STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN / ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART B

for STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act

**For reporting on
FFY 2022**

Montana

PART B DUE February 1, 2024

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

Introduction

Instructions

Provide sufficient detail to ensure that the Secretary and the public are informed of and understand the State's systems designed to drive improved results for students with disabilities and to ensure that the State Educational Agency (SEA) and Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) meet the requirements of IDEA Part B. This introduction must include descriptions of the State's General Supervision System, Technical Assistance System, Professional Development System, Stakeholder Involvement, and Reporting to the Public.

Intro - Indicator Data

Executive Summary

Additional information related to data collection and reporting

Number of Districts in your State/Territory during reporting year

398

General Supervision System:

The systems that are in place to ensure that the IDEA Part B requirements are met (e.g., integrated monitoring activities; data on processes and results; the SPP/APR; fiscal management; policies, procedures, and practices resulting in effective implementation; and improvement, correction, incentives, and sanctions).

The Montana comprehensive system of general supervision includes multiple components: a review of each Individual with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Part B applicant's policies and procedures; the application, allocation, distribution, fiscal risk assessment, and accountability of special education funds; formal complaints, due process hearings, mediation, and the Early Assistance Program (EAP). The special education and legal units track data to ensure required compliance and/or corrections are made.

The State Education Agency (SEA) is transitioning from a compliance monitoring system to an Integrated Monitoring System (IMS) to conduct its General Supervision obligations. Under the former, the SEA compliance monitoring process consisted of the: review of individual student records; review of district policy, practices, and procedures; virtual records review and/or site visits; and communication with teachers and specialists.

With the incorporation of the IMS the SEA, in addition to the above actions, is reviewing the following in more depth:
•	The provision of FAPE in the least restrictive environment (LRE);
•	General supervision, including effective monitoring;
•	A system of transition services;
• The use of resolution meetings including mediation; and
•	Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services, to the extent the representation is the result of inappropriate identification.

All identified noncompliance is recorded, verified, and accounted for through a process of:
1)	Notification of all identified noncompliance;
2)	Required correction of all identified noncompliance with the one-year timeline;
3)	District submission of updated data, verifying 100 percent post-monitoring compliance;
4)	Review of district practices and procedures;
5) Completion of required technical assistance and professional development; and
6)	Issuance of a final report to the district upon completion of all required compliance monitoring requirements.
Each LEA is monitored on a five-year cycle. The State Operated or State Funded programs are monitored on a three-year cycle. A standard protocol is used to select records to review.
If a LEA completes the correction of each instance of noncompliance and provides the SEA with additional records as requested, to verify ongoing evidence of compliance, no finding is issued. In the process for determination of findings, the OPI considers the following:
	(1) If the noncompliance was systemic or found in only a small percentage of files;
	(2) If the noncompliance showed a denial of a basic right under the IDEA; and
	(3) If the noncompliance represents an isolated incident or reflects a long-standing failure to 	meet requirements (systemic).
In addition to requesting additional records to show ongoing evidence of compliance, the SEA may require the district to also receive additional training or technical assistance.

During the last LEA monitoring cycle, the SEA identified 126 instances of non-compliance that were not related to any of the SPP/APR indicators. These instances were verified using both prongs of the verification process described in the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) 09-02 Memorandum and subsequent OSEP memo 23-01 guidance. All 126 instances of

noncompliance were corrected within the one-year timeline.

IDEA Part B Program - Fiscal
The special education unit oversees the application, allocation, and distribution of approximately $46 million of federal special education funds; ensures the accountability for the use of those funds and oversees all related IDEA grant reporting and requirements. The fiscal manager reviews, approves the applications for the IDEA funds, and determines if expenditures are allowable. This unit oversees the distribution of IDEA discretionary funds to support programs that are a specific area of need as identified in the APR.

Early Assistance Program (EAP)
The EAP provides technical assistance to help parents, adult students, guardians, school district staff, advocates and other members of the special education community understand the requirements of IDEA or implementing Montana laws. The EAP provides informal dispute resolution for special education issues relating to a student's free and appropriate public education, any violation of Part B of the IDEA or implementing Montana laws. The intention is to resolve special education disagreements amicably, with the lowest level of third-party involvement possible. In addition to the EAP, there are several other dispute resolution options available under the IDEA, including: Individualized Education Program (IEP) facilitation, mediation, state administrative complaints, due process hearings, and expedited due process hearings. These options are administered and overseen by the EAP staff in collaboration with special education staff.

IDEA Part B Program - Data and Accountability
The Data and Accountability staff oversee the collection, analysis and reporting of all special education data required for federal and state reporting purposes. The staff provides technical assistance and support to local district staff in the management of student data related to special education. The staff also provide technical assistance to LEAs for the Special Education module of our statewide student information system and works with the system vendor to ensure compliance with state and federal regulations.

Technical Assistance System:

The mechanisms that the State has in place to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidence-based technical assistance and support to LEAs.

The Special Education Unit is organized into three sub-units that have specific functions and provide technical assistance related to those functions. These units include School Improvement, Continuing Education and Technical Assistance (CETA), and IDEA Part B. IDEA Part B does include data and accountability as well as early childhood.

The School Improvement unit provides both broad and specific technical assistance and training related to all aspects of the special education process, proper use and documentation of records, and student specific issues. General technical assistance training and specific LEA technical assistance is provided as requested or required. Annually, training is provided across the state for teachers on compliance and the implementation of IDEA, as well as training on current updates. Topics are determined based on monitoring data, frequently asked questions from the field, questions to the Early Assistance Program (EAP), and special education updates, both nationally and locally.

Technical assistance is also provided to ensure timely correction of all identified noncompliance and training is given related to such non-compliance.

The CETA unit is responsible for implementing several major training initiatives for the OPI that focus on instructional practices and interventions. The activities are expanded upon in the Professional Development section.

The IDEA Part B Program unit provides technical assistance to LEA's in applying for, using, and accounting of federal special education funds. Assistance is also provided in developing and implementing program narratives, interlocal agreements, and special education procedures. Data and Accountability staff provide LEAs with technical assistance for all data entry and reporting for required state and federal special education reporting purposes. The early childhood staff collaborate with Part C staff and provide technical assistance as requested on transition from IDEA Part C to IDEA Part B. The staff member also collaborates with other units within the SEA to provide support in early literacy and the Jump Start program. Training is conducted via phone, Zoom, TEAMS and/or in-person, depending on the needs of the LEA.

Technical assistance and updates are regularly provided to directors of special education at conferences and regional Montana Council of Administrators of Special Education (MCASE) meetings. In addition, the SEA staff have areas of expertise that are available to LEA's, as requested for technical assistance and/or training. Such expertise includes former special education teachers with knowledge from preschool classrooms, special education classrooms and inclusion, Speech/Language Pathologists, and former classroom teachers. The SEA is in its third year of providing several monthly Community of Practice (CoP) calls through zoom. In addition, the SEA continues to hold monthly special education director calls to provide updates and to discuss current issues related to special education.

Montana currently works with several federal Technical Assistance centers including the following: National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI), the Center on Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS), Early Childhood Technical Assistance (ECTA), the Center for IDEA Fiscal Reporting (CIFR), the IDEA Data Center (IDC), and the Center for IDEA Early Childhood Data Systems (DaSy). These centers provide the SEA insight into what other states are doing, provide general and intensive technical assistance, as well as supporting what the SEA is currently doing.

Working with the Technical Assistance for Excellence in Special Education (TAESE) staff, the SEA has facilitated the Montana Higher Education Consortium (HEC). The HEC provides a mechanism for collaboration, networking, discussion, and advising of critical issues among Montana Institutes of Higher Education. The consortium works towards encouraging a more seamless

educational system and merging general and special education into one unified system; understanding and promoting the use of evidence-based academic and behavioral strategies; and closely linking Montana teacher training and educational leadership programs to early childhood programs, K-12 education, and the SEA.

The TAESE center also provides technical assistance to the state through facilitating the SEA's annual stakeholder meeting, conducting stakeholder input activities, and compiling and analyzing input. In addition, TAESE provides specific orientation training to Montana's State Special Education Advisory Panel, special education data collection and analysis of Indicator 8, Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD), TASK12 Educational Interpreters Performance Assessment (EIPA), Dispute Resolution in Special Education (DRSE) workgroups, Jobs Alike Work Groups (monitoring and low incidence disabilities) and other technical assistance as needed.

Montana has been a member of the Results-Based Accountability Cross-State Learning Collaborative through NCSI. Based on the state's general supervision responsibilities, we are evaluating our monitoring process and data to improve our assessment of special education program effectiveness at the LEA level. This, then, will drive not only the focus of our program reviews and monitoring, but also the scope of those activities. The purpose of this work is to better identify and meet the individual unique needs of each Montana LEA as they work to improve the outcomes for students with disabilities.

All initiatives across the SEA have been developed to include evidence-based practices. Montana's Multi-Tiered Systems of Supports (MTSS) initiative, for example, is based on the research and program developed by the Center on PBIS, an OSEP Technical Assistance Center. Montana's model for our State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) implementation is premised on the commitment to target and focus on existing supports already in place throughout the SEA. These major initiatives were all developed under planning, research, stakeholder involvement, and based on known evidence-based practices that produce positive results.

Professional Development System:

The mechanisms the State has in place to ensure that service providers have the skills to effectively provide services that improve results for children with disabilities.

Professional development is provided through multiple areas in the Special Education department. The Continuing Education and Technical Assistance (CETA) and the School Improvement Units have integrated responsibilities.

Montana's Statewide Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD) is comprised of regional offerings (Regional CSPD), the State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG), the Montana Autism Education Project (MAEP), Higher Education Consortium (HEC), the Montana Teacher Learning Hub, Pre-Monitoring training, and additional training at conferences. Special Education staff have a lead role in the SEA Summer Institute (SI) and High School (HS) Forum. Training for general education personnel is supported by the projects above to increase skills to respond to the needs of students with disabilities in the regular classroom.

The Regional CSPD structure includes five councils, each led by a regional coordinator, who provide free training for parents, special educators, general educators, and paraprofessionals. The regional coordinators meet monthly as part of the statewide CSPD council. The SEA provides reports to the councils with indicator data, trends in monitoring, and evaluations. The councils analyze the data to align their activities to the APR indicators. This process directs professional development toward improving student outcomes for each indicator. Continuing for 2022-23 was the statewide priority area of the "Science of Reading." In 2022-23, CSPD regions delivered 127 training events with 1,934 attendees in total.

Montana continued efforts for our 2020 SPDG: Montana's Tiered System of Supports. The SPDG provides training and coaching support to districts for building capacity to implement a systems-level problem-solving approach to facilitate the adoption of evidence-based academic and behavioral practices to improve student outcomes. MT's SPDG provides autonomy to districts allowing them select professional development based on individual needs. The focus in 2022-23 was developing modules for district and building level teams, training Systems coaches, and supporting 10 pilot districts through the developed modules from Regions 1, 2, and 3. Six districts from Regions 4 & 5 joined in spring 2023. All materials developed are available on the MTSS training site. Our SPDG partnership with the MT Empowerment Center (MEC) provided public service announcements and MTSS resources for parents.

Special Education staff collaborate with the Indian Education for All (IEFA) and Tribal Student Achievement, Relations, and Resiliency (TSARR) Units on the development and delivery of professional development to meet the unique needs of Montana's American Indian students. The IEFA and TSARR Unit staff are partners on the SEA's SI and HS Forum providing relevant sessions to ensure the SEA addresses culturally and linguistically responsiveness.

Educating students with autism requires specific skills and knowledge beyond what is acquired through teacher preservice programs. The goals of the SEA's Montana Autism Education Project (MAEP) are to:
1) Increase district-level knowledge of how to educate students with autism through in-person training, interactive video training, on-site technical assistance, and peer-to-peer collaboration; and
2) Develop interagency collaboration between the SEA, school districts, Part C Agency providers, Department of Public Health and Human Services, the MEC, and Institutes of Higher Education (IHE).

The MAEP offers free autism and/or behavior consultations to public school students who qualify under the IDEA. Board Certified Behavior Analysts, Speech-Language pathologists, and experienced educators are among the part-time consultants at the SEA. During the 2022-23 school year, the MAEP provided 58 different trainings, for a total of 93 trainings. These trainings were attended by 1,480 Montana educators, parents, and others who have an interest in autism and behavior management for a total of 6,650 hours of training completed. Topics included the identification of students with autism, compliance with the rule on the use of

aversive treatment procedures, data collection, writing IEP goals, behavior management, addressing executive functioning needs for students with autism, autism and girls, evidence-based practices, safety skills, communication needs and systems, using assistive technology for behavior support, principals of reinforcement, and iPad usage.

With the assistance of the TAESE at the Utah State University, the SEA continues to work with representatives of all Montana teacher preparation programs to improve preservice instruction through our Higher Education Consortium (HEC). The HEC has met twice a year since 1999 to discuss critical issues and share ideas. The meetings have created a strong partnership and collaboration between faculty members of the teacher training programs and the SEA. The HEC met twice in 2022-23, with guided discussions and presentations in the fall on teacher recruitment and retention programs and building relationships and resilience with MentorMT. The spring meeting included a discussion on CAEP accreditation, a presentation on new Montana accreditation standards, and efforts to expand opportunities for native educators and partnerships with tribal colleges.

The Montana Teacher Learning Hub is committed to providing active learning, high quality content, and relevant topics through an accessible, free online learning system. This past year the Special Education Unit supported eight Hub Courses for improving skills for teachers of students with disabilities. These included a four-part SpEd Series: Special Education Overview for all School Staff; Referrals, Evaluations and Eligibility; Writing Compliant IEPs; and Writing Transition IEPs; and four introductory courses: General Education Teacher Role in SPED, 2E: Twice Exceptional, A Bit about Braille, and Practical Strategies for Using Technology to Assist Notetaking. These eight courses for educators had a total of 458 participants for 2022-23. Through the Hub, the Special Education unit transitioned three previously facilitated paraeducator courses to self-paced courses: Orientation to Special Education for Paraprofessionals (V2), Instructional Strategies for Paraeducators (V2), and Instructional Teamwork for Paraeducators (V2) which increased participation to 46 in 2022-23, from only four participants in 2021-22. The hub also supports two MTSS Courses and one on high leverage practices from CEEDAR.

During the 2022-23 school year the monitoring team provided optional Pre-monitoring professional development for LEA's/Coops/State supported programs scheduled for comprehensive monitoring during the 2023-24 year. Professional Development (PD) was provided to Special Education case-managers and administration in both the virtual/onsite formats. Pre-Monitoring Trainings were provided to 12/14 districts and/or cooperatives.

The SEA SI and HS Forum events provided professional development to general and special education faculty. A one-day HS Forum was held in November 2022 promoting the use of the MTSS framework for academics, behavior, and mental health in a secondary environment with 160 attendees. The SEA SI provided five-days of PD in June 2023 with a focus on Special Education, MTSS, evidence-based practices, PBIS, IEFA, and mental health. Many other SEA Units provided sessions at all tiers to meet the needs of all students, including students with disabilities and tribal students. The 2023 SI event included over 150 sessions and 577 attendees. The SEA Special education staff presented at the Montana Council for Exceptional Children (MCEC) and Montana Council for Administrators of Special Education (MCASE) Conferences as well as multiple other events.

Stakeholder Engagement:

The mechanisms for broad stakeholder engagement, including activities carried out to obtain input from, and build the capacity of, a diverse group of parents to support the implementation activities designed to improve outcomes, including target setting and any subsequent revisions to targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.

Discussions and Stakeholder input of the State's Performance Plan (SPP), Annual Performance Report (APR), State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), and Results Driven Accountability (RDA)/Results Based Accountability (RBA) began in 2013 with our State Special Education Advisory Panel. The Panel is fully vested and broadly representative of Montana. Additionally, many of the panel members as well as SEA staff serve in other agency or organization leadership positions or on advisory groups in the disability community. This enables MT to draw insight and advice from a broad group of stakeholders with an understanding of Montana's unique needs, strengths, and potential weaknesses.

Other stakeholder groups we sponsor and/or engage include:
1) Our Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD) includes both regional and state councils that regularly meet to assess APR data and to evaluate professional development priorities and results.
2) The State Education Agency (SEA) staff has developed strong working relationships with other Montana agencies that serve youth and adults with disabilities. The SEA staff participate as members of advisory councils for early childhood, vocational rehabilitation, low incidence disabilities, developmental disabilities, and the state independent living council. This has strengthened the commitments of the agencies working with Montana's youth to facilitate smooth transitions from birth to adulthood.
3) Working with the Technical Assistance for Excellence in Special Education (TAESE) staff, the SEA has facilitated the Montana Higher Education Consortium (HEC). The HEC provides a mechanism for collaboration, networking, discussion, and advising of critical issues among Montana Institutes of Higher Education. The consortium works towards encouraging a more seamless educational system and merging general and special education into one unified system; understanding and promoting the use of evidence-based academic and behavioral strategies; and closely linking Montana teacher training and educational leadership programs to early childhood programs, K-12 education, and the SEA.
4) The SEA staff is engaged with the Schools Administrators of Montana (SAM) which include affiliates for Superintendents, Principals, Special Education Administrators, and Information Technology (IT) Directors. This partnership gives the SEA the opportunity to develop collaborative partnerships with the Local Education Agencies (LEAs). The SEA also provides SAM with a grant to help fund the Montana Recruitment Project. This program focuses on recruiting hard to fill positions such as speech/language pathologists, special education teachers, occupational therapists, and school psychologists for our districts.
5) Annually, the SEA brings together representatives from various stakeholder groups for a joint meeting facilitated by TAESE. This meeting brings stakeholders together to share up-dates and gather input from each other. There is a comprehensive representation of the Montana disability community, families and parents of children and students with and without disabilities.

During the FFY22 reporting period, the Student Support Services Senior Manager met with the parents and community members of the Montana School for the Deaf & Blind (MSDB) to start creating a graduate profile. In addition, our Early Assistance Program (EAP) Director presented to the parents of MSDB on the IDEA Framework (state purposes), general supervisory responsibilities and OPI's role as an SEA. The EAP Director also provided information on dispute resolution options and where at the OPI parents could go for technical assistance.

The Montana Empowerment Center and the OPI conducted various virtual presentations for parents of students with disabilities birth through age 21 and LEA staff. During the reporting period, the OPI presented on Present Levels of Academic Achievement Functional Performance (PLAAFPs), Measurable Annual Goals (MAGs), Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS), transitions, early childhood, and extended school year. Superintendent Arntzen hosted multiple community events in four geographically diverse cities across the state in December of 2022. Parents listened to the goals of legislators for education and then had the opportunity to ask questions of the legislators. Throughout the reporting period, OPI provided numerous virtual trainings for parents regarding student and school safety and supporting youth with ASD and other developmental disorders.

Annually, the OPI assists with the Montana Youth Transitions (MYT) Conference. The OPI team works in conjunction with MYT to present, coach, and mentor educators, parents, and students. This conference brings together the transition team of youth, parents, and professionals to learn strategies and resources to build a seamless transition plan from high school to the adult world. One parent stated the following, "This was my first time at the conference, and I had no idea there were so many things out there to help my son. The sessions on parenting techniques and educational tools were eye-opening, and I feel more equipped to support my child's learning journey."

Apply stakeholder engagement from introduction to all Part B results indicators (y/n)

YES

Number of Parent Members:

10

Parent Members Engagement:

Describe how the parent members of the State Advisory Panel, parent center staff, parents from local and statewide advocacy and advisory committees, and individual parents were engaged in setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.

The State Advisory Panel has a diverse group of participants and parents from across the state. The Panel meets four times a year, and each meeting includes an opportunity for engagement in setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress. The information presented and the meeting minutes can be found on the Advisory Panel webpage (https://opi.mt.gov/Educators/School-Climate-Student-Wellness/Special-Education/Special-Education-Advisory-Panel). This information can also be found in the Annual Report, which is a compilation of the minutes from each meeting and a description of the action items taken by the panel throughout the year.

Activities to Improve Outcomes for Children with Disabilities:

The activities conducted to increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents to support the development of implementation activities designed to improve outcomes for children with disabilities.

