

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

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

For reporting on
School Year 2016-17

MONTANA



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

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202

INTRODUCTION

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

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

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

PART I

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

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

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

PART II

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

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

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 2016-17 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Thursday, December 14, 2017**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Thursday, February 15, 2018**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2016-17, unless otherwise noted.

The format states will use to submit the Consolidated State Performance Report has changed to an online submission starting with SY 2004-05. This online submission system is being developed through the Education Data Exchange Network (EDEN) and will make the submission process less burdensome. Please see the following section on transmittal instructions for more information on how to submit this year's Consolidated State Performance Report.

TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

The Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) data will be collected online from the SEAs, using the EDEN web site. The EDEN web site will be modified to include a separate area (sub-domain) for CSPR data entry. This area will utilize EDEN formatting to the extent possible and the data will be entered in the order of the current CSPR forms. The data entry screens will include or provide access to all instructions and notes on the current CSPR forms; additionally, an effort will be made to design the screens to balance efficient data collection and reduction of visual clutter.

Initially, a state user will log onto EDEN and be provided with an option that takes him or her to the "SY 2016-17 CSPR". The main CSPR screen will allow the user to select the section of the CSPR that he or she needs to either view or enter data. After selecting a section of the CSPR, the user will be presented with a screen or set of screens where the user can input the data for that section of the CSPR. A user can only select one section of the CSPR at a time. After a state has included all available data in the designated sections of a particular CSPR Part, a lead state user will certify that Part and transmit it to the Department. Once a Part has been transmitted, ED will have access to the data. States may still make changes or additions to the transmitted data, by creating an updated version of the CSPR. Detailed instructions for transmitting the SY 2016-17 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

		OMB Number: 1810-0724
		Expiration Date: 5/31/2018
<p>Consolidated State Performance Report For State Formula Grant Programs under the Elementary And Secondary Education Act as amended in 2001</p>		
Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: <input type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2016-17 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2016-17		
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 II**

For reporting on
School Year 2016-17



**PART II DUE FEBRUARY 15, 2018
5PM EST**

2.1 IMPROVING BASIC PROGRAMS OPERATED BY LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES (TITLE I, PART A)

This section collects data on Title I, Part A programs.

2.1.1 Student Achievement in Schools with Title I, Part A Programs

The following sections collect data on student academic achievement on the State's assessments in schools that receive Title I, Part A funds and operate either Schoolwide programs or Targeted Assistance programs.

2.1.1.1 Student Achievement in Mathematics in Schoolwide Schools (SWP)

In the format of the table below, provide the number of students in SWP schools who completed the assessment and for whom a proficiency level was assigned, in grades 3 through 8 and high school, on the State's mathematics assessments under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA. Also, provide the number of those students who scored at or above proficient. The percentage of students who scored at or above proficient is calculated automatically.

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or above Proficient	Percentage at or above Proficient
3	5,064	2,072	40.92
4	4,815	1,759	36.53
5	4,836	1,639	33.89
6	3,758	1,168	31.08
7	3,405	1,064	31.25
8	3,390	982	28.97
High School	3,071	859	27.97
Total	28,339	9,543	33.67
Comments:			

2.1.1.2 Student Achievement in Reading/Language Arts in Schoolwide Schools (SWP)

This section is similar to 2.1.1.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on performance on the State's reading/language arts assessment in SWP.

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or above Proficient	Percentage at or above Proficient
3	4,784	2,007	41.95
4	4,486	1,904	42.44
5	4,580	2,075	45.31
6	3,768	1,518	40.29
7	3,423	1,480	43.24
8	3,389	1,315	38.80
High School	3,072	1,286	41.86
Total	27,502	11,585	42.12
Comments:			

2.1.1.3 Student Achievement in Mathematics in Targeted Assistance Schools (TAS)

In the table below, provide the number of all students in TAS who completed the assessment and for whom a proficiency level was assigned, in grades 3 through 8 and high school, on the State's mathematics assessments under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA. Also, provide the number of those students who scored at or above proficient. The percentage of students who scored at or above proficient is calculated automatically.

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or above Proficient	Percentage at or above Proficient
3	4,385	2,202	50.22
4	4,385	2,090	47.66
5	4,328	1,760	40.67
6	4,883	1,887	38.64
7	4,916	2,076	42.23
8	4,776	1,838	38.48
High School	3,738	1,331	35.61
Total	31,411	13,184	41.97

Comments: Response to ED Comment:

Seventy-eight percent of Montana students who were tested in spring of 2017 were at a school with a Title I program. This number is split between school wide programs (37 percent) and targeted assistance programs (41 percent). Only 22 percent of Montana students who were tested in spring of 2017 were at a school with no Title I program. Students at schools with targeted programs had a higher percent of student proficient than schools with school wide programs in both math (~8 percent) and Reading/ELA (~11 percent). Schools with no Title I program had a higher percent proficient than the targeted assistance program schools in both math (~6 percent) and Reading/ELA (4 percent). The fact that Montana has such a high percentage of students at Title I schools, combined with the smaller difference in reported proficiency between non-Title I schools and Title I targeted schools, has caused the overall state proficiency rate to be slightly below the rate for the targeted Title I program schools.

2.1.1.4 Student Achievement in Reading/Language Arts in Targeted Assistance Schools (TAS)

This section is similar to 2.1.1.3. The only difference is that this section collects data on performance on the State's reading/language arts assessment by all students in TAS.

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or above Proficient	Percentage at or above Proficient
3	4,141	2,152	51.97
4	4,132	2,123	51.38
5	4,111	2,339	56.90
6	4,884	2,502	51.23
7	4,923	2,767	56.21
8	4,783	2,506	52.39
High School	3,738	1,948	52.11
Total	30,712	16,337	53.19

Comments: Response to ED comment:

Seventy-eight percent of Montana students who were tested in spring of 2017 were at a school with a Title I program. This number is split between school wide programs (37 percent) and targeted assistance programs (41 percent). Only 22 percent of Montana students who were tested in spring of 2017 were at a school with no Title I program. Students at schools with targeted programs had a higher percent of student proficient than schools with school wide programs in both math (~8 percent) and Reading/ELA (~11 percent). Schools with no Title I program had a higher percent proficient than the targeted assistance program schools in both math (~6 percent) and Reading/ELA (4 percent). The fact that Montana has such a high percentage of students at Title I schools, combined with the smaller difference in reported proficiency between non-Title I schools and Title I targeted schools, has caused the overall state proficiency rate to be slightly below the rate for the targeted Title I program schools.

2.1.2 Title I, Part A Student Participation

The following sections collect data on students participating in Title I, Part A by various student characteristics.

2.1.2.1 Student Participation in Public Title I, Part A by Special Services or Programs

In the table below, provide the number of public school students served by either Public Title I SWP or TAS programs at any time during the regular school year for each category listed. Count each student only once in each category even if the student participated during more than one term or in more than one school or district in the State. Count each student in as many of the categories that are applicable to the student. Include pre-kindergarten through grade 12. Do not include the following individuals: (1) adult participants of adult literacy programs funded by Title I, (2) private school students participating in Title I programs operated by local educational agencies, or (3) students served in Part A local neglected programs.

Special Services or Programs	# Students Served
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	9,479
Limited English proficient students	2,400
Students who are homeless	1,412
Migratory students	186
Comments:	

2.1.2.2 Student Participation in Public Title I, Part A by Racial/Ethnic Group

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of public school students served by either public Title I SWP or TAS at any time during the regular school year. Each student should be reported in only one racial/ethnic category. Include pre-kindergarten through grade 12. The total number of students served will be calculated automatically.

Do not include: (1) adult participants of adult literacy programs funded by Title I, (2) private school students participating in Title I programs operated by local educational agencies, or (3) students served in Part A local neglected programs.

Race/Ethnicity	# Students Served
American Indian or Alaska Native	13,657
Asian	443
Black or African American	584
Hispanic or Latino	3,096
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	170
White	43,470
Two or more races	2,610
Total	64,030
Comments:	

2.1.2.3 Student Participation in Title I, Part A by Grade Level

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of students participating in Title I, Part A programs by grade level and by type of program: Title I public targeted assistance programs (Public TAS), Title I schoolwide programs (Public SWP), private school students participating in Title I programs (private), and Part A local neglected programs (local neglected). The totals column by type of program will be automatically calculated.

Age/Grade	Public TAS	Public SWP	Private	Local Neglected	Total
Age Birth through 2	0	0	5	0	5
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	5	1,230	23	0	1,258
K	531	5,078	97	0	5,706
1	721	4,825	115	6	5,667
2	822	5,014	117	8	5,961
3	800	5,177	94	8	6,079
4	719	4,961	117	8	5,805
5	637	4,989	107	7	5,740
6	556	3,849	96	7	4,508
7	516	3,528	101	9	4,154
8	542	3,528	87	9	4,166
9	513	4,036	56	12	4,617
10	371	3,852	55	5	4,283
11	305	3,414	29	9	3,757
12	233	3,332	36	3	3,604
Ungraded	0	0	1	0	1
TOTALS	7,271	56,813	1,136	91	65,311
Comments:					

2.1.2.4 Student Participation in Title I, Part A Targeted Assistance Programs by Instructional and Support Services

The following sections collect data about the participation of students in TAS.

