvement - Year 1			
Great	3013040	Whittier	00378							School Improvement - Year 2			
Great	3013050	Great Falls	00380							Restructuring Year 2			
Hamil	3013260	Washingt	00387							School Improvement - Year 2			
Hamil	3013260	Hamilton	00388							School Improvement - Year 2			
Hamil	3013260	Daly	00384							School Improvement - Year 2			
Hardi	3013310	Hardin	00396							Restructuring Year 2			
Hardi	3013310	Hardin	00395							Restructuring Year 2			
Hardi	3013310	Hardin	00394							Restructuring Year 2			
Hardi	3013310	Crow	00392							Restructuring Year 2			
Hardi	3013340	Hardin	00397							Restructuring Year 2			
Harle	3013395	Harlem	00399							Corrective Action			
Harle	3013395	Harlem 7-	00909							Restructuring Year 2			
Harle	3013400	Harlem	00400							Corrective Action			



Havre	3013560	Highland	00408							Corrective Action			
Havre	3013560	Lincoln-	00409							Corrective Action			
Havre	3013560	Sunnyside	00410							Restructuring Year 1 (planning)			
Havre	3013560	Havre	00406							Restructuring Year 1 (planning)			
Havre	3013590	Havre	00411							Corrective Action			
Hays-	3013660	Hays-	00934							Restructuring Year 2			
Hays-	3013660	Hays-	00413							Restructuring Year 2			
Hays-	3013660	Lodge	00097							Restructuring Year 2			
Heart	3000099	Heart	00414							Corrective Action			
Heart	3000099	Heart	00924							Restructuring Year 2			
Heart	3000099	Heart	01031							Restructuring Year 2			
Helen	3000005	Helena	00885							Restructuring Year 2			
Helen	3000005	Smith	00425							School Improvement - Year 1			
Helen	3000005	Central	00418							School Improvement - Year 2			
Helen	3000005	Bryant	00416							School Improvement - Year 2			
Helen	3013830	Helena	00430							Restructuring Year 2			
Hellga	3013860	Hellgate	01010							School Improvement - Year 2			
Hot	3014610	Hot	00448							School Improvement - Year 1			
Jeffer	3015120	Jefferson	00461							Corrective Action			
Kila	3015570	Kila	00480							School Improvement - Year 2			
Lame	3016050	Lame	01049							Restructuring Year 2			
Lame	3016050	Lame	00494							Restructuring Year 2			
Lame	3000095	Lame	00137							Restructuring Year 2			
Laurel	3016200	Fred W	00497							School Improvement - Year 2			
Laurel	3016200	West	00499							School Improvement - Year 2			
Laurel	3016200	Laurel	00890							School Improvement - Year 2			
Laurel	3016230	Laurel	00501							School Improvement - Year 1			
Lewist	3016490	Highland	00508							School Improvement - Year 2			
Lewist	3016490	Garfield	00507							School Improvement - Year 2			
Libby	3016530	Libby High	00518							Corrective Action			
Libby	3016530	Libby	00517							School Improvement - Year 2			
Lincol	3016770	Lincoln Co	00521							Restructuring Year 1 (planning)			
Lockw	3016950	Lockwood	00912							Corrective Action			
Lodge	3017010	Lodge	00533							Restructuring Year 2			
Lodge	3017010	Lodge	00931							Restructuring Year 2			
Lodge	3017040	Lodge	00534							Restructuring Year 2			
Lolo	3017130	Lolo	00821							School Improvement - Year 1			
Malta	3017580	Malta K-5	00545							School Improvement - Year 1			
Miles	3018410	Washingt	00561							Corrective Action			
Miles	3018410	Garfield	00823							School Improvement - Year 1			
Misso	3018570	Lewis &	00572							Corrective Action			
Misso	3018570	Porter	00565							Restructuring Year 1 (planning)			
Misso	3018540	Hellgate	00562							Corrective Action			
Misso	3018540	Big Sky	00824							Restructuring Year 1 (planning)			
Morin	3018960	Morin	00590							School Improvement - Year 1			