Throughout the reporting period, the Montana Special Education Advisory Panel met four times. The advisory panel consisted of 17 members, five of whom have children with disabilities, and representatives from Disability Rights Monana (DRM) and the Montana Empowerment Center (MEC), the state's Parent Training and Information (PTI) center. During the advisory panel meetings, members provided input on targets and feedback on improvement strategies related to each indicator.

In January 2023, the APR, was reviewed with the panel members. The panel members provided feedback specific to Indicator 8. It was decided by the Panel that the SEA would move from a paper/pencil parent survey to a fully electronic survey.

Soliciting Public Input:

The mechanisms and timelines for soliciting public input for setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.

The APR was presented to the Advisory Panel in January 2023. At that meeting, the Panel was asked to provide feedback on the activities currently being conducted by the SEA and to provide suggestions about additional activities the SEA could engage in to improve outcomes for students with disabilities.

Making Results Available to the Public:

The mechanisms and timelines for making the results of the target setting, data analysis, development of the improvement strategies, and evaluation available to the public.

The APR will be posted to the SEA Website (https://opi.mt.gov/Educators/School-Climate-Student-Wellness/Special-Education/Special-Education-Annual-Performance-Report) as a part of the Annual Performance Report after the OPI receives its determination letter from OSEP.

Reporting to the Public

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2021 performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State's submission of its FFY 2021 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State's SPP/APR, including any revisions if the State has revised the targets that it submitted with its FFY 2021 APR in 2023, is available.

The February 1, 2024, Montana Annual Performance Report will be made available to the public via the OPI Web site (https://opi.mt.gov/Educators/School-Climate-Student-Wellness/Special-Education/Special-Education-Annual-Performance-Report). An electronic announcement of the report with links to the Montana Annual Performance Report will be sent stakeholders through the SEA Compass Monthly Newsletter.

Reporting to the Public on the Performance of each LEA

In accordance with section 616(b)(2)(C)(ii)(I) of IDEA, the SEA will report annually to the public on the performance of each local educational agency (LEA) on the targets in the State Performance Plan. The report on performance of LEAs will be made available to the public on the SEA Web site (https://gems.opi.mt.gov/school-district-data) no later than July 1, 2024. The SEA will not report information on performance to the public that would result in the disclosure of personally identifiable information about individual children or data that is insufficient to yield statistically reliable information.

To access the reports from the link above:
1. Select the District Profile option.
2. Select a district from the list on the right side.
3. Click on the Program & Course Offerings tab above the district list.
4. Select the Special Education District Performance Report
5. When you select that button, you will be at the report, looking at the relevant district for the prior FY.
6. To review a different year, select the desired year from the drop down in the upper left of the screen.

Please note these reports may take a few minutes to load.

The GEMS platform is built to be used with Safari, Firefox, Chrome, and Edge. It will not work with older versions of Internet Explorer as it is no longer supported by Microsoft. Occasionally, an error report is received that the PowerBI will not load. If that happens, wait a couple minutes and refresh the page.

The MT OPI State Director of Special Education worked with the agency partners to resolve the access to Growth and Enhancement of Montana Students (GEMS).

Note:
* When reviewing an Elementary district, Indicators 1 & 2 will not be populated and when reviewing the high school district, Indicators 6 & 7 will not be populated, but place holders may still be there and show NA.
* In the GEMS system, NA can mean an indicator is not applicable, the count of the students in this group is 0, or the district was not monitored the year in which the data is reported. An asterisk notes the cell size is less than 10.

Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

The State has not provided a description of the activities conducted to increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents. In its FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must provide the required information.

The State's IDEA Part B determination for both 2022 and 2023 is Needs Assistance. In the State's 2023 determination letter, the Department advised the State of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers, and required the State to work with appropriate entities. The Department directed the State to determine the results elements and/or compliance indicators, and improvement strategies, on which it will focus its use of available technical assistance, in order to improve its performance. The State must report, with its FFY 2022 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2024, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR
Technical Assistance Sources the SEA received assistance.
Montana currently works with several federal Technical Assistance centers including the following: National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI), the Early Childhood Technical Assistance (ECTA), the Center for IDEA Fiscal Reporting (CIFR), the IDEA Data Center (IDC), and the Center for IDEA Early Childhood Data Systems (DaSy).

Actions taken as result of that technical assistance.
1)	NCSI has provided the SEA with improvement strategies on how to align the work in special education with the work in general education. This has created more collaboration, meetings, and conversations across the SEA divisions. The SEA has also taken a look at the general supervision requirements and has started to focus on areas of improvement such as fiscal and programmatic monitoring. This will also include what other units are doing so as not to duplicate efforts. Work has begun on moving the Special Education unit towards incorporating all data together for a more seamless report for our LEAs.
2)	CIFR (and NCSI) have been providing intensive technical assistance since June of 2023. The four areas chosen to improve on over the course of the next several years include: written procedures and protocols for LEA Fiscal Monitoring; put our process of reallocation into writing aside from just the business protocols; create written procedures for LEAs explaining the CEIS process; and explore the requirements and process of creating a high-cost fund. In addition to improving on the four areas, the SEA continues to be a part of the Community of Practice (CoPs) & TA calls offered by CIFR.
3)	IDC has provided the Part B data manger, reporting manger, and the 619 Coordinator with Data Quality Peer to Peer

group calls to increase the capacity of understanding of IDEA data. IDC continues to hold monthly calls with the data and reporting manager to provide any guidance on concerns the SEA may have. IDC was also utilized to help the SEA to better analyze the data for the SPP/APR during the reporting period. Intensive TA was provided for Indicator 14 as the SEA helped to pilot IDC's non-response bias tool.

4)   The 619 Coordinator joins monthly calls ECTA continues to provide. The coordinator was able to attend multiple in-person conferences with ECTA staff and meet one to one as needed. There has also been discussion on how to improve our preschool outcome measures. Work continues to be done in this area.

Intro - OSEP Response

The State's determinations for both 2022 and 2023 were Needs Assistance. Pursuant to Section 616(e)(1) of the IDEA and 34 C.F.R. § 300.604(a), OSEP's June 23, 2023 determination letter informed the State that it must report with its FFY 2022 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2024, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. The State provided the required information.

Intro - Required Actions

The State's IDEA Part B determination for both 2023 and 2024 is Needs Assistance. In the State's 2024 determination letter, the Department advised the State of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers, and required the State to work with appropriate entities. The Department directed the State to determine the results elements and/or compliance indicators, and improvement strategies, on which it will focus its use of available technical assistance, in order to improve its performance. The State must report, with its FFY 2023 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2025, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.

Indicator 1: Graduation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) exiting special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in ED*Facts* file specification FS009.

Measurement

States must report a percentage using the number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma in the numerator and the number of all youth with IEPs who exited high school (ages 14-21) in the denominator.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Data for this indicator are "lag" data. Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, use data from 2021-2022), and compare the results to the target.

Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) graduated with a state-defined alternate diploma; (c) received a certificate; (d) reached maximum age; or (e) dropped out.

Do not include in the denominator the number of youths with IEPs who exited special education due to: (a) transferring to regular education; or (b) who moved but are known to be continuing in an educational program.

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma are different, please explain.

1 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	78.65%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target >=	81.80%	82.00%	82.90%	76.00%	77.00%
Data	76.76%	76.53%	78.03%	78.65%	73.73%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	78.00%	79.00%	80.00%	80.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Discussions and Stakeholder input of the State's Performance Plan (SPP), Annual Performance Report (APR), State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), and Results Driven Accountability (RDA)/Results Based Accountability (RBA) began in 2013 with our State Special Education Advisory Panel. The Panel is fully vested and broadly representative of Montana. Additionally, many of the panel members as well as SEA staff serve in other agency or organization leadership positions or on advisory groups in the disability community. This enables MT to draw insight and advice from a broad group of stakeholders with an understanding of Montana's unique needs, strengths, and potential weaknesses.

Other stakeholder groups we sponsor and/or engage include:
1) Our Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD) includes both regional and state councils that regularly meet to assess APR data and to evaluate professional development priorities and results.
2) The State Education Agency (SEA) staff has developed strong working relationships with other Montana agencies that serve youth and adults with disabilities. The SEA staff participate as members of advisory councils for early childhood, vocational rehabilitation, low incidence disabilities, developmental disabilities, and the state independent living council. This has strengthened the commitments of the agencies working with Montana's youth to facilitate smooth transitions from birth to adulthood.
3) Working with the Technical Assistance for Excellence in Special Education (TAESE) staff, the SEA has facilitated the Montana Higher Education Consortium (HEC). The HEC provides a mechanism for collaboration, networking, discussion, and advising of critical issues among Montana Institutes of Higher Education. The consortium works towards encouraging a more seamless

educational system and merging general and special education into one unified system; understanding and promoting the use of evidence-based academic and behavioral strategies; and closely linking Montana teacher training and educational leadership programs to early childhood programs, K-12 education, and the SEA.

4) The SEA staff is engaged with the Schools Administrators of Montana (SAM) which include affiliates for Superintendents, Principals, Special Education Administrators, and Information Technology (IT) Directors. This partnership gives the SEA the opportunity to develop collaborative partnerships with the Local Education Agencies (LEAs). The SEA also provides SAM with a grant to help fund the Montana Recruitment Project. This program focuses on recruiting hard to fill positions such as speech/language pathologists, special education teachers, occupational therapists, and school psychologists for our districts.

5) Annually, the SEA brings together representatives from various stakeholder groups for a joint meeting facilitated by TAESE. This meeting brings stakeholders together to share up-dates and gather input from each other. There is a comprehensive representation of the Montana disability community, families and parents of children and students with and without disabilities.

During the FFY22 reporting period, the Student Support Services Senior Manager met with the parents and community members of the Montana School for the Deaf & Blind (MSDB) to start creating a graduate profile. In addition, our Early Assistance Program (EAP) Director presented to the parents of MSDB on the IDEA Framework (state purposes), general supervisory responsibilities and OPI's role as an SEA. The EAP Director also provided information on dispute resolution options and where at the OPI parents could go for technical assistance.

The Montana Empowerment Center and the OPI conducted various virtual presentations for parents of students with disabilities birth through age 21 and LEA staff. During the reporting period, the OPI presented on Present Levels of Academic Achievement Functional Performance (PLAAFPs), Measurable Annual Goals (MAGs), Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS), transitions, early childhood, and extended school year. Superintendent Arntzen hosted multiple community events in four geographically diverse cities across the state in December of 2022. Parents listened to the goals of legislators for education and then had the opportunity to ask questions of the legislators. Throughout the reporting period, OPI provided numerous virtual trainings for parents regarding student and school safety and supporting youth with ASD and other developmental disorders.

Annually, the OPI assists with the Montana Youth Transitions (MYT) Conference. The OPI team works in conjunction with MYT to present, coach, and mentor educators, parents, and students. This conference brings together the transition team of youth, parents, and professionals to learn strategies and resources to build a seamless transition plan from high school to the adult world. One parent stated the following, "This was my first time at the conference, and I had no idea there were so many things out there to help my son. The sessions on parenting techniques and educational tools were eye-opening, and I feel more equipped to support my child's learning journey."

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	798
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	51
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	0
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	296

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma	Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
798	1,145	73.73%	78.00%	69.69%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

Montana has a relatively small number of exiting students each year, and a small number of graduates reported on the exit report. Part of that is because of the nature of the collection – students who move during their senior year are counted as moved, rather than graduates. This is the cause for differences in the data each year. The 2021-2022 school year was still experiencing the effects of COVID, part of which involved a high level of movement in and around our Native American reservations. Those students who did successfully graduate during the exiting reporting year but moved at some point, did not count as graduates, accounting for the slippage in our graduation rate.

Graduation Conditions

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma.

The Montana Board of Public Education has set the following as the minimum graduation requirements for all Montana students. Each local school board has the option to add additional requirements and most choose to add more rigorous requirements that all students in their district must meet. In some cases, this may result in a special education student needing to spend more than 4 years working towards their high school diploma. It can create a barrier to graduation for students who transfer to or from one Montana High School to another with more rigorous graduation standards.

10.55.905 : GRADUATION REQUIREMENTS - Administrative Rules of the State of Montana

10.55.905 GRADUATION REQUIREMENTS

(1) As a minimum, a school district's requirements for graduation shall include a total of 20 units of study that enable all students to meet the content standards and content-specific grade-level learning progressions.

(2) In order to meet the content and performance standards, the following 13 units shall be part of the 20 units required for all students to graduate:

(a) 4 units of English language arts;

(b) 2 units of mathematics;

(c) 2 units of social studies;

(d) 2 units of science;

(e) 1 unit of health enhancement, with 1/2 unit each year for two years;

(f) 1 unit of arts; and

(g) 1 unit of career and technical education.

(3) Units of credit earned in any Montana high school accredited by the Board of Public Education shall be accepted by all Montana high schools.

(4) In accordance with the policies of the local board of trustees, students may be graduated from high school with less than four years enrollment.

History: 20-2-114, MCA; IMP, 20-2-121, 20-3-106, 20-7-101, MCA; NEW, 1989 MAR p. 342, Eff. 7/1/89; AMD, 1998 MAR p. 2707, Eff. 10/9/98; AMD, 2000 MAR p. 3340, Eff. 12/8/00; AMD, 2012 MAR p. 2042, Eff. 7/1/13.

Are the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet to graduate with a regular high school diploma different from the conditions noted above? (yes/no)

NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

1 - OSEP Response

1 - Required Actions

Indicator 2: Drop Out

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in ED*Facts* file specification FS009.

Measurement

States must report a percentage using the number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out in the numerator and the number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21) in the denominator.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Data for this indicator are "lag" data. Describe the results of the State's examination of the section 618 exiting data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, use data from 2021-2022), and compare the results to the target.

Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) graduated with a state-defined alternate diploma; (c) received a certificate; (d) reached maximum age; or (e) dropped out.

Do not include in the denominator the number of youths with IEPs who exited special education due to: (a) transferring to regular education; or (b) who moved but are known to be continuing in an educational program.

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth. Please explain if there is a difference between what counts as dropping out for all students and what counts as dropping out for students with IEPs.

2 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	21.26%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target <=	3.40%	3.40%	3.40%	21.26%	21.16%
Data	3.72%	3.16%	3.81%	21.26%	20.61%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target <=	21.06%	20.96%	20.86%	20.76%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Discussions and Stakeholder input of the State's Performance Plan (SPP), Annual Performance Report (APR), State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), and Results Driven Accountability (RDA)/Results Based Accountability (RBA) began in 2013 with our State Special Education Advisory Panel. The Panel is fully vested and broadly representative of Montana. Additionally, many of the panel members as well as SEA staff serve in other agency or organization leadership positions or on advisory groups in the disability community. This enables MT to draw insight and advice from a broad group of stakeholders with an understanding of Montana's unique needs, strengths, and potential weaknesses.

Other stakeholder groups we sponsor and/or engage include:
1) Our Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD) includes both regional and state councils that regularly meet to assess APR data and to evaluate professional development priorities and results.
2) The State Education Agency (SEA) staff has developed strong working relationships with other Montana agencies that serve youth and adults with disabilities. The SEA staff participate as members of advisory councils for early childhood, vocational rehabilitation, low incidence disabilities, developmental disabilities, and the state independent living council. This has strengthened the commitments of the agencies working with Montana's youth to facilitate smooth transitions from birth to adulthood.
3) Working with the Technical Assistance for Excellence in Special Education (TAESE) staff, the SEA has facilitated the Montana Higher Education Consortium (HEC). The HEC provides a mechanism for collaboration, networking, discussion, and advising of critical issues among Montana Institutes of Higher Education. The consortium works towards encouraging a more seamless educational system and merging general and special education into one unified system; understanding and promoting the use of evidence-based academic and behavioral strategies; and closely linking Montana teacher training and educational leadership

programs to early childhood programs, K-12 education, and the SEA.

4) The SEA staff is engaged with the Schools Administrators of Montana (SAM) which include affiliates for Superintendents, Principals, Special Education Administrators, and Information Technology (IT) Directors. This partnership gives the SEA the opportunity to develop collaborative partnerships with the Local Education Agencies (LEAs). The SEA also provides SAM with a grant to help fund the Montana Recruitment Project. This program focuses on recruiting hard to fill positions such as speech/language pathologists, special education teachers, occupational therapists, and school psychologists for our districts.

5) Annually, the SEA brings together representatives from various stakeholder groups for a joint meeting facilitated by TAESE. This meeting brings stakeholders together to share up-dates and gather input from each other. There is a comprehensive representation of the Montana disability community, families and parents of children and students with and without disabilities.

During the FFY22 reporting period, the Student Support Services Senior Manager met with the parents and community members of the Montana School for the Deaf & Blind (MSDB) to start creating a graduate profile. In addition, our Early Assistance Program (EAP) Director presented to the parents of MSDB on the IDEA Framework (state purposes), general supervisory responsibilities and OPI's role as an SEA. The EAP Director also provided information on dispute resolution options and where at the OPI parents could go for technical assistance.

The Montana Empowerment Center and the OPI conducted various virtual presentations for parents of students with disabilities birth through age 21 and LEA staff. During the reporting period, the OPI presented on Present Levels of Academic Achievement Functional Performance (PLAAFPs), Measurable Annual Goals (MAGs), Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS), transitions, early childhood, and extended school year. Superintendent Arntzen hosted multiple community events in four geographically diverse cities across the state in December of 2022. Parents listened to the goals of legislators for education and then had the opportunity to ask questions of the legislators. Throughout the reporting period, OPI provided numerous virtual trainings for parents regarding student and school safety and supporting youth with ASD and other developmental disorders.

Annually, the OPI assists with the Montana Youth Transitions (MYT) Conference. The OPI team works in conjunction with MYT to present, coach, and mentor educators, parents, and students. This conference brings together the transition team of youth, parents, and professionals to learn strategies and resources to build a seamless transition plan from high school to the adult world. One parent stated the following, "This was my first time at the conference, and I had no idea there were so many things out there to help my son. The sessions on parenting techniques and educational tools were eye-opening, and I feel more equipped to support my child's learning journey."

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	798
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	51
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	0
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	296

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out	Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
296	1,145	20.61%	21.06%	25.85%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

The 2021-2022 school year was the first school year following COVID that all districts were back in person for the full year. Of the 296 students reported as a drop out for the FFY2021 exiting data (the data used in this report), 77 of them (26%) reported that they withdrew to enroll in a non-diploma program. In Montana, that is the code that is used for students who withdraw to test for their GED, or to enroll in Job Corps, or another program that will allow them to attain a GED while learning job skills at the same time.

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth

The dropout definition for all students in the state of Montana is:

Dropouts are the count of individuals who:

were enrolled in school on the date of the previous year October enrollment count or at some time during the previous school year and were not enrolled on the date of the current school year October count,

or

were not enrolled at the beginning of the previous school year but were expected to enroll and did not re-enroll during the year, "no show", and were not enrolled on the date of the current school year October count,

and

have not graduated from high school or completed a state or district-approved high school educational program,

and

have not transferred to another school, been temporarily absent due to a school-recognized illness or suspension, or died.

Is there a difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, explain the difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs.

Dropouts for Indicator 2 are counted based on the requirements in the EDFacts File specifications for FS009: Dropped Out

These students were enrolled at the start of the reporting period but were not enrolled at the end of the reporting period and did not exit special education through any of the other means. This includes dropouts, runaways, GED recipients (in cases where students are required to drop out of the secondary educational program to pursue the GED certificate), expulsions, status unknown, students who moved but are not known to be continuing in another educational program, and other exiters from special education.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

2 - OSEP Response

2 - Required Actions

Indicator 3A: Participation for Children with IEPs

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

> A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
>
> B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
>
> C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
>
> D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

3A. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using ED*Facts* file specifications FS185 and 188.

Measurement

A. Participation rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs participating in an assessment) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs enrolled during the testing window)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The participation rate is based on all children with IEPs, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3A: Provide separate reading/language arts and mathematics participation rates for children with IEPs for each of the following grades: 4, 8, & high school. Account for ALL children with IEPs, in grades 4, 8, and high school, including children not participating in assessments and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3A - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2018	96.71%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2018	93.65%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2018	81.38%
Math	A	Grade 4	2018	70.53%
Math	B	Grade 8	2018	92.75%
Math	C	Grade HS	2018	85.68%

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Discussions and Stakeholder input of the State's Performance Plan (SPP), Annual Performance Report (APR), State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), and Results Driven Accountability (RDA)/Results Based Accountability (RBA) began in 2013 with our State Special Education Advisory Panel. The Panel is fully vested and broadly representative of Montana. Additionally, many of the panel members as well as SEA staff serve in other agency or organization leadership positions or on advisory groups in the disability community. This enables MT to draw insight and advice from a broad group of stakeholders with an understanding of Montana's unique needs, strengths, and potential weaknesses.