2.1.2.4.1 Student Participation in Title I, Part A Targeted Assistance Programs by Instructional Services

In the table below, provide the number of students receiving each of the listed instructional services through a TAS program funded by Title I, Part A. Students may be reported as receiving more than one instructional service. However, students should be reported only once for each instructional service regardless of the frequency with which they received the service.

TAS Instructional Service	# Students Served
Mathematics	4,313
Reading/language arts	5,401
Science	173
Social studies	114
Vocational/career	27
Other instructional services	44
Comments:	

2.1.2.4.2 Student Participation in Title I, Part A Targeted Assistance Programs by Support Services

In the table below, provide the number of students receiving each of the listed support services through a TAS program funded by Title I, Part A. Students may be reported as receiving more than one support service. However, students should be reported only once for each support service regardless of the frequency with which they received the service.

TAS Support Service	# Students Served
Health, dental, and eye care	10
Supporting guidance/advocacy	23
Other support services	32
Comments:	

2.1.3 Staff Information for Title I, Part A Targeted Assistance Programs (TAS)

In the table below, provide the number of full-time equivalent (FTE) staff funded by a Title I, Part A TAS in each of the staff categories. For staff who work with both TAS and SWP, report only the FTE attributable to their TAS responsibilities.

For paraprofessionals only, provide the percentage of paraprofessionals who were qualified in accordance with Section 1119 (c) and (d) of ESEA.

See the FAQs following the table for additional information.

Staff Category	Staff FTE	Percentage Qualified
Teachers	188.07	
Paraprofessionals ¹	321.05	99.87
Other paraprofessionals (translators, parental involvement, computer assistance) ²	8.16	
Clerical support staff	1.52	
Administrators (non-clerical)	5.79	
Comments:		

FAQs on staff information

- a. *What is a "paraprofessional?"* An employee of an LEA who provides instructional support in a program supported with Title I, Part A funds. Instructional support includes the following activities:
- (1) Providing one-on-one tutoring for eligible students, if the tutoring is scheduled at a time when a student would not otherwise receive instruction from a teacher;
 - (2) Providing assistance with classroom management, such as organizing instructional and other materials;
 - (3) Providing assistance in a computer laboratory;
 - (4) Conducting parental involvement activities;
 - (5) Providing support in a library or media center;
 - (6) Acting as a translator; or
 - (7) Providing instructional services to students.
- b. *What is an "other paraprofessional?"* Paraprofessionals who do not provide instructional support, for example, paraprofessionals who are translators or who work with parental involvement or computer assistance.
- c. *Who is a qualified paraprofessional?* A paraprofessional who has (1) completed 2 years of study at an institution of higher education; (2) obtained an associate's (or higher) degree; or (3) met a rigorous standard of quality and been able to demonstrate, through a formal State or local academic assessment, knowledge of and the ability to assist in instructing reading, writing, and mathematics (or, as appropriate, reading readiness, writing readiness, and mathematics readiness) (Sections 1119(c) and (d).) For more information on qualified paraprofessionals, please refer to the Title I paraprofessionals Guidance, available at: <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/paraguidance.doc>

¹ Consistent with ESEA, Title I, Section 1119(g)(2).

² Consistent with ESEA, Title I, Section 1119(e).

2.1.3.1 Paraprofessional Information for Title I, Part A Schoolwide Programs

In the table below, provide the number of FTE paraprofessionals who served in SWP and the percentage of these paraprofessionals who were qualified in accordance with Section 1119 (c) and (d) of *ESEA*. Use the additional guidance found below the previous table.

Paraprofessional Information	Paraprofessionals FTE	Percentage Qualified
Paraprofessionals ³	186.98	49.53
Comments:		

³ Consistent with *ESEA*, Title I, Section 1119(g)(2).

2.1.4 Parental Involvement Reservation Under Title I, Part A

In the table below provide information on the amount of Title I, Part A funds reserved by LEAs for parental involvement activities under Section 1118 (a)(3) of the ESEA. The percentage of LEAs FY 2016 Title I Part A allocations reserved for parental involvement will be automatically calculated from the data entered in Rows 2 and 3.

Parental Involvement Reservation	LEAs that Received a Federal Fiscal Year (FY) 2016 (School Year 2016-17) Title I, Part A Allocation of \$500,000 or less	LEAs that Received a Federal Fiscal Year (FY) 2016 (School Year 2016-17) Title I, Part A Allocation of more than \$500,000
Number of LEAs*	385	16
Sum of the amount reserved by LEAs for parental involvement	77,114	214,906
Sum of LEAs' FY 2016 Title I, Part A allocations	25,977,588	17,549,719
Percentage of LEAs' FY 2016 Title I, Part A allocations reserved for parental involvement	0.30	1.22

*The sum of Column 2 and Column 3 should equal the number of LEAs that received an FY 2016 Title I, Part A allocation.

In the comment box below, provide examples of how LEAs in your State used their Title I Part A, set-aside for parental involvement during SY 2016-17.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

2.3 EDUCATION OF MIGRANT CHILDREN (TITLE I, PART C)

This section collects data on the Migrant Education Program (Title I, Part C) for the performance period of September 1, 2016 through August 31, 2017. This section is composed of the following subsections:

- | Population data of eligible migrant children
- | Academic data of eligible migrant students
- | Data of migrant children served during the performance period
- | School data
- | Project data
- | Personnel data

Report a child in the age/grade category in which s/he spent the majority of his/her time while residing in the State during the performance period.

There are two exceptions to this rule. The first exception to this rule is a child who turns 3 during the performance period would be reported as "Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)," **only if the child's residency in the state was verified after the child turned three.** The second exception to this rule may be a child who turns 22 years of age during the performance period, who would be reported at the appropriate age/grade category for the performance period.

2.3.1 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 performance period of September 1, 2016 through August 31, 2017. This section also collects a report on the procedures used by States to produce true, reliable, and valid child counts.

To provide the child counts, each SEA should have implemented sufficient procedures and internal controls 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 disclose known data limitations to the Department, and explain how and when it will resolve data quality issues through corrective actions in the box below, which precedes Section 2.3.1.1 *Category 1 Child Count*.

Note: In submitting this information, the Authorizing State Official must certify that, to the best of his/her knowledge, the State has taken action to ensure that 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:

1. *How is "out-of-school" defined?* Out-of-school means children 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 HSED 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, nor does it include temporary absences (e.g., summer/intersession, suspension or illness).
2. *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 HSED through a K-12 institution, or those in a correctional setting. (Students working on a HSED outside of a K-12 institution are counted as out-of-school youth.)

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 and how and when these concerns will be resolved.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Comments:

2.3.1.1 Category 1 Child Count (Eligible Migrant Children)

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 performance period of September 1, 2016 through August 31, 2017. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the performance period only once in the age/grade category in which s/he spent the majority of his/her time while residing in the State, during the performance period. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include children age birth through 2 years.

Age/Grade	Eligible Migrant Children
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	134
K	74
1	75
2	70
3	69
4	89
5	63
6	58
7	52
8	82
9	81
10	58
11	63
12	32

Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	25
Total	1,025
Comments:	

2.3.1.1.1 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.

Comments: The Category 1 MEP Child Count does not represent more than a 10 percent increase/decrease from the previous year. 4.8 percent more children were identified in 2016-17.

2.3.1.1.2 Birth through Two Child Count

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number of eligible migrant children from birth through age 2 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, resided in your State for one or more days during the performance period of September 1, 2016 through August 31, 2017.

Age/Grade	Eligible Migrant Children
Age Birth through 2	72
Comments:	

2.3.1.2 Category 2 Child Count (Eligible Migrant Children Served by the MEP During the Summer/ Intersession Term)

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 performance period of September 1, 2016 through August 31, 2017. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the performance period only once in the age/grade category in which s/he spent the majority of his/her time while residing in the State, during the performance 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 who received only referred services (non-MEP funded).

Age/Grade	Eligible Migrant Children Served by the MEP During the Summer/Intersession Term
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	110
K	56
1	55
2	46
3	49
4	67
5	41
6	42
7	39
8	57
9	56
10	43
11	53
12	4
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	9
Total	727
Comments:	

2.3.1.2.1 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.

Comments: The 2016-17 Category 2 Child Count does not represent more than a 10 percent increase/decrease from the previous year. 5.5 percent fewer children were served during the summer of 2017 due primarily to the historic fire season.

2.3.1.2.2 Birth through Two Eligible Migrant Children Served by the MEP During the Summer/Intersession Term

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number of eligible migrant children from age birth through 2 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 performance period of September 1, 2016 through August 31, 2017. 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.

Do not include:

- ┆ Children who received only referred services (non-MEP funded).

Age/Grade	Eligible Migrant Children Served by the MEP During the Summer/Intersession Term
Age Birth through 2	0
Comments:	

2.3.1.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures

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

2.3.1.3.1 Student Information System

In the space below, respond to the following questions: What system did the State use to compile and generate the Category 1 child count for this performance period? Please check the box that applies.