Nashu	3019170	Nashua	00594							School Improvement - Year 1			
Noxon	3019500	Noxon	00600							School Improvement - Year 1			
Park H	3020100	Park High	00611							School Improvement - Year 2			
Pendr	3020240	Pendroy	00615							School Improvement - Year 1			
Plenty	3013360	Plenty	00398							Restructuring Year 2			
Polso	3021060	Cherry	00630							Corrective Action			
Polso	3021060	Linderman	00631							Corrective Action			
Polso	3021060	Polson 7-8	00632							School Improvement - Year 1			
Polso	3021090	Polson	00633							Restructuring Year 2			
Poplar	3021240	Poplar	00637							Restructuring Year 2			
Poplar	3021240	Poplar 5-6	01044							Restructuring Year 2			
Poplar	3021240	Poplar 7-8	00636							Restructuring Year 2			
Poplar	3021270	Poplar	00638							Restructuring Year 2			
Pryor	3021720	Pryor	00647							Restructuring Year 2			
Pryor	3021720	Pryor 7-8	00930							Restructuring Year 2			
Rocky	3022750	Rocky Boy	00986							Restructuring Year 2			
Rocky	3022750	Rocky Boy	00666							Restructuring Year 2			
Rocky	3028911	Rocky Boy	01086							Restructuring Year 2			
Ronan	3022790	K William	00669							Corrective Action			
Ronan	3022790	Pablo	00667							School Improvement - Year 2			
Ronan	3022790	Ronan	00668							School Improvement - Year 2			
Ronan	3022800	Ronan	00670							Corrective Action			
Roseb	3022890	Rosebud 7	01050							School Improvement - Year 1			
Seeley	3023730	Seeley	00689							School Improvement - Year 1			
Shelb	3023910	Shelby	00694							School Improvement - Year 2			
St	3006110	St Ignatius	00174							School Improvement - Year 1			
St	3006110	St Ignatius	00994							School Improvement - Year 2			
Steve	3025020	Stevensvill	00719							School Improvement - Year 1			
Steve	3025050	Stevensvill	00720							School Improvement - Year 2			
Sunbu	3025320	Hillside	00081							School Improvement - Year 1			
Target	3025890	Target	00734							School Improvement - Year 2			
Thom	3026070	Thompson	01052							School Improvement - Year 2			
Three	3026160	Three	00973							School Improvement - Year 1			
Troy	3026550	Troy 7-8	00999							Corrective Action			
Troy	3026550	W F	00748							School Improvement - Year 2			
Troy H	3026580	Troy High	00749							School Improvement - Year 1			
White	3027790	Whitetfish	00775							School Improvement - Year 2			
White	3027810	Whitehall	00777							School Improvement - Year 2			
Wolf	3028590	Southside	00797							Restructuring Year 2			
Wolf	3028590	Wolf Point	00798							Restructuring Year 2			
Wolf	3028590	Northside	00796							Restructuring Year 2			
Wolf	3028620	Wolf Point	00799							Restructuring Year 2			
Wyola	3028800	Wyola	00804							Restructuring Year 2			
Wyola	3028800	Wyola 7-8	00355							School Improvement - Year 2			

**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 2010-11 (based on SY 2009-10 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 2010-11</b>
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	11
Extension of the school year or school day	2
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	2
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	2
Replacement of the principal	
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	2
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	2
<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 2010-11 (based on SY 2009-10 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)	24
Reopening the school as a public charter school	
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	
Takeover the school by the State	
Other major restructuring of the school governance	50
<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.

--

## 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 2011-12 based on the data from SY 2010-11. 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 2011-12 (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 \(Get MS Excel Viewer\)](#).

<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>.

**1.4.5.1 - List of Districts Receiving Title I Funds and Were Identified for Improvement**

District Name	NCES/CCD ID Code	Reading/Language Arts		Mathematics		Other Academic Indicator		District Improvement Status for SY 2011-12	District Receiving Title I Funds (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							Corrective Action	
Anaconda H S	3002030							Corrective Action	
Arlee Elem	3002220							Improvement	
Arlee H S	3002250							Improvement	
Ashland Elem	3000008							Corrective Action	
Baker K-12 Schools	3002730							Improvement	
Belgrade Elem	3003290							Improvement	
Bigfork H S	3003840							Improvement	
Billings Elem	3003870							Corrective Action	
Billings H S	3003900							Corrective Action	
Bonner Elem	3004260							Improvement	
Box Elder Elem	3004440							Corrective Action	
Box Elder H S	3004500							Improvement	
Bozeman Elem	3004560							Corrective Action	
Bozeman H S	3004590							Improvement	
Brockton H S	3005040							Corrective Action	
Browning Elem	3005140							Corrective Action	
Browning H S	3005190							Corrective Action	
Butte Elem	3005280							Corrective Action	
Butte H S	3005310							Corrective Action	
Colstrip Elem	3007050							Corrective Action	
Columbia Falls Elem	3007110							Corrective Action	
Columbia Falls H S	3007140							Corrective Action	
Custer County H S	3007930							Improvement	
Cut Bank Elem	3000003							Corrective Action	
Darby K-12 Schools	3008280							Corrective Action	
Deer Lodge Elem	3008670							Corrective Action	
DeSmet Elem	3008880							Corrective Action	
Dillon Elem	3008910							Corrective Action	
Dodson K12	3009120							Improvement	
East Glacier Park Elem	3009510							Improvement	
East Helena Elem	3009560							Corrective Action	
Evergreen Elem	3010920							Improvement	

