

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

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

For reporting on
School Year 2007-08

MONTANA



PART I DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 19, 2008
PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 2009

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202

INTRODUCTION

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

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

The *NCLB* Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2007-08 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 2007-08 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, December 19, 2008**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 27, 2009**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2007-08, 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 2007-08 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 2007-08 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

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

		OMB Number: 1810-0614
		Expiration Date: 10/31/2010
<p>Consolidated State Performance Report For State Formula Grant Programs under the Elementary And Secondary Education Act as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001</p>		
Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2007-08 <input type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2007-08		
Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report:		
Address:		
Person to contact about this report:		
Name:		
Telephone:		
Fax:		
e-mail:		
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type):		
_____ Signature		_____ Date

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART I**

For reporting on
School Year 2007-08



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 19, 2008
5PM EST**

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

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

1.1.1 Academic Content Standards

In the space below, provide a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. 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 taken or planned."

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

The Montana Board of Public Education approved the Standards Review Schedule as follows: Science - November 2006; Library Media and Technology - August 2008; Mathematics and Communication Arts - 2008-09; Social Studies, Arts, Career and Technology Education, Workplace Competencies - 2009-10; School Counseling, World Languages, Health Enhancement - Proposed 2010-11.

The Montana Standards process remains as stated below.

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

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

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

1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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.

1.1.4 Assessments in Science

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

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The first administration of the Science CRT and CRT-Alternate was in the 2007-2008 school year. Achievement standards have been set for the grades tested. The tested grades are 4, 8, and 10.

State's assessments and academic achievement standards in science not yet approved.

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

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

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

1.2.1 Participation of All Students in Mathematics Assessment

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

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	75,754	75,249	99.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	8,471	8,356	98.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	894	889	99.4
Black, non-Hispanic	778	773	99.4
Hispanic	1,991	1,972	99.0
White, non-Hispanic	63,620	63,259	99.4
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	9,517	9,383	98.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,070	3,025	98.5
Economically disadvantaged students	27,979	27,713	99.0
Migratory students	201	199	99.0
Male	39,143	38,841	99.2
Female	36,611	36,408	99.4

Comments: The total number of children with disabilities tested does not equal the number/sum of children with disabilities who completed the assessment due to the differences in reporting requirements between *NCLB* (EDEN N081) and *IDEA* (EDEN N093). The requirements for excluding and including students are not the same.

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

1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Mathematics Assessment

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

The data provided below should include mathematics participation data from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. Do not include results from students 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	2,938	32.2
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	5,526	60.5
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	674	7.4
Total	9,138	

Comments: The total number of children with disabilities tested does not equal the number/sum of children with disabilities who completed the assessment due to the differences in reporting requirements between *NCLB* (EDEN N081) and *IDEA* (EDEN N093). The requirements for excluding and including students are not the same.

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

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	75,754	75,256	99.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	8,471	8,369	98.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	894	882	98.7
Black, non-Hispanic	778	773	99.4
Hispanic	1,991	1,969	98.9
White, non-Hispanic	63,620	63,263	99.4
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	9,517	9,383	98.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,070	3,019	98.3
Economically disadvantaged students	27,979	27,729	99.1
Migratory students	201	199	99.0
Male	39,143	38,851	99.2
Female	36,611	36,405	99.4
Comments:			

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

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

This section is similar to 1.2.2 and collects data on the State's *NCLB* 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. Do not include results from students 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	2,965	32.5
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	5,477	60.1
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	674	7.4
Total	9,116	
Comments: The total number of children with disabilities tested does not equal the sum of children with disabilities who completed the assessment due to the reporting process of protecting the security of confidential information in Montana's small rural schools.		

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

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 *NCLB* science assessment.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	33,122	32,787	99.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	3,545	3,472	97.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	401	397	99.0
Black, non-Hispanic	330	324	98.2
Hispanic	824	819	99.4
White, non-Hispanic	28,022	27,777	99.1
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	4,150	4,075	98.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,255	1,230	98.0
Economically disadvantaged students	11,512	11,353	98.6
Migratory students	80	80	100.0
Male	17,045	16,853	98.9
Female	16,077	15,934	99.1
Comments:			

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

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

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 *NCLB* science assessment.

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	1,464	36.7
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	2,232	56.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	290	7.3
Total	3,986	
Comments: The total number of children with disabilities tested does not equal the sum of children with disabilities who completed the assessment due to the reporting process of protecting the security of confidential information in Montana's small rural schools.		

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

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

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

1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics

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

The student group "children with disabilities (*IDEA*)" includes children who participated in the regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments.

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

1.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts

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

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

1.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science

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

Limited English Proficiency (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.

1.3.1.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	10,506	6,623	63.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,323	510	38.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	100	76	76.0
Black, non-Hispanic	136	71	52.2
Hispanic	291	157	54.0
White, non-Hispanic	8,656	5,809	67.1
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,346	488	36.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	528	167	31.6
Economically disadvantaged students	4,349	2,243	51.6
Migratory students	26	14	53.8
Male	5,476	3,518	64.2
Female	5,030	3,105	61.7
Comments: Changing and moving student populations affect the outcome of the migratory students.			

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

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

Grade 3	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	10,506	8,779	83.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,323	876	66.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	100	93	93.0
Black, non-Hispanic	136	102	75.0
Hispanic	291	234	80.4
White, non-Hispanic	8,656	7,474	86.3
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,346	739	54.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	528	293	55.5
Economically disadvantaged students	4,349	3,282	75.5
Migratory students	26	17	65.4
Male	5,476	4,426	80.8
Female	5,030	4,353	86.5
Comments: Changing and moving student populations affect the outcome of the migratory students.			

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

1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	0	0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	0	0	0.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.0
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	0	0	0.0
Female	0	0	0.0
Comments: Montana does not test science in grade 3. Montana only tests science in grades 4, 8 and 10 as required by NCLB.			