Student Information System	(Yes/No)
NGS	<u>Yes</u>
MIS 2000	<u>No</u>
COEStar	<u>No</u>
MAPS	<u>No</u>
Other Student Information System. Please identify the system:	<u>No</u>

Student Information System	(Yes/No)
Was the Category 2 child count for this performance period generated using the same system?	<u>Yes</u>

If the State's Category 2 count was generated using a different system than the Category 1 count please identify the specific system that generates the Category 2 count.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

2.3.1.3.3 Methods Used To Count Children

In the space below, please describe the procedures and processes at the State level used to ensure all eligible children, ages 3-21, are accounted for in the performance period. In particular, describe how the State includes and counts only:

- | The unduplicated count of eligible migrant children, ages 3-21. Only include children two years of age whose residency in the state has been verified after turning three.
- | Children who met the program eligibility criteria (e.g., were within 3 years of a qualifying move, and were entitled to a free public education through grade 12 in the State, or preschool children below the age and grade level at which the agency provides free public education). Children who were resident in your State for at least 1 day during the performance period (September 1 through August 31).
- | Children who-in the case of Category 2-were served for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods.
- | Children once per age/grade level for each child count category.
- | Children who had an SEA approved Certificate of Eligibility (COE) and were entered in the State's migrant student database.

Core eligibility, family history, and demographic data is collected by recruiters (trained by SEA personnel or consultants on an annual basis) through a direct family interview and documented on the Certificate of Eligibility (COE) that complies with all of the National COE requirements. Data was collected throughout the reporting period between September 1, 2016, and August 31, 2017.

Data are entered into the NGS database by trained data entry personnel and reviewed by local and state data administrators. Project sites use NGS to run data checks and various reports throughout the reporting period prior to submitting final data to the SEA. The data are organized within NGS to reflect all eligibility information required by statute and obtained during the interview, which has been documented on the COE that comports with the National COE template. Each COE is validated and checked for accuracy by the local project director and the SEA's Designee Data Administrator. 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 dynamic database. Before a new student record can be created, the system checks for duplication based on the student's last name or similar last name by using a system generated "wild card" prompt. The wild card prompt allows data entry personnel to check potential duplicate students by displaying students that have a range of similar information. Potential duplicates are then checked against additional fields such as first name, birth date, and parents' names. Any matches generate further review that 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 by SEA's Data Designee. 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, and only verified qualifying activities and moves can be entered into the data system. The Montana Office of Public Instruction migrant data analyst and LOA MEP data staff and trained data personnel attend to MSIX work lists in a timely manner and crosschecks between NGS, AIM, and MSIX.

NGS selects students for the unique student count based upon the enrollment/performance period and current 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 timeframe.

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 or who have received their HiSET are not given new enrollments in NGS.
- For 12-month counts, any type of eligible enrollment is counted.
- For the summer/intersession (Category 2) counts, the report includes enrollments with a summer or intersession type of enrollment.

Following is an example of the criteria used to gather the data from the database; for these examples, the YR1 and YR2 are used to represent the school year selection. For the 201617 school year option, YR1=2016 and YR2=2017. 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 qualifying move within three years. For the school year 2016-17, YR3=2014. The data for the count is retrieved using the following criteria:

Enrollment Date Information:

- the withdrawal date is between 9/1/YR1 and 8/31/YR2; or
 - the enrollment date is between 9/1/YR1 and 8/31/YR2; or
 - the residency verification date is between 9/1/YR1 and 8/31/YR2.
 - the termination reason does not equal 'G' (Graduated), 'E' (GED/HiSET) or 'D' (Deceased) and the termination date is greater than 8/31/YR1. The QAD greater than or equal to 9/1/YR3.
- Birth date Information:
- the student must be between 3 and 21 years 11 months old to be counted.

In the case of Category 2 children, only those in attendance or who are served by a mobile or in-orchard tutorial are counted as eligible children served. Children who are identified, but who do not participate in any MEP funded services are not counted as part of the Category 2 count and considered to be residency-only students. For children that turned three years old during the performance period, recruiters use an NGS report to track 2-year-olds about to turn three and schedule visits with families to verify residency and to enroll or refer 3-year-olds into programs if possible. NGS counts only those 3-year-olds who are actually in residence in the state on or after their third birthday. The same scrutiny is applied to migrant students who graduate or receive their HiSET. Recruiters, MEP staff, and data entry persons record the graduation or HiSET information for students meeting those criteria. While we do serve students who are seniors during a given performance period, once that student has completed a high school diploma or HiSET, the student will no longer be deemed eligible for the MEP. Any post-graduation or HiSET completion student may receive post-graduation mentoring or assistance if needed, but only as a continuation student, not a student eligible for inclusion in the Category 1 or 2 counts.

How does the State ensure that the system that transmits migrant data to the Department accurately accounts for all the migrant children in every ED Facts data file (see the Office of Migrant Education's CSPR Rating Instrument for the criteria needed to address this question)?

The New Generation System (NGS) is a web-based interstate information network that communicates demographic, educational, and health data on migrant students to educators and stakeholders throughout the nation. The NGS system is designed to capture educational and health data on migrant students. The system allows educators to record the movement of migrant students through the educational process by producing online records of a student's educational progress and health profile. Educators can generate a student transfer document to facilitate academic placement as the student transfers schools. NGS also allows educators to generate various student-level, management, and Office of Migrant Education performance reports and MSIX uploads. Highly trained staff understand the file specifications for EDEN and the CSPR so that member states' data can be transmitted flawlessly to

state data contacts during the performance-reporting period. In addition to reports and functions designed to ease day-to-day migrant data activities, the NGS has an extensive management level report section dedicated solely to assist in preparing the CSPR. It provides complete student level reports used to account for all the migrant children in the EDFacts data files. Our experienced state staff review these reports periodically during the year and again before the CSPR is finalized to ensure the accuracy of the Eden file submission.

Use of MSIX to Verify Data Quality	(Yes/No)
Does the State use data in the Migrant Student Information Exchange (MSIX) to verify the quality of migrant data? If MSIX is utilized, please explain how.	_No_

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

We do use MSIX to the extent possible to verify data quality, but continue intense interstate follow-up with sending states where we have access to source data. To that end, no significant issues of MTMEP data quality were found in our prospective re-interviewing process, our interstate COE sharing with Washington state in 2016-17, or in our missed enrollment follow-up procedures. Using the MSIX missed enrollment report, we were unable to verify with potential families residency in Montana for qualifying work. We could not locate these families at their last known addresses in Washington or Texas. Families either had resettled to another location within our state or had left Montana for another state before our recruiters could find them.

MSIX does help us to be comprehensive in the methods we use to assess our identification and recruitment procedures. Using this feature of MSIX in the past, we have been able to locate families who were in MSIX and who had traveled to Montana that further enabled us to (1) identify new isolated, rural areas in our state where we did not have continual ID and R going on, as well as keeping recruiters aware of the time period when we might anticipate that happening again, and (2) work with sending states to ensure the quality of their data in MSIX. Using MSIX assists the MTMEP to continuously improve its identification and recruitment practices

2.3.1.3.4 Quality Control Processes

In the space below, respond to the following questions :

Quality Control Processes	Yes/No
Is student eligibility based on a personal interview (face-to-face or phone call) with a parent, guardian, or other responsible adult, or youth-as-worker?	<u>Yes</u>
Does the SEA and/or regional offices train recruiters at least annually on eligibility requirements, including the basic eligibility definition, economic necessity, temporary vs. seasonal, processing, etc.?	<u>Yes</u>
Does the SEA have a formal process, beyond the recruiter's determination, for reviewing and ensuring the accuracy of written eligibility information [e.g., COEs are reviewed and initialed by the recruiter's supervisor and/or other reviewer(s)]?	<u>Yes</u>
Are incomplete or otherwise questionable COEs returned to the recruiter for correction, further explanation, documentation, and/or verification?	<u>Yes</u>
Does the SEA provide recruiters with written eligibility guidance (e.g., a handbook)?	<u>Yes</u>
Does the SEA review student attendance records at summer/intersession projects to verify that the total unduplicated number of eligible migrant students served in the summer/intersession is reconciled with the Category 2 Count ?	<u>Yes</u>
Does the SEA have both a local and state-level process for resolving eligibility questions?	<u>Yes</u>
Are written procedures provided to regular school year and summer/intersession personnel on how to collect and report pupil enrollment and withdrawal data?	<u>Yes</u>
Are records/data entry personnel provided training on how to review regular school year and summer/inter-session site records, input data, and run reports used for child count purposes?	<u>Yes</u>

In the space below, describe the results of **any** re-interview processes used by the SEA during the performance period to test the accuracy of the State's MEP eligibility determinations.

Results	#
The number of eligibility determinations sampled.	30
The number of eligibility determinations sampled for which a re-interview was completed.	26
The number of eligibility determinations sampled for which a re-interview was completed and the child was found eligible.	26

Describe any reasons for non-response in the re-interviewing process.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Thirty statewide, randomly selected COEs were reviewed by state data staff as a part of on-going quality assurance. Twenty-six of the 30 families were found and re-interviewed with no findings of ineligibility. Four families were not in state when interviews were completed or were not at their last known address.