Other stakeholder groups we sponsor and/or engage include:
1) Our Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD) includes both regional and state councils that regularly meet to assess APR data and to evaluate professional development priorities and results.
2) The State Education Agency (SEA) staff has developed strong working relationships with other Montana agencies that serve youth and adults with disabilities. The SEA staff participate as members of advisory councils for early childhood, vocational rehabilitation, low incidence disabilities, developmental disabilities, and the state independent living council. This has strengthened the commitments of the agencies working with Montana's youth to facilitate smooth transitions from birth to adulthood.
3) Working with the Technical Assistance for Excellence in Special Education (TAESE) staff, the SEA has facilitated the Montana Higher Education Consortium (HEC). The HEC provides a mechanism for collaboration, networking, discussion, and advising of critical issues among Montana Institutes of Higher Education. The consortium works towards encouraging a more seamless educational system and merging general and special education into one unified system; understanding and promoting the use of evidence-based academic and behavioral strategies; and closely linking Montana teacher training and educational leadership programs to early childhood programs, K-12 education, and the SEA.
4) The SEA staff is engaged with the Schools Administrators of Montana (SAM) which include affiliates for Superintendents, Principals, Special Education Administrators, and Information Technology (IT) Directors. This partnership gives the SEA the opportunity to develop collaborative partnerships with the Local Education Agencies (LEAs). The SEA also provides SAM with a grant to help fund the Montana Recruitment Project. This program focuses on recruiting hard to fill positions such as speech/language pathologists, special education teachers, occupational therapists, and school psychologists for our districts.
5) Annually, the SEA brings together representatives from various stakeholder groups for a joint meeting facilitated by TAESE. This meeting brings stakeholders together to share up-dates and gather input from each other. There is a comprehensive representation of the Montana disability community, families and parents of children and students with and without disabilities.

During the FFY22 reporting period, the Student Support Services Senior Manager met with the parents and community members of the Montana School for the Deaf & Blind (MSDB) to start creating a graduate profile. In addition, our Early Assistance Program (EAP) Director presented to the parents of MSDB on the IDEA Framework (state purposes), general supervisory responsibilities and OPI's role as an SEA. The EAP Director also provided information on dispute resolution options and where at the OPI parents could go for technical assistance.

The Montana Empowerment Center and the OPI conducted various virtual presentations for parents of students with disabilities birth through age 21 and LEA staff. During the reporting period, the OPI presented on Present Levels of Academic Achievement Functional Performance (PLAAFPs), Measurable Annual Goals (MAGs), Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS), transitions, early childhood, and extended school year. Superintendent Arntzen hosted multiple community events in four geographically diverse cities across the state in December of 2022. Parents listened to the goals of legislators for education and then had the opportunity to ask questions of the legislators. Throughout the reporting period, OPI provided numerous virtual trainings for parents regarding student and school safety and supporting youth with ASD and other developmental disorders.

Annually, the OPI assists with the Montana Youth Transitions (MYT) Conference. The OPI team works in conjunction with MYT to present, coach, and mentor educators, parents, and students. This conference brings together the transition team of youth, parents, and professionals to learn strategies and resources to build a seamless transition plan from high school to the adult world. One parent stated the following, "This was my first time at the conference, and I had no idea there were so many things out there to help my son. The sessions on parenting techniques and educational tools were eye-opening, and I feel more equipped to support my child's learning journey."

FFY 2022 Data Disaggregation from ED*Facts*

Data Source:
SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

Date:
01/10/2024

Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade (1)

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs (2)	1,820	1,562	1,243

Group			
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations (3)	1,031	892	886
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations (3)	622	484	39
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	142	114	108

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

Date:

01/10/2024

Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs (2)	1,820	1,562	1,243
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations (3)	697	546	929
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations (3)	951	805	40
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	141	114	108

(1) The children with IEPs who are English learners and took the ELP in lieu of the regular reading/language arts assessment are not included in the prefilled data in this indicator.

(2) The children with IEPs count excludes children with disabilities who were reported as exempt due to significant medical emergency in row a for all the prefilled data in this indicator.

(3) The term "regular assessment" is an aggregation of the following types of assessments, as applicable for each grade/ grade group: regular assessment based on grade-level achievement standards, advanced assessment, Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority (IADA) pilot assessment, high school regular assessment I, high school regular assessment II, high school regular assessment III and locally-selected nationally recognized high school assessment in the prefilled data in this indicator.

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	1,795	1,820	97.43%	95.00%	98.63%	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	1,490	1,562	95.13%	95.00%	95.39%	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	1,033	1,243	79.90%	95.00%	83.11%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	1,789	1,820	97.01%	95.00%	98.30%	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	1,465	1,562	91.97%	95.00%	93.79%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	1,077	1,243	85.35%	95.00%	86.65%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Regulatory Information

The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]

Public Reporting Information

Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.

Special Education Assessment Participation data can be found at

https://opi.mt.gov/Educators/School-Climate-Student-Wellness/Special-Education/IDEA-Data.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3A - OSEP Response

3A - Required Actions

Indicator 3B: Proficiency for Children with IEPs (Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

        A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.

        B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.

        C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.

        D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

3B. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using ED*Facts* file specifications FS175 and 178.

Measurement

B. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3B: Proficiency calculations in this SPP/APR must result in proficiency rates for children with IEPs on the regular assessment in reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (separately) in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3B - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2018	17.18%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2018	10.50%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2018	5.71%
Math	A	Grade 4	2018	15.17%
Math	B	Grade 8	2018	5.74%
Math	C	Grade HS	2018	4.76%

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	17.40%	17.50%	17.60%	17.70%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	10.70%	10.80%	10.90%	11.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	5.90%	6.00%	6.10%	6.20%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	15.40%	15.50%	15.60%	15.70%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	5.90%	6.00%	6.10%	6.20%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	5.00%	5.10%	5.20%	5.30%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Discussions and Stakeholder input of the State's Performance Plan (SPP), Annual Performance Report (APR), State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), and Results Driven Accountability (RDA)/Results Based Accountability (RBA) began in 2013 with our

State Special Education Advisory Panel. The Panel is fully vested and broadly representative of Montana. Additionally, many of the panel members as well as SEA staff serve in other agency or organization leadership positions or on advisory groups in the disability community. This enables MT to draw insight and advice from a broad group of stakeholders with an understanding of Montana's unique needs, strengths, and potential weaknesses.

Other stakeholder groups we sponsor and/or engage include:
1) Our Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD) includes both regional and state councils that regularly meet to assess APR data and to evaluate professional development priorities and results.
2) The State Education Agency (SEA) staff has developed strong working relationships with other Montana agencies that serve youth and adults with disabilities. The SEA staff participate as members of advisory councils for early childhood, vocational rehabilitation, low incidence disabilities, developmental disabilities, and the state independent living council. This has strengthened the commitments of the agencies working with Montana's youth to facilitate smooth transitions from birth to adulthood.
3) Working with the Technical Assistance for Excellence in Special Education (TAESE) staff, the SEA has facilitated the Montana Higher Education Consortium (HEC). The HEC provides a mechanism for collaboration, networking, discussion, and advising of critical issues among Montana Institutes of Higher Education. The consortium works towards encouraging a more seamless educational system and merging general and special education into one unified system; understanding and promoting the use of evidence-based academic and behavioral strategies; and closely linking Montana teacher training and educational leadership programs to early childhood programs, K-12 education, and the SEA.
4) The SEA staff is engaged with the Schools Administrators of Montana (SAM) which include affiliates for Superintendents, Principals, Special Education Administrators, and Information Technology (IT) Directors. This partnership gives the SEA the opportunity to develop collaborative partnerships with the Local Education Agencies (LEAs). The SEA also provides SAM with a grant to help fund the Montana Recruitment Project. This program focuses on recruiting hard to fill positions such as speech/language pathologists, special education teachers, occupational therapists, and school psychologists for our districts.
5) Annually, the SEA brings together representatives from various stakeholder groups for a joint meeting facilitated by TAESE. This meeting brings stakeholders together to share up-dates and gather input from each other. There is a comprehensive representation of the Montana disability community, families and parents of children and students with and without disabilities.

During the FFY22 reporting period, the Student Support Services Senior Manager met with the parents and community members of the Montana School for the Deaf & Blind (MSDB) to start creating a graduate profile. In addition, our Early Assistance Program (EAP) Director presented to the parents of MSDB on the IDEA Framework (state purposes), general supervisory responsibilities and OPI's role as an SEA. The EAP Director also provided information on dispute resolution options and where at the OPI parents could go for technical assistance.

The Montana Empowerment Center and the OPI conducted various virtual presentations for parents of students with disabilities birth through age 21 and LEA staff. During the reporting period, the OPI presented on Present Levels of Academic Achievement Functional Performance (PLAAFPs), Measurable Annual Goals (MAGs), Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS), transitions, early childhood, and extended school year. Superintendent Arntzen hosted multiple community events in four geographically diverse cities across the state in December of 2022. Parents listened to the goals of legislators for education and then had the opportunity to ask questions of the legislators. Throughout the reporting period, OPI provided numerous virtual trainings for parents regarding student and school safety and supporting youth with ASD and other developmental disorders.

Annually, the OPI assists with the Montana Youth Transitions (MYT) Conference. The OPI team works in conjunction with MYT to present, coach, and mentor educators, parents, and students. This conference brings together the transition team of youth, parents, and professionals to learn strategies and resources to build a seamless transition plan from high school to the adult world. One parent stated the following, "This was my first time at the conference, and I had no idea there were so many things out there to help my son. The sessions on parenting techniques and educational tools were eye-opening, and I feel more equipped to support my child's learning journey."

FFY 2022 Data Disaggregation from ED*Facts*
Data Source:
SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)
Date:
01/10/2024
Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment	1,653	1,376	925
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above	228	132	107

proficient against grade level			
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	74	30	8

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

01/10/2024

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment	1,648	1,351	969
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	196	63	43
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	74	20	5

(1)The term "regular assessment" is an aggregation of the following types of assessments as applicable for each grade/ grade group: regular assessment based on grade-level achievement standards, advanced assessment, Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority (IADA) pilot assessment, high school regular assessment I, high school regular assessment II, high school regular assessment III and locally-selected nationally recognized high school assessment in the prefilled data in this indicator.

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	302	1,653	15.50%	17.40%	18.27%	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	162	1,376	12.85%	10.70%	11.77%	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	115	925	8.44%	5.90%	12.43%	Met target	No Slippage

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	270	1,648	13.33%	15.40%	16.38%	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	83	1,351	5.41%	5.90%	6.14%	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	48	969	2.96%	5.00%	4.95%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Regulatory Information

The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]

Public Reporting Information

Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.

Montana publicly reports Assessment proficiency data on its GEMS website (https://gems .opi.mt.gov/student-data). This is the public data storage and reporting platform used for all data within the OPI.

Instructions to access the data can be found on the IDEA Data page on the OPI website (https://opi.mt.gov/Portals/182/Page%20Files/Special%20Education/IDEA%20Data/Accessing%20Assessment%20Proficiency%20Data%20in%20GEMS.pdf?ver=2022-09-30-083434-713)

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3B - OSEP Response

3B - Required Actions

Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Children with IEPs (Alternate Academic Achievement Standards)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.

B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.

C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.

D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

3C. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using ED*Facts* file specifications FS175 and 178.

Measurement

C. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against alternate academic achievement standards) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3C: Proficiency calculations in this SPP/APR must result in proficiency rates for children with IEPs on the alternate assessment in reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (separately) in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time

of testing.

3C - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2018	48.33%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2018	41.75%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2018	51.11%
Math	A	Grade 4	2018	50.85%
Math	B	Grade 8	2018	45.63%
Math	C	Grade HS	2018	43.33%

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	48.70%	48.80%	48.90%	50.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	42.00%	42.10%	42.20%	42.30%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	51.40%	51.50%	51.60%	51.70%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	51.20%	51.30%	51.40%	51.50%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	46.00%	46.10%	46.20%	46.30%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	43.70%	43.80%	43.90%	44.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Discussions and Stakeholder input of the State's Performance Plan (SPP), Annual Performance Report (APR), State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), and Results Driven Accountability (RDA)/Results Based Accountability (RBA) began in 2013 with our State Special Education Advisory Panel. The Panel is fully vested and broadly representative of Montana. Additionally, many of the panel members as well as SEA staff serve in other agency or organization leadership positions or on advisory groups in the disability community. This enables MT to draw insight and advice from a broad group of stakeholders with an understanding of Montana's unique needs, strengths, and potential weaknesses.

Other stakeholder groups we sponsor and/or engage include:
1) Our Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD) includes both regional and state councils that regularly meet to assess APR data and to evaluate professional development priorities and results.
2) The State Education Agency (SEA) staff has developed strong working relationships with other Montana agencies that serve youth and adults with disabilities. The SEA staff participate as members of advisory councils for early childhood, vocational rehabilitation, low incidence disabilities, developmental disabilities, and the state independent living council. This has strengthened the commitments of the agencies working with Montana's youth to facilitate smooth transitions from birth to adulthood.
3) Working with the Technical Assistance for Excellence in Special Education (TAESE) staff, the SEA has facilitated the Montana Higher Education Consortium (HEC). The HEC provides a mechanism for collaboration, networking, discussion, and advising of critical issues among Montana Institutes of Higher Education. The consortium works towards encouraging a more seamless educational system and merging general and special education into one unified system; understanding and promoting the use of evidence-based academic and behavioral strategies; and closely linking Montana teacher training and educational leadership programs to early childhood programs, K-12 education, and the SEA.
4) The SEA staff is engaged with the Schools Administrators of Montana (SAM) which include affiliates for Superintendents, Principals, Special Education Administrators, and Information Technology (IT) Directors. This partnership gives the SEA the opportunity to develop collaborative partnerships with the Local Education Agencies (LEAs). The SEA also provides SAM with a grant to help fund the Montana Recruitment Project. This program focuses on recruiting hard to fill positions such as speech/language pathologists, special education teachers, occupational therapists, and school psychologists for our districts.
5) Annually, the SEA brings together representatives from various stakeholder groups for a joint meeting facilitated by TAESE. This meeting brings stakeholders together to share up-dates and gather input from each other. There is a comprehensive representation of the Montana disability community, families and parents of children and students with and without disabilities.

During the FFY22 reporting period, the Student Support Services Senior Manager met with the parents and community members of the Montana School for the Deaf & Blind (MSDB) to start creating a graduate profile. In addition, our Early Assistance Program (EAP) Director presented to the parents of MSDB on the IDEA Framework (state purposes), general supervisory responsibilities and OPI's role as an SEA. The EAP Director also provided information on dispute resolution options and where at the OPI parents could go for technical assistance.

The Montana Empowerment Center and the OPI conducted various virtual presentations for parents of students with disabilities birth through age 21 and LEA staff. During the reporting period, the OPI presented on Present Levels of Academic Achievement Functional Performance (PLAAFPs), Measurable Annual Goals (MAGs), Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS), transitions, early childhood, and extended school year. Superintendent Arntzen hosted multiple community events in four geographically diverse cities across the state in December of 2022. Parents listened to the goals of legislators for education and then had the opportunity to ask questions of the legislators. Throughout the reporting period, OPI provided numerous virtual trainings for parents regarding student and school safety and supporting youth with ASD and other developmental disorders.

Annually, the OPI assists with the Montana Youth Transitions (MYT) Conference. The OPI team works in conjunction with MYT to present, coach, and mentor educators, parents, and students. This conference brings together the transition team of youth, parents, and professionals to learn strategies and resources to build a seamless transition plan from high school to the adult world. One parent stated the following, "This was my first time at the conference, and I had no idea there were so many things out there to help my son. The sessions on parenting techniques and educational tools were eye-opening, and I feel more equipped to support my child's learning journey."

FFY 2022 Data Disaggregation from ED*Facts*

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

01/10/2024

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment	142	114	108

b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	64	38	62

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

01/10/2024

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment	141	114	108
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	83	56	57

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	64	142	43.27%	48.70%	45.07%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	38	114	46.99%	42.00%	33.33%	Did not meet target	Slippage
C	Grade HS	62	108	53.57%	51.40%	57.41%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group B, if applicable

The OPI has examined the proficiency rates by district to identify those districts that had a decrease from 2021-22 to 2022-23. Of the 24 districts that had grade 8 ALT test-takers in both years, 7 saw a decrease in their proficiency rates in Reading; 12 had no difference; and 5 had an increase. There were 31 districts who had grade 8 ALT test-takers this year but not last year. There were 29 districts that had a 0% proficiency score this year. Of these 29, 8 had a 0% proficiency rate the previous year as well, 2 had a higher than 0% proficiency rate, and the other 19 did not have any alt test-takers the previous year. Given the very small numbers of ALT test-takers, it is not unusual to see volatility in the proficiency rates from one year to the next.

Note that while the OPI would like to be able to pinpoint the reasons for slippage, the slippage is so small that it is virtually impossible to do so. If only 15 more students across the 51 districts that had 8th grade ALT test-takers this year would have scored proficient on the grade 8 reading test, there would have been no slippage. It is hard to determine where these 15 students should have come from. Thirty-three of the 51 districts had only one ALT test-taker. Only 3 of the 51 districts had more than 4 ALT test-takers. For these three, two saw a decrease in their score, and one saw an increase.

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	83	141	50.96%	51.20%	58.87%	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	56	114	53.75%	46.00%	49.12%	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	57	108	44.05%	43.70%	52.78%	Met target	No Slippage

Regulatory Information

The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]

Public Reporting Information

Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.

Montana publicly reports Assessment proficiency data on its GEMS website (https://gems.opi.mt.gov/student-data). This is the public data store and reporting platform used for all data within the OPI.

Instructions to access the data can be found on the IDEA Data page on the OPI website (https://opi.mt.gov/Portals/182/Page%20Files/Special%20Education/IDEA%20Data/Accessing%20Assessment%20Proficiency%20Data%20in%20GEMS.pdf?ver=2022-09-30-083434-713)

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3C - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3C - OSEP Response

3C - Required Actions

Indicator 3D: Gap in Proficiency Rates (Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

        A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.

        B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.

        C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.

        D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

3D. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using ED*Facts* file specifications FS175 and 178.

Measurement

D. Proficiency rate gap = [(proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2022-2023 school year) subtracted from the (proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2022-2023 school year)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes all children enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3D: Gap calculations in this SPP/APR must result in the proficiency rate for children with IEPs were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2022-2023 school year compared to the proficiency rate for all students who were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2022-2023 school year. Calculate separately for reading/language arts and math in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3D - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2018	30.12
Reading	B	Grade 8	2018	37.29
Reading	C	Grade HS	2018	40.54
Math	A	Grade 4	2018	30.20
Math	B	Grade 8	2018	30.65
Math	C	Grade HS	2018	28.85

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A <=	Grade 4	29.92	29.82	29.72	26.20
Reading	B <=	Grade 8	37.09	36.99	36.89	36.79
Reading	C <=	Grade HS	40.34	40.24	40.14	40.04
Math	A <=	Grade 4	30.00	29.90	29.80	29.70
Math	B <=	Grade 8	30.45	30.35	30.25	30.15

Math	C <=	Grade HS	28.65	28.55	28.45	28.35

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Discussions and Stakeholder input of the State's Performance Plan (SPP), Annual Performance Report (APR), State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), and Results Driven Accountability (RDA)/Results Based Accountability (RBA) began in 2013 with our State Special Education Advisory Panel. The Panel is fully vested and broadly representative of Montana. Additionally, many of the panel members as well as SEA staff serve in other agency or organization leadership positions or on advisory groups in the disability community. This enables MT to draw insight and advice from a broad group of stakeholders with an understanding of Montana's unique needs, strengths, and potential weaknesses.