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

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.3.1.2 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	10,522	7,027	66.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,248	518	41.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	113	98	86.7
Black, non-Hispanic	124	76	61.3
Hispanic	286	147	51.4
White, non-Hispanic	8,751	6,188	70.7
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,376	498	36.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	450	122	27.1
Economically disadvantaged students	4,251	2,277	53.6
Migratory students	27	15	55.6
Male	5,441	3,673	67.5
Female	5,081	3,354	66.0
Comments:			

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

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

Grade 4	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	10,522	8,313	79.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,248	686	55.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	113	99	87.6
Black, non-Hispanic	124	90	72.6
Hispanic	286	200	69.9
White, non-Hispanic	8,751	7,238	82.7
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,376	619	45.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	450	149	33.1
Economically disadvantaged students	4,251	2,910	68.5
Migratory students	27	16	59.3
Male	5,441	4,175	76.7
Female	5,081	4,138	81.4
Comments:			

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

1.3.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	10,522	6,556	62.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,248	424	34.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	113	79	69.9
Black, non-Hispanic	124	66	53.2
Hispanic	286	143	50.0
White, non-Hispanic	8,751	5,844	66.8
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,376	506	36.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	450	69	15.3
Economically disadvantaged students	4,251	2,078	48.9
Migratory students	27	10	37.0
Male	5,441	3,524	64.8
Female	5,081	3,032	59.7
Comments:			

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

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

1.3.1.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	10,492	7,080	67.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,224	512	41.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	106	87	82.1
Black, non-Hispanic	122	69	56.6
Hispanic	301	161	53.5
White, non-Hispanic	8,739	6,251	71.5
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,355	436	32.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	423	102	24.1
Economically disadvantaged students	4,116	2,211	53.7
Migratory students	25	14	56.0
Male	5,463	3,673	67.2
Female	5,029	3,407	67.7
Comments: Changing and moving student populations affect the outcome of these students.			

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

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

Grade 5	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	10,492	8,548	81.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,224	716	58.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	106	88	83.0
Black, non-Hispanic	122	94	77.0
Hispanic	301	214	71.1
White, non-Hispanic	8,739	7,436	85.1
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,355	614	45.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	423	132	31.2
Economically disadvantaged students	4,116	2,882	70.0
Migratory students	25	18	72.0
Male	5,463	4,283	78.4
Female	5,029	4,265	84.8
Comments: Changing and moving student populations affect the outcome of these students.			

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

1.3.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	0	0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	0	0	0.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.0
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	0	0	0.0
Female	0	0	0.0
Comments: Montana does not test science in grade 5. Montana only tests science in grades 4, 8 and 10 as required by NCLB.			

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

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.3.1.4 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	10,776	6,806	63.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,190	481	40.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	151	110	72.8
Black, non-Hispanic	98	47	48.0
Hispanic	303	153	50.5
White, non-Hispanic	9,034	6,015	66.6
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,318	299	22.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	420	107	25.5
Economically disadvantaged students	4,101	2,015	49.1
Migratory students	38	25	65.8
Male	5,555	3,529	63.5
Female	5,221	3,277	62.8
Comments: Changing and moving student populations affect the outcome of the migratory and hispanic students.			

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

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

Grade 6	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	10,776	9,005	83.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,190	750	63.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	151	136	90.1
Black, non-Hispanic	98	82	83.7
Hispanic	303	231	76.2
White, non-Hispanic	9,034	7,806	86.4
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,318	598	45.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	420	168	40.0
Economically disadvantaged students	4,101	3,014	73.5
Migratory students	38	30	78.9
Male	5,555	4,486	80.8
Female	5,221	4,519	86.6
Comments: Changing and moving student populations affect the outcome of the migratory and hispanic students.			

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

1.3.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	0	0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	0	0	0.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.0
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	0	0	0.0
Female	0	0	0.0
Comments: Montana does not test science in grade 6. Montana only tests science in grades 4, 8 and 10 as required by NCLB.			

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

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.3.1.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	10,858	7,245	66.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,189	470	39.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	136	103	75.7
Black, non-Hispanic	92	58	63.0
Hispanic	272	144	52.9
White, non-Hispanic	9,169	6,470	70.6
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,348	337	25.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	444	88	19.8
Economically disadvantaged students	3,901	2,012	51.6
Migratory students	32	20	62.5
Male	5,604	3,725	66.5
Female	5,254	3,520	67.0
Comments: Changing and moving student populations affect the outcome of these students.			

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

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

Grade 7	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	10,858	9,014	83.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,189	746	62.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	136	117	86.0
Black, non-Hispanic	92	83	90.2
Hispanic	272	196	72.1
White, non-Hispanic	9,169	7,872	85.9
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,348	576	42.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	444	180	40.5
Economically disadvantaged students	3,901	2,822	72.3
Migratory students	32	23	71.9
Male	5,604	4,509	80.5
Female	5,254	4,505	85.7
Comments: Changing and moving student populations affect the outcome of these students.			

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

1.3.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	0	0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	0	0	0.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.0
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	0	0	0.0
Female	0	0	0.0
Comments: Montana does not test science in grade 7. Montana only tests science in grades 4, 8 and 10 as required by NCLB.			

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

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.3.1.6 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	11,151	6,624	59.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,175	342	29.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	142	102	71.8
Black, non-Hispanic	127	58	45.7
Hispanic	276	133	48.2
White, non-Hispanic	9,431	5,989	63.5
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,428	252	17.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	453	69	15.2
Economically disadvantaged students	4,031	1,784	44.3
Migratory students	34	18	52.9
Male	5,766	3,417	59.3
Female	5,385	3,207	59.6
Comments: Changing and moving student populations affect the outcome of these students.			

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

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

Grade 8	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	11,151	9,043	81.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,175	681	58.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	142	125	88.0
Black, non-Hispanic	127	104	81.9
Hispanic	276	198	71.7
White, non-Hispanic	9,431	7,935	84.1
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,428	555	38.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	453	170	37.5
Economically disadvantaged students	4,031	2,823	70.0
Migratory students	34	27	79.4
Male	5,766	4,446	77.1
Female	5,385	4,597	85.4
Comments: Changing and moving student populations affect the outcome of these students.			

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

1.3.3.6 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	11,151	6,577	59.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,175	326	27.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	142	94	66.2
Black, non-Hispanic	127	58	45.7
Hispanic	276	117	42.4
White, non-Hispanic	9,431	5,982	63.4
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,428	320	22.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	453	45	9.9
Economically disadvantaged students	4,031	1,739	43.1
Migratory students	34	17	50.0
Male	5,766	3,509	60.9
Female	5,385	3,068	57.0
Comments:			

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

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

1.3.1.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - High School

High School	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	11,449	5,986	52.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,122	273	24.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	146	96	65.8
Black, non-Hispanic	79	26	32.9
Hispanic	262	99	37.8
White, non-Hispanic	9,840	5,492	55.8
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,346	196	14.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	352	30	8.5
Economically disadvantaged students	3,230	1,142	35.4
Migratory students	19	7	36.8
Male	5,838	3,114	53.3
Female	5,611	2,872	51.2
Comments: Changing and moving student populations affect the outcome of the migratory students.			