Procedures For Independent Prospective Re-Interviews	
What was the most recent year that the MEP conducted independent prospective re-interviews (i.e., interviewers were neither SEA or LEA staff members responsible for administering or operating the MEP, nor any other persons who worked on the initial eligibility determinations being tested)? If independent prospective re-interviews were not administered in any of the three performance periods, please provide an explanation in the "Comment" row at the end of this table.	SY 2016-17
Procedures	Yes/No
Was the sampling of eligible children random?	<u>Yes</u>
Was the sampling statewide?	<u>Yes</u>

Comment:

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

FAQ on independent prospective re-interviews:

- a. *What are independent prospective re-interviews?* Independent prospective re-interviews allow confirmation of your State's eligibility determinations and the accuracy of the numbers of migrant children in your State reports. Independent prospective interviews should be conducted at least once every three years by an independent interviewer, performed on the current year's identified migrant children.

If the sampling was stratified by group/area please describe the procedures. Only enter a response if your State completed independent prospective re-interviews in SY 2016-17.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

As part of the ongoing quality control process that the SEA has crafted to ensure the accuracy of the state's MEP eligibility determinations, policy was established that conforms with the Prospective Re-Interviewing regulation (Section 200.89(b)(2)) that states that these re-interviews are to be conducted on current year eligibility determinations using a small sample size of randomly selected COEs. The actual number of COEs selected for re-interviewing depends upon the number of children in the project and the type of mobility patterns to which the families conform according to the guidance provided. For the 2016-17 performance period, the data quality team determined that a stratified random sample COEs selected through a sequence generator using the resources of random.org and the Montana COE numbers for each of the families would be completed and would be performed by a paid outside contractor who is trained in re-interviewing protocols. This process found all eligibility determinations documented by MTMEP recruitment staff to be valid.

In the interest of interstate coordination and collaboration, as well as continuous improvement of data quality, the MTMEP provided COE copies of all Washington-based students identified in Montana in the 2016-17 performance period to the Washington state MEP MSDR in order for their recruiters to follow up on children identified in Montana during the 2017 summer cherry harvest. In this way, the MTMEP helps to ensure that currently mobile, shared students will be identified and served in their home base state of Washington. This process also serves as an informal re-interviewing strategy for over 300 migrant students during which the quality of Montana data is checked for accuracy by Washington recruiters. No eligibility issues or data quality issues were

reported because of that process, providing yet another layer of data scrutiny by the MTMEP.

Please describe the sampling replacement by the State. Only enter a response if your State completed independent prospective re-interviews in SY 2016-17.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The MTMEP utilizes a randomly generated replacement sample methodology as required in the re-interviewing process outlined by OME.

We conduct annual data quality reviews internally at the SEA by verifying data in NGS, AIM (the Montana Student Data Base system that contains assessment and other disaggregated data), and MSIX in an ongoing, weekly manner. We monitor data and COES during onsite visits.

Obtaining Data From Families	
Check the applicable box to indicate how the re-interviews were conducted	
Face-to-face re-interviews	
Phone Interviews	
Both	
Obtaining Data From Families	
	Yes/No
Was there a protocol for verifying all information used in making the original eligibility determination?	<u>Yes</u>
Were re-interviewers independent from the original interviewers?	<u>Yes</u>

If you did conduct independent re-interviews in this reporting period, describe how you ensured that the process was independent. Only enter a response if your State completed independent prospective re-interviews in SY 2016-17 .

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

An out-of-state independent contractor was hired to perform the re-interviews. The contractor was given and understood the MTMEP protocols for re-interviewing and the maintenance of independent findings and confidentiality. No SEA or LOA staff or anyone responsible for administering the MTMEP or making the initial determinations was part of the re-interviewing process.

The second part of the MTMEP's two-prong approach to re-interviewing and data quality control concentrates on the MTMEP's most mobile population with current qualifying moves. This approach includes sending actual copies of all Montana COEs for Washington-based migrant children to the Washington State Migrant Student Data and Records office in Washington for their review every performance period. Washington state trained recruiters use data from these COEs in locating families in Washington and conducting their initial interviewing process. They contact us if they find any data that needs correction or completion that, in turn, assists our recruiters in maintaining a high level of both data quality and independent monitoring by outside recruiters.

In the space below, refer to the results of **any** re-interview processes used by the SEA, and if any of the migrant children were found ineligible, describe those corrective actions or improvements that will be made by the SEA to improve the accuracy of its MEP eligibility determinations.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

No migrant children were found to be ineligible. Three spellings of first names were found to be inaccurate. Corrections in data systems were made to those records.

In the space below, please respond to the following question:

Does the state collect all the required data elements and data sections on the National Certificate of Eligibility (COE)?	<u>Yes</u>
---	------------

2.3.2 Eligible Migrant Children

2.3.2.1 Priority for Services

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children who have been classified as having "Priority for Services." The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Priority for Services During the Performance Period
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	61
K	37
1	34
2	33
3	43
4	65
5	54
6	50
7	46
8	69
9	55
10	35
11	48
12	25
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	11
Total	666
Comments:	

FAQ on priority for services:

Who is classified as having "priority for service?" Migratory children who are failing or most at risk of failing to meet the State's challenging academic content standards and student academic achievement standards, and whose education has been interrupted during the regular school year.

2.3.2.2 Limited English Proficient

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children who are also limited English proficient (LEP). The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Limited English Proficient (LEP) During the Performance Period
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	82
K	35
1	33
2	29
3	29
4	38
5	26
6	24
7	27
8	39
9	35
10	32
11	32
12	5
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	7
Total	473
Comments:	

2.3.2.3 Children with Disabilities (IDEA)

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children who are also children with disabilities (*IDEA*) under Part B or Part C of the *IDEA*. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Children with Disabilities (IDEA) During the Performance Period
Age Birth through 2	0
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	2
K	1
1	1
2	2
3	0
4	1
5	1
6	6
7	3
8	2
9	3
10	2
11	5
12	2
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	1
Total	32
Comments:	

2.3.2.4 Qualifying Arrival Date (QAD)

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children whose qualifying arrival date (QAD) occurred within 12 months from the last day of the performance period, August 31, 2017 (i.e., QAD during the performance period). The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Qualifying Arrival Date During the Performance Period
Age Birth through 2	58
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	87
K	40
1	36
2	34
3	31
4	51
5	26
6	23
7	31
8	40
9	42
10	30
11	40
12	9
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	6
Total	584
Comments:	

2.3.2.5 Qualifying Arrival Date During the Regular School Year

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children whose qualifying arrival date occurred during the performance period's regular school year (i.e., QAD during the 2016-17 regular school year). The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Qualifying Arrival Date During the Regular School Year
Age Birth through 2	5
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	26
K	12
1	8
2	10
3	7
4	13
5	7
6	2
7	12
8	4
9	12
10	2
11	8
12	6
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	5
Total	139

Comments:

FAQ on Regular School Year:

How is "regular school year" defined? For schools that operate on a traditional calendar, the regular school year is the period from the beginning of school in the State in the fall to the end in the spring, generally from September to June. For schools that operate on a year-round schedule without a traditional long summer break, the regular school term is the aggregate of all those periods throughout the year when the school (or part of the school) is in session providing the annual amount of instruction analogous to the traditional school-year regular term.

2.3.2.6 Referrals — During the Performance Period

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children who, during the performance period, received an educational or educationally related service funded by a non-MEP program/organization that they would not have otherwise received without efforts supported by MEP funds. Children should be reported only once regardless of the frequency with which they received a referred service. Include children who received a referral only or who received both a referral and MEP-funded services. Do not include children who received a referral from the MEP, but did not receive services from the non-MEP program/organization to which they were referred. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Referrals During the Performance Period
Age Birth through 2	47
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	55
K	69
1	74
2	65
3	65
4	83
5	58
6	55
7	49
8	79
9	76
10	55
11	57
12	27
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	10
Total	924

Comments: The data representing the increase in referrals during the performance period have been validated as correct. During the 2016-17 data collection, the MTMEP service delivery protocols emphasized that all families identified as eligible for the MEP be referred, as appropriate, for assistance with health, dental, housing, food and/or transportation vouchers, preschool and daycare services, job training and career guidance, and legal services. During the previous performance period, not all sub-grantees made these referrals.

2.3.2.8 Academic Status

The following questions collect data about the academic status of **eligible** migrant students.

2.3.2.8.1 Dropouts

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant students who dropped out of school. The total is calculated automatically.

Grade	Dropouts During the Performance Period
7	0
8	0
9	0
10	1
11	1
12	1
Ungraded	0
Total	3
Comments:	

FAQ on Dropouts:

How is "dropouts" defined? The term used for students, who, (1) were enrolled in a school for at least one day during the 2016-17 performance period, (2) were not enrolled at the beginning of the current (2017-18) performance period, (3) who have not graduated from high school or completed a State- or district-approved educational program, and (4) who do not meet any of the following exclusionary conditions: (a) transfer to another 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. Students who dropped out-of-school prior to the 2016-17 performance period should not be reported in this item.

2.3.2.8.2 HSED (High School Equivalency Diploma)

In the table below, provide the total unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant students who obtained a High School Equivalency Diploma (HSED) by passing a high school equivalency test that your state accepts (e.g., GED, HiSET, TASC).

Obtained HSED	#
Obtained a HSED in your State During the Performance Period	2
Comments:	

2.3.3 Services for Eligible Migrant Children

The following questions collect data about MEP services provided to eligible migrant children during the performance period.