Other stakeholder groups we sponsor and/or engage include:
1) Our Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD) includes both regional and state councils that regularly meet to assess APR data and to evaluate professional development priorities and results.
2) The State Education Agency (SEA) staff has developed strong working relationships with other Montana agencies that serve youth and adults with disabilities. The SEA staff participate as members of advisory councils for early childhood, vocational rehabilitation, low incidence disabilities, developmental disabilities, and the state independent living council. This has strengthened the commitments of the agencies working with Montana's youth to facilitate smooth transitions from birth to adulthood.
3) Working with the Technical Assistance for Excellence in Special Education (TAESE) staff, the SEA has facilitated the Montana Higher Education Consortium (HEC). The HEC provides a mechanism for collaboration, networking, discussion, and advising of critical issues among Montana Institutes of Higher Education. The consortium works towards encouraging a more seamless educational system and merging general and special education into one unified system; understanding and promoting the use of evidence-based academic and behavioral strategies; and closely linking Montana teacher training and educational leadership programs to early childhood programs, K-12 education, and the SEA.
4) The SEA staff is engaged with the Schools Administrators of Montana (SAM) which include affiliates for Superintendents, Principals, Special Education Administrators, and Information Technology (IT) Directors. This partnership gives the SEA the opportunity to develop collaborative partnerships with the Local Education Agencies (LEAs). The SEA also provides SAM with a grant to help fund the Montana Recruitment Project. This program focuses on recruiting hard to fill positions such as speech/language pathologists, special education teachers, occupational therapists, and school psychologists for our districts.
5) Annually, the SEA brings together representatives from various stakeholder groups for a joint meeting facilitated by TAESE. This meeting brings stakeholders together to share up-dates and gather input from each other. There is a comprehensive representation of the Montana disability community, families and parents of children and students with and without disabilities.

During the FFY22 reporting period, the Student Support Services Senior Manager met with the parents and community members of the Montana School for the Deaf & Blind (MSDB) to start creating a graduate profile. In addition, our Early Assistance Program (EAP) Director presented to the parents of MSDB on the IDEA Framework (state purposes), general supervisory responsibilities and OPI's role as an SEA. The EAP Director also provided information on dispute resolution options and where at the OPI parents could go for technical assistance.

The Montana Empowerment Center and the OPI conducted various virtual presentations for parents of students with disabilities birth through age 21 and LEA staff. During the reporting period, the OPI presented on Present Levels of Academic Achievement Functional Performance (PLAAFPs), Measurable Annual Goals (MAGs), Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS), transitions, early childhood, and extended school year. Superintendent Arntzen hosted multiple community events in four geographically diverse cities across the state in December of 2022. Parents listened to the goals of legislators for education and then had the opportunity to ask questions of the legislators. Throughout the reporting period, OPI provided numerous virtual trainings for parents regarding student and school safety and supporting youth with ASD and other developmental disorders.

Annually, the OPI assists with the Montana Youth Transitions (MYT) Conference. The OPI team works in conjunction with MYT to present, coach, and mentor educators, parents, and students. This conference brings together the transition team of youth, parents, and professionals to learn strategies and resources to build a seamless transition plan from high school to the adult world. One parent stated the following, "This was my first time at the conference, and I had no idea there were so many things out there to help my son. The sessions on parenting techniques and educational tools were eye-opening, and I feel more equipped to support my child's learning journey."

FFY 2022 Data Disaggregation from ED*Facts*
Data Source:
SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)
Date:
01/10/2024
Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS

Group			
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	11,064	11,155	9,499
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	1,653	1,376	925
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	5,025	5,020	5,072
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	92	42	13
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	228	132	107
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	74	30	8

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

01/10/2024

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	11,052	11,050	9,639
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	1,648	1,351	969
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	4,814	3,493	2,918
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	129	32	6
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	196	63	43
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	74	20	5

(1)The term "regular assessment" is an aggregation of the following types of assessments as applicable for each grade/ grade group: regular assessment based on grade-level achievement standards, advanced assessment, Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority (IADA) pilot assessment, high school regular assessment I, high school regular assessment II, high school regular assessment III and locally-selected nationally recognized high school assessment in the prefilled data in this indicator.

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	18.27%	46.25%	30.39	29.92	27.98	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	11.77%	45.38%	32.74	37.09	33.61	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	12.43%	53.53%	33.82	40.34	41.10	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group C, if applicable

The main reason for the slippage is that the all-student rate increased at a greater degree than the students with disability rate. The average increase in proficiency rates for the all-student rate is 12.2% and for the SWD rate it is 3.65%. If we examine the average increase based on only those districts that had at least 10 SWD high school test-takers (19 districts), the average increase in proficiency rates for the all-student rate is 10.22% and for the SWD rate it is 1.47%.

Of the 94 districts that had high school reading proficiency scores both years, 80 of these districts saw an increase in their all-student proficiency rates; but only 27 of these 80 districts also saw an increase in their SWD proficiency rate. Fifteen of the 94 districts experienced a decrease in their SWD rate; 32 had an increase; and 47 had no difference in their proficiency rate. All 47 of these districts had a 0% proficiency rate. Of the 15 that had a decrease in their scores, five had at least 10 SWD test-takers.

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	16.38%	44.72%	28.38	30.00	28.34	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	6.14%	31.90%	25.05	30.45	25.76	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	4.95%	30.34%	22.20	28.65	25.38	Met target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3D - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3D - OSEP Response

The State's FFY 2022 data represent slippage from the FFY 2021 data and the State did not meet its FFY 2022 target for this indicator. The State did not, as required, provide the reasons for slippage.

3D - Required Actions

Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

> A. Percent of local educational agencies (LEA) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and

> B. Percent of LEAs that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

Data Source

State discipline data, including State's analysis of State's Discipline data collected under IDEA Section 618, where applicable. Discrepancy can be computed by either comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates for nondisabled children within the LEA or by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of LEAs that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for more than 10 days during the school year of children with IEPs) divided by the (# of LEAs in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable))] times 100.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of LEAs totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement.

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, use data from 2021-2022), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

> --The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or

> --The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates of suspensions and expulsions for nondisabled children within the LEAs.

In the description, specify which method the State used to determine possible discrepancies and explain what constitutes those discrepancies.

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the section 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2021-2022 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported section 618 data in 2021-2022 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2022-2023, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2021-2022 section 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2022 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2021-2022 (which can be found in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR introduction).

Indicator 4A: Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation (based upon LEAs that met the minimum n and/or cell size requirement, if applicable). If significant discrepancies occurred, describe how the State educational agency reviewed and, if appropriate, revised (or required the affected local educational agency to revise) its policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, to ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices comply with applicable requirements.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the LEA with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, dated July 24, 2023.

If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

4A - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2016	0.00%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target <=	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Data	0.00%				

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target <=	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Discussions and Stakeholder input of the State's Performance Plan (SPP), Annual Performance Report (APR), State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), and Results Driven Accountability (RDA)/Results Based Accountability (RBA) began in 2013 with our State Special Education Advisory Panel. The Panel is fully vested and broadly representative of Montana. Additionally, many of the panel members as well as SEA staff serve in other agency or organization leadership positions or on advisory groups in the disability community. This enables MT to draw insight and advice from a broad group of stakeholders with an understanding of Montana's unique needs, strengths, and potential weaknesses.

Other stakeholder groups we sponsor and/or engage include:
1) Our Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD) includes both regional and state councils that regularly meet to assess APR data and to evaluate professional development priorities and results.
2) The State Education Agency (SEA) staff has developed strong working relationships with other Montana agencies that serve youth and adults with disabilities. The SEA staff participate as members of advisory councils for early childhood, vocational rehabilitation, low incidence disabilities, developmental disabilities, and the state independent living council. This has strengthened the commitments of the agencies working with Montana's youth to facilitate smooth transitions from birth to adulthood.
3) Working with the Technical Assistance for Excellence in Special Education (TAESE) staff, the SEA has facilitated the Montana Higher Education Consortium (HEC). The HEC provides a mechanism for collaboration, networking, discussion, and advising of critical issues among Montana Institutes of Higher Education. The consortium works towards encouraging a more seamless educational system and merging general and special education into one unified system; understanding and promoting the use of evidence-based academic and behavioral strategies; and closely linking Montana teacher training and educational leadership programs to early childhood programs, K-12 education, and the SEA.
4) The SEA staff is engaged with the Schools Administrators of Montana (SAM) which include affiliates for Superintendents, Principals, Special Education Administrators, and Information Technology (IT) Directors. This partnership gives the SEA the opportunity to develop collaborative partnerships with the Local Education Agencies (LEAs). The SEA also provides SAM with a grant to help fund the Montana Recruitment Project. This program focuses on recruiting hard to fill positions such as speech/language pathologists, special education teachers, occupational therapists, and school psychologists for our districts.
5) Annually, the SEA brings together representatives from various stakeholder groups for a joint meeting facilitated by TAESE. This meeting brings stakeholders together to share up-dates and gather input from each other. There is a comprehensive representation of the Montana disability community, families and parents of children and students with and without disabilities.

During the FFY22 reporting period, the Student Support Services Senior Manager met with the parents and community members of the Montana School for the Deaf & Blind (MSDB) to start creating a graduate profile. In addition, our Early Assistance Program (EAP) Director presented to the parents of MSDB on the IDEA Framework (state purposes), general supervisory responsibilities and OPI's role as an SEA. The EAP Director also provided information on dispute resolution options and where at the OPI parents could go for technical assistance.

The Montana Empowerment Center and the OPI conducted various virtual presentations for parents of students with disabilities birth through age 21 and LEA staff. During the reporting period, the OPI presented on Present Levels of Academic Achievement Functional Performance (PLAAFPs), Measurable Annual Goals (MAGs), Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS), transitions, early childhood, and extended school year. Superintendent Arntzen hosted multiple community events in four geographically diverse cities across the state in December of 2022. Parents listened to the goals of legislators for education and then had the opportunity to ask questions of the legislators. Throughout the reporting period, OPI provided numerous virtual trainings for parents regarding student and school safety and supporting youth with ASD and other developmental disorders.

Annually, the OPI assists with the Montana Youth Transitions (MYT) Conference. The OPI team works in conjunction with MYT to present, coach, and mentor educators, parents, and students. This conference brings together the transition team of youth, parents, and professionals to learn strategies and resources to build a seamless transition plan from high school to the adult world. One

parent stated the following, "This was my first time at the conference, and I had no idea there were so many things out there to help my son. The sessions on parenting techniques and educational tools were eye-opening, and I feel more equipped to support my child's learning journey."

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n/cell-size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met the State-established n/cell size. Report the number of LEAs excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

399

Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy	Number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n/cell-size	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0		0.00%		N/A	N/A

Choose one of the following comparison methodologies to determine whether significant discrepancies are occurring (34 CFR §300.170(a))

The rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs in each LEA compared to the rates for nondisabled children in the same LEA

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

OPI has been using the same methodology for Indicator 4A since 2005-06. At that time, OPI and stakeholders did a thorough review of the suspension data and determined that this methodology i.e., a minimum cell size of 10 and a statistical test difference between the suspension rates of students with disabilities (SWD) and students without disabilities (SWOD), was the best methodology to enable OPI to accurately identify those districts with a significant discrepancy in their suspensions of greater than 10 days without falsely identifying those districts due to a small numbers issue. Montana has a large number of districts and a small number of SWD which means that most districts have very small numbers of SWD (in 2021-22, 56% of districts had less than 20 SWD; 78% had less than 50 SWD; only 9% of districts had more than 100 SWD).

Furthermore, the number of SWD suspended for greater than 10 days in any given school year is very small. In 2021-22, out of 20,014 SWD, only 35 SWD at 26 districts were suspended/expelled for more than 10 days. Of the 26 districts that suspended at least one SWD for more than 10 days, 21 districts suspended only one SWD; the other five districts suspended between 2-4 SWD for greater than 10 days.

However, while OPI believes that the current methodology is a strong one in terms of preventing false positives, OPI believes that now is the time to change its methodology to ensure that OPI is reviewing at least some districts each year for significant discrepancy. By doing so, OPI will be demonstrating to the districts across the state that even though very small numbers of SWD are being suspended for greater than 10 days, OPI is taking very seriously the data that shows SWD are being suspended at greater rates than SWOD. OPI will convene a group of stakeholders this summer to examine the 2022-23 suspension data and to determine going forward what methodology will be the best to ensure that district disciplinary policies, procedures, and practices comply with requirements of the law.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2022 using 2021-2022 data)

Provide a description of the review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

No review occurred because no district met the minimum N for this indicator.

The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

4A - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must explain how its methodology is reasonably designed to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs, including how the State's LEAs are being examined for significant discrepancy under the State's chosen methodology; and how the State's threshold for measuring significant discrepancy in the rate of long-term suspensions and expulsions is reasonably designed.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

A LEA is determined to have a significant discrepancy if, given a minimum N of 10, it demonstrates a statistical difference in long-term suspension and expulsion rates for students with disabilities when compared to the long-term suspension and expulsion rates for students without disabilities. The statistical test is a one-tail test at the .01 significance level. Montana uses a Z score of 2.33 to determine a statistical difference.

Montana conducted a review of LEA long-term suspension and expulsion rates for students with disabilities to determine if a significant discrepancy occurred within a LEA. This is calculated by comparing the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions of students with disabilities to the rates of long-term suspension and expulsion rates of nondisabled students within each LEA. Montana uses a test of the difference between proportions as the methodology for identifying significant discrepancy. The minimum N of 10 is applied to the numerator of this equation - that is, if an LEA does not have at least 10 students with disabilities who had a long-term suspension or expulsion, the data is reviewed for that LEA, but it is not considered for this indicator. The minimum N of 10 was determined after consultation with the Special Education Advisory Panel.

For any districts that do meet the minimum N of 10 and are determined to have a significant discrepancy, a full Policies, Practices, and Procedures review is completed. If it is determined that the LEA has inappropriate policies, practices, or procedures that led to the discrepancy, the OPI would issue a finding and work with the LEA to correct the issues, utilizing the OSEP 23-01 memo requirements .

As noted in OSEP's Part B Indicator Measurement Table, data used in the state's examination is from the 2021-2022 school year, resulting in a one-year data lag for this indicator.

Montana did not have any districts that met the minimum "n" for this indicator.

4A - OSEP Response

OSEP's Required Actions in response to the State's FFY 2021 SPP/APR required the State to explain, in its FFY 2022 SPP/APR, how its methodology is reasonably designed to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs. In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State indicated that it plans to review its methodology for this indicator. OSEP appreciates the State's efforts. However, for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, OSEP notes that the State's methodology continues to result in a threshold for measuring significant discrepancy in the rate of long-term suspension and expulsion rates of children with IEPs that falls above the median of thresholds used by all States. Additionally, OSEP notes that the State included none the State's LEAs in its analysis of rates of suspension and expulsion of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs. Therefore, OSEP could not determine whether the State's methodology is reasonably designed to determine significant discrepancies in the rate of long-term suspensions and expulsions for children with disabilities.

4A - Required Actions

In the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the State must explain how its methodology is reasonably designed to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs, including how the State's threshold for measuring significant discrepancy in the rate of long-term suspensions and expulsions is reasonably designed and how the State's LEAs are being examined for significant discrepancy under the State's chosen methodology.

Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

> A. Percent of local educational agencies (LEA) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and

> B. Percent of LEAs that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

Data Source

State discipline data, including State's analysis of State's Discipline data collected under IDEA Section 618, where applicable. Discrepancy can be computed by either comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates for nondisabled children within the LEA or by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of LEAs that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of more than 10 days during the school year of children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards) divided by the (# of LEAs in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of LEAs totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement.

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, use data from 2021-2022), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

> --The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or

> --The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to the rates of suspensions and expulsions for nondisabled children within the LEAs

In the description, specify which method the State used to determine possible discrepancies and explain what constitutes those discrepancies.

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the section 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2021-2022 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported section 618 data in 2021-2022 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2022-2023, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2021-2022 section 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2022 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2021-2022 (which can be found in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR introduction).

Indicator 4B: Provide the following: (a) the number of LEAs that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) for children with IEPs; and (b) the number of those LEAs in which policies, procedures or practices contribute to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the LEA with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, dated July 24, 2023.

If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Targets must be 0% for 4B.

4B - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2016	0.00%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%				

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n/cell-size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met the State-established n/cell size. Report the number of LEAs excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

399

Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those LEAs that have policies, procedure or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n/cell-size	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	0		0%		N/A	N/A

Choose one of the following comparison methodologies to determine whether significant discrepancies are occurring (34 CFR §300.170(a))

The rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs in each LEA compared to the rates for nondisabled children in the same LEA

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

OPI has been using the same methodology for Indicator 4B since 2009-10. At that time, OPI and stakeholders did a thorough review of the suspension data and determined that this methodology i.e., a minimum cell size of 10 and a statistical test difference between the suspension rates of students with disabilities (SWD) and students without disabilities (SWOD), was the best methodology to enable OPI to accurately identify those districts with a significant discrepancy in their suspensions of greater than 10 days without falsely identifying those districts due to a small numbers issue. Montana has a large number of districts and a small number of SWD which means that most districts have very small numbers of SWD (in 2021-22, 56% of districts had less than 20 SWD; 78% had less than 50 SWD; only 9% of districts had more than 100 SWD).

Furthermore, the number of SWD suspended for greater than 10 days in any given school year is very small. In 2021-22, out of 20,014 SWD, only 35 SWD at 26 districts were suspended/expelled for more than 10 days. Of the 26 districts that suspended at least one SWD for more than 10 days, 21 districts suspended only one SWD; the other five districts suspended between 2-4 SWD for greater than 10 days. Of these 35 suspended SWD, 22 were white; 3 Hispanic, 8 Native American, and 2 multi-racial.

However, while OPI believes that the current methodology is a strong one in terms of preventing false positives, OPI believes that now is the time to change its methodology to ensure that OPI is reviewing at least some districts each year for significant discrepancy. By doing so, OPI will be demonstrating to the districts across the state that even though very small numbers of SWD are being suspended for greater than 10 days, OPI is taking very seriously the data that shows SWD are being suspended at greater rates than SWOD. OPI will convene a group of stakeholders this summer to examine the 2022-23 suspension data and to determine going forward what methodology will be the best to ensure that district disciplinary policies, procedures, and practices comply with requirements of the law.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2022 using 2021-2022 data)

Provide a description of the review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

No review was completed as no LEA met the minimum N for this indicator.

The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

4B - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must explain how its methodology is reasonably designed to determine if significant discrepancies, by race or ethnicity, are occurring in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs, including how the State's LEAs are being examined for significant discrepancy under the State's chosen methodology; and how the State's threshold for measuring significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of long-term suspensions and expulsions is reasonably designed.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

OPI has been using the same methodology for Indicator 4A since 2005-06. At that time, OPI and stakeholders did a thorough review of the suspension data and determined that this methodology i.e., a minimum cell size of 10 and a statistical test difference between the suspension rates of students with disabilities (SWD) and students without disabilities (SWOD), was the best methodology to enable OPI to accurately identify those districts with a significant discrepancy in their suspensions of greater than 10 days without

falsely identifying those districts due to a small numbers issue. Montana has a large number of districts and a small number of SWD which means that most districts have very small numbers of SWD (in 2021-22, 56% of districts had less than 20 SWD; 78% had less than 50 SWD; only 9% of districts had more than 100 SWD).

Furthermore, the number of SWD suspended for greater than 10 days in any given school year is very small. In 2021-22, out of 20,014 SWD, only 35 SWD at 26 districts were suspended/expelled for more than 10 days. Of the 26 districts that suspended at least one SWD for more than 10 days, 21 districts suspended only one SWD; the other five districts suspended between 2-4 SWD for greater than 10 days.

However, while OPI believes that the current methodology is a strong one in terms of preventing false positives, OPI believes that now is the time to change its methodology to ensure that OPI is reviewing at least some districts each year for significant discrepancy. By doing so, OPI will be demonstrating to the districts across the state that even though very small numbers of SWD are being suspended for greater than 10 days, OPI is taking very seriously the data that shows SWD are being suspended at greater rates than SWOD. OPI will convene a group of stakeholders this summer to examine the 2022-23 suspension data and to determine going forward what methodology will be the best to ensure that district disciplinary policies, procedures, and practices comply with requirements of the law.