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

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

High School	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	11,449	8,811	77.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,122	571	50.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	146	113	77.4
Black, non-Hispanic	79	54	68.4
Hispanic	262	168	64.1
White, non-Hispanic	9,840	7,905	80.3
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,346	523	38.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	352	93	26.4
Economically disadvantaged students	3,230	2,082	64.5
Migratory students	19	14	73.7
Male	5,838	4,258	72.9
Female	5,611	4,553	81.1
Comments: Changing and moving student populations affect the outcome of the migratory students.			

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

1.3.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Science - High School

High School	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	11,449	4,862	42.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,122	187	16.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	146	74	50.7
Black, non-Hispanic	79	20	25.3
Hispanic	262	68	26.0
White, non-Hispanic	9,840	4,513	45.9
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,346	199	14.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	352	14	4.0
Economically disadvantaged students	3,230	896	27.7
Migratory students	19	8	42.1
Male	5,838	2,609	44.7
Female	5,611	2,253	40.2
Comments:			

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

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

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 schools and districts and the total number of those schools and districts that made AYP based on data for the SY 2007-08. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2007-08	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2007-08
Schools	820	589	71.8
Districts	419	286	68.3
Comments: More schools missed AYP due to more tested grades and higher AMO targets included in the determinations.			

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

1.4.2 Title I School Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public Title I schools by type and the total number of those schools that made AYP based on data for the SY 2007-08 school year. Include only public Title I schools. Do not include Title I programs operated by local educational agencies in private schools. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2007-08	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2007-08
All Title I schools	625	422	67.5
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	185	90	48.6
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	440	332	75.4
Comments: More schools missed AYP due to more tested grades and higher AMO targets included in the determinations.			

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

1.4.3 Accountability of Districts That Received Title I Funds

In the table below, provide the total number of districts that received Title I funds and the total number of those districts that made AYP based on data for SY 2007-08. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2007-08	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2007-08
317	188	59.3
Comments: One district of the 317 is not required to have an AYP status because it was non-operating in 2007-08.		

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

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

1.4.4 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

1.4.4.1 List of Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

In the following table, provide a list of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 for the SY 2008-09 based on the data from SY 2007-08. For each school on the list, provide the following:

- District Name and NCES ID Code
- School Name and 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 2008-09 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: School Improvement – Year 1, School Improvement – Year 2, Corrective Action, Restructuring Year 1 (planning), or Restructuring Year 2 (implementing))¹
- Whether (yes or no) the school is or is not a Title I school (*This column **must be completed** by States that choose to list all schools in improvement. Column is optional for States that list only Title I schools.*)
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003(a).
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003 (g).

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

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

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

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

District Name	NCES/CCD ID Code	Area(s) in which district missed AYP						District Improvement Status for SY 2008-09	District Receiving Title I Funds (Yes/No)
		Reading/Language Arts		Mathematics		Other Academic Indicator			
		Proficiency Target	Participation Rate Target Met (Yes/No)	Proficiency Target (Yes/No)	Participation Rate Target Met (Yes/No)	Academic Indicator (elementary/middle schools) (Yes/No)	Graduation Rate (high school) (Yes/No)		
Anaconda H S	3002030	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	NA	Yes	ImYr1	Yes
Ashland Elem	3000008	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	CYr3	Yes
Billings Elem	3003870	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	CYr2	Yes
Billings H S	3003900	No	Yes	No	Yes	NA	Yes	CYr2	Yes
Box Elder Elem	3004440	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	CYr6	Yes
Brockton Elem	3005010	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	HCYr5	Yes
Brockton H S	3005040	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	CYr7	Yes
Browning Elem	3005140	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	CYr7	Yes
Browning H S	3005190	No	Yes	No	Yes	NA	No	CYr7	Yes
Butte Elem	3005280	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	CYr2	Yes
Butte H S	3005310	No	Yes	No	Yes	NA	No	ImYr1	Yes
Columbia Falls Elem	3007110	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	ImYr2	Yes
Columbia Falls H S	3007140	No	Yes	No	Yes	NA	No	ImYr1	Yes
Corvallis K-12 Schools	3007410	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	ImYr1	Yes
Culbertson Elem	3007830	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	ImYr2	Yes
Cut Bank Elem	3000003	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	ImYr1	Yes
Deer Lodge Elem	3008670	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	HImYr1	Yes
DeSmet Elem	3008880	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	ImYr1	Yes
Dodson Elem	3009090	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	ImYr2	Yes
Dutton/Brady K-12 Schools	3000102	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	HImYr1	Yes
Flathead H S	3015420	No	Yes	No	Yes	NA	Yes	ImYr1	No
Frazer Elem	3011420	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	HCYr6	Yes
Frazer H S	3011460	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	CYr7	Yes
Great Falls Elem	3013040	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	CYr2	Yes
Great Falls H S	3013050	No	Yes	No	Yes	NA	Yes	ImYr2	Yes
Hamilton K-12 Schools	3013260	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	ImYr2	Yes
Hardin Elem	3013310	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	CYr3	Yes
Hardin H S	3013340	No	Yes	No	Yes	NA	No	CYr3	Yes
Harlem Elem	3013395	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	CYr6	Yes
Havre Elem	3013560	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	CYr2	Yes
Hays-Lodge Pole K-12 Schls	3013660	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	CYr7	Yes
Heart Butte K-12 Schools	3000099	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	CYr7	Yes
Helena Elem	3000005	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	CYr2	Yes
Helena H S	3013830	No	Yes	No	Yes	NA	Yes	ImYr2	Yes
Lame Deer Elem	3016050	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	CYr6	Yes
Lame Deer H S	3000095	No	Yes	No	Yes	NA	Yes	CYr6	Yes
Laurel Elem	3016200	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	CYr2	Yes

Districts that Received Title I Funds and Were Identified for Improvement
Montana 1.4.5.1

Lincoln County H S	3016770	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	NA	Yes	ImYr1	Yes
Lodge Grass Elem	3017010	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	CYr7	Yes
Lodge Grass H S	3017040	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	CYr6	Yes
Lolo Elem	3017130	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	ImYr1	Yes
Miles City Elem	3018410	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	ImYr1	Yes
Missoula Elem	3018570	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	CYr2	Yes
Missoula H S	3018540	No	Yes	No	Yes	NA	Yes	CYr2	Yes
Plenty Coups H S	3013360	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	CYr7	Yes
Polson Elem	3021060	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	CYr1	Yes
Polson H S	3021090	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	No	CYr1	Yes
Poplar Elem	3021240	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	CYr7	Yes
Poplar H S	3021270	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	Yes	CYr6	Yes
Pryor Elem	3021720	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	CYr6	Yes
Rocky Boy Elem	3022750	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	CYr7	Yes
Rocky Boy H S	3028911	Yes	Yes	No	No	NA	Yes	CYr7	Yes
Ronan Elem	3022790	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	ImYr1	Yes
Shelby Elem	3023900	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	HImYr1	Yes
Shelby H S	3023910	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	NA	Yes	ImYr1	Yes
Wolf Point Elem	3028590	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	CYr3	Yes
Wolf Point H S	3028620	No	Yes	No	Yes	NA	No	CYr2	Yes
Wyola Elem	3028800	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	NA	CYr6	Yes