Flathead H S	3015420							Corrective Action	
Forsyth Elem	3011160							Improvement	
Forsyth H S	3011190							Corrective Action	
Frazer Elem	3011420							Corrective Action	
Frazer H S	3011460							Corrective Action	
Frenchtown K-12	3011520							Improvement	
Geraldine Elem	3012180							Improvement	
Gildford Colony Elem	3012350							Improvement	
Glasgow K-12 Schools	3012420							Corrective Action	
Glendive Elem	3012510							Corrective Action	
Great Falls Elem	3013040							Corrective Action	
Great Falls H S	3013050							Corrective Action	
Hamilton K-12 Schools	3013260							Corrective Action	
Hardin Elem	3013310							Corrective Action	
Hardin H S	3013340							Corrective Action	
Harlem Elem	3013395							Corrective Action	
Harlem H S	3013400							Corrective Action	
Harlowton Elem	3013440							Improvement	
Havre Elem	3013560							Corrective Action	
Havre H S	3013590							Corrective Action	
Hays-Lodge Pole K-12	3013660							Corrective Action	
Heart Butte K-12	3000099							Corrective Action	
Helena Elem	3000005							Corrective Action	
Helena H S	3013830							Corrective Action	
Hot Springs Elem	3014610							Improvement	
Huntley Project K-12	3014700							Corrective Action	
Jefferson H S	3015120							Corrective Action	
Kila Elem	3015570							Improvement	
Lame Deer Elem	3016050							Corrective Action	
Lame Deer H S	3000095							Corrective Action	
Laurel Elem	3016200							Corrective Action	
Laurel H S	3016230							Improvement	
Lewistown Elem	3016490							Corrective Action	
Libby K-12 Schools	3016530							Corrective Action	
Lincoln County H S	3016770							Corrective Action	
Lincoln K-12 Schools	3016810							Improvement	
Livingston Elem	3016880							Improvement	
Lockwood Elem	3016950							Improvement	
Lodge Grass Elem	3017010							Corrective Action	
Lodge Grass H S	3017040							Corrective Action	
Lolo Elem	3017130							Corrective Action	
Malta K-12 Schools	3017580							Improvement	

Miles City Elem	3018410								Corrective Action	
Missoula Elem	3018570								Corrective Action	
Missoula H S	3018540								Corrective Action	
Morin Elem	3018960								Improvement	
Nashua K-12 Schools	3019170								Corrective Action	
Noxon Elem	3000090								Improvement	
Noxon H S	3019500								Improvement	
Park H S	3020100								Improvement	
Pendroy Elem	3020240								Improvement	
Plenty Coups H S	3013360								Corrective Action	
Polson Elem	3021060								Corrective Action	
Polson H S	3021090								Corrective Action	
Poplar Elem	3021240								Corrective Action	
Poplar H S	3021270								Corrective Action	
Pryor Elem	3021720								Corrective Action	
Rocky Boy Elem	3022750								Corrective Action	
Rocky Boy H S	3028911								Corrective Action	
Ronan Elem	3022790								Corrective Action	
Ronan H S	3022800								Corrective Action	
Rosebud Elem	3022890								Improvement	
Roundup Elem	3023040								Corrective Action	
Shelby Elem	3023900								Corrective Action	
Shelby H S	3023910								Improvement	
Shepherd Elem	3023940								Improvement	
Smith Valley Elem	3002850								Improvement	
St Ignatius K-12 Schools	3006110								Corrective Action	
Stevensville H S	3025050								Improvement	
Superior K-12 Schools	3025470								Corrective Action	
Target Range Elem	3025890								Improvement	
Three Forks Elem	3026160								Improvement	
Townsend K-12 Schools	3004980								Improvement	
Troy Elem	3026550								Improvement	
Troy H S	3026580								Improvement	
Valier Elem	3027060								Improvement	
West Valley Elem	3027570								Improvement	
West Yellowstone K-12	3027630								Corrective Action	
Whitefish Elem	3027740								Improvement	
Whitefish H S	3027790								Improvement	
Whitehall Elem	3027810								Improvement	
Wolf Point Elem	3028590								Corrective Action	
Wolf Point H S	3028620								Corrective Action	
Wyola Elem	3028800								Corrective Action	