4B - OSEP Response

OSEP's Required Actions in response to the State's FFY 2021 SPP/APR submission required the State to explain, in its FFY 2022 SPP/APR, how its methodology is reasonably designed to determine if significant discrepancies, by race or ethnicity, are occurring in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs. In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State indicated that it plans to review its methodology for this indicator. OSEP appreciates the State's efforts. However, for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, OSEP notes that the State included none of the State's LEAs in its analysis of rates of suspension and expulsion of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs. Additionally, the State reported that it uses a "statistical test difference between the suspension rates of students with disabilities (SWD) and students without disabilities (SWOD)" as part of its methodology. It is unclear what 'statistical test difference' is used as part of the State's methodology. Therefore, OSEP could not determine whether the State's methodology is reasonably designed to determine significant discrepancies, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of long-term suspensions and expulsions for children with disabilities.

4B- Required Actions

In the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the State must explain how its methodology is reasonably designed to determine if significant discrepancies, by race and ethnicity, are occurring in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs, including how the State's LEAs are being examined for significant discrepancy under the State's chosen methodology, and how the State's threshold for measuring significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of long-term suspensions and expulsions is reasonably designed.

Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 5 (Kindergarten) - 21)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served:

  A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;

  B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and

  C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in ED*Facts* file specification FS002.

Measurement

  A. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

  B. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

  C. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)]times 100.

Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

States must report five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in kindergarten in this indicator. Five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in preschool programs are included in Indicator 6.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA, explain.

5 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
A	2019	Target >=	52.40%	52.50%		52.50%	52.60%
A	53.10%	Data	49.51%	51.08%	53.10%	54.60%	56.10%
B	2019	Target <=	11.10%	11.10%		11.10%	11.00%
B	10.67%	Data	11.32%	10.78%	10.67%	10.13%	9.86%
C	2019	Target <=	1.40%	1.40%		1.40%	1.30%
C	1.54%	Data	1.06%	1.35%	1.54%	1.36%	1.08%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	52.70%	52.80%	52.90%	53.20%
Target B <=	10.90%	10.80%	10.70%	10.60%
Target C <=	1.20%	1.10%	1.00%	0.90%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Discussions and Stakeholder input of the State's Performance Plan (SPP), Annual Performance Report (APR), State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), and Results Driven Accountability (RDA)/Results Based Accountability (RBA) began in 2013 with our State Special Education Advisory Panel. The Panel is fully vested and broadly representative of Montana. Additionally, many of the panel members as well as SEA staff serve in other agency or organization leadership positions or on advisory groups in the disability community. This enables MT to draw insight and advice from a broad group of stakeholders with an understanding of Montana's unique needs, strengths, and potential weaknesses.

Other stakeholder groups we sponsor and/or engage include:
1) Our Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD) includes both regional and state councils that regularly meet to assess APR data and to evaluate professional development priorities and results.
2) The State Education Agency (SEA) staff has developed strong working relationships with other Montana agencies that serve youth and adults with disabilities. The SEA staff participate as members of advisory councils for early childhood, vocational rehabilitation, low incidence disabilities, developmental disabilities, and the state independent living council. This has strengthened the commitments of the agencies working with Montana's youth to facilitate smooth transitions from birth to adulthood.
3) Working with the Technical Assistance for Excellence in Special Education (TAESE) staff, the SEA has facilitated the Montana Higher Education Consortium (HEC). The HEC provides a mechanism for collaboration, networking, discussion, and advising of critical issues among Montana Institutes of Higher Education. The consortium works towards encouraging a more seamless educational system and merging general and special education into one unified system; understanding and promoting the use of evidence-based academic and behavioral strategies; and closely linking Montana teacher training and educational leadership programs to early childhood programs, K-12 education, and the SEA.
4) The SEA staff is engaged with the Schools Administrators of Montana (SAM) which include affiliates for Superintendents, Principals, Special Education Administrators, and Information Technology (IT) Directors. This partnership gives the SEA the opportunity to develop collaborative partnerships with the Local Education Agencies (LEAs). The SEA also provides SAM with a grant to help fund the Montana Recruitment Project. This program focuses on recruiting hard to fill positions such as speech/language pathologists, special education teachers, occupational therapists, and school psychologists for our districts.
5) Annually, the SEA brings together representatives from various stakeholder groups for a joint meeting facilitated by TAESE. This meeting brings stakeholders together to share up-dates and gather input from each other. There is a comprehensive representation of the Montana disability community, families and parents of children and students with and without disabilities.

During the FFY22 reporting period, the Student Support Services Senior Manager met with the parents and community members of the Montana School for the Deaf & Blind (MSDB) to start creating a graduate profile. In addition, our Early Assistance Program (EAP) Director presented to the parents of MSDB on the IDEA Framework (state purposes), general supervisory responsibilities and OPI's role as an SEA. The EAP Director also provided information on dispute resolution options and where at the OPI parents could go for technical assistance.

The Montana Empowerment Center and the OPI conducted various virtual presentations for parents of students with disabilities birth through age 21 and LEA staff. During the reporting period, the OPI presented on Present Levels of Academic Achievement Functional Performance (PLAAFPs), Measurable Annual Goals (MAGs), Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS), transitions, early childhood, and extended school year. Superintendent Arntzen hosted multiple community events in four geographically diverse cities across the state in December of 2022. Parents listened to the goals of legislators for education and then had the opportunity to ask questions of the legislators. Throughout the reporting period, OPI provided numerous virtual trainings for parents regarding student and school safety and supporting youth with ASD and other developmental disorders.

Annually, the OPI assists with the Montana Youth Transitions (MYT) Conference. The OPI team works in conjunction with MYT to present, coach, and mentor educators, parents, and students. This conference brings together the transition team of youth, parents, and professionals to learn strategies and resources to build a seamless transition plan from high school to the adult world. One parent stated the following, "This was my first time at the conference, and I had no idea there were so many things out there to help my son. The sessions on parenting techniques and educational tools were eye-opening, and I feel more equipped to support my child's learning journey."

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	20,292
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	11,701
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	08/30/2023	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the	1,942

Source	Date	Description	Data
(EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)		regular class less than 40% of the day	
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in separate schools	156
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in residential facilities	42
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	29

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.
NO

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Education Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	11,701	20,292	56.10%	52.70%	57.66%	Met target	No Slippage
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	1,942	20,292	9.86%	10.90%	9.57%	Met target	No Slippage
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	227	20,292	1.08%	1.20%	1.12%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

5 - OSEP Response

5 - Required Actions

Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 3, 4, and aged 5 who are enrolled in a preschool program attending a:

> A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and

> B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.

> C. Receiving special education and related services in the home.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in ED*Facts* file specification FS089.

Measurement

> A. Percent = [(# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program) divided by the (total # of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

> B. Percent = [(# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility) divided by the (total # of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

> C. Percent = [(# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs receiving special education and related services in the home) divided by the (total # of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

States must report five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in preschool programs in this indicator. Five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in kindergarten are included in Indicator 5.

States may choose to set one target that is inclusive of children ages 3, 4, and 5, or set individual targets for each age.

For Indicator 6C: States are not required to establish a baseline or targets if the number of children receiving special education and related services in the home is less than 10, regardless of whether the State chooses to set one target that is inclusive of children ages 3, 4, and 5, or set individual targets for each age. In a reporting period during which the number of children receiving special education and related services in the home reaches 10 or greater, States are required to develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

For Indicator 6C: States may express their targets in a range (*e.g.*, 75-85%).

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under IDEA section 618, explain.

6 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data (Inclusive) – 6A, 6B, 6C

Part	FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
A	Target >=	45.10%	45.10%		45.10%	45.20%
A	Data	40.54%	40.53%	29.99%	28.28%	30.01%
B	Target <=	27.50%	27.50%		27.50%	27.40%
B	Data	32.23%	34.67%	44.32%	48.05%	48.77%
C	Target <=					
C	Data				0.92%	0.65%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Discussions and Stakeholder input of the State's Performance Plan (SPP), Annual Performance Report (APR), State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), and Results Driven Accountability (RDA)/Results Based Accountability (RBA) began in 2013 with our State Special Education Advisory Panel. The Panel is fully vested and broadly representative of Montana. Additionally, many of the panel members as well as SEA staff serve in other agency or organization leadership positions or on advisory groups in the disability community. This enables MT to draw insight and advice from a broad group of stakeholders with an understanding of Montana's unique needs, strengths, and potential weaknesses.

Other stakeholder groups we sponsor and/or engage include:
1) Our Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD) includes both regional and state councils that regularly meet to assess APR data and to evaluate professional development priorities and results.
2) The State Education Agency (SEA) staff has developed strong working relationships with other Montana agencies that serve youth and adults with disabilities. The SEA staff participate as members of advisory councils for early childhood, vocational rehabilitation, low incidence disabilities, developmental disabilities, and the state independent living council. This has strengthened the commitments of the agencies working with Montana's youth to facilitate smooth transitions from birth to adulthood.
3) Working with the Technical Assistance for Excellence in Special Education (TAESE) staff, the SEA has facilitated the Montana Higher Education Consortium (HEC). The HEC provides a mechanism for collaboration, networking, discussion, and advising of critical issues among Montana Institutes of Higher Education. The consortium works towards encouraging a more seamless educational system and merging general and special education into one unified system; understanding and promoting the use of evidence-based academic and behavioral strategies; and closely linking Montana teacher training and educational leadership programs to early childhood programs, K-12 education, and the SEA.
4) The SEA staff is engaged with the Schools Administrators of Montana (SAM) which include affiliates for Superintendents, Principals, Special Education Administrators, and Information Technology (IT) Directors. This partnership gives the SEA the opportunity to develop collaborative partnerships with the Local Education Agencies (LEAs). The SEA also provides SAM with a grant to help fund the Montana Recruitment Project. This program focuses on recruiting hard to fill positions such as speech/language pathologists, special education teachers, occupational therapists, and school psychologists for our districts.
5) Annually, the SEA brings together representatives from various stakeholder groups for a joint meeting facilitated by TAESE. This meeting brings stakeholders together to share up-dates and gather input from each other. There is a comprehensive representation of the Montana disability community, families and parents of children and students with and without disabilities.

During the FFY22 reporting period, the Student Support Services Senior Manager met with the parents and community members of the Montana School for the Deaf & Blind (MSDB) to start creating a graduate profile. In addition, our Early Assistance Program (EAP) Director presented to the parents of MSDB on the IDEA Framework (state purposes), general supervisory responsibilities and OPI's role as an SEA. The EAP Director also provided information on dispute resolution options and where at the OPI parents could go for technical assistance.

The Montana Empowerment Center and the OPI conducted various virtual presentations for parents of students with disabilities birth through age 21 and LEA staff. During the reporting period, the OPI presented on Present Levels of Academic Achievement Functional Performance (PLAAFPs), Measurable Annual Goals (MAGs), Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS), transitions, early childhood, and extended school year. Superintendent Arntzen hosted multiple community events in four geographically diverse cities across the state in December of 2022. Parents listened to the goals of legislators for education and then had the opportunity to ask questions of the legislators. Throughout the reporting period, OPI provided numerous virtual trainings for parents regarding student and school safety and supporting youth with ASD and other developmental disorders.

Annually, the OPI assists with the Montana Youth Transitions (MYT) Conference. The OPI team works in conjunction with MYT to present, coach, and mentor educators, parents, and students. This conference brings together the transition team of youth, parents, and professionals to learn strategies and resources to build a seamless transition plan from high school to the adult world. One parent stated the following, "This was my first time at the conference, and I had no idea there were so many things out there to help my son. The sessions on parenting techniques and educational tools were eye-opening, and I feel more equipped to support my child's learning journey."

Targets

Please select if the State wants to set baseline and targets based on individual age ranges (i.e. separate baseline and targets for each age), or inclusive of all children ages 3, 4, and 5.

Inclusive Targets

Please select if the State wants to use target ranges for 6C.

Target Range not used

Baselines for Inclusive Targets option (A, B, C)

Part	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
A	2019	29.99%
B	2019	44.32%
C		

Inclusive Targets – 6A, 6B

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	45.30%	45.50%	45.50%	45.60%
Target B <=	27.30%	27.20%	27.10%	27.00%

Inclusive Targets – 6C

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target C <=				

Prepopulated Data

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)

Date:

08/30/2023

Description	3	4	5	3 through 5 - Total
Total number of children with IEPs	259	482	79	820
a1. Number of children attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	64	182	25	271
b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	126	172	25	323
b2. Number of children attending separate school	11	20	3	34
b3. Number of children attending residential facility	0	0	0	0
c1. Number of children receiving special education and related services in the home	2	4	0	6

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.
NO

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data - Aged 3 through 5

Preschool Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	271	820	30.01%	45.30%	33.05%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	357	820	48.77%	27.30%	43.54%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C. Home	6	820	0.65%		0.73%	N/A	N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The State reported fewer than ten children receiving special education and related services in the home in FFY 2022. The State is not required to provide targets for Indicator 6C until any fiscal year in which ten or more children receive special education and related services in the home.

6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

6 - OSEP Response

The State reported fewer than ten children receiving special education and related services in the home in FFY 2022. The State is not required to provide targets for Indicator 6C until any fiscal year in which ten or more children receive special education and related services in the home.

6 - Required Actions

Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved:

A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);

B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication and early literacy); and

C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

Outcomes:

A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and
C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

Progress categories for A, B and C:

a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = [(# of preschool children who did not improve functioning) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:

Summary Statement 1: Of those preschool children who entered the preschool program below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

Measurement for Summary Statement 1: Percent = [(# of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in category (d)) divided by (# of preschool children reported in progress category (a) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (b) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (d))] times 100.

Summary Statement 2: The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

Measurement for Summary Statement 2: Percent = [(# of preschool children reported in progress category (d) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (e)) divided by (the total # of preschool children reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e))] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling of **children for assessment** is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See General Instructions on page 3 for additional instructions on sampling.)

In the measurement include, in the numerator and denominator, only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. States will use the progress categories for each of the three Outcomes to calculate and report the two Summary Statements. States have provided targets for the two Summary Statements for the three Outcomes (six numbers for targets for each FFY).

Report progress data and calculate Summary Statements to compare against the six targets. Provide the actual numbers and percentages for the five reporting categories for each of the three Outcomes.

In presenting results, provide the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers." If a State is using the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary (COS), then the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers" has been defined as a child who has been assigned a score of 6 or 7 on the COS.

In addition, list the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator, including if the State is using the ECO COS.

7 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
A1	2008	Target >=	76.90%	77.00%	77.00%	77.00%	77.10%
A1	61.40%	Data	84.62%	76.19%	80.00%	86.59%	93.55%
A2	2008	Target >=	75.40%	75.50%	75.50%	75.50%	75.60%
A2	59.20%	Data	63.49%	64.43%	68.11%	71.64%	75.22%
B1	2008	Target >=	80.90%	81.00%	81.00%	81.00%	81.10%
B1	70.30%	Data	85.00%	85.23%	84.48%	81.60%	89.11%
B2	2008	Target >=	58.40%	58.50%	58.50%	58.50%	58.60%
B2	31.60%	Data	50.40%	50.52%	58.38%	55.97%	57.52%
C1	2008	Target >=	75.80%	75.90%	75.90%	75.90%	76.00%
C1	58.10%	Data	82.35%	76.23%	79.46%	84.34%	96.77%
C2	2008	Target >=	75.80%	75.90%	75.90%	75.90%	76.00%
C2	64.10%	Data	63.10%	64.43%	70.27%	68.66%	76.99%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A1 >=	77.20%	77.30%	77.40%	77.50%
Target A2 >=	75.70%	75.80%	75.90%	76.00%
Target B1 >=	81.20%	81.30%	81.40%	81.50%
Target B2 >=	58.70%	58.80%	58.90%	59.00%
Target C1 >=	76.10%	76.20%	76.30%	76.40%
Target C2 >=	76.10%	76.20%	76.30%	76.40%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Discussions and Stakeholder input of the State's Performance Plan (SPP), Annual Performance Report (APR), State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), and Results Driven Accountability (RDA)/Results Based Accountability (RBA) began in 2013 with our State Special Education Advisory Panel. The Panel is fully vested and broadly representative of Montana. Additionally, many of the panel members as well as SEA staff serve in other agency or organization leadership positions or on advisory groups in the disability community. This enables MT to draw insight and advice from a broad group of stakeholders with an understanding of Montana's unique needs, strengths, and potential weaknesses.

Other stakeholder groups we sponsor and/or engage include:
1) Our Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD) includes both regional and state councils that regularly meet to assess APR data and to evaluate professional development priorities and results.
2) The State Education Agency (SEA) staff has developed strong working relationships with other Montana agencies that serve

youth and adults with disabilities. The SEA staff participate as members of advisory councils for early childhood, vocational rehabilitation, low incidence disabilities, developmental disabilities, and the state independent living council. This has strengthened the commitments of the agencies working with Montana's youth to facilitate smooth transitions from birth to adulthood.

3) Working with the Technical Assistance for Excellence in Special Education (TAESE) staff, the SEA has facilitated the Montana Higher Education Consortium (HEC). The HEC provides a mechanism for collaboration, networking, discussion, and advising of critical issues among Montana Institutes of Higher Education. The consortium works towards encouraging a more seamless educational system and merging general and special education into one unified system; understanding and promoting the use of evidence-based academic and behavioral strategies; and closely linking Montana teacher training and educational leadership programs to early childhood programs, K-12 education, and the SEA.

4) The SEA staff is engaged with the Schools Administrators of Montana (SAM) which include affiliates for Superintendents, Principals, Special Education Administrators, and Information Technology (IT) Directors. This partnership gives the SEA the opportunity to develop collaborative partnerships with the Local Education Agencies (LEAs). The SEA also provides SAM with a grant to help fund the Montana Recruitment Project. This program focuses on recruiting hard to fill positions such as speech/language pathologists, special education teachers, occupational therapists, and school psychologists for our districts.

5) Annually, the SEA brings together representatives from various stakeholder groups for a joint meeting facilitated by TAESE. This meeting brings stakeholders together to share up-dates and gather input from each other. There is a comprehensive representation of the Montana disability community, families and parents of children and students with and without disabilities.

During the FFY22 reporting period, the Student Support Services Senior Manager met with the parents and community members of the Montana School for the Deaf & Blind (MSDB) to start creating a graduate profile. In addition, our Early Assistance Program (EAP) Director presented to the parents of MSDB on the IDEA Framework (state purposes), general supervisory responsibilities and OPI's role as an SEA. The EAP Director also provided information on dispute resolution options and where at the OPI parents could go for technical assistance.

The Montana Empowerment Center and the OPI conducted various virtual presentations for parents of students with disabilities birth through age 21 and LEA staff. During the reporting period, the OPI presented on Present Levels of Academic Achievement Functional Performance (PLAAFPs), Measurable Annual Goals (MAGs), Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS), transitions, early childhood, and extended school year. Superintendent Arntzen hosted multiple community events in four geographically diverse cities across the state in December of 2022. Parents listened to the goals of legislators for education and then had the opportunity to ask questions of the legislators. Throughout the reporting period, OPI provided numerous virtual trainings for parents regarding student and school safety and supporting youth with ASD and other developmental disorders.

Annually, the OPI assists with the Montana Youth Transitions (MYT) Conference. The OPI team works in conjunction with MYT to present, coach, and mentor educators, parents, and students. This conference brings together the transition team of youth, parents, and professionals to learn strategies and resources to build a seamless transition plan from high school to the adult world. One parent stated the following, "This was my first time at the conference, and I had no idea there were so many things out there to help my son. The sessions on parenting techniques and educational tools were eye-opening, and I feel more equipped to support my child's learning journey."