1.4.4.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for schools in corrective action, provide the number of schools for which the listed corrective actions under *NCLB* were implemented in SY 2007-08 (based on SY 2006-07 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2007-08
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	6
Extension of the school year or school day	4
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	2
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	1
Replacement of the principal	1
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	2
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	6
Comments:	

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

1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2

In the table below, for schools in restructuring – year 2 (implementation year), provide the number of schools for which the listed restructuring actions under *NCLB* were implemented in SY 2007-08 (based on SY 2006-07 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Restructuring Action	# of Title I Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	7
Reopening the school as a public charter school	0
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	0
Take over the school by the State	0
Other major restructuring of the school governance	36
Comments:	

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

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.

The "other major restructuring of the school governance" actions primarily include reorganizing into building and district level leadership teams and correlate teams using the Montana Effective Schools Correlates and Indicators based on effective schools research by Lezotte, et al, and adapted from a similar document developed by the Kentucky Department of Education.

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 2008-09 based on the data from SY 2007-08. For each district on the list, provide the following:

- District Name and 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 2008-09 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: Improvement or Corrective Action²)
- Whether the district is a district that received Title I funds. Indicate "Yes" if the district received Title I funds and "No" if the district did not receive Title I funds. (**This column must be completed by States that choose to list all districts or all districts in improvement.** This column is optional for States that list only districts in improvement that receive Title I funds.)

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

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

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

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

District Name	NCES/CCD ID Code	Area(s) in which district missed AYP						District Improvement Status for SY 2008-09	District Receiving Title I Funds (Yes/No)
		Reading/Language Arts		Mathematics		Other Academic Indicator			
		Proficiency Target	Participation Rate Target Met (Yes/No)	Proficiency Target (Yes/No)	Participation Rate Target Met (Yes/No)	Academic Indicator (elementary/middle schools) (Yes/No)	Graduation Rate (high school) (Yes/No)		
Anaconda H S	3002030	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	NA	Yes	ImYr1	Yes
Ashland Elem	3000008	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	CYr3	Yes
Billings Elem	3003870	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	CYr2	Yes
Billings H S	3003900	No	Yes	No	Yes	NA	Yes	CYr2	Yes
Box Elder Elem	3004440	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	CYr6	Yes
Brockton Elem	3005010	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	HCYr5	Yes
Brockton H S	3005040	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	CYr7	Yes
Browning Elem	3005140	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	CYr7	Yes
Browning H S	3005190	No	Yes	No	Yes	NA	No	CYr7	Yes
Butte Elem	3005280	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	CYr2	Yes
Butte H S	3005310	No	Yes	No	Yes	NA	No	ImYr1	Yes
Columbia Falls Elem	3007110	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	ImYr2	Yes
Columbia Falls H S	3007140	No	Yes	No	Yes	NA	No	ImYr1	Yes
Corvallis K-12 Schools	3007410	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	ImYr1	Yes
Culbertson Elem	3007830	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	ImYr2	Yes
Cut Bank Elem	3000003	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	ImYr1	Yes
Deer Lodge Elem	3008670	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	HImYr1	Yes
DeSmet Elem	3008880	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	ImYr1	Yes
Dodson Elem	3009090	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	ImYr2	Yes
Dutton/Brady K-12 Schools	3000102	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	HImYr1	Yes
Flathead H S	3015420	No	Yes	No	Yes	NA	Yes	ImYr1	No
Frazer Elem	3011420	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	HCYr6	Yes
Frazer H S	3011460	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	CYr7	Yes
Great Falls Elem	3013040	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	CYr2	Yes
Great Falls H S	3013050	No	Yes	No	Yes	NA	Yes	ImYr2	Yes
Hamilton K-12 Schools	3013260	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	ImYr2	Yes
Hardin Elem	3013310	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	CYr3	Yes
Hardin H S	3013340	No	Yes	No	Yes	NA	No	CYr3	Yes
Harlem Elem	3013395	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	CYr6	Yes
Havre Elem	3013560	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	CYr2	Yes
Hays-Lodge Pole K-12 Schls	3013660	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	CYr7	Yes
Heart Butte K-12 Schools	3000099	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	CYr7	Yes
Helena Elem	3000005	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	CYr2	Yes
Helena H S	3013830	No	Yes	No	Yes	NA	Yes	ImYr2	Yes
Lame Deer Elem	3016050	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	CYr6	Yes
Lame Deer H S	3000095	No	Yes	No	Yes	NA	Yes	CYr6	Yes
Laurel Elem	3016200	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	CYr2	Yes

Districts that Received Title I Funds and Were Identified for Improvement
Montana 1.4.5.1

Lincoln County H S	3016770	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	NA	Yes	ImYr1	Yes
Lodge Grass Elem	3017010	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	CYr7	Yes
Lodge Grass H S	3017040	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	CYr6	Yes
Lolo Elem	3017130	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	ImYr1	Yes
Miles City Elem	3018410	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	ImYr1	Yes
Missoula Elem	3018570	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	CYr2	Yes
Missoula H S	3018540	No	Yes	No	Yes	NA	Yes	CYr2	Yes
Plenty Coups H S	3013360	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	Too Few	CYr7	Yes
Polson Elem	3021060	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	CYr1	Yes
Polson H S	3021090	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	No	CYr1	Yes
Poplar Elem	3021240	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	CYr7	Yes
Poplar H S	3021270	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	Yes	CYr6	Yes
Pryor Elem	3021720	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	CYr6	Yes
Rocky Boy Elem	3022750	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	CYr7	Yes
Rocky Boy H S	3028911	Yes	Yes	No	No	NA	Yes	CYr7	Yes
Ronan Elem	3022790	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	ImYr1	Yes
Shelby Elem	3023900	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	HImYr1	Yes
Shelby H S	3023910	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	NA	Yes	ImYr1	Yes
Wolf Point Elem	3028590	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	CYr3	Yes
Wolf Point H S	3028620	No	Yes	No	Yes	NA	No	CYr2	Yes
Wyola Elem	3028800	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	NA	CYr6	Yes

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

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

School Coaches - These are ten distinguished educators who are part-time state employees of OPI who will spend three to five days per month on-site in the schools of districts in corrective action year two or higher. They will be change facilitators who assist the district superintendent, school principals, and staff to implement the recommendations of the SRT. They have received initial two-day training from personnel of the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory which will be followed by four additional 1.5 day trainings and monthly coaches' meetings facilitated by OPI School Support System Specialists. The on-site visits are beginning in late November for the 2007-2008 school year.