Eligible migrant children who are served include:

- ▮ Migrant children who were eligible for and received instructional or support services funded in whole or in part with MEP funds.
- ▮ Children who continued to receive MEP-funded services during the term their eligibility ended.
- ▮ Migrant children who are not included in your State's Category I or Category II child counts because they did not reside in your State for at least one day during the performance period (e.g., interstate collaboration), but who were eligible in another State and received instructional services funded in whole or in part with MEP funds in your State. If you report such children, please provide an explanatory comment in the comment box for each relevant CSPR question.

Do not include:

- ▮ Children who were served through a Title I **Schoolwide Program** (SWP) where MEP funds were consolidated with those of other programs.
- ▮ Children who received only referred services (non-MEP funded).
- ▮ Children who were served for one additional school year after their eligibility ended, if comparable services were not available through other programs.
- ▮ Children who were in secondary school after their eligibility ended, and served through credit accrual programs until graduation (e.g., children served under the continuation of services authority, Section (1304(e)(2-3))).

FAQ on Services:

What are services? Services are a subset of all allowable activities that the MEP can provide through its programs and projects. "Services" are those educational or educationally related activities that: (1) directly benefit a migrant child; (2) address a need of a migrant child consistent with the SEA's comprehensive needs assessment and service delivery plan; (3) are grounded in scientifically based research or, in the case of support services, are a generally accepted practice; and (4) are designed to enable the program to meet its measurable outcomes and contribute to the achievement of the State's performance targets/annual measurable objectives. Activities related to identification and recruitment activities, parental involvement, program evaluation, professional development, or administration of the program are examples of allowable activities that are not considered services. Other examples of an allowable activity that would not be considered a service would be the one-time act of providing instructional packets to a child or family, and handing out leaflets to migrant families on available reading programs as part of an effort to increase the reading skills of migrant children. Although these are allowable activities, they are not services because they do not meet all of the criteria above.

2.3.3.2 Priority for Services – During the Regular School Year

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children who have been classified as having "priority for services" and who received MEP funded instructional or support services during the regular school year. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Priority for Services During the Regular School Year
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	25
K	10
1	9
2	14
3	24
4	36
5	38
6	30
7	25
8	38
9	31
10	7
11	18
12	22
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	11
Total	338
Comments:	

2.3.4.2 Priority for Services – During the Summer/Intersession Term

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children who have been classified as having "priority for services" and who received MEP- funded instructional or support services during the summer/intersession term. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Priority for Services During the Summer/Intersession Term
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	52
K	35
1	32
2	29
3	31
4	49
5	37
6	37
7	35
8	48
9	40
10	31
11	40
12	4
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	3
Total	503
Comments:	

2.3.5 MEP Services – During the Performance Period

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children who received MEP-funded instructional or support services at any time during the performance period. Do not count the number of times an individual child received a service intervention. The total number of students served is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Served During the Performance Period
Age Birth through 2	56
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	126
K	73
1	75
2	70
3	68
4	88
5	63
6	58
7	52
8	82
9	81
10	58
11	63
12	32
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	25
Total	1,070
Comments:	

2.3.5.1 Priority for Services – During the Performance Period

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children who have been classified as having "priority for services" and who received MEP-funded instructional or support services during the performance period. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Priority for Services During the Performance Period
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	61
K	37
1	34
2	33
3	43
4	65
5	54
6	50
7	46
8	69
9	55
10	35
11	48
12	25
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	11
Total	666

Comments: The data representing increases in the numbers of PFS students in Grades 4 and 8 have been validated as correct. Changing student populations in grade levels because of mobility and at-risk criteria resulted in increased numbers.

2.3.5.2 Continuation of Services – During the Performance Period

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of migrant children who received MEP-funded instructional or support services during the performance period under the continuation of services authority Sections 1304(e)(2–3). Do **not** include children served under Section 1304(e)(1), which are children whose eligibility expired during the school term. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Continuation of Services During the Performance Period
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	0
K	0
1	0
2	0
3	0
4	0
5	0
6	0
7	0
8	0
9	0
10	0
11	0
12	0
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	0
Comments:	

2.3.5.3 Instructional Service – During the Performance Period

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children who received any type of MEP-funded instructional service during the performance period. Include children who received instructional services provided by either a teacher or a paraprofessional. Children should be reported only once regardless of the frequency with which they received a service intervention. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Instructional Service During the Performance Period
Age Birth through 2	1
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	69
K	54
1	63
2	52
3	53
4	67
5	49
6	42
7	43
8	46
9	39
10	28
11	28
12	18
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	3
Total	655
Comments: The data have been validated as accurate. Change in student populations in the grade levels is due to mobility, which resulted in increased numbers.	

2.3.5.3.1 Type of Instructional Service – During the Performance Period

In the table below, provide the number of **eligible** migrant children reported in the table above who received MEP-funded reading instruction, mathematics instruction, or high school credit accrual during the performance period. Include children who received such instructional services provided by a teacher only. Children may be reported as having received more than one type of instructional service in the table. However, children should be reported only once within each type of instructional service that they received regardless of the frequency with which they received the instructional service. The totals are calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Reading Instruction During the Performance Period	Mathematics Instruction During the Performance Period	High School Credit Accrual During the Performance Period
Age Birth through 2	1	1	////////////////////////////////////
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	37	13	////////////////////////////////////
K	27	33	////////////////////////////////////
1	39	42	////////////////////////////////////
2	27	29	////////////////////////////////////
3	28	31	////////////////////////////////////
4	37	44	////////////////////////////////////
5	22	28	////////////////////////////////////
6	21	26	////////////////////////////////////
7	21	27	////////////////////////////////////
8	14	22	0
9	10	15	22
10	6	12	17
11	9	14	19
12	0	0	18
Ungraded	0	0	0
Out-of-school	1	1	0
Total	300	338	76

Comments: Response to ED comment:

The data are correct as submitted. The increases in Reading and Math instructional services are due to the fact that a certified elementary teacher was funded by the MEP to provided supplemental reading and math instruction to migrant students during the performance period. Additional certified elementary teachers were also funded in the summer projects. With regard to the increase in secondary credit accrual, more migrant secondary students sought assistance from the secondary outreach instructors during the performance period; most, but not all, of those students made progress toward partial credit accrual.

FAQ on Types of Instructional Services:

What is "high school credit accrual"? Instruction in courses that accrue credits needed for high school graduation provided by a teacher for students on a regular or systematic basis, usually for a predetermined period of time. Includes correspondence courses taken by a student under the supervision of a teacher. Beginning with SY 2016-17, high school credit accrual may include the age/grade categories of Grade 8 through Grade 12.

2.3.5.3.2 Support Services with Breakout for Counseling Services – During the Performance Period

In the table below, in the column titled **Support Services**, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children who received any MEP-funded support service during the performance period. In the column titled **Breakout of Counseling Services During the Performance Period**, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children who received a counseling service during the performance period. Children should be reported only once in each column regardless of the frequency with which they received a support service intervention. The totals are calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Support Services During the Performance Period	Breakout of Counseling Service During the Performance Period
Age Birth through 2	56	0
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	126	0
K	73	0
1	75	1
2	70	0
3	68	0
4	88	0
5	63	0
6	58	4
7	52	4
8	82	8
9	81	9
10	58	4
11	63	8
12	32	4
Ungraded	0	0
Out-of-school	25	4
Total	1,070	46

Comments: The data have been validated as correct. Increases in referrals for Grades 7, 8, and 9 were due to an enhanced effort in Montana to provide migrant students in middle school and junior high school access to pupil services, such as counseling, mental health referrals, and career guidance, because of the comprehensive needs assessment process.

FAQs on Support Services:

- a. *What are support services?* These MEP-funded services include, but are not limited to, health, nutrition, counseling, and social services for migrant families; necessary educational supplies, and transportation. The one-time act of providing instructional or informational packets to a child or family does not constitute a support service.
- b. *What are counseling services?* Services to help a student to better identify and enhance his or her educational, personal, or occupational potential; relate his or her abilities, emotions, and aptitudes to educational and career opportunities; utilize his or her abilities in formulating realistic plans; and achieve satisfying personal and social development. These activities take place between one or more counselors and one or more students as counselees, between students and students, and between counselors and other staff members. The services can also help the child address life problems or personal crisis that result from the culture of migrancy.

2.3.6 School Data - During the Regular School Year

The following questions are about the enrollment of eligible migrant children in schools during the regular school year.

2.3.6.1 Schools and Enrollment - During the Regular School Year

In the table below, provide the number of public schools that enrolled **eligible** migrant children at any time during the regular school year. Schools include public schools that serve school age (e.g., grades K through 12) children. Also, provide the number of **eligible** migrant children who were enrolled in those schools. Since more than one school in a State may enroll the same migrant child at some time during the regular school year, the number of children may include duplicates.

Schools	#
Number of schools that enrolled eligible migrant children	164
Number of eligible migrant children enrolled in those schools	532
Comments:	

2.3.6.2 Schools Where MEP Funds Were Consolidated in Schoolwide Programs (SWP) – During the Regular School Year

In the table below, provide the number of schools where MEP funds were consolidated in an SWP. Also, provide the number of **eligible** migrant children who were enrolled in those schools at any time during the regular school year. Since more than one school in a State may enroll the same migrant child at some time during the regular school year, the number of children may include duplicates.