### 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 Unit** - The unit consists of a Director, one Specialist, and a Coordinator. 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. They work collaboratively with the Instructional Innovations Unit with that Director and a Specialist. Together, the four full-time staff oversees 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 short-term workers of the OPI. They conduct a comprehensive review and evaluation of district and school operations 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 that is then delivered in person by the OPI School Support System Specialists, with findings and recommendations that are to form the basis of the district and school continuous improvement process (and plans). All schools 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, some of them a second follow-up review. Many of these districts are extremely high poverty and located on or near the seven American Indian reservations in Montana.

**School Improvement Consultants** - 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 that are in corrective action year two or higher. They receive on-going training from the Unit Directors and Specialists at OPI plus periodic training from selected external providers. They carry out dual roles. 1) They are change facilitators who assist the district superintendent, school principals, and staff to implement the recommendations of the SRT. 2) They work directly with principals and teachers to improve instructional methodology, classroom discipline, and assist in developing professional learning communities in the school.

**External Technical Assistance Providers** - The OPI has contracted with Cambium Learning to provide external consultants that deliver on-site assistance to other schools in improvement or corrective action that do not receive the monthly assistant from the School Improvement Consultants.



**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 2010-11 (based on SY 2009-10 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 2010-11</b>
Implemented a new curriculum based on State standards	43
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	2
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 2009-10 and beginning of SY 2010-11 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 2010-11 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	0	0
Schools	28	10
<b>Comments:</b>		

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2010-11 data was complete	09/13/11
---	----------

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

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 2010-11.

**1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations**

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2010 (SY 2010-11) Title I, Part A allocation that the SEA reserved in accordance with Section 1003(a) of *ESEA* and §200.100(a) of ED's regulations governing the reservation of funds for school improvement under Section 1003(a) of *ESEA*: 4.0 %

**Comments:**

--

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

For SY 2010-11 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 2010-11.

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. Evaluation activities were on-going and included data on leading indicators. Funds covered salary, benefits, and travel of SIG Director (for Sec. 1003(g) funds).

**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 2010-11 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 Montana Legislature in the 2009 session, have been used to fund "After School Grants" which included grants for two districts (four Tier I schools) with SIG funding.

## 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	51,344
Applied to transfer	15
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	15
<b>Comments:</b>	

**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	116

**FAQs about public school choice:**

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

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

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

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

**Comments:**

<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	25,771
Applied for supplemental educational services	410
Received supplemental educational services	410
<b>Comments:</b>	

**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	\$ 763,776
<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.

	<b>Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)</b>	<b>Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified</b>	<b>Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified</b>	<b>Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified</b>	<b>Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified</b>
All classes	23,963	23,748	99.1	215	0.9
All elementary classes	12,419	12,308	99.1	111	0.9
All secondary classes	11,544	11,440	99.1	104	0.9

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.	<u>Yes</u>
---	------------

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

--

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

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

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

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

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

	Percentage
Elementary School Classes	
Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	
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	10.0
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	90.0
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)	91.0
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	9.0
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	
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.

**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).

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 a different category in 1.5.3 than it would be in 1.5.1.

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	2,656	2,628	98.9
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	1,656	1,646	99.4
<b>Secondary Schools</b>			
High Poverty secondary Schools	1,670	1,626	97.4
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	3,567	3,550	99.5

#### 1.5.3.1 Poverty Quartile Breaks

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	57.6	23.4
Poverty metric used	Free and Reduced Lunch Percentage	
Secondary schools	46.1	26.1
Poverty metric used	Free and Reduced Lunch Percentage	

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

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

**1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS**

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

**1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs**

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

**Table 1.6.1 Definitions:**

1. **Types of Programs** = Types of programs described in the subgrantee's local plan (as submitted to the State or as implemented) that is closest to the descriptions in [http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/files/uploads/5/Language\\_Instruction\\_Educational\\_Programs.pdf](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>Yes</u>	Sheltered English instruction	
<u>Yes</u>	Structured English immersion	
<u>No Response</u>	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)	
<u>Yes</u>	Content-based ESL	
<u>Yes</u>	Pull-out ESL	
<u>Yes</u>	Other (explain in comment box below)	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Supplemental Reading Instruction

**1.6.2 Student Demographic Data**

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

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

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

Number of ALL LEP students in the State	3,300
<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.