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

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

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

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

1.4.5.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for districts in corrective action, provide the number of districts in corrective action in which the listed corrective actions under *NCLB* were implemented in SY 2007-08 (based on SY 2006-07 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Corrective Action	# of Districts receiving Title I funds in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2007-08
Implementing a new curriculum based on State standards	20
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	0
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	6
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	0
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	0
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	0
Restructured the district	0
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2006-07 and beginning of SY 2007-08 as a corrective action)	0
Comments:	

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

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 2007-08 data and the results of those appeals.

	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts	2	1
Schools	7	1
Comments:		

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

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2007-08 data was complete	08/14/08
---	----------

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

1.4.8 School Improvement Status

In the section below, "Schools in Improvement" means Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of *ESEA* for SY 2007-08.

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

The table below pertains only to schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08.

- In the **SY 2007-08 column**, provide the total number and percentage of students in schools receiving School Improvement funds in SY 2007-08 who were:
 - Proficient in mathematics as measured by your State's assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* in SY 2007-08.
 - Proficient in reading/language arts as measured by your State's assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* in SY 2007-08.
 - Total number of schools for which the data in this table are reported. This should be the total number of schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08.
- In the **SY 2006-07 column**, provide the requested data for the same schools whose student proficiency data are reported for SY 2007-08. No total is requested for schools in SY 2006-07.

Category	SY 2007-08	SY 2006-07
Total number of students who were enrolled in schools that received assistance through Section 1003 (a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	7,413	7,443
Total number of students who were proficient in mathematics in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	3,017	2,985
Percentage of students who were proficient in mathematics in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	40.7	40.1
Total number of students who were proficient in reading/language arts in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	4,529	4,439
Percentage of students who were proficient in reading/language arts in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	61.1	59.6
Number of schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	55	
Comments: 1) Please ensure that the enrollment reported includes only students who were in grades assessed under section 1111 of <i>ESEA</i> . For details, see the FAQ in the EDEN CSPR "Getting Started" section that ED posted during the CSPR Part I submission process in response to a question from a State. 2) Please ensure that the figures in the SY 2006-07 column include only data for schools that received assistance through section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08.		
These counts and percentages only include grades 3-8, 10.		

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

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

1.4.8.2 School Improvement Status and School Improvement Assistance

In the table below, indicate the number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08 that:

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

Category	# of Schools
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08 that made adequate yearly progress based on testing in SY 2007-08	7
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08 that exited improvement status based on testing in SY 2007-08	2
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08 that did not make adequate yearly progress based on testing in SY 2007-08	48
Comments:	

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

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.4.8.3 Effective School Improvement Strategies

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

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4	Column 5	Column 6	Column 7
Effective Strategy or Combination of Strategies Used (See response options in "Column 1 Response Options Box" below.) If your State's response includes a "5" (other strategies), identify the specific strategy(s) in Column 2.	Description of "Other Strategies" This response is limited to 500 characters.	Number of schools in which the strategy(s) was used	Number of schools that used the strategy(s), made AYP, and exited improvement status	Number of schools that used the strategy(s), made AYP, but did not exit improvement status	Most common other Positive Outcome from the Strategy (See response options in "Column 6 Response Options Box" below)	Description of "Other Positive Outcome" if Response for Column 6 is "D" This response is limited to 500 characters.
6 = Combo 1	Combination of 1 & 2	55	2	5	A	
Comments:						

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

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

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

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.4.8.4 Sharing of Effective Strategies

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

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

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

Note: New section for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2007 (SY 2007-08) 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*: 3.5 %

Comments:

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

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

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

In the tables below, provide the requested information for FY 2007 (SY 2007-08).

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter allocation data.
Download template: [Question 1.4.8.5.2 \(Get MS Excel Viewer\)](#)

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

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

Name of LEA with One or More Schools Provided Assistance through Section 1003(a) Funds in SY 2007-08	NCES LEA ID	Amount of LEA's 1003(a) Allocation
Pryor Elem	3021720	37519
Hardin Elem	3013310	62911
Lodge Grass Elem	3017010	25465
Wyola Elem	3028800	33572
Harlem Elem	3013395	4848
Hays-Lodge Pole K-12	3013660	43024
Great FallsElem	3013040	49139
Browning Elem	3005140	118419
Box Elder Elem	3004440	30693
Rocky Boy Elem	3022750	69190
Polson Elem	3021060	7175
Helena HS	3013830	8639
Missoula Elem	3018570	29591
Dodson Elem	3009090	10000
Heart Butte K-12	3000099	25463
Powell County HS	3021450	10000
Poplar Elem	3021240	43486
Wolf Point Elem	3028590	53276
Brockton Elem	3005010	22689
Lame Deer Elem	3016050	89650
Ashland Elem	3000008	20000
Butte HS	3005310	21327
Frazer Elem	3011420	50463
Billings Elem	3003870	5000
Total		871539

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 2007-08.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

These funds were not utilized in School Year 2007-08 as we did not allocate any Sec. 1003(g) funds until July 1, 2008, for School Year 2008-09.

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

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

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 2007-08 that were supported by **funds other than Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) funds** to address the achievement problems of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of *ESEA*.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

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

Students who are eligible for public school choice includes:

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

	# Students
Eligible for public school choice	14,458
Applied to transfer	2
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	2

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

	Yes/No
Enrolled in a school identified for improvement	<u>Yes</u>
Transferred in the current school year, only	<u>Yes</u>
Transferred in a prior year and in the current year	<u>No</u>
Comments:	

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

1.4.9.1.3 Funds Spent on Public School Choice

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

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$ 0
Comments: No funds were spent to transport the 2 students who participated in public school choice. Their transportation needs were accommodated within the district's regular system.	