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed

151

Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)

Outcome A Progress Category	Number of children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	0	0.00%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	18	11.92%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	25	16.56%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	44	29.14%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	64	42.38%

Outcome A	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age	69	87	93.55%	77.20%	79.31%	Met target	No Slippage

Outcome A	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. *Calculation:(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)*							
A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. *Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)*	108	151	75.22%	75.70%	71.52%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication)

Outcome B Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	0	0.00%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	33	21.85%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	34	22.52%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	66	43.71%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	18	11.92%

Outcome B	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. *Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)*	100	133	89.11%	81.20%	75.19%	Did not meet target	Slippage
B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. *Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)*	84	151	57.52%	58.70%	55.63%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

Outcome C Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	0	0.00%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	19	12.58%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	26	17.22%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	46	30.46%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	60	39.74%

Outcome C	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. *Calculation:(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)*	72	91	96.77%	76.10%	79.12%	Met target	No Slippage
C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. *Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)*	106	151	76.99%	76.10%	70.20%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A2	Montana has a very small n size for this indicator. A change of just one or two children will cause a decrease in the overall percentage. For FFY2021, there were 96 out 134 students who were functioning within age expectations by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. For FFY2022, that number was 108 out of 151.
B1	Montana has a very small n size for this indicator. A change of just one or two children will cause a decrease in the overall percentage. For FFY2021, there were 102 out 125 students who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. For FFY2022, that number was 100 out of 133.
B2	Montana has a very small n size for this indicator. A change of just one or two children will cause a decrease in the overall percentage. For FFY2021, there were 96 out 134 students who were functioning within age expectations by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. For FFY2022, that number was 84 out of 151.
C2	Montana has a very small n size for this indicator. A change of just one or two children will cause a decrease in the overall percentage. For FFY2021, there were 96 out 134 students who were functioning within age expectations by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. For FFY2022, that number was 106 out of 151.

Does the State include in the numerator and denominator only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years? (yes/no)

YES

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary (COS) process? (yes/no)

YES

List the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator.

Montana uses a standardized required editor-based reporting form to collect entering and exiting preschool outcomes data. The form is included in our special education module within our state-wide student data system, along with all required special education forms. The report is run by the Part B data manager.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

7 - OSEP Response

7 - Required Actions

Indicator 8: Parent involvement

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities) divided by the (total # of respondent parents of children with disabilities)] times 100.

Instructions

*Sampling **of parents from whom response is requested** is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See General Instructions on page 3 for additional instructions on sampling.)*

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

If the State is using a separate data collection methodology for preschool children, the State must provide separate baseline data, targets, and actual target data or discuss the procedures used to combine data from school age and preschool data collection methodologies in a manner that is valid and reliable.

While a survey is not required for this indicator, a State using a survey must submit a copy of any new or revised survey with its SPP/APR.

Report the number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed and the number of respondent parents. The survey response rate is automatically calculated using the submitted data.

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2022 response rate to the FFY 2021 response rate) and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The State must also analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and take steps to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross-section of parents of children with disabilities.

Include in the State's analysis the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States must consider race/ethnicity. In addition, the State's analysis must also include at least one of the following demographics: age of the student, disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

States must describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

If the analysis shows that the demographics of the children for whom parents responding are not representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services in the State, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State distributed the survey to parents (e.g., by mail, by e-mail, on-line, by telephone, in-person through school personnel), and how responses were collected.

States are encouraged to work in collaboration with their OSEP-funded parent centers in collecting data.

8 - Indicator Data

Question	Yes / No
Do you use a separate data collection methodology for preschool children?	NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Discussions and Stakeholder input of the State's Performance Plan (SPP), Annual Performance Report (APR), State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), and Results Driven Accountability (RDA)/Results Based Accountability (RBA) began in 2013 with our State Special Education Advisory Panel. The Panel is fully vested and broadly representative of Montana. Additionally, many of the panel members as well as SEA staff serve in other agency or organization leadership positions or on advisory groups in the disability community. This enables MT to draw insight and advice from a broad group of stakeholders with an understanding of Montana's unique needs, strengths, and potential weaknesses.

Other stakeholder groups we sponsor and/or engage include:
1) Our Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD) includes both regional and state councils that regularly meet to assess APR data and to evaluate professional development priorities and results.
2) The State Education Agency (SEA) staff has developed strong working relationships with other Montana agencies that serve youth and adults with disabilities. The SEA staff participate as members of advisory councils for early childhood, vocational rehabilitation, low incidence disabilities, developmental disabilities, and the state independent living council. This has strengthened

the commitments of the agencies working with Montana's youth to facilitate smooth transitions from birth to adulthood.
3) Working with the Technical Assistance for Excellence in Special Education (TAESE) staff, the SEA has facilitated the Montana Higher Education Consortium (HEC). The HEC provides a mechanism for collaboration, networking, discussion, and advising of critical issues among Montana Institutes of Higher Education. The consortium works towards encouraging a more seamless educational system and merging general and special education into one unified system; understanding and promoting the use of evidence-based academic and behavioral strategies; and closely linking Montana teacher training and educational leadership programs to early childhood programs, K-12 education, and the SEA.
4) The SEA staff is engaged with the Schools Administrators of Montana (SAM) which include affiliates for Superintendents, Principals, Special Education Administrators, and Information Technology (IT) Directors. This partnership gives the SEA the opportunity to develop collaborative partnerships with the Local Education Agencies (LEAs). The SEA also provides SAM with a grant to help fund the Montana Recruitment Project. This program focuses on recruiting hard to fill positions such as speech/language pathologists, special education teachers, occupational therapists, and school psychologists for our districts.
5) Annually, the SEA brings together representatives from various stakeholder groups for a joint meeting facilitated by TAESE. This meeting brings stakeholders together to share up-dates and gather input from each other. There is a comprehensive representation of the Montana disability community, families and parents of children and students with and without disabilities.

During the FFY22 reporting period, the Student Support Services Senior Manager met with the parents and community members of the Montana School for the Deaf & Blind (MSDB) to start creating a graduate profile. In addition, our Early Assistance Program (EAP) Director presented to the parents of MSDB on the IDEA Framework (state purposes), general supervisory responsibilities and OPI's role as an SEA. The EAP Director also provided information on dispute resolution options and where at the OPI parents could go for technical assistance.

The Montana Empowerment Center and the OPI conducted various virtual presentations for parents of students with disabilities birth through age 21 and LEA staff. During the reporting period, the OPI presented on Present Levels of Academic Achievement Functional Performance (PLAAFPs), Measurable Annual Goals (MAGs), Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS), transitions, early childhood, and extended school year. Superintendent Arntzen hosted multiple community events in four geographically diverse cities across the state in December of 2022. Parents listened to the goals of legislators for education and then had the opportunity to ask questions of the legislators. Throughout the reporting period, OPI provided numerous virtual trainings for parents regarding student and school safety and supporting youth with ASD and other developmental disorders.

Annually, the OPI assists with the Montana Youth Transitions (MYT) Conference. The OPI team works in conjunction with MYT to present, coach, and mentor educators, parents, and students. This conference brings together the transition team of youth, parents, and professionals to learn strategies and resources to build a seamless transition plan from high school to the adult world. One parent stated the following, "This was my first time at the conference, and I had no idea there were so many things out there to help my son. The sessions on parenting techniques and educational tools were eye-opening, and I feel more equipped to support my child's learning journey."

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	65.50%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target >=	70.40%	70.50%	70.50%	70.50%	70.60%
Data	74.00%	73.88%	79.05%	73.35%	65.66%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	70.70%	70.80%	70.90%	71.00%

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities	Total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
323	452	65.66%	70.70%	71.46%	Met target	No Slippage

Since the State did not report preschool children separately, discuss the procedures used to combine data from school age and preschool surveys in a manner that is valid and reliable.

Parents of students with disabilities, including preschool students, are given an opportunity to complete the survey. As in previous years, in FFY2022, the survey was given to parents at the annual IEP meeting, parent-teacher conferences, and community functions; in many cases it was also sent via mail. This personalized distribution method ensured all parents received the survey; furthermore, school staff personally encouraged the parents to complete the survey. Parents of students at all grade levels, including preschool, received, and were encouraged to respond to the survey. The survey that parents of preschool students receive is identical to the survey that parents of K-12 students receive. And as mentioned, the same distribution methods are used for both groups of parents. The data analysis method used for both groups of parents is identical. Therefore, the combined data from preschool and K-12 surveys are valid and reliable.

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

4,364

Percentage of respondent parents

10.36%

Response Rate

FFY	2021	2022
Response Rate	9.40%	10.36%

Describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

The metric used to determine representativeness is +/-3 discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group.

Include the State's analyses of the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States must include race/ethnicity in their analysis. In addition, the State's analysis must also include at least one of the following demographics: age of the student, disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

The State compared the representation by race/ethnicity and primary disability in the population to the representation in the respondents using a +/- 3% criteria to identify over-or under-representativeness.

Using this methodology, differences were found by race/ethnicity and disability. The SWD population consists of 70% of Whites and 18% of American Indians; the respondents consist of 78% of Whites and 9% of American Indians. All other racial/ethnic groups were within 3% of their population. In terms of disability groups, there were six groups that exceeded the +/- 3% criteria: the SWD population consists of students with the following disabilities: 7% of Autism, 8% of Developmental Delay, 30% of Specific Learning Disability, 21% of Multiple Disabilities, 10% of Other Health Impairments, 17% of Speech/Language Impairment; the respondents consist of: 15% Autism, 5% of Developmental Delay, 24% of Specific Learning Disability, 18% of Multiple Disabilities, 5% of Other Health Impairments, 20% of Speech/Language Impairment. All other disabilities were within 3% of their population.

The demographics of the children for whom parents are responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. (yes/no)

NO

If no, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics

Montana historically has gotten high response rates from parents of children who are white and/or have learning disabilities, while getting low response rates from parents of Hispanic students, American Indian students, and students with lower incidence disabilities. The American Indian and Hispanic populations in Montana are the second and third largest racial/ethnic subgroups. However, they still account for less than 10% of the total population of students surveyed. Given this, having one or two surveys from that subgroup not returned will lower the representative rate for that group.

Beginning with the FFY2023 APR, Montana is implementing an electronic survey rather than paper, and will be moving from a

sample of parents to a census. The SEA believes this will allow us to reach more of our underrepresented parents by allowing them to complete the survey during the annual IEP review, parent teacher conferences, or anytime throughout the year. We have also reduced the number of questions, asking targeted questions to obtain quality information from parents. These questions were developed in consultation with the Montana Empowerment Center (our OSEP Funded PTI), Disability Rights Montana, the Special Education Advisory Panel, and Special Education Directors. The survey will be provided in both English, Spanish and Braille.

Describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The SEA is moving from a sample to a census survey, decreased the number of questions asked from 23 to 10, moved from paper to electronic, and have moved away from English only by adding Spanish and Braille. It is believed that more parents will be reached, such as those with English as a Second Language and our low incidence disability population.
The SEA is in the process of hiring a Parent Liaison within the Special Education Division. This person will be able to assist parents in filling out the survey should they need assistance.

Describe the analysis of the response rate including any nonresponse bias that was identified, and the steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of parents of children with disabilities.

Nonresponse bias measures the differences in opinions between respondents and non-respondents in meaningful ways, such as the positivity of responses. A few things can be examined to determine nonresponse bias. One is the overall response rate. The higher the response rate, the less likely nonresponse bias will occur. Our response rate is 10.36%, which is higher than last year's response rate, still lower than we would like. However, it is possible that those parents who did not respond are different in some meaningful way in their level of positivity from those who did respond. Thus, we proceeded with the next two ways for examining nonresponse bias.

Second, the representativeness of the responses can be examined. Although significant differences were found in response rates by race/ethnicity and disability, the actual responses of these different groups of parents showed very few or no significant differences in the overall parent involvement percentage.

Third, we can compare the responses of parents who responded early in the process to those who responded later in the process. The idea being that perhaps those who do not immediately respond are different in some meaningful way than those who respond immediately. These results showed no statistically significant differences between parents who responded earlier and parents who responded later. Therefore, we conclude that nonresponse bias is not present.

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	YES
If yes, has your previously approved sampling plan changed?	NO

Describe the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates.

Please use this link to access the description of Montana's sampling plan approved by OSEP in June 2023. This description includes charts and graphs to support the SEA's decision that cannot be included in this document.

https://opi.mt.gov/Portals/182/Page%20Files/Special%20Education/Annual%20Performance%20Report/MontanaIndicator8SamplingPlanJune2023.pdf?ver=2023-12-14-101114-940

Survey Question	Yes / No
Was a survey used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised survey?	NO
If yes, provide a copy of the survey.	

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

8 - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2022 data are from a response group that is representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

This information can be found in the "Include the State's analyses of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States must include race/ethnicity in their analysis. In addition, the State's analysis must also include at least one of the following demographics: age of

the student, disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process."

8 - OSEP Response

In its narrative the State reported, "[p]arents of students with disabilities, including preschool students, are given an opportunity to complete the survey" and "[t]his personalized distribution method ensured all parents received the survey." However, the State did not describe how the survey data are combined in a manner that yields valid and reliable data.

8 - Required Actions

In the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the State must describe how the survey data are combined in a manner that yields valid and reliable data, as required by the Measurement Table.

Additionally, in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2023 data are from a response group that is representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

Compliance indicator: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

Data Source

State's analysis, based on State's Child Count data collected under IDEA section 618, to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "disproportionate representation." Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

Based on its review of the 618 data for the reporting year, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2022 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2023).

Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size for any racial/ethnic group.

Consider using multiple methods in calculating disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups to reduce the risk of overlooking potential problems. Describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation.

Provide the number of districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services and the number of those districts identified with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training) and any enforcement actions that were taken. If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

9 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	0.00%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021

Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

165

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
5	0	233	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met target	No Slippage

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

Define "disproportionate representation." Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

A LEA is determined to have disproportionate representation if, given a minimum N of 10, a LEA demonstrates a statistically significant difference in the proportion of students with disabilities of racial and ethnic groups receiving special education and related services compared to the proportion of students with disabilities of all other racial and ethnic groups and receiving special education and related services in that LEA, within a 99 percent confidence interval.

Using a minimum N of 10 and a 99 percent confidence interval, a test of difference between proportions was used to measure statistically significant differences between the special education identification rate for students of a specific racial and ethnic group and the special education identification rate for all other students within that LEA. Target data show that five of the 398 LEAs demonstrated a statistically significant difference, resulting in determination of disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services. The minimum N of 10 is applied to the numerator of this equation - that is, if a LEA does not have at least 10 students with disabilities in a particular racial/ethnic category, the data is reviewed for that LEA, but it is not counted for this indicator.

Of the 398 districts in Montana for the 2022-2023 school year, 233 met the minimum N in at least one of the racial groups and were included in the calculations for that racial group. There were 165 districts that did not meet the minimum N in any racial category and were excluded from all calculations.

Describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification.

Once an LEA is flagged for disproportionate representation, the policies and procedures of that LEA, results of on-site compliance monitoring, and dispute resolution data were   reviewed to determine if the disproportionate representation is due to inappropriate identification. The districts were informed of the results of the review.

The LEA reviews included:
-- Interviews with Administration;
-- Review of the most current Program Narratives and Policies;
-- Review of two Special Education files (Evaluation Reports (ERs) and Individualized Education Plans (IEPs)) from each district of students that were disproportionately represented ;
-- Review of Child Count information; and

-- Consideration of the most current Monitoring Data

Upon SEA's review of LEAs identified as having potential Disproportionate Representation, the SEA has determined that these qualifiers do not suggest inappropriate (over) identification of minority groups as defined in Indicator 9.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

9 - OSEP Response

9 - Required Actions

Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

Compliance indicator: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.

 (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

Data Source

State's analysis, based on State's Child Count data collected under IDEA section 618, to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "disproportionate representation." Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

Based on its review of the section 618 data for the reporting year, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), (e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures). In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2022 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2023).

Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA. Provide these data at a minimum for children in the following six disability categories: intellectual disability, specific learning disabilities, emotional disturbance, speech or language impairments, other health impairments, and autism. If a State has identified disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories other than these six disability categories, the State must include these data and report on whether the State determined that the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size for any racial/ethnic group.

Consider using multiple methods in calculating disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups to reduce the risk of overlooking potential problems. Describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation.

Provide the number of districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories and the number of those districts identified with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

10 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	0.00%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

256

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	142	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met target	No Slippage

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

Define "disproportionate representation." Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

A LEA is determined to have disproportionate representation if, given a minimum N of 10, an LEA demonstrates a statistically significant difference in the proportion of students with disabilities of racial and ethnic groups within a specific disability category receiving special education and related services compared to the proportion of students with disabilities of all other racial and ethnic groups and in specific other disability categories receiving special education and related services in that LEA, within a 99 percent confidence interval.

Using a minimum N of 10 and a 99 percent confidence interval, a test of difference between proportions was used to measure statistically significant differences between the special education identification rate for students of a specific racial and ethnic group and specific disability category, and the special education identification rate for all other students within that LEA. Target data show that none one of the 398 LEAs demonstrated a statistically significant difference, resulting in determination of disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services. The minimum N of 10 is applied to the numerator of this equation - that is, if a LEA does not have at least 10 students with disabilities in a particular racial/ethnic category and specific disability category, the data is not reviewed for that LEA.

Of the 398 districts in Montana for the 2022-2023 school year, 142 met the minimum N in at least one of the racial groups and were included in the calculations for that racial group. A total of 256 LEAs did not meet the minimum N in any of the racial groups reviewed and were excluded from all calculations.

Describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate overrepresentation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

The state did not identify any districts with a disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories for the 2022-2023 school year. However, had the state identified any districts, the following procedures would have been utilized to ensure that the identification was not the result of inappropriate identification.

If a LEA is flagged for disproportionate representation, a review of the practices, policies, and procedures is completed, results of on-site compliance monitoring, and dispute resolution data are reviewed to determine if the disproportionate representation is due to inappropriate identification . The district is informed of the results of the review.

The LEA reviews included:
-- Interviews with Administration;
-- Review of the most current Program Narratives and Policies;
-- Review of two SPED files (including ERs and IEPs) from the district;
-- Review of Child Count data; and
-- Consideration of the most current monitoring data.
Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

10 - OSEP Response

10 - Required Actions

Indicator 11: Child Find

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

Compliance indicator: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system and must be based on actual, not an average, number of days. Indicate if the State has established a timeline and, if so, what is the State's timeline for initial evaluations.

Measurement

> a. # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.
> b. # of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline).
> Account for children included in (a), but not included in (b). Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.
>
> Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100.

Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Note that under 34 CFR §300.301(d), the timeframe set for initial evaluation does not apply to a public agency if: (1) the parent of a child repeatedly fails or refuses to produce the child for the evaluation; or (2) a child enrolls in a school of another public agency after the timeframe for initial evaluations has begun, and prior to a determination by the child's previous public agency as to whether the child is a child with a disability. States should not report these exceptions in either the numerator (b) or denominator (a). If the State-established timeframe provides for exceptions through State regulation or policy, describe cases falling within those exceptions and include in b.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

11 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	93.00%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	97.91%	99.44%	100.00%	95.93%	Not Valid and Reliable

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

(a) Number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received	(b) Number of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline)	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
36	36	Not Valid and Reliable	100%	100.00%	Met target	N/A

Number of children included in (a) but not included in (b)

0

Account for children included in (a) but not included in (b). Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.

Indicate the evaluation timeline used:

The State used the 60 day timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

State monitoring

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.

The OPI collected the indicator data as a part of its compliance monitoring procedures during the 2022-2023 school year. Compliance monitors reviewed   a sampling of student records for students who were initially referred for a special education evaluation. Monitors enter the date consent was received, date of the last assessment completed for the evaluation and the date of the Evaluation Report meeting into the OPI Monitoring application. The system calculates the number of calendar days between the date consent was received and the date the last assessment was completed. If more than 60 calendar days passed, the monitor is prompted to enter the reason.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

11 - Prior FFY Required Actions

The State did not provide valid and reliable data for FFY 2021. The State must provide valid and reliable data for FFY 2022 in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

The SEA ensured the data provided was valid and reliable by having multiple agency staff review the data. The SEA has implemented internal controls to verify the data matches with what is written in addition to having IDC, an OSEP funded technical assistance center, review the work as well.

11 - OSEP Response

11 - Required Actions

Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.

Measurement

        a. # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.
        b. # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays.
        c. # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
        d. # of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR   §300.301(d) applied.
        e. # of children determined to be eligible for early intervention services under Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.
        f. # of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34   CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.

Account for children included in (a), but not included in b, c, d, e, or f. Indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed, and the reasons for the delays.

Percent = [(c) divided by (a - b - d - e - f)] times 100.

Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Targets must be 100%.