	<b>#</b>
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	830
<b>Comments:</b>	

**1.6.2.3 Most Commonly Spoken Languages in the State**

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

Language	# LEP Students
German	278
North American Indian	191
Spanish; Castilian	101
Russian	44
Uncoded languages	29

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

### 1.6.3 Student Performance Data

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

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

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

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	2,781
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	519
Total	3,300
<p><b>Comments:</b> There is a data delay that accounts for some discrepancies. The snapshot from AIM, the student database, and the bar-code data file for the ELP assessment are not taken at the same time. The 3,300 figure reported in the CSPR is the LEP count taken the first Monday of October, approximately three weeks before the opening of the month-long ELP testing window. During that time district personnel are updating their data files based on the results of the ELP assessment received in April. The information for the bar-code labels is extracted from AIM in July. Both the Title III staff and the staff of the Measurement &amp; Accountability Division continually monitor the AIM data for discrepancies and contact local district staff for clarification/correction of the data. The Montana Office of Public Instruction (OPI) is in the process of updating the data elements for LEP and immigrant students in the AIM system. For the next school year, the data elements will be attached to enrollment, not program participation. There will be training conducted in the summer of 2012 to explain and clarify the changes to the student database. With the initiation of the statewide data warehouse next school year, school districts will indicate the reasons that students identified as LEP have not taken the ELP assessment.</p>	

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

	#
Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	486
Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	17.5
<b>Comments:</b>	



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

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

	<b>#</b>
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	710
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	120
Total	830
<b>Comments:</b> The data has been verified. There were additional districts that transferred their Title III funds to Schoolwide Title I programs, which meant that all LEP students in the LEA were identified as receiving Title III services, while previously the funds were targeted for serving certain students.	
In the table below, provide the number of Title III students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time and whose progress cannot be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO1. Report this number ONLY if the State did not include these students in establishing AMAO1/ making progress target and did not include them in the calculations for AMAO1/ making progress (# and % making progress).	
	<b>#</b>
Number of Title III students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time whose progress cannot be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO 1.	223

**1.6.3.2.2 Title III LEP English Language Proficiency Results**

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

**Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:**

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

In the table below, provide the State targets for the number and percent of students 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	132	27.1	199	28.00
Attained proficiency	132	18.6	213	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).	No
State offers the State mathematics content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
State offers the State science content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
<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)
<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)
<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)
<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.
- 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
17	7	24

**Comments:**

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

**Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:**

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
10	6	60.0	4

**Comments:**

**1.6.3.6.3 MFLEP Students Results for Reading/Language Arts**

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

**Table 1.6.3.6.3 Definitions:**

1. **# Tested** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in reading/language arts 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
10	8	80.0	2
<b>Comments:</b>			

**1.6.3.6.4 MFLEP Students Results for Science**

In the table below, report results for monitored former LEP(MFLEP) students who took the annual science assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned out of language instruction educational programs and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are 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
3			3
<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	75
# - Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	0
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	2
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	0
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	48
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	8
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2009-10 and 2010-11)	0
# - Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2010-11 for not meeting Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years	0
# - Number of subgrantees that have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2007-08, 2008-09, 2009-10, and 2010-11)	0

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

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

**Comments:** The Montana Office of Public Instruction (OPI) submitted revised AMAOs and an amendment to the Consolidated State Application to the U.S. Department of Education in September 2010. The OPI has responded to three inquiries regarding the AMAOs, most recently in October 2011. Although an approval of the AMAOs or the amendment has never been received, the AMAO determinations were made after AYP determinations were finalized in August 2011. The amendment submission included the establishment of a minimum number of 30, in accordance with the minimum number approved for Title I AYP determinations. The inclusion of the minimum N affected the AMAO determinations of numerous LEAs since there are currently 38 districts participating in Title III, 31 of which participate through consortium and serve small numbers of LEP students. In the fall of 2011 the OPI joined the WIDA consortium and subsequently changed the ELP assessment to the WIDA ACCESS, which was administered for the first time in December-January. The definition of proficient for LEP students will be revised this summer, to align with the WIDA proficiency levels. New AMAOs will be developed and submitted to the U.S. Department of Education by fall of 2012.