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

1.4.9.1.4 Availability of Public School Choice Options

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

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

	# LEAs
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	30
Comments:	

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

FAQs about public school choice:

- a. *How should States report data on Title I public school choice for those LEAs that have open enrollment and other choice programs?* An LEA may consider a student as eligible for and participating in Title I public school choice, and may consider costs for transporting that student towards its funds spent on transportation for public school choice, if the student meets the following conditions:
 - Has a "home" or "neighborhood" school (to which the student would have been assigned, in the absence of a choice program) that receives Title I funds and has been identified, under the statute, as in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring; and
 - Has elected to enroll, at some point since July 1, 2002 (the effective date of the Title I choice provisions), and after the home school has been identified as in need of improvement, in a school that has not been so identified and is attending that school; and
 - Is using district transportation services to attend such a school.³
- b. *How do States report on public school choice for those LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice (e.g., LEAs in which all schools in a grade level are in school improvement, LEAs that have only a single school at that grade level, or LEAs whose schools are so remote from one another that choice is impracticable)?* For those LEAs, States should count as eligible all students who attend identified Title I schools. States should report that no eligible schools or students were provided the option to transfer and should provide an explanation why choice is not possible within the LEA in the Comment Section.

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

1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

1.4.9.2.2 Supplemental Educational Services – Students

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

	# Students
Eligible for supplemental educational services	6,796
Applied for supplemental educational services	10
Received supplemental educational services	10
Comments:	

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

1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services

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

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$ 15,000
Comments:	

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

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 each of the school types listed and the number of those core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified (as the term is defined in Section 9101(23) of *ESEA*) and the number taught by teachers who are not highly qualified. The percentage of core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified and the percentage taught by teachers who are not highly qualified will be calculated automatically. Below the table are FAQs about these data. The percentages used for high- and low-poverty schools and the poverty metric used to determine those percentages are reported in 1.5.3.

School Type	# of Core Academic Classes (Total)	# of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	# of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified
All schools	27,319	26,926	98.6	393	1.4
Elementary level					
High-poverty schools	1,767	1,755	99.3	12	0.7
Low-poverty schools	831	829	99.8	2	0.2
All elementary schools	5,805	5,771	99.4	34	0.6
Secondary level					
High-poverty schools	2,455	2,411	98.2	44	1.8
Low-poverty schools	6,239	6,152	98.6	87	1.4
All secondary schools	21,514	21,155	98.3	359	1.7
Comments: The Department's previous understanding, based on recent monitoring, was that HQT information for special education classes would not be collected until the 2008-09 school year. That is correct for Montana. Therefore, the data for 2007-08 school year would not include special education. Montana has included special education where it was reported and is not conclusive at this time of this report period.					

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.

Special Education teachers teaching core academic classes.
--

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

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 were Highly Qualified to teach English and history, he/she would be counted as Highly Qualified in two of the four subjects in the numerator.
- g. *What is a "high-poverty school"?* Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "high-poverty" schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State. The poverty quartile breaks are reported later in this section.
- h. *What is a "low-poverty school"?* Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "low-poverty" schools as schools in the bottom quartile of poverty in the State. The poverty quartile breaks are reported later in this section.

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

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

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

	Percentage
Elementary School Classes	
Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	32.3
Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	26.5
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	41.2
Other (please explain in comment box below)	
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

	Percentage
Secondary School Classes	
Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	51.8
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	14.5
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	33.7
Other (please explain in comment box below)	
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

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

	High-Poverty Schools (more than what %)	Low-Poverty Schools (less than what %)
Elementary schools	53.1	21.2
Poverty metric used	Free-reduced meals	
Secondary schools	53.1	21.2
Poverty metric used	Free-reduced meals	
Comments: The CSPR program rounds these figures up making them equal percentages when they are not. Elementary should be 53.11% high-poverty; low-poverty 21.20% and Secondary should be high-poverty 53.13% low-poverty 21.18%.		

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

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

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

1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

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

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/expert/glossary.html>.
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	
<u>No Response</u>	Developmental bilingual	
<u>Yes</u>	Heritage language	Dakota, Crow, Cree, Salish, Kootenai
<u>No Response</u>	Sheltered English instruction	
<u>No Response</u>	Structured English immersion	
<u>Yes</u>	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)	
<u>Yes</u>	Content-based ESL	
<u>No Response</u>	Pull-out ESL	
<u>Yes</u>	Other (explain in comment box below)	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other: Supplemental Reading Instruction

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

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. LEP students are defined as all students assessed for English language proficiency (ELP) using an annual State ELP assessment as required under Section 1111(b)(7) of *ESEA* in the reporting year and who meet the LEP definition in 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 in Section 3121(a)(4) of Title III) in the ALL LEP student count in this table.

Number of ALL LEP students in the State	6,720
Comments:	

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

Note: New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

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 the number of LEP students who received services in Title III language instructional education programs.

	#
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	3,647
Comments:	

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

1.6.2.3 Most Commonly Spoken Languages in the State

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

Language	# LEP Students
Blackfeet	1,487
Crow	1,372
Other - American Indian	716
Cheyenne	607
German	602

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Spanish - 395 Cree - 394 Sioux/Dakota - 361 Chippewa - 356 Salish - 351

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

1.6.3 Student Performance Data

This section collects data on LEP student English language proficiency, as required by Sections 1111(h)(4)(D) and 3121(b)(1).

1.6.3.1.1 ALL LEP Participation in State Annual English Language Proficiency Assessment

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

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	5,448
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	1,272
Total	6,720
Comments: The figure of 6,720 is derived from an October 2007 count date. Local districts can change/update their student data files anytime during the year.	

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

Note: New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

	#
Number proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	3,876
Percent proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	57.7
Comments: % proficient: 59 % advanced: 12	

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

Note: New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.6.3.2.1 Title III LEP Participation in English Language Proficiency

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

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	2,500
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	700
Total	3,200
Comments: Districts update their student data on a continual basis, as students become proficient, they are not included in the assessment.	

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

Note: New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.6.3.2.2 Title III LEP English Language Proficiency Results

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

Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:

1. **Making Progress** = Number of Title III LEP students who met the definition of "Making Progress" as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
2. **ELP Attainment** = Number of Title III LEP students who attained English language proficiency as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
3. **Results** = Number and percent of Title III LEP students who met the State definition of "Making Progress" and the number and percent that met the State definition of "Attainment" of English language proficiency.

	Results	
	#	%
Making progress	1,253	51.0
ELP attainment	83	3.0
Comments:		

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

1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments

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

1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language

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

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

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

Note: New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

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 *NCLB* accountability determinations for mathematics.

Language(s)
Comments:

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

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 *NCLB* accountability determinations for reading/language arts.

Language(s)
Comments:

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

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 *NCLB* accountability determinations for science.