Schools	#
Number of schools where MEP funds were consolidated in a schoolwide program	
Number of eligible migrant children enrolled in those schools	
Comments: Montana did not have schools where MEP funds were consolidated in SWP during the regular school year.	

2.3.7 MEP Project Data

The following questions collect data on MEP projects.

2.3.7.1 Type of MEP Project

In the table below, provide the number of projects that are funded in whole or in part with MEP funds. A MEP project is the entity that receives MEP funds from the State or through an intermediate entity that receives the MEP funds from the State and provides services directly to the migrant child. Do not include projects where MEP funds were consolidated in SWP.

Also, provide the number of migrant children **served** in the projects. Since children may receive services in more than one project, the number of children may include duplicates.

Type of MEP Project	Number of MEP Projects	Number of Migrant Children Served in the Projects
Regular school year - school day only	0	0
Regular school year - school day/extended day	0	0
Summer/intersession only	2	456
Year round	3	671
Comments:		

FAQs on type of MEP project:

- a. *What is a project?* A project is any entity that receives MEP funds and provides services directly to migrant children in accordance with the State Service Delivery Plan and State approved subgrant applications or contracts. A project's services may be provided in one or more sites. Each project should be counted once, regardless of the number of sites in which it provides services.
- b. *What are Regular School Year – School Day Only projects?* Projects where all MEP services are provided during the school day during the regular school year.
- c. *What are Regular School Year – School Day/Extended Day projects?* Projects where some or all MEP services are provided during an extended day or week during the regular school year (e.g., some services are provided during the school day and some outside of the school day; e.g., all services are provided outside of the school day).
- d. *What are Summer/Intersession Only projects?* Projects where all MEP services are provided during the summer/intersession term.
- e. *What are Year Round projects?* Projects where all MEP services are provided during the regular school year and summer/intersession term.

2.4 PREVENTION AND INTERVENTION PROGRAMS FOR CHILDREN AND YOUTH WHO ARE NEGLECTED, DELINQUENT, OR AT RISK (TITLE I, PART D, SUBPARTS 1 AND 2)

This section collects data on programs and facilities that serve students who are neglected, delinquent, or at risk under Title I, Part D, and characteristics about and services provided to these students.

Throughout this section:

- | Report data for the program year of July 1, 2016 through June 30, 2017.
- | Count programs/facilities based on how the program was classified to ED for funding purposes.
- | Do not include programs funded solely through Title I, Part A.
- | Use the definitions listed below:
 - | **Adult Corrections:** An adult correctional institution is a facility in which persons, including persons 21 or under, are confined as a result of conviction for a criminal offense.
 - | **At-Risk Programs:** Programs operated (through LEAs) that target students who are at risk of academic failure, have a drug or alcohol problem, are pregnant or parenting, have been in contact with the juvenile justice system in the past, are at least 1 year behind the expected age/grade level, have limited English proficiency, are gang members, have dropped out of school in the past, or have a high absenteeism rate at school.
 - | **Juvenile Corrections:** An institution for delinquent children and youth is a public or private residential facility other than a foster home that is operated for the care of children and youth who have been adjudicated delinquent or in need of supervision. Include any programs serving adjudicated youth (including non-secure facilities and group homes) in this category.
 - | **Juvenile Detention Facilities:** Detention facilities are shorter-term institutions that provide care to children who require secure custody pending court adjudication, court disposition, or execution of a court order, or care to children after commitment.
 - | **Neglected Programs:** An institution for neglected children and youth is a public or private residential facility, other than a foster home, that is operated primarily for the care of children who have been committed to the institution or voluntarily placed under applicable State law due to abandonment, neglect, or death of their parents or guardians.
 - | **Other:** Any other programs, not defined above, which receive Title I, Part D funds and serve non-adjudicated children and youth.

2.4.1 State Agency Title I, Part D Programs and Facilities – Subpart 1

The following questions collect data on Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 programs and facilities.

2.4.1.1 Programs and Facilities - Subpart 1

In the table below, provide the number of State agency Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 programs and facilities that serve neglected and delinquent students and the average length of stay by program/facility type, for these students. Report only programs and facilities that received Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 funding during the reporting year. Count a facility once if it offers only one type of program. If a facility offers more than one type of program (i.e., it is a multipurpose facility), then count each of the separate programs. The total number of programs/facilities will be automatically calculated. Below the table is a FAQ about the data collected in this table.

State Program/Facility Type	# Programs/Facilities	Average Length of Stay in Days
Neglected programs	0	0
Juvenile detention	0	0
Juvenile corrections	1	120
Adult corrections	2	110
Other	0	0
Total	3	////////////////////
Comments:		

FAQ on Programs and Facilities - Subpart 1:

How is average length of stay calculated? The average length of stay should be weighted by number of students and should include the number of days, per visit, for each student enrolled during the reporting year, regardless of entry or exit date. Multiple visits for students who entered more than once during the reporting year can be included. The average length of stay in days should not exceed 365.

2.4.1.1.1 Programs and Facilities That Reported - Subpart 1

In the table below, provide the number of State agency Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 programs/facilities that reported data on neglected and delinquent students.

The total row will be automatically calculated.

State Program/Facility Type	# Reporting Data
Neglected programs	0
Juvenile detention	0
Juvenile corrections	1
Adult corrections	2
Other	0
Total	3
Comments:	

2.4.1.2 Students Served – Subpart 1

In the tables below, provide the number of neglected and delinquent students served in State agency Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 programs and facilities. Report only students who received Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 services during the reporting year. In the first table, provide in row 1 the unduplicated number of students served by each program, and in row 2, the total number of students in row 1 who are long-term. In the subsequent tables provide the number of students served by disability (*IDEA*) and limited English proficiency (LEP), by race/ethnicity, by sex, and by age. The total number of students by race/ethnicity, by sex and by age will be automatically calculated.

# of Students Served	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Total Unduplicated Students Served			98	99	
Total Long Term Students Served			95	99	

Student Subgroups	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Students with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			36	35	
LEP Students			0	0	

Race/Ethnicity	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaska Native			29	15	
Asian			0	0	
Black or African American			2	3	
Hispanic or Latino			2	6	
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			0	0	
White			59	56	
Two or more races			6	19	
Total			98	99	

Sex	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Male			98	99	
Female			0	0	
Total			98	99	

Age	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
3 through 5			0	0	
6			0	0	
7			0	0	
8			0	0	
9			0	0	
10			0	0	
11			0	0	
12			1	0	
13			0	0	
14			1	0	
15			5	0	
16			26	0	
17			30	0	
18			34	12	
19			1	25	
20			0	30	
21			0	32	
Total			98	99	

If the total number of students differs by demographics, please explain in comment box below.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Comments: Response to ED comments:

These numbers are correct.

FAQ on Unduplicated Count:

What is an unduplicated count? An unduplicated count is one that counts students only once, even if they were admitted to a facility or program multiple times within the reporting year.

FAQ on long-term:

What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2016 through June 30, 2017.

2.4.1.3.2 Academic and Vocational Outcomes While in the State Agency Program/Facility or Within 90 Calendar Days After Exit

In the tables below, for each program type, provide the number of students who attained academic and vocational outcomes.

The first table includes outcomes a student is able to achieve only after exit. In this table, provide the unduplicated number of students who enrolled, or planned to enroll, in their local district school within 90 calendar days after exiting. A student may be reported only once, per program type.

The second table includes outcomes a student is able to achieve only one time. In this table, provide the unduplicated number of students who attained the listed outcomes either while enrolled in the State agency program/facility column (“in fac.”) or in the 90 days after exit column. A student may be reported only once across the two time periods, per program type.

The third table includes outcomes a student may achieve more than once. In the “in fac.” column, provide the unduplicated number of students who attained academic and vocational outcomes while enrolled in the State agency program/facility. In the “90 days after exit” column provide the unduplicated number of students who attained academic and vocational outcomes within 90 calendar days after exiting. If a student attained an outcome once in the program/facility and once during the 90 day transition period, that student may be reported once in each column.

Outcomes (once per student, only after exit)	Neglected Programs		Juvenile Detention		Juvenile Corrections		Adult Corrections		Other Programs	
	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit
# of Students Who Enrolled in their local district school 90 days after exit										
Outcomes (once per student)	Neglected Programs		Juvenile Detention		Juvenile Corrections		Adult Corrections		Other Programs	
# of Students Who	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit
Earned a GED					5		68			
Obtained high school diploma					11		0			
Outcomes (once per student per time period)	Neglected Programs		Juvenile Detention		Juvenile Corrections		Adult Corrections		Other Programs	
# of Students Who	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit
Earned high school course credits					67		0			
Enrolled in a GED program					29		99			
Accepted and/or enrolled into post-secondary education					5		5			
Enrolled in job training courses/programs					83		29			
Obtained employment					5		31			

FAQ on facilities collecting data on student outcomes after exit:

In the text box below, please account for any missing or incomplete data after exit.

This response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments: Montana does not have data to report for C181; collection of post-exit data is not allowable under state law.