#### 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
134	90	2

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

In the student database the number of students identified as immigrant is collected, that number is compared with the number in districts from the year before, those districts that have a significant increase (5 or more students) are eligible to apply for the \$20,000 set-aside for Emergency Immigrant funding. What the current student database doesn't allow is to distinguish those immigrant students who are also identified as LEP and receiving Title III formula language instructional educational services.



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

	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	205
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*.	5

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 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	40	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students		
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students		
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards		
Subject matter knowledge for teachers		
Other (Explain in comment box)	19	
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	34	506
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	27	149
PD provided to principals	23	84
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	13	26
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	20	159
PD provided to community based organization personnel	5	31
Total		955

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Curriculum development; teaching reading to LEP students
--

### 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 2010-11 funds July 1, 2010, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2010, for SY 2010-11 programs. Then the "# of days/\$\$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
7/6/10	7/1/10	0
<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 E-grant System NCLB application opened May 17, 2010.

**1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS**

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

	#
Persistently Dangerous Schools	0
<b>Comments:</b>	

## 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 2009-10). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	80.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	59.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	87.6
Black, non-Hispanic	73.0
Hispanic	67.9
White, non-Hispanic	83.5
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	78.4
Limited English proficient	55.3
Economically disadvantaged	74.6
Migratory students	70.0
Male	78.9
Female	82.1
<b>Comments:</b> Last year's rate applied to all students; this year's data is the first year with migrant specific data.	

#### FAQs on graduation rates:

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

### 1.8.2 Dropout Rates

In the table below, provide the dropout rates calculated using the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's (NCES) Common Core of Data (CCD) for the **previous school year** (SY 2009-10). Below the table is a FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Dropout Rate
All Students	3.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	7.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	1.6
Black, non-Hispanic	4.2
Hispanic	4.1
White, non-Hispanic	2.4
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	3.6
Limited English proficient	8.3
Economically disadvantaged	4.2
Migratory students	1.6
Male	3.3
Female	2.6
<b>Comments:</b>	

#### 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	410	26
LEAs with subgrants	5	5
Total	415	31
<b>Comments:</b> The data would read LEAs without subgrants reporting data as 410 (26 actually reported a number, the rest were 0). LEAs with subgrants reporting data as 5 for a total of 415.		

**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)	6	4
K	49	129
1	7	142
2	14	126
3	14	136
4	6	135
5	10	107
6	4	88
7	8	86
8	8	79
9	9	93
10	9	61
11	10	47
12	29	91
Ungraded	0	0
Total	183	1,324
<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	14	303
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	140	747
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	11	88
Hotels/Motels	18	186
Total	183	1,324
<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.

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b># Homeless Children/Youths Served by Subgrants</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	4
K	129
1	142
2	126
3	136
4	135
5	107
6	88
7	86
8	79
9	93
10	61
11	47
12	91
Ungraded	0
Total	1,324
<b>Comments:</b>	

**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.

	<b># Homeless Students Served</b>
Unaccompanied youth	154
Migratory children/youth	29
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	100
Limited English proficient students	43
<b>Comments:</b>	

### 1.9.3 Academic Achievement of Homeless Students

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

#### 1.9.3.1 Reading Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient
3	104	79
4	118	80
5	91	66
6	80	61
7	76	52
8	61	41
High School	37	21
<b>Comments:</b>		

#### 1.9.3.2 Mathematics Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient
3	104	59
4	119	59
5	92	48
6	80	29
7	75	34
8	61	28
High School	37	10
<b>Comments:</b>		

## 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, 2010 through August 31, 2011. This section also collects a report on the procedures used by States to produce true, accurate, and valid child counts.

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

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

### FAQs on Child Count:

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

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

**1.10.1 Category 1 Child Count**

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number by age/grade of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, resided in your State for one or more days during the reporting period of September 1, 2010 through August 31, 2011. 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)	127
K	51
1	57
2	63
3	69
4	63
5	78
6	58
7	67
8	56
9	56
10	68
11	61
12	19
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	32
Total	925
<b>Comments:</b>	

**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 9 fewer children identified in the 2010-11 Child Count compared with the previous year, for a total of 925. There were 934 children identified in the 2009-10 Child Count. This is a .7% (less than 1% decrease). This is primarily due to the use of genetic beet seed which eliminated the use of traditional manual hoeing and thinning. As a result, migrant laborers were not hired again in one of our largest project locations.