Language(s)
Comments:

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

Note: New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP 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 (MFLEP) students include:

- Students who have transitioned out of a language instruction educational program funded by Title III into classrooms that are not tailored for LEP students.
- Students who are no longer receiving LEP services and who are being monitored for academic content achievement for 2 years after the transition.

Table 1.6.3.6.1 Definitions:

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

# Year One	# Year Two	Total
12	0	12
Comments: In year 2 there were no students reported.		

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

1.6.3.6.2 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Mathematics

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

Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:

1. **# Tested** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in mathematics in all AYP grades.
2. **# At or Above Proficient** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual mathematics assessment.
3. **% Results** = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the number tested.
4. **# Below proficient** = State-aggregated number 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
12	10	83.3	2
Comments:			

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

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

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

Table 1.6.3.6.3 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
12	12	100.0	0
Comments:			

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

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

Table 1.6.3.6.4 Definitions:

1. **# Tested** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in science.
2. **# At or Above Proficient** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual science assessment.
3. **% Results** = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the 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
5	3	60.0	2
Comments:			

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

Note: New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

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	69
Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	2
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	9
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	7
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	27
Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	32
Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2006-07 and 2007-08)	0
Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2007-08 for not meeting Title III AMAOs	0
Number of subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2004-05, 2005-06, 2006-07, and 2007-08)	0
Comments: This is the first year that all three AMAOs have been determined.	

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

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>
Comments: Montana met AMAO 1.	

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

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.	
Comments:	

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

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 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 in Section 3301(6) and enrolled in the elementary or secondary schools in the State.
2. **Students in 3114(d)(1) Program** = Number of immigrant students who participated in programs for immigrant children and youth funded under Section 3114(d)(1), using the funds reserved for immigrant education programs/activities. This number should not include immigrant students who receive services in Title III 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 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
170	145	5

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.

5.7% or \$20,000 is reserved for Emergency Immigrant programs.

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

1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development

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

1.6.6.1 Teacher Information

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

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

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

	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	173
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	46

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.

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

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

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

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

Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:

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

Type of Professional Development Activity	# Subgrantees	
Instructional strategies for LEP students	7	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	8	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	0	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	9	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	0	
Other (Explain in comment box)	1	
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	13	325
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	8	45
PD provided to principals	10	43
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	8	13
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	12	61
PD provided to community based organization personnel	3	20
Total		507

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other: Content instruction designed for LEP students.

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

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 2007-08 funds July 1, 2007, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2007, for SY 2007-08 programs. Then the "# of days/\$\$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
07/01/07	07/01/07	
Comments: Distribution depends on when the grantees complete and are approved for the consolidated application and when funds are requested. The number of days range between 1-90.		

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

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.

We feel that we are doing a good job.

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

1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS

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

	#
Persistently Dangerous Schools	0
Comments:	

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

1.8 GRADUATION RATES AND DROPOUT RATES

This section collects graduation and dropout rates.

1.8.1 Graduation Rates

In the table below, provide the graduation rates calculated using the methodology that was approved as part of the State's accountability plan for the **previous school year** (SY 2006-07). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	84.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	63.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	90.4
Black, non-Hispanic	76.6
Hispanic	79.1
White, non-Hispanic	87.1
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	
Limited English proficient	
Economically disadvantaged	
Migratory students	
Male	83.1
Female	86.2
Comments:	

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

FAQs on graduation rates:

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

1.8.2 Dropout Rates

In the table below, provide the dropout rates calculated using the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's (NCES) Common Core of Data (CCD) for the **previous school year** (SY 2006-07). Below the table is a FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Dropout Rate
All Students	2.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	5.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	1.0
Black, non-Hispanic	3.1
Hispanic	4.4
White, non-Hispanic	2.3
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	
Limited English proficient	
Economically disadvantaged	
Migratory students	
Male	3.0
Female	2.3
Comments: Information for the all student dropout rate is not available at this time.	

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

FAQ on dropout rates:

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

1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS PROGRAM

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

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

	#	# LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	414	414
LEAs with subgrants	5	5
Total	419	419
Comments:		

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

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

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

1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youths

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

Age/Grade	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs With Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	0	0
K	31	55
1	44	58
2	33	54
3	26	56
4	28	43
5	28	63
6	21	55
7	21	35
8	15	44
9	13	31
10	13	21
11	20	22
12	39	18
Ungraded	0	0
Total	332	555
Comments:		

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

1.9.1.2 Primary Nighttime Residence of Homeless Children and Youths

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

	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs With Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	45	178
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	219	184
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	11	7
Hotels/Motels	57	186
Total	332	555
Comments:		

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

1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

1.9.2.1 Homeless Children and Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

Age/Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	0
K	57
1	59
2	56
3	56
4	44
5	63
6	55
7	35
8	44
9	28
10	21
11	21
12	19
Ungraded	0
Total	558
Comments:	

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

1.9.2.2 Subpopulations of Homeless Students Served

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

	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied youth	33
Migratory children/youth	1
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	118
Limited English proficient students	38
Comments:	

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

1.9.2.3 Educational Support Services Provided by Subgrantees

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

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

1.9.2.4 Barriers To The Education Of Homeless Children And Youth

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other Barriers: One district continues to face questions of guardianship.

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

1.9.2.5 Academic Progress of Homeless Students

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

1.9.2.5.1 Reading Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Reading Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	36	23
4	20	11
5	29	15
6	23	11
7	9	4
8	15	6
High School	12	8
Comments:		

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

1.9.2.5.2 Mathematics Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Mathematics Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	35	14
4	20	9
5	29	14
6	23	10
7	9	4
8	15	3
High School	12	6
Comments:		

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

1.10 MIGRANT CHILD COUNTS

This section collects the Title I, Part C, Migrant Education Program (MEP) child counts which States are required to provide and may be used to determine the annual State allocations under Title I, Part C. The child counts should reflect the reporting period of September 1, 2007 through August 31, 2008. This section also collects a report on the procedures used by States to produce true, accurate, and valid child counts.

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

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

FAQs on Child Count:

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

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

1.10.1 Category 1 Child Count

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number by age/grade of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, resided in your State for one or more days during the reporting period of September 1, 2007 through August 31, 2008. This figure includes all eligible migrant children who may or may not have participated in MEP services. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

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

Age/Grade	12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	107
K	66
1	68
2	75
3	78
4	71
5	80
6	82
7	100
8	90
9	87
10	85
11	74
12	28
Ungraded	4
Out-of-school	26
Total	1,121

Comments:

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

1.10.1.1 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Category 1 Child Count represents less than a 10% decrease in migrant children identified in the 2006-07 Category Child Count. There were 63 fewer children identified in the 2007-08 Child Count.