Category f is to be used only by States that have an approved policy for providing parents the option of continuing early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

12 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	67.00%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	97.73%	93.67%	97.62%	93.94%	89.09%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	169
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	31
c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	80
d. Number for whom parent refusals to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.	35
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	17
f. Number of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.	1

Measure	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3 who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	80	85	89.09%	100%	94.12%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Number of children who served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination that are not included in b, c, d, e, or f

5

Account for children included in (a), but not included in b, c, d, e, or f. Indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed, and the reasons for the delays.

The five children included in (a), but not in b, c, d, e, or f were from five different LEAs. The range of days beyond the third birthday to when the child was determined eligible and an IEP was in place, was 28 to 68 days. Three of the LEAs reported that they did not make the timeline due to not receiving the referral from Part C in a timely enough manner to have eligibility determined and/or an IEP in place by the 3rd birthday . One LEA reported staffing issues (availability of OT and PT to conduct the assessments needed to determine eligibility) as the reason. Lastly, one LEA reported they incorrectly entered the child's birthday in their system and did not realize it until too late to get the determination done by the 3rd birthday. All 5 LEAs were able to demonstrate compliance with other children who were referred by Part C in the same federal fiscal year.

Attach PDF table (optional)

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.

The OPI uses a census-level data collection for this indicator. The Part C Lead Agency submits data through a secure data file transfer system, regarding all children referred to a school district to the OPI. The OPI collates this data and verifies the referral through the statewide student database system. This system contains documentation of the referral, the eligibility determination and, if the child is eligible, the student's IEP. This allows the OPI to determine district compliance with the Part C to Part B transition requirements. By using this method, the OPI can account for all children in the state who transition from Part C to Part B.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

For FFY 2021, at the time of this data collection, the evaluation process and IEP development had occurred for the children for whom the eligibility determination had not been made or an IEP developed by their third birthday. All instances of noncompliance with this requirement had been corrected in a timely manner. The LEAs that had an identified instance of noncompliance were required to provide subsequent documentation of 100 percent compliance with the Part C to Part B transition requirements. For

each of these LEAs, their FFY2022 data demonstrated that they did understand the requirements of IDEA, and they were able to get all determinations and IEPs written by the 3rd birthdays for children referred from a Part C Agency.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
6	6	6	-6

FFY 2021 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

The State verified that each of the five LEAs are correctly implementing the regulatory requirements by achieving 100% compliance as required with OSEP 23-01. The State required each of the LEAs to submit additional documents for children who were referred by Part C to Part B to show evidence that child was evaluated, and an IEP was implemented by the child's third birthday. This was done through the State's integrated monitoring activities and also through the Student Information System (SIS). All documents were submitted within the one-year timeline. It was determined that each instance of noncompliance was an isolated instance.

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

The State continues to review each individual case of noncompliance by requiring the LEA to submit the corrections to the SEA. Once those corrections are made, the LEA is required to submit additional documentation that the assessments and evaluation were completed, and an IEP was implemented before the child's third birthday. The SEA does child specific monitoring, and the LEAs are required to make all corrections for any item to be found noncompliant and then the LEA is required to submit additional documentation, related to the original findings, before the LEA is found to be in 100% compliance as required with OSEP 23-01.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

12 - Prior FFY Required Actions

The State did not report that it identified any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance. In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must report how it verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2020: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2021, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

The required actions in FFY21 SPP/APR required the State demonstrate that each LEA corrected the findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 SPP/APR. The SEA identified 4 findings in FFY 2020.

The SEA did verify that each of the three LEAs where the four findings of noncompliance were identified, the LEAs are correctly implementing the regulatory requirements by achieving 100% compliance as required in OSEP 23-01. The State required each of

the LEAs to submit additional documents for children who were referred by Part C to Part B to show evidence that child was evaluated, and an IEP was implemented by the child's third birthday. This was done through the State's integrated monitoring activities and also through the Student Information System (SIS). All documents were submitted within the one-year timeline. It was determined that each instance of noncompliance was an isolated instance. One LEA did not receive the referral from Part C until 10 days before the child's third birthday and the other two LEAs reported that staff was not able to assess the children due to being quarantined because of COVID.

The State continues to review each individual case of noncompliance by requiring the LEA to submit the corrections to the SEA. Once those corrections are made, the LEA is required to submit additional documentation that the assessments and evaluation were completed, and an IEP was implemented before the child's third birthday. The SEA does child specific monitoring, and the LEAs are required to make all corrections for any item to be found noncompliant and then the LEA is required to submit additional documentation, related to the original findings, before the LEA is found to be in 100% compliance as required in OSEP 23-01.

12 - OSEP Response

The State did not demonstrate that each LEA corrected the findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 and FFY 2020 because it did not report that it verified correction of those findings, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. Specifically, the State did not report that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 and FFY 2020 is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA.

12 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2022, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for this indicator. In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, that the remaining six (6) uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021, and the remaining four (4) uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 were corrected. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 and each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 and FFY 2020 is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. In the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022, although its FFY 2022 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022.

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency that is likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services, including, if appropriate, pre-employment transition services, was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.

 (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency that is likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services, including, if appropriate, pre-employment transition services, was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority) divided by the (# of youth with an IEP age 16 and above)] times 100.

If a State's policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16, the State may, but is not required to, choose to include youth beginning at that younger age in its data for this indicator. If a State chooses to do this, it must state this clearly in its SPP/APR and ensure that its baseline data are based on youth beginning at that younger age.

Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

13 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2009	85.30%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	98.68%	69.03%	73.53%	72.37%	48.98%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth aged 16 and above with IEPs that contain each of the required components for secondary transition	Number of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
57	69	48.98%	100%	82.61%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

State monitoring

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.

The SEA collected the indicator data as a part of its compliance monitoring procedures during the 2022-2023 school year. Compliance monitors reviewed a sampling of student records for students, ages 16 and older, to ensure their IEPs include appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age-appropriate transition assessments, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet their postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition service needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP team meeting where transition services were to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency that is likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services, including, if appropriate, pre-employment transition services, was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.

Question	Yes / No
Do the State's policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16?	NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
25	25	25	-25

FFY 2021 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

The State verified that each of the LEAs are correctly implementing the regulatory requirements by achieving 100% compliance as required in OSEP 23-01. The State required each of the LEAs to submit additional secondary transition IEPs. This was done through the State's integrated monitoring activities and also through the Student Information System (SIS). All documents were submitted within the one-year timeline. It was determined that each instance of noncompliance was an isolated instance.

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

The State continues to review each individual case of noncompliance by requiring the LEA to submit the corrections to the SEA. Once those corrections are made, the LEA is required to submit additional secondary transition IEPs. The SEA does child specific monitoring, and the LEAs are required to make all corrections for any item to be found noncompliant and then the LEA is required to submit additional documentation, related to the original findings, before the LEA is found to be in 100% compliance as required in OSEP 23-01.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
FFY 2020	11	11	0

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

FFY 2020

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

The State verified that each of the LEAs are correctly implementing the regulatory requirements by achieving 100% compliance as required in OSEP 23-01. The State required each of the LEAs to submit additional secondary transition IEPs. This was done through the State's integrated monitoring activities and also through the Student Information System (SIS). All documents were submitted within the one-year timeline. It was determined that each instance of noncompliance was an isolated instance.

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

The State continues to review each individual case of noncompliance by requiring the LEA to submit the corrections to the SEA. Once those corrections are made, the LEA is required to submit additional secondary transition IEPs. The SEA does child specific monitoring, and the LEAs are required to make all corrections for any item to be found noncompliant and then the LEA is required to submit additional documentation, related to the original findings, before the LEA is found to be in 100% compliance as required in OSEP 23-01.

13 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2021, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that the remaining 11 uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 were corrected. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 and each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2020: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

The OPI reviewed individual student records to verify LEA's child find and evaluation/re-evaluation processes and procedures meet the IDEA requirements and Montana's Administrative Rules.
Compliance monitoring activities consisted of:
• Review of a sampling of individual student records to examine current practices and documentation;
• Review of district policy, practices, and procedures;
• Visit selected schools, when appropriate; and
• Communication with individual teachers and specialists to discuss records, when appropriate.

All identified noncompliance is recorded, verified, and accounted for through a process of:

• Notification to the district of all identified noncompliance;
• Required correction of all identified noncompliance as per OSEP's 23-01 memo on general supervision;
• District submission of up-dated data verifying 100 percent post-monitoring compliant policy, practice, and procedure;
• Timely issuance of findings, including corrective actions, for uncorrected identified noncompliance. Each finding cites a specific regulation, either federal or state, and describes the nature of the noncompliance;
• Additional issuance, when appropriate, of required technical assistance, professional development and/or district submission of up-dated data verifying 100 percent post-monitoring compliance in policy, practice, and procedure for issues corrected but originally identified to a degree that is indicative of systemic concern;
• Completion of required technical assistance and professional development activities; and
• The issuance of a final report to the district upon completion of all required compliance monitoring requirements.
The OPI maintains tracking systems for compliance monitoring and due process hearings, mediation, state complaints, and other Early Assistance Program activities. The tracking systems are reviewed, on no less than a monthly basis, to ensure timelines are met and procedures are being followed. Personnel maintaining the tracking systems are responsible for ensuring program specialists are kept aware of the timelines. Program specialists follow up with the LEAs, as appropriate, to ensure corrective actions required are being completed in accord with the designated times. Using these procedures, OPI has verified that each instance of noncompliance has been corrected and the LEAs identified are now correctly implementing the regulatory requirements.

13 - OSEP Response

The State did not demonstrate that each LEA corrected the findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 and FFY 2020 because it did not report that it verified correction of those findings, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. The State did not report that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 and FFY 2020 is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA.

13 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2022, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for this indicator. In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, that the remaining 25 uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021, and the remaining 11 uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 were corrected. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 and each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 and FFY 2020 is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. In the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022, although its FFY 2022 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022.

Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Results indicator: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:

> A. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.
>
> B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.
>
> C. Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

A. Percent enrolled in higher education = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.

B. Percent enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.

C. Percent enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.

Instructions

*Sampling **of youth who had IEPs and are no longer in secondary school** is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates of the target population. (See General Instructions on page 3 for additional instructions on sampling.)*

Collect data by September 2023 on students who left school during 2021-2022, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2021-2022 or who were expected to return but did not return for the current school year. This includes all youth who had an IEP in effect at the time they left school, including those who graduated with a regular diploma or some other credential, dropped out, or aged out.

I. *Definitions*

Enrolled in higher education as used in measures A, B, and C means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis in a community college (two-year program) or college/university (four or more year program) for at least one complete term, at any time in the year since leaving high school.

Competitive employment as used in measures B and C: States have two options to report data under "competitive employment":

Option 1: Use the same definition as used to report in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, i.e., competitive employment means that youth have worked for pay at or above the minimum wage in a setting with others who are nondisabled for a period of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes military employment.

Option 2: States report in alignment with the term "competitive integrated employment" and its definition, in section 7(5) of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA). For the purpose of defining the rate of compensation for students working on a "part-time basis" under this category, OSEP maintains the standard of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This definition applies to military employment.

Enrolled in other postsecondary education or training as used in measure C, means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis for at least 1 complete term at any time in the year since leaving high school in an education or training program (e.g., Job Corps, adult education, workforce development program, vocational technical school which is less than a two-year program).

Some other employment as used in measure C means youth have worked for pay or been self-employed for a period of at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes working in a family business (e.g., farm, store, fishing, ranching, catering services).

II. *Data Reporting*

States must describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

Provide the total number of targeted youth in the sample or census.

Provide the actual numbers for each of the following mutually exclusive categories. The actual number of "leavers" who are:

  1. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school;
  2. Competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education);
  3. Enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed);
  4. In some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).

"Leavers" should only be counted in one of the above categories, and the categories are organized hierarchically. So, for example, "leavers" who are enrolled in full- or part-time higher education within one year of leaving high school should only be reported in category 1, even if they also happen to be employed. Likewise, "leavers" who are not enrolled in either part- or full-time higher education, but who are competitively employed, should only be reported under category 2, even if they happen to be enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program.

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2022 response rate to the FFY 2021 response rate), and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The State must also analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and take steps to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

III. *Reporting on the Measures/Indicators*
Targets must be established for measures A, B, and C.

Measure A: For purposes of reporting on the measures/indicators, please note that any youth enrolled in an institution of higher education (that meets any definition of this term in the Higher Education Act (HEA)) within one year of leaving high school *must* be reported under measure A. This could include youth who also happen to be competitively employed, or in some other training program; however, the key outcome we are interested in here is enrollment in higher education.

Measure B: All youth reported under measure A should also be reported under measure B, in addition to all youth that obtain competitive employment within one year of leaving high school.

Measure C: All youth reported under measures A and B should also be reported under measure C, in addition to youth that are enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program, or in some other employment.

Include the State's analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. States must include race/ethnicity in their analysis. In addition, the State's analysis must include at least one of the following demographics: disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

If the analysis shows that the response data are not representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State collected the data.

14 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Measure	Baseline	FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
A	2022	Target >=	26.90%	27.00%	15.75%	15.75%	15.85%
A	13.08%	Data	22.85%	15.51%	17.30%	12.72%	12.73%
B	2022	Target >=	73.70%	73.80%	60.75%	60.75%	60.85%
B	63.76%	Data	75.30%	60.58%	62.87%	59.36%	65.58%
C	2022	Target >=	87.30%	87.40%	79.75%	79.75%	79.85%
C	79.83%	Data	87.58%	79.57%	78.48%	73.98%	80.52%

FFY 2021 Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=		13.08%	13.18%	13.28%
Target B >=		63.76%	63.86%	63.96%
Target C >=		79.03%	79.50%	80.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Discussions and Stakeholder input of the State's Performance Plan (SPP), Annual Performance Report (APR), State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), and Results Driven Accountability (RDA)/Results Based Accountability (RBA) began in 2013 with our State Special Education Advisory Panel. The Panel is fully vested and broadly representative of Montana. Additionally, many of the panel members as well as SEA staff serve in other agency or organization leadership positions or on advisory groups in the disability community. This enables MT to draw insight and advice from a broad group of stakeholders with an understanding of Montana's unique needs, strengths, and potential weaknesses.

Other stakeholder groups we sponsor and/or engage include:
1) Our Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD) includes both regional and state councils that regularly meet to assess APR data and to evaluate professional development priorities and results.
2) The State Education Agency (SEA) staff has developed strong working relationships with other Montana agencies that serve youth and adults with disabilities. The SEA staff participate as members of advisory councils for early childhood, vocational rehabilitation, low incidence disabilities, developmental disabilities, and the state independent living council. This has strengthened the commitments of the agencies working with Montana's youth to facilitate smooth transitions from birth to adulthood.
3) Working with the Technical Assistance for Excellence in Special Education (TAESE) staff, the SEA has facilitated the Montana Higher Education Consortium (HEC). The HEC provides a mechanism for collaboration, networking, discussion, and advising of critical issues among Montana Institutes of Higher Education. The consortium works towards encouraging a more seamless educational system and merging general and special education into one unified system; understanding and promoting the use of evidence-based academic and behavioral strategies; and closely linking Montana teacher training and educational leadership programs to early childhood programs, K-12 education, and the SEA.
4) The SEA staff is engaged with the Schools Administrators of Montana (SAM) which include affiliates for Superintendents, Principals, Special Education Administrators, and Information Technology (IT) Directors. This partnership gives the SEA the opportunity to develop collaborative partnerships with the Local Education Agencies (LEAs). The SEA also provides SAM with a grant to help fund the Montana Recruitment Project. This program focuses on recruiting hard to fill positions such as speech/language pathologists, special education teachers, occupational therapists, and school psychologists for our districts.
5) Annually, the SEA brings together representatives from various stakeholder groups for a joint meeting facilitated by TAESE. This meeting brings stakeholders together to share up-dates and gather input from each other. There is a comprehensive representation of the Montana disability community, families and parents of children and students with and without disabilities.

During the FFY22 reporting period, the Student Support Services Senior Manager met with the parents and community members of the Montana School for the Deaf & Blind (MSDB) to start creating a graduate profile. In addition, our Early Assistance Program (EAP) Director presented to the parents of MSDB on the IDEA Framework (state purposes), general supervisory responsibilities and OPI's role as an SEA. The EAP Director also provided information on dispute resolution options and where at the OPI parents could go for technical assistance.

The Montana Empowerment Center and the OPI conducted various virtual presentations for parents of students with disabilities birth through age 21 and LEA staff. During the reporting period, the OPI presented on Present Levels of Academic Achievement Functional Performance (PLAAFPs), Measurable Annual Goals (MAGs), Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS), transitions, early childhood, and extended school year. Superintendent Arntzen hosted multiple community events in four geographically diverse cities across the state in December of 2022. Parents listened to the goals of legislators for education and then had the opportunity to ask questions of the legislators. Throughout the reporting period, OPI provided numerous virtual trainings for parents regarding student and school safety and supporting youth with ASD and other developmental disorders.

Annually, the OPI assists with the Montana Youth Transitions (MYT) Conference. The OPI team works in conjunction with MYT to present, coach, and mentor educators, parents, and students. This conference brings together the transition team of youth, parents, and professionals to learn strategies and resources to build a seamless transition plan from high school to the adult world. One parent stated the following, "This was my first time at the conference, and I had no idea there were so many things out there to help my son. The sessions on parenting techniques and educational tools were eye-opening, and I feel more equipped to support my child's learning journey."

In addition to the above mentioned input, the SEA meet with the Special Education Advisory Panel. Montana has chosen to reset baseline for Indicator 14 in the FFY2022 APR for two reasons: a change to the data set and updating the survey questions to increase data quality. Targets for FFY2023, FFY2024, and FFY2025 have also been reset.

Montana is changing the student data set used for indicator 14 to the Exiting Data reported in FS009. This will more closely align with the data reported in Indicators 1 and 2 and allow Montana to look at the same cohort of students when analyzing the data. Previously, Montana used the students certified in the graduation/drop out data collection as those were the students who were

reported in the adjusted cohort graduation rate and aligned to the prior data reported for Indicators 1 and 2.

Montana also updated the survey used to collect the information to remove two questions that were causing data quality concerns. The questions were difficult for the parents and students to answer, and the answers could be inferred by another question.

In the January 2023 meeting of the state Special Education Advisory Panel, Montana presented these proposed changes. After some discussion, the Advisory Panel voted to support Montana moving forward with the changes. In May 2023, the OPI met with the Advisory Panel and multiple other stakeholder groups to discuss the changes again, and to set targets for FFY2023, FFY2024, FFY2025. Because Montana did not anticipate a large change to the baseline data with the changes made, stakeholders determined that leaving the targets as previously set was appropriate, and to revisit the discussion in FFY2023 when actual baseline data is available.

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Total number of targeted youth in the sample or census	1,137
Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	803
Response Rate	70.62%
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	105
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	407
3. Number of respondent youth enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed)	48
4. Number of respondent youth who are in some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).	81

Measure	Number of respondent youth	Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	105	803	12.73%		13.08%	N/A	N/A
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	512	803	65.58%		63.76%	N/A	N/A
C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other	641	803	80.52%		79.83%	N/A	N/A

Measure	Number of respondent youth	Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
employment (1+2+3+4)							

Please select the reporting option your State is using:

Option 2: Report in alignment with the term "competitive integrated employment" and its definition, in section 7(5) of the Rehabilitation Act, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA), and 34 CFR §361.5(c)(9). For the purpose of defining the rate of compensation for students working on a "part-time basis" under this category, OSEP maintains the standard of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This definition applies to military employment.

Response Rate

FFY	2021	2022
Response Rate	70.64%	70.62%

Describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

To assess the representativeness of the respondents with respect to the population, the distribution of population subgroups among respondents was compared to the distribution in the population. Montana's threshold was +/- 3%. Response rates were also compared across groups to identify groups that may be systematically less likely to respond to the survey using a Chi-Squared test of independence to identify statistically significant differences in likelihood of responding to the survey. Montana's threshold was $p < 0.05$.

Include the State's analyses of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. States must include race/ethnicity in its analysis. In addition, the State's analysis must include at least one of the following demographics: disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

To assess the representativeness of the respondents, Montana compared the respondents to the target population of leavers that were sent the survey as required. The respondents were representative with respect to the exit reason, race/ethnicity, and disability category. Differences between respondents and the population for all categories analyzed were no larger than 2.5 percentage points.