2.4.1.6 Academic Performance – Subpart 1

The following questions collect data on the academic performance of neglected and delinquent long-term students served by Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 in reading and mathematics.

2.4.1.6.1 Academic Performance in Reading – Subpart 1

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of long-term students served by Title I, Part D, Subpart 1, who participated in reading pre-and post-testing. Students should be reported in only one of the four change categories.

Report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Students who were pre-tested prior to July 1, 2016, may be included if their post-test was administered during the reporting year. Students who were post-tested after the reporting year ended should be counted in the following year. Below the table is an FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Long-term students with negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams			2	7	
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			17	15	
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			14	20	
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			53	40	
Total			86	82	
Comments:					

FAQ on long-term students:

What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2016 through June 30, 2017.

2.4.1.6.2 Academic Performance in Mathematics – Subpart 1

This section is similar to 2.4.1.6.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on mathematics performance.

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Long-term students with negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams			2	8	
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			19	10	
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			13	20	
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			52	34	
Comments:					

2.4.2 LEA Title I, Part D Programs and Facilities – Subpart 2

The following questions collect data on Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 programs and facilities.

2.4.2.1 Programs and Facilities – Subpart 2

In the table below, provide the number of LEA Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 programs and facilities that serve neglected and delinquent students and the yearly average length of stay by program/facility type for these students. Report only the programs and facilities that received Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 funding during the reporting year. Count a facility once if it offers only one type of program. If a facility offers more than one type of program (i.e., it is a multipurpose facility), then count each of the separate programs. The total number of programs/ facilities will be automatically calculated. Below the table is an FAQ about the data collected in this table.

LEA Program/Facility Type	# Programs/Facilities	Average Length of Stay (# days)
At-risk programs	12	54
Neglected programs	2	3
Juvenile detention	4	20
Juvenile corrections	0	0
Other	0	0
Total	18	////////////////////
Comments:		

FAQ on average length of stay:

How is average length of stay calculated? The average length of stay should be weighted by number of students and should include the number of days, per visit for each student enrolled during the reporting year, regardless of entry or exit date. Multiple visits for students who entered more than once during the reporting year can be included. The average length of stay in days should not exceed 365.

2.4.2.1.1 Programs and Facilities That Reported - Subpart 2

In the table below, provide the number of LEA Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 programs and facilities that reported data on neglected and delinquent students.

The total row will be automatically calculated.

LEA Program/Facility Type	# Reporting Data
At-risk programs	12
Neglected programs	2
Juvenile detention	4
Juvenile corrections	0
Other	0
Total	18
Comments:	

2.4.2.2 Students Served – Subpart 2

In the tables below, provide the number of neglected and delinquent students served in LEA Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 programs and facilities. Report only students who received Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 services during the reporting year. In the first table, provide in row 1 the unduplicated number of students served by each program, and in row 2, the total number of students in row 1 who are long-term. In the subsequent tables, provide the number of students served by disability (*IDEA*), and limited English proficiency (LEP), by race/ethnicity, by sex, and by age. The total number of students by race/ethnicity, by sex, and by age will be automatically calculated.

# of Students Served	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Total Unduplicated Students Served	623	112	669		
Total Long Term Students Served	113	14	26		

Student Subgroups	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Students with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	95	0	49		
LEP Students	2	0	0		

Race/Ethnicity	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaska Native	108	57	343		
Asian	3	0	6		
Black or African American	23	0	28		
Hispanic or Latino	19	6	9		
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	3	0	0		
White	424	42	272		
Two or more races	39	7	11		
Total	619	112	669		

Sex	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Male	379	54	444		
Female	240	58	225		
Total	619	112	669		

Age	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
3 through 5	0	23	0		
6	0	8	0		
7	0	17	0		
8	0	8	0		
9	0	12	0		
10	4	10	0		
11	11	17	5		
12	23	10	20		
13	63	1	55		
14	83	4	107		
15	126	2	165		
16	141	0	169		
17	145	0	148		
18	23	0	0		
19	0	0	0		
20	0	0	0		
21	0	0	0		
Total	619	112	669		

If the total number of students differs by demographics, please explain. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

A 4-child error was discovered in the original submission (the stored procedure calculated the total incorrectly) after the submission deadline, so the file was corrected and resubmitted. The mistake is in total (Y) for LE0098 (record #523, Line 524. Response to ED comment: (1) These numbers are correct.

(2) These numbers are correct.

FAQ on Unduplicated Count:

What is an unduplicated count? An unduplicated count is one that counts students only once, even if they were admitted to a facility or program multiple times within the reporting year.

FAQ on long-term:

What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2016 through June 30, 2017.

2.4.2.3.2 Academic and Vocational Outcomes While in the LEA Program/Facility or Within 90 Calendar Days After Exit

In the tables below, for each program type, provide the number of students who attained academic and vocational outcomes.

The first table includes outcomes a student is able to achieve only after exit. In this table, provide the unduplicated number of students who enrolled, or planned to enroll, in their local district school within 90 calendar days after exiting. A student may be reported only once, per program type.

The second table includes outcomes a student is able to achieve only one time. In this table, provide the unduplicated number of students who attained the listed outcomes either while enrolled in the LEA program/facility column ("in fac.") or in the 90 days after exit column. A student may be reported only once across the two time periods, per program type.

The third table includes outcomes a student may achieve more than once. In the "in fac." column, provide the unduplicated number of students who attained academic and vocational outcomes while enrolled in the LEA program/facility. In the "90 days after exit" column provide the unduplicated number of students who attained academic and vocational outcomes within 90 calendar days after exiting. If a student attained an outcome once in the program/facility and once during the 90 day transition period, that student may be reported once in each column.

Outcomes (once per student), only after exit	At-Risk Programs		Neglected Programs		Juvenile Detention		Juvenile Corrections		Other Programs	
# of Students Who Enrolled in their local district school 90 days after exit										
Outcomes (once per student)	At-Risk Programs		Neglected Programs		Juvenile Detention		Juvenile Corrections		Other Programs	
# of Students Who	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit
Earned a GED										
Obtained high school diploma										
Outcomes (once per student per time period)	At-Risk Programs		Neglected Programs		Juvenile Detention		Juvenile Corrections		Other Programs	
# of Students Who	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit
Earned high school course credits										
Enrolled in a GED program										
Accepted and/or enrolled into post-secondary education										
Enrolled in job training courses/programs										
Obtained employment										

FAQ on facilities collecting data on student outcomes after exit:

In the text box below, please account for any missing or incomplete data after exit.

This response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments: Montana does not have data for C181 to report; collection of post-exit data is not allowable under state law.

Response to ED comment:
These numbers are correct.

2.4.2.6 Academic Performance – Subpart 2

The following questions collect data on the academic performance of neglected and delinquent long-term students served by Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 in reading and mathematics.

2.4.2.6.1 Academic Performance in Reading – Subpart 2

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of long-term students served by Title I, Part D, Subpart 2, who participated in reading pre- and post-testing. Students should be reported in only one of the four change categories. Reporting pre- and post-test data for at-risk students in the table below is optional.

Report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Students who were pre-tested prior to July 1, 2016, may be included if their post-test was administered during the reporting year. Students who were post-tested after the reporting year ended should be counted in the following year. Below the table is an FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Long-term students with negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams	4	0	1		
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	11	0	5		
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	44	0	3		
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	19	2	0		
Total	78	2	9		
Comments: Response to ED comment: These numbers are correct.					

FAQ on long-term:

What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2016, through June 30, 2017.

Is reporting pre/post-test data for at-risk programs required? No, reporting pre/post-test data for at-risk students is no longer required, but States have the option to continue to collect and report it within the CSPR.

2.4.2.6.2 Academic Performance in Mathematics – Subpart 2

This section is similar to 2.4.2.6.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on mathematics performance.

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Long-term students with negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams	4	0	2		
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	12	0	10		
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	36	0	1		
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	26	0	0		
Comments: Response to ED comment: These numbers are correct.					

FAQ on long-term:

What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2016, through June 30, 2017.

Is reporting pre/post-test data for at-risk programs required? No, reporting pre/post-test data for at-risk students is no longer required, but States have the option to continue to collect and report it within the CSPR.

2.9 RURAL EDUCATION ACHIEVEMENT PROGRAM (REAP) (TITLE VI, PART B, SUBPARTS 1 AND 2)

This section collects data on the Rural Education Achievement Program (REAP) Title VI, Part B, Subparts 1 and 2.

2.9.2 LEA Use of Rural Low-Income Schools Program (RLIS) (Title VI, Part B, Subpart 2) Grant Funds

In the table below, provide the number of eligible LEAs that used RLIS funds for each of the listed purposes.