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

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, 2007 through August 31, 2008. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. Count a child who moved to different schools within the State and who was served in both traditional summer and year-round school intersession programs only once. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

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

Age/Grade	Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	99
K	52
1	57
2	60
3	67
4	61
5	70
6	69
7	86
8	81
9	76
10	74
11	70
12	6
Ungraded	4
Out-of-school	23
Total	955
Comments:	

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

1.10.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Category 2 Child Count represents less than a 10% decrease from last year's Category 2 Child Count. There were 24 fewer children who participated in summer programs in the 2008 season.

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

1.10.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures

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

1.10.3.1 Student Information System

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The state of Montana utilizes the New Generation System (NGS) as its primary source of Child Count data compilation. NGS was the primary source used for the previous year Child Count (2006-07); it was used for both the Category 1 and Category 2 Child Count for the 2007-08 submission.

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

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, through the collection of the core eligibility, family history and demographic data collected by trained recruiters through a direct family interview and documented on a Certificate of Eligibility (COE). Data are then entered into the NGS database by trained data entry personnel and reviewed by local and state administrators. Data is further validated by running crosschecks with the Comprehensive Needs Assessment and Priority for Services software (CNAPS) and a Performance Report Access program that enter the final paper performance report information submitted by LOAs. These two methods provide a method of crosschecks and oversight.

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

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.

[Empty text box]

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.

[Empty text box]

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

1.10.3.3 Methods Used To Count Children

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

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

Selection Criteria

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

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

Below is an example of the criteria used to gather the data from the database. For these examples, the YR1 and YR2 are used to represent the school year selection. For example, for the 2007-2008 school year option, YR1 = 2007 and YR2 = 2008. 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 2007-2008, YR3 = 2004. The data for the count is retrieved by the following criteria:

Enrollment Date Information:

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

- The QAD greater than or equal to 9/1/YR3.

Birthdate Information:

- o The student must be between 3 and 21 years 11 months old to be counted.
- o If the student turns 3 during the school year and the enrollment date is greater than birthdate or enrollment is less than birth date 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 birth date 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.

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

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 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 as well as the CNAPS software which provides yet another review of data at the SEA level. For those children who are still in residence and who have no changes in demographic information after their original qualifying move, a new parental signature is obtained on a line at the bottom of the original COE. In most cases, however, a new COE is completed for all eligible children on an annual basis and residency is confirmed through a direct interview process. If the recruiter has made multiple attempts for a direct interview with the parent or legal guardian of the migrant student being recruited, and the recruiter has a phone number at which the family can be reached, the recruiter may conduct the interview over the phone. Copies of re-certified COEs with new parental signatures are kept on file at the local level and also sent to the SEA. The SEA establishes a deadline for entering all data into the systems pertaining to a particular reporting year. After the established deadline, the SEA then runs the federal performance report from NGS data. These data are crosschecked against locally submitted performance reports whose numbers have been entered into an Access database at the SEA, as well as against original s COEs at the SEA level before submission to OME. Because the Montana program is such a small one, the crosschecking is performed manually at the SEA where the data specialist and the migrant director compare reports generated by both the NGS, local sites, and hand counting of the COEs themselves. Once any discrepancies have been resolved, final performance report information is submitted to OME.

A Data Management Review Team has also been initiated at the SEA which oversees all data collection and data flow for the purposes of the Comprehensive Needs Assessment and PFS Determination. Utilizing both the CNAPS software and NGS, data can be checked and re-checked for accuracy. The CNAPS software helps to 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) and is used in conjunction with the extensive report generator capability within NGS which can crosscheck data at the district, unique count, supplemental program and eligibility levels, to name a few.

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

As part of the on-going quality control process that the SEA has crafted to ensure the accuracy of the state's MEP eligibility determinations, policy was established which conforms with the Prospective Re-Interviewing regulation (Section 200.89(b)(2) which states that these re-interviews are conducted annually on current year eligibility determinations using a small sample size of approximately 50 randomly selected COEs.

The actual number of COEs selected for re-interviewing depends upon the number of children in the project and the type of mobility patterns to which the families conform. Following is a summary report which presents an overview of the process used by the MT MEP.

TIMELINE

The interviews were conducted in Missoula on October 26 and 27, 2007.

SAMPLE Selection

The Montana MEP supervised re-interviewing of more than 50 Hmong and Russian migrant students identified in the Missoula MEP in October 2007.

Students identified on an NGS campus report were ordered via Excel's random number generator.

PROCEDURES

Translators fluent in the Hmong and Russian languages were used to conduct the interviews following the established Montana MEP re-interviewing protocols approved by OME in former Re-interviewing Initiative. The interviews were conducted in person with one or more of the available parents. The results of each re-interview were recorded on a standard re-interview form, including those interviews which were attempted, but not completed because of an inability to locate the family or the family's absence from home. No anomalies were discovered between information recorded on the original COE and the subsequent interview questions. The biggest issue in both communities which rely heavily on a cash-only economy in the huckleberry and mushroom harvesting activities that they perform was documentation for PMOL. Many of the workers and families do receive TANF benefits and were very wary of answering any questions about the nature of their work and the amount of money they made harvesting these crops. It was determined in all cases that the worker and the worker's family, as a matter of economic necessity harvest these crops. The worker and their family members travel across county and state boundaries to harvest these products.

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

At all project areas with significant numbers of eligible children, data is entered into NGS by trained data entry specialists; for those with fewer than 30 children, data is entered by the state Migrant Data Specialist who works closely with the state recruiter regarding these children and all others. NGS provides discrete and aggregate data on individual identification, age, residency dates, qualifying move dates, and other information pertinent to defining terms of eligibility. NGS also provides each student with a unique identification number, pertinent school history, academic information and/or supportive 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) and re-checked using the Performance Report ACCESS Program and Comprehensive Needs Assessment and Priority for Service System (CNAPS), both created in-house. No consolidation of data occurs.

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

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. In addition, further veracity is assured by the re-checking of all data entered into NGS when it is uploaded into the Performance Report ACCESS program and CNAPS software; data are also scrutinized before its 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 systems as well as the MSDR system used in Washington state. These three methodologies help to ensure the veracity and validity of the data submitted and are complemented by the Montana MEP's mission to provide the highest level of training possible to all recruiters, data entry personnel and other migrant funded staff so that errors of commission or omission are eliminated. It is the fundamental belief of the Montana MEP that only eligible migrant students who meet all aspects of the statutory definition should ever be identified as such and that any variation in this policy will not be tolerated.

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

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.

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

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.

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