Response rates were also compared across groups to identify groups that may be systematically less likely to respond to the survey. Since differences in response rates may be attributable to random, non-systematic factors, a Chi-Squared test of independence was used to identify statistically significant differences in likelihood of responding to the survey. Our analysis found no statistically significant differences in response rates between different race/ethnicity categories, exit reason, or across disability categories.

The response data is representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. (yes/no)

YES

If no, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.

Describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

Montana removed two questions from the survey that appeared to cause responders confusion and result in surveys not being completed. The answers to these two questions can be inferred from the answers to other questions on the survey, providing valid and reliable data for respondents, and hopefully increasing the response rate overall.

The collection of post-school outcomes is completed by each LEA, not by the SEA or an outside contractor. The SEAhas identified the LEAs that appear to be having the greatest problem with locating dropout and minority youths to survey in prior years. The

SEAcontinues to work with these specific LEAs on strategies to find and survey these youth more effectively. Moving forward, Montana will continue to make TA available to all LEAs as they work to contact students and complete the surveys.

Describe the analysis of the response rate including any nonresponse bias that was identified, and the steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

Montana worked with the IDEA Data Center (IDC) to utilize their non-response bias tool for the analysis of the FFY2022 Indicator 14 data. In that analysis we reviewed response rates by race/ethnicity (using American Indian, Hispanic, Multi-Racial, White, and grouping the others into one group as there are less than 20 students in each of those categories), disability category (using Autism, Cognitive Disability, Emotional Disturbance, Multiple Disabilities, Other Health Impairments, Specific Learning Disabilities, and grouping all other categories together into one as they all had less than 20 students in the population), and basis of exit. Analysis of representativeness of response rates indicates there is no nonresponse bias if underrepresented and overrepresented groups differ on the outcome of interest (e.g. post-secondary outcomes).

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO
Survey Question	**Yes / No**
Was a survey used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised survey?	YES
If yes, attach a copy of the survey	Pss Blank Survey 2023

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Montana worked with the IDEA Data Center (IDC) to utilize their non-response bias tool for the analysis of the FFY2022 Indicator 14 data. In that analysis we reviewed response rates by race/ethnicity (using American Indian, Hispanic, Multi-Racial, White, and grouping the others into one group as there are less than 20 students in each of those categories), disability category (using Autism, Cognitive Disability, Emotional Disturbance, Multiple Disabilities, Other Health Impairments, Specific Learning Disabilities, and grouping all other categories together into one as they all had less than 20 students in the population), and basis of exit. Analysis of representativeness of response rates indicates there is no nonresponse bias if underrepresented and overrepresented groups differ on the outcome of interest (e.g. post-secondary outcomes).

14 - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must describe strategies which are expected to increase the response rate for those groups that are underrepresented.

In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2022 data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

Montana worked with the IDEA Data Center (IDC) to utilize their non-response bias tool for the analysis of the FFY2022 Indicator 14 data. In that analysis we reviewed response rates by race/ethnicity (using American Indian, Hispanic, Multi-Racial, White, and grouping the others into one group as there are less than 20 students in each of those categories), disability category (using Autism, Cognitive Disability, Emotional Disturbance, Multiple Disabilities, Other Health Impairments, Specific Learning Disabilities, and grouping all other categories together into one as they all had less than 20 students in the population), and basis of exit. Analysis of representativeness of response rates indicates there is no nonresponse bias if underrepresented and overrepresented groups differ on the outcome of interest (e.g. post-secondary outcomes).

14 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2022, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State revised its targets for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

14 - Required Actions

Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results Indicator: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.

 (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the ED*Facts* Metadata and Process System (E*MAPS*)).

Measurement

Percent = (3.1(a) divided by 3.1) times 100.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data under IDEA section 618, explain.

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

15 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges
Target Range is used

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/15/2023	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	0
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/15/2023	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	0

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.
NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Discussions and Stakeholder input of the State's Performance Plan (SPP), Annual Performance Report (APR), State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), and Results Driven Accountability (RDA)/Results Based Accountability (RBA) began in 2013 with our State Special Education Advisory Panel. The Panel is fully vested and broadly representative of Montana. Additionally, many of the panel members as well as SEA staff serve in other agency or organization leadership positions or on advisory groups in the disability community. This enables MT to draw insight and advice from a broad group of stakeholders with an understanding of Montana's unique needs, strengths, and potential weaknesses.

Other stakeholder groups we sponsor and/or engage include:
1) Our Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD) includes both regional and state councils that regularly meet to assess APR data and to evaluate professional development priorities and results.
2) The State Education Agency (SEA) staff has developed strong working relationships with other Montana agencies that serve youth and adults with disabilities. The SEA staff participate as members of advisory councils for early childhood, vocational rehabilitation, low incidence disabilities, developmental disabilities, and the state independent living council. This has strengthened the commitments of the agencies working with Montana's youth to facilitate smooth transitions from birth to adulthood.
3) Working with the Technical Assistance for Excellence in Special Education (TAESE) staff, the SEA has facilitated the Montana Higher Education Consortium (HEC). The HEC provides a mechanism for collaboration, networking, discussion, and advising of critical issues among Montana Institutes of Higher Education. The consortium works towards encouraging a more seamless educational system and merging general and special education into one unified system; understanding and promoting the use of

evidence-based academic and behavioral strategies; and closely linking Montana teacher training and educational leadership programs to early childhood programs, K-12 education, and the SEA.

4) The SEA staff is engaged with the Schools Administrators of Montana (SAM) which include affiliates for Superintendents, Principals, Special Education Administrators, and Information Technology (IT) Directors. This partnership gives the SEA the opportunity to develop collaborative partnerships with the Local Education Agencies (LEAs). The SEA also provides SAM with a grant to help fund the Montana Recruitment Project. This program focuses on recruiting hard to fill positions such as speech/language pathologists, special education teachers, occupational therapists, and school psychologists for our districts.

5) Annually, the SEA brings together representatives from various stakeholder groups for a joint meeting facilitated by TAESE. This meeting brings stakeholders together to share up-dates and gather input from each other. There is a comprehensive representation of the Montana disability community, families and parents of children and students with and without disabilities.

During the FFY22 reporting period, the Student Support Services Senior Manager met with the parents and community members of the Montana School for the Deaf & Blind (MSDB) to start creating a graduate profile. In addition, our Early Assistance Program (EAP) Director presented to the parents of MSDB on the IDEA Framework (state purposes), general supervisory responsibilities and OPI's role as an SEA. The EAP Director also provided information on dispute resolution options and where at the OPI parents could go for technical assistance.

The Montana Empowerment Center and the OPI conducted various virtual presentations for parents of students with disabilities birth through age 21 and LEA staff. During the reporting period, the OPI presented on Present Levels of Academic Achievement Functional Performance (PLAAFPs), Measurable Annual Goals (MAGs), Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS), transitions, early childhood, and extended school year. Superintendent Arntzen hosted multiple community events in four geographically diverse cities across the state in December of 2022. Parents listened to the goals of legislators for education and then had the opportunity to ask questions of the legislators. Throughout the reporting period, OPI provided numerous virtual trainings for parents regarding student and school safety and supporting youth with ASD and other developmental disorders.

Annually, the OPI assists with the Montana Youth Transitions (MYT) Conference. The OPI team works in conjunction with MYT to present, coach, and mentor educators, parents, and students. This conference brings together the transition team of youth, parents, and professionals to learn strategies and resources to build a seamless transition plan from high school to the adult world. One parent stated the following, "This was my first time at the conference, and I had no idea there were so many things out there to help my son. The sessions on parenting techniques and educational tools were eye-opening, and I feel more equipped to support my child's learning journey."

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target >=	75.00% - 100.00%	75.00% - 100.00%			
Data	100.00%	0.00%			

Targets

FFY	2022 (low)	2022 (high)	2023 (low)	2023 (high)	2024 (low)	2024 (high)	2025 (low)	2025 (high)
Target >=								

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target (low)	FFY 2022 Target (high)	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0					N/A	N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The State reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2022. The State is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more resolution sessions were held.

15 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

15 - OSEP Response

The State reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2022. The State is not required to meet its targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more resolution sessions were held.

15 - Required Actions

Indicator 16: Mediation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3(B))

Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the ED*Facts* Metadata and Process System (E*MAPS*)).

Measurement

Percent = (2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) divided by 2.1) times 100.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of mediations is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of mediations reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data under IDEA section 618, explain.

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

16 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range is used

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/15/2023	2.1 Mediations held	4
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/15/2023	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	1
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/15/2023	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	1

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Discussions and Stakeholder input of the State's Performance Plan (SPP), Annual Performance Report (APR), State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), and Results Driven Accountability (RDA)/Results Based Accountability (RBA) began in 2013 with our State Special Education Advisory Panel. The Panel is fully vested and broadly representative of Montana. Additionally, many of the panel members as well as SEA staff serve in other agency or organization leadership positions or on advisory groups in the disability community. This enables MT to draw insight and advice from a broad group of stakeholders with an understanding of Montana's unique needs, strengths, and potential weaknesses.

Other stakeholder groups we sponsor and/or engage include:
1) Our Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD) includes both regional and state councils that regularly meet to assess APR data and to evaluate professional development priorities and results.
2) The State Education Agency (SEA) staff has developed strong working relationships with other Montana agencies that serve youth and adults with disabilities. The SEA staff participate as members of advisory councils for early childhood, vocational rehabilitation, low incidence disabilities, developmental disabilities, and the state independent living council. This has strengthened the commitments of the agencies working with Montana's youth to facilitate smooth transitions from birth to adulthood.
3) Working with the Technical Assistance for Excellence in Special Education (TAESE) staff, the SEA has facilitated the Montana Higher Education Consortium (HEC). The HEC provides a mechanism for collaboration, networking, discussion, and advising of

critical issues among Montana Institutes of Higher Education. The consortium works towards encouraging a more seamless educational system and merging general and special education into one unified system; understanding and promoting the use of evidence-based academic and behavioral strategies; and closely linking Montana teacher training and educational leadership programs to early childhood programs, K-12 education, and the SEA.

4) The SEA staff is engaged with the Schools Administrators of Montana (SAM) which include affiliates for Superintendents, Principals, Special Education Administrators, and Information Technology (IT) Directors. This partnership gives the SEA the opportunity to develop collaborative partnerships with the Local Education Agencies (LEAs). The SEA also provides SAM with a grant to help fund the Montana Recruitment Project. This program focuses on recruiting hard to fill positions such as speech/language pathologists, special education teachers, occupational therapists, and school psychologists for our districts.

5) Annually, the SEA brings together representatives from various stakeholder groups for a joint meeting facilitated by TAESE. This meeting brings stakeholders together to share up-dates and gather input from each other. There is a comprehensive representation of the Montana disability community, families and parents of children and students with and without disabilities.

During the FFY22 reporting period, the Student Support Services Senior Manager met with the parents and community members of the Montana School for the Deaf & Blind (MSDB) to start creating a graduate profile. In addition, our Early Assistance Program (EAP) Director presented to the parents of MSDB on the IDEA Framework (state purposes), general supervisory responsibilities and OPI's role as an SEA. The EAP Director also provided information on dispute resolution options and where at the OPI parents could go for technical assistance.

The Montana Empowerment Center and the OPI conducted various virtual presentations for parents of students with disabilities birth through age 21 and LEA staff. During the reporting period, the OPI presented on Present Levels of Academic Achievement Functional Performance (PLAAFPs), Measurable Annual Goals (MAGs), Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS), transitions, early childhood, and extended school year. Superintendent Arntzen hosted multiple community events in four geographically diverse cities across the state in December of 2022. Parents listened to the goals of legislators for education and then had the opportunity to ask questions of the legislators. Throughout the reporting period, OPI provided numerous virtual trainings for parents regarding student and school safety and supporting youth with ASD and other developmental disorders.

Annually, the OPI assists with the Montana Youth Transitions (MYT) Conference. The OPI team works in conjunction with MYT to present, coach, and mentor educators, parents, and students. This conference brings together the transition team of youth, parents, and professionals to learn strategies and resources to build a seamless transition plan from high school to the adult world. One parent stated the following, "This was my first time at the conference, and I had no idea there were so many things out there to help my son. The sessions on parenting techniques and educational tools were eye-opening, and I feel more equipped to support my child's learning journey."

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target >=	80.00% - 100.00%	80.00% - 100.00%			
Data	100.00%	0.00%		100.00%	

Targets

FFY	2022 (low)	2022 (high)	2023 (low)	2023 (high)	2024 (low)	2024 (high)	2025 (low)	2025 (high)
Target >=								

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Number of mediations held	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target (low)	FFY 2022 Target (high)	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
1	1	4				50.00%	N/A	N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The State reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2022. The State is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more mediations were held.

16 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

16 - OSEP Response

The State reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2022. The State is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more mediations were held.

16 - Required Actions

Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

The State's SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

Measurement

The State's SPP/APR includes an SSIP that is a comprehensive, ambitious, yet achievable multi-year plan for improving results for children with disabilities. The SSIP includes each of the components described below.

Instructions

Baseline Data*:* The State must provide baseline data that must be expressed as a percentage and which is aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) (SiMR) for Children with Disabilities.

Targets*:* In its FFY 2020 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2022, the State must provide measurable and rigorous targets (expressed as percentages) for each of the six years from FFY 2020 through FFY 2025. The State's FFY 2025 target must demonstrate improvement over the State's baseline data.

Updated Data: In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, due February 2022 through February 2027, the State must provide updated data for that specific FFY (expressed as percentages) and that data must be aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) Children with Disabilities. In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, the State must report on whether it met its target.

Overview of the Three Phases of the SSIP

It is of the utmost importance to improve results for children with disabilities by improving educational services, including special education and related services. Stakeholders, including parents of children with disabilities, local educational agencies, the State Advisory Panel, and others, are critical participants in improving results for children with disabilities and should be included in developing, implementing, evaluating, and revising the SSIP and included in establishing the State's targets under Indicator 17. The SSIP should include information about stakeholder involvement in all three phases.

Phase I: Analysis:

- Data Analysis;

- Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity;

- State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities;

- Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies; and

- Theory of Action.

Phase II: Plan (which, is in addition to the Phase I content (including any updates)) outlined above):

- Infrastructure Development;

- Support for local educational agency (LEA) Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices; and

- Evaluation.

Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation (which, is in addition to the Phase I and Phase II content (including any updates)) outlined above):

- Results of Ongoing Evaluation and Revisions to the SSIP.

Specific Content of Each Phase of the SSIP

Refer to FFY 2013-2015 Measurement Table for detailed requirements of Phase I and Phase II SSIP submissions.

Phase III should only include information from Phase I or Phase II if changes or revisions are being made by the State and/or if information previously required in Phase I or Phase II was not reported.

Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation

In Phase III, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress implementing the SSIP. This includes: (A) data and analysis on the extent to which the State has made progress toward and/or met the State-established short-term and long-term outcomes or objectives for implementation of the SSIP and its progress toward achieving the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities (SiMR); (B) the rationale for any revisions that were made, or that the State intends to make, to the SSIP as the result of implementation, analysis, and evaluation; and (C) a description of the meaningful stakeholder engagement. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

A.   Data Analysis

As required in the Instructions for the Indicator/Measurement, in its FFYs 2020 through 2025 SPPs/APRs, the State must report data for that specific FFY (expressed as actual numbers and percentages) that are aligned with the SiMR. The State must report on whether the State met its target. In addition, the State may report on any additional data (e.g., progress monitoring data) that were collected and analyzed that would suggest progress toward the SiMR. States using a subset of the population from the indicator (e.g., a sample, cohort model) should describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR if that was not described in Phase I or Phase II of the SSIP.

B.   Phase III Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

The State must provide a narrative or graphic representation, (e.g., a logic model) of the principal activities, measures and outcomes that were implemented since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., February 1, 2023). The evaluation should align with the theory of action described in Phase I and the evaluation plan described in Phase II. The State must describe any changes to the activities, strategies, or timelines described in Phase II and include a rationale or justification for the changes. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

The State must summarize the infrastructure improvement strategies that were implemented, and the short-term outcomes achieved, including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up. The State must describe the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2022 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2023, i.e., July 1, 2023-June 30, 2024).

The State must summarize the specific evidence-based practices that were implemented and the strategies or activities that supported their selection and ensured their use with fidelity. Describe how the evidence-based practices, and activities or strategies that support their use, are intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (e.g., behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes, and/or child outcomes. Describe any additional data (e.g., progress monitoring data) that was collected to support the on-going use of the evidence-based practices and inform decision-making for the next year of SSIP implementation.

C. Stakeholder Engagement

The State must describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts and how the State addressed concerns, if any, raised by stakeholders through its engagement activities.

Additional Implementation Activities

The State should identify any activities not already described that it intends to implement in the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2022 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2023, i.e., July 1, 2023-June 30, 2024) including a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes that are related to the SiMR. The State should describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

17 - Indicator Data

Section A: Data Analysis

What is the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR)?

The number and percent of American Indian students with disabilities who successfully complete their secondary education will increase.

Has the SiMR changed since the last SSIP submission? (yes/no)

NO

Is the State using a subset of the population from the indicator (*e.g.*, a sample, cohort model)? (yes/no)

NO

Is the State's theory of action new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)

NO

Please provide a link to the current theory of action.

https://opi.mt.gov/Portals/182/Page Files/Special Education/Annual Performance Report/MT_ToA_ FINAL.pdf?ver=2021-12-02-090633-033

Progress toward the SiMR

Please provide the data for the specific FFY listed below (expressed as actual number and percentages)*.*

Select yes if the State uses two targets for measurement. (yes/no)

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2013	63.50%

Targets

FFY	Current Relationship	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	Data must be greater than or equal to the target	68.70%	68.80%	68.90%	69.00%

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Number of American Indian Special Education High School Completers	Number of American Indian Special Education High School Students eligible to complete in 2021-2022	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
139	156	72.09%	68.70%	89.10%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide the data source for the FFY 2022 data.

The data for the FFY2022 Data came from the Graduation/Dropout certification taken in Fall 2022. This certification is done within Montana's statewide student information system.

Please describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR.

Data are collected within the statewide student information system and certified to the OPI through the Graduation/Dropout certification. Data is verified and analyzed by the Data Operations team of the OPI.

Optional: Has the State collected additional data *(i.e., benchmark, CQI, survey)* **that demonstrates progress toward the SiMR? (yes/no)**

NO

Did the State identify any general data quality concerns, unrelated to COVID-19, that affected progress toward the SiMR during the reporting period? (yes/no)

NO

Did the State identify any data quality concerns directly related to the COVID-19 pandemic during the reporting period? (yes/no)

NO

Section B: Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

Please provide a link to the State's current evaluation plan.

https://opi.mt.gov/Portals/182/Page Files/Special Education/Annual Performance Report/Evaluation Questions FINAL 3-26-2020.pdf?ver=2021-12-02-090632-053

Is the State's evaluation plan new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)

NO

Provide a summary of each infrastructure improvement strategy implemented in the reporting period:

Redesign Internal SEA Infrastructure to Support Intra-agency Collaboration and Coordination.

The SEA is continually enhancing and improving the internal infrastructure to support inter-agency collaboration and coordination. One vital aspect of this work is the continuation of the Knowledge Keepers of Indigenous Nations (KKIN) and their work with students, communities, and school districts. This reporting year the KKIN adopted Articles of Association to provide guidance on how to support educators serving American Indian students. The KKIN worked closely alongside the Resilience In Something Else (RISE) youth group and their dynamic interaction has infused student voice into school improvement efforts. Another aspect of the work that has been pivotal, is the addition of two American Indian Student Achievement (AISA) positions. The AISA staff provided training and support to schools serving American Indian students using evidence-based interventions like

wraparound and restorative practices, as well as promising practices centered on culture, identity, and mental wellness.

Additionally, the American Indian Task Force continued to meet monthly. This is a long-standing Task Force within the OPI. The SSIP Implementation Specialist is a member of this group. The purpose of the Task Force is to develop strategic and aligned plans among all OPI staff who work with American Indian students to promote success and wellbeing. The AISA taskforce has two goals: (1) Develop a Framework that guides districts on how to structure education that fits American Indian learners, one that is focusing on the whole child, and includes building self-identity and building