Purpose	# LEAs
Teacher recruitment and retention, including the use of signing bonuses and other financial incentives	3
Teacher professional development, including programs that train teachers to utilize technology to improve teaching and to train special needs teachers	5
Educational technology, including software and hardware as described in Title II, Part D	0
Parental involvement activities	6
Activities authorized under the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program (Title IV, Part A)	0
Activities authorized under Title I, Part A	10
Activities authorized under Title III (Language instruction for LEP and immigrant students)	0
Comments:	

2.9.2.1 Goals and Objectives

In the space below, describe the progress the State has made in meeting the goals and objectives for the Rural Low-Income Schools (RLIS) Program as described in its June 2002 Consolidated State application. Provide quantitative data where available.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Montana funds all RLIS-eligible districts by formula and every year the number and names of those districts change. In order to find commonality, only those who were consistently in the RLIS program are reported here. Although other LEAs were funded in SY 2015-16, they were only in the program for a short time so no trend is evident. Since 2004, there have been 5 LEAs consistently eligible for the RLIS program and they are reported below;

GOAL 1: ALL STUDENTS WILL ATTAIN PROFICIENCY OR BETTER IN READING AND MATHEMATICS.
 Montana began using a new statewide assessment in spring 2015. These scores represent a baseline due to: (1) this is a new test; (2) this is the third year that students were tested on the computer and not on paper; (3) during the first year, the contractor experienced many problems delivering the tests. Districts were allowed to opt out of the test, and others could not finish due to technical issues. Overall scores are lower due to the new test and higher academic standards.

Cut Bank Elementary has 27.3 percent proficient and 13.2 percent advance in reading and 23.9 percent proficient and 9.6 percent advanced in mathematics in 2017.
 Hardin Elementary has 17.1 percent proficient and 5.0 percent advance or better in reading and 9.1 percent proficient and 2.9 percent advance in mathematics in 2017.
 Libby K-12 Schools has 33.8 percent proficient and 21.9 percent in advance in reading and 24.1 percent proficient and 19.1 in advance in mathematics in 2017.
 Ronan Elementary has 22.6 percent proficient and 8.6 percent in advance in reading and 13.8 percent proficient and 6.8 in advance proficient in mathematics in 2017.
 Wolf Point Elementary has 13.3 percent proficient in reading and 7.1 percent proficient in mathematics in 2017.

GOAL 5: ALL STUDENTS WILL GRADUATE FROM HIGH SCHOOL.
 The following information are graduation rates from 2017;
 Cut Bank 100% seniors graduated in 2017.
 Hardin 89% and/or 89seniors graduated in 2017
 Libby K-12 87% and/or 91seniors graduated in 2017
 Ronan 93% and/or 77 seniors graduated in 2017.
 Wolf Point Elementary 85% and/or 46 seniors graduated in 2017

2.10 FUNDING TRANSFERABILITY FOR STATE AND LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES (TITLE VI, PART A, SUBPART 2)

2.10.1 State Transferability of Funds

In the table below, indicate whether the state transferred funds under the state transferability authority.

State Transferability of Funds	Yes/No
Did the State transfer funds under the State Transferability authority of Section 6123(a) during SY 2016-17?	<u>No</u>
Comments:	

2.10.2 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Transferability of Funds

In the table below, indicate the number of LEAs that notified the state that they transferred funds under the LEA transferability authority.

LEA Transferability of Funds	#
LEAs that notified the State that they were transferring funds under the LEA Transferability authority of Section 6123(b).	10
Comments:	

2.10.2.1 LEA Funds Transfers

In the table below, provide the total number of LEAs that transferred funds from an eligible program to another eligible program.

Program	# LEAs Transferring Funds FROM Eligible Program	# LEAs Transferring Funds TO Eligible Program
Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Section 2121)	0	0
Educational Technology State Grants (Section 2412(a)(2)(A))	0	0
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (Section 4112(b)(1))	0	0
State Grants for Innovative Programs (Section 5112(a))	0	0
Title I, Part A, Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs		10

In the table below provide the total amount of FY 2016 appropriated funds transferred from and to each eligible program.

Program	Total Amount of Funds Transferred FROM Eligible Program	Total Amount of Funds Transferred TO Eligible Program
Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Section 2121)	0.00	0.00
Educational Technology State Grants (Section 2412(a)(2)(A))	0.00	0.00
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (Section 4112(b)(1))	0.00	0.00
State Grants for Innovative Programs (Section 5112(a))	0.00	0.00
Title I, Part A, Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs		0.00
Total	0.00	0.00
Comments:		

The Department plans to obtain information on the use of funds under both the State and LEA Transferability Authority through evaluation studies.

2.11 GRADUATION RATES⁴

This section collects graduation rates.

2.11.1 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort 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 **current school year** (SY 2016-17). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

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

Student Group	# Students in Cohort	# of Graduates	Graduation Rate
All Students	10,670	9,158	85.83
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,334	922	69.12
Asian or Pacific Islander	149	136	91.28
<i>Asian</i>	113	106	93.81
<i>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</i>	36	30	83.33
Black or African American	162	131	80.86
Hispanic or Latino	431	343	79.58
White	8,594	7,626	88.74
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,338	1,027	76.76
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	424	269	63.44
Economically disadvantaged students	5,012	3,841	76.64

FAQs on graduation rates:

What is the regulatory adjusted cohort graduation rate? For complete definitions and instructions, please refer to the non-regulatory guidance, which can be found here: <http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/hsrguidance.pdf>.

The response is limited to 500 characters.

The 2016-17 4-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for American Indian students is based on a small sample; fewer than 850 students in this cohort. The change in the % is based on 95 American Indian students graduating in 2016-17 that did not in 2015-16.

The 2016-17 4-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for EL students is based on a small sample; fewer than 400 students in this cohort. The change in the % is based on 2 EL students graduating in 2016-17 that did not 2015-16.

⁴ The "Asian/Pacific Islander" row in the tables below represent either the value reported by the state to the Department of Education for the major racial and ethnic group "Asian/Pacific Islander" or an aggregation of values reported by the state for the major racial and ethnic groups "Asian" and "Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander or Pacific Islander" (and "Filipino" in the case of California). When the values reported in the Asian/Pacific Islander row represent the U. S. Department of Education aggregation of other values reported by the state, the detail for "Asian" and "Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander" are also included in the following rows. Disaggregated reporting for the adjusted cohort graduation rate data is done according to the provisions outlined within each state's Accountability Workbooks or Accountability Workbooks Addenda. Accordingly, not every state uses major racial and ethnic groups which enable detail of Asian American/Pacific Islander (AAPI) populations.

2.12 LISTS OF SCHOOLS AND DISTRICTS

This section contains data on school statuses. States with approved *ESEA* Flexibility requests should follow the instructions in section 2.12.1. All other states should follow the instructions in section 2.12.2. These tables will be generated based on data submitted to *EDFacts* and included as part of each state's certified report; states will no longer upload their lists separately. Data will be generated into separate reports for each question listed below.

2.12.1 List of Schools for *ESEA* Flexibility States

2.12.1.2 List of Priority and Focus Schools

Instructions for States that identified priority and focus schools⁵ under *ESEA* flexibility for SY 2017-18: Provide the information listed in the bullets below for those schools.

- | District Name
- | District NCES ID Code
- | School Name
- | School NCES ID Code
- | Status for SY 2017-18 (Use one of the following status designations: priority or focus)
- | If applicable, State-specific status in addition to priority or focus (e.g., grade, star, or level)
- | Whether (yes or no) the school is a Title I school (*This information must be provided by all States.*)
- | Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through Section 1003(a).
- | Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through Section 1003(g).

The data for this question are reported through *EDFacts* files and compiled in the EDEN031 "List of Priority and Focus Schools" report in the *EDFacts* Reporting System (ERS). The *EDFacts* files and data groups used in this report are listed in the CSPR Crosswalk. The CSPR Data Key contains more detailed information on how the data are populated into the report.

Before certifying Part II of the CSPR, a state user must run the EDEN031 report in ERS and verify that the state's data are correct. The final, certified data from this report will be made publicly available alongside the state's certified CSPR PDF.

Comments: Montana did not have priority and focus schools.

⁵ The definitions of priority and focus schools are provided in the document titled, *ESEA Flexibility*. This document may be accessed on the Department's Web page at <http://www.ed.gov/esea/flexibility/documents/esea-flexibility.doc>

2.12.2 List of Schools for All Other States

2.12.2.1 List of Schools Identified for Improvement

Instructions for States that identified schools for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under *ESEA* section 1116 for SY 2017-18: Provide the information listed in the bullets below for those schools.

- | District Name
- | District NCES ID Code
- | School Name
- | School NCES ID Code
- | Status for SY 2017-18 (Use one of the following status designations: School Improvement – Year 1, School Improvement – Year 2, Corrective Action, Restructuring Year 1 (planning), or Restructuring Year 2 (implementing)⁶
- | Whether (yes or no) the school is a Title I school (*This information must be provided by all States.*)
- | Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through Section 1003(a).
- | Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through Section 1003(g).

The data for this question are reported through *EDFacts* files and compiled in the EDEN033 "List of Schools Identified for Improvement" report in the *EDFacts* Reporting System (ERS). The *EDFacts* files and data groups used in this report are listed in the CSPR Crosswalk. The CSPR Data Key contains more detailed information on how the data are populated into the report.

Before certifying Part II of the CSPR, a state user must run the EDEN033 report in ERS and verify that the state's data are correct. The final, certified data from this report will be made publicly available alongside the state's certified CSPR PDF.

Comments:

⁶ The school improvement statuses are defined in *LEA and School Improvement Non-Regulatory Guidance*. This document may be accessed on the Department's Web page at <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/schoolimprovementguid.doc>.