**1.10.2 Category 2 Child Count**

In the table below, enter by age/grade the unduplicated statewide number of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, were served for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods that occurred within the reporting period of September 1, 2010 through August 31, 2011. 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)	118
K	44
1	44
2	49
3	57
4	51
5	66
6	46
7	60
8	46
9	49
10	61
11	61
12	2
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	27
Total	781
<b>Comments:</b>	

**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 1.825% increase in the number of children identified and served during the summer session. This is due primarily to the larger and longer cherry harvest.

### 1.10.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures

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

#### 1.10.3.1 Student Information System

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The state of Montana utilizes the New Generation System (NGS) as its primary source of Child Count data compilation. The NGS was the primary source used for the previous year Child Count (2009-10); it was used for both the Category 1 and Category 2 Child Count for the 2010-11 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, 2010 and August 31, 2011. 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. Each COE is validated and checked for accuracy by the local project director and the SEA Data Administrator.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

### 1.10.3.3 Methods Used To Count Children

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The NGS query is programmed to count a student only once statewide in the Category 1 and Category 2 counts. In order to avoid duplication and to assure correct student identification, 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.

Following is an example of the criteria used to gather the data from the database:

- 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 2010-2011 school year option, YR1=2010 and YR2=2011. 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 2010-2011, Yr3=2008. 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 matches generate further review which is conducted by the Data Review Team at the SEA. In addition, the state education agency (SEA) runs unique student reports on an on-going basis; these reports are disseminated to the LOAs for crosschecking of student verification. Each LOA is able to query the centralized database for a district level unique student count in both Category 1 and Category 2. NGS district reports are used in conjunction with the unique student count report to provide an ongoing verification of student enrollment into the system. Once the data have been entered at the local and/or state level, they are crosschecked against paper copies of the COE by trained local personnel, and then, once again, at the SEA. Some larger sites have local databases which are maintained for crosschecking purposes. For those children who are still in residence and who have no changes in demographic information after their original qualifying move, a new parental signature is obtained on a line at the bottom of the original COE. In most cases, however, a new COE is completed for all eligible children on an annual basis and residency is confirmed through a direct interview process. If the recruiter has made multiple attempts for a direct interview with the parent or legal guardian of the migrant student being recruited, and the recruiter has a phone number at which the family can be reached, the recruiter may conduct the interview over the phone. Copies of re-certified COEs with new parental signatures are kept on file at the local level and also sent to the SEA. The SEA establishes a deadline for entering all data into the systems pertaining to a particular reporting year. After the established deadline, the SEA then runs the federal performance report from NGS data. These data are crosschecked against locally submitted performance reports whose numbers have been entered into an Access database at the SEA, as well as against original COEs at the SEA level before submission to OME. Because the Montana program is such a small one, the crosschecking is performed manually at the SEA where the data specialist and the migrant director compare reports generated by the NGS, local sites, and hand counting of the COEs themselves. Once any discrepancies have been resolved, final performance report information is submitted to OME.

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.10.3.4. Quality Control Processes

As part of the on-going quality control process that the SEA has crafted to ensure the accuracy of the state's MEP eligibility determinations, policy was established which conforms with the Prospective Re-Interviewing regulation (Section 200.89(b) (2) which states that these re-interviews are conducted annually on current year eligibility determinations using a small sample size of approximately 50 randomly selected COEs. The actual number of COEs selected for re-interviewing depends upon the number of children in the project and the type of mobility patterns to which the families conform according to the guidance provided. Following is a summary report which presents an overview of the process used by the MT MEP for 2010-2011.

## TIMELINE and PROCESSES

Following procedures outlined in the Technical Assistance Guide on Re-Interviewing, the Data Quality Team determined that it would concentrate on those children who were recruited between September 1, 2010 and August 30, 2011 who had a new qualifying move and whose eligibility had not been determined on prior moves. Using an enhanced two-prong approach to re-interviewing, the Data Team concentrated on the MT MEP's most mobile population with current, rather than prior, qualifying moves. The first prong of this comprehensive quality control process involved the hiring of a trained, bilingual interviewer, Mrs. Rachel Carrera of Sunnyside, Washington and providing her with copies of randomly selected COEs from the largest sending school district in Washington State. Mrs. Carrera was trained in the re-interviewing process and provided over 50 copies of Montana COEs from a randomly generated set. She was also provided a copy of the re-interviewing completion form and asked to interview as many of the families in person as possible and to complete the re-interviewing protocol (shown as an attachment) form for each completed re-interview. Mrs. Carrera successfully completed 31 comprehensive re-interviews in person with one or more of the available parents or guardians.

No significant discrepancies were reported and no improper eligibility determinations were found. The few discrepancies found had to do with changed phone numbers, addresses, or spellings of children's first names. This first prong of the Montana MEP Data Quality Control process which used a trained non Washington State MEP-employed independent contractor (as recommended to us by OME) to perform the re-interviews of families from Sunnyside, Washington was in addition to the second prong of the MT MEP Quality Control Process in which copies of all MT COEs with a home-base listed as Washington state are sent to the Washington State Migrant Student Data and Records (MSDR) office for Washington state trained recruiters to use in their interviewing process. Because we chose to do this as close to the initial eligibility determination, we knew that some families may not have arrived back in their home base districts in time to be re-interviewed, so a large enough random sample was used to accommodate for non-response. Some families leave their work in the cherry orchards of Montana to go on to other states like Oregon, California and Idaho before they return back to their home base in Washington. Some do not arrive back in time for the fall school enrollment. In order to arrive at 31 completed prospective re-interviews, a sample was drawn from the 143 students who had migrated to the Flathead Valley in Montana from Sunnyside, Washington. This was done in order to ensure that interviews performed in Montana were done accurately and with a high degree of reliability. Students were randomly selected through a sequence generator using the resources of random.org.

A total of 553 migrant children were identified and recruited in Flathead Valley (Polson) project in summer of 2011; 507 of those children were identified as being from Washington state. The remainder was from California, Oregon and Texas. The attached chart depicts the Interstate Migration Statistics for the Flathead Lake MEP. Only states with greater than 3 students are included in this chart.

### Interstate Migration Statistics for the Flathead Lake MEP

States that Flathead Lake MEP student Migrate from

(states with >3 students)

California: 23 students

Oregon: 10 students

Texas: 5 students

Washington: 507 students

School Districts in Washington State (districts with >3 students)

Beverly: 8 students

Ephrata: 6 students

Grandview: 86 students

Granger: 22 students

Kennewick: 19 students

Mabton: 23 students

Mattawa: 10 students

Outlook: 15 students

Parker: 6 students

Prosser: 13 students

Sunnyside: 143 students

Toppenish: 13 students

Wapato: 71 students

Yakima: 48 students

Washington State trained recruiters fluent in Spanish were used to conduct a second tier of interviews for the entire set of

MT COEs (507 children) from the 2011 summer program. The results of each of those interviews were recorded in the WA MSDR system. To date, no substantive differences were reported between information recorded on the original MT COE and the information found in subsequent WA MEP interviews. In the past, if discrepancies were found, they were immediately reported to the MT SEA by WA MSDR staff, investigated and, when necessary, acted upon. This methodology is the most transparent, cost-effective, and efficient method for re-interviewing that a state like Montana is able to implement given the shortness of the harvesting season and the interstate nature of the moves. It is also an excellent example of interstate coordination and student information exchange. With this year's added step of hiring an independent contractor (who is not a Washington state MEP employee) to conduct targeted re-interviews, rather than solely relying on Washington state recruiters, another level of reliability has been added to our quality control process.

#### RE-INTERVIEWING QUESTIONNAIRE

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

At all project areas with significant numbers of eligible children, data is entered into NGS by trained data entry specialists; for those with fewer than 30 children, data is entered by the state Migrant Data Specialist who works closely with the state recruiter regarding these children and all others. The NGS provides discrete and aggregate data on individual identification, age, residency dates, qualifying move dates, and other information pertinent to defining terms of eligibility. The NGS also provides each student with a unique identification number, pertinent school history, academic information and/or supportive service(s) information. These NGS electronic records are then transmitted via the Internet to the succeeding school districts within the NGS consortium for use with placement, credit accrual, testing, and/or health information. Additionally, data checks are performed when data is entered into AIM (state student information system). No consolidation of data occurs. Checks are also completed when data is uploaded and consolidated in MSIX. Additionally, during the 2010-11 reporting period, the new ID and R manual was updated and conforms to 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 Unique Student Number, COE/family and age/grade reports that spot check accuracy of data. 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 and MSIX systems.

These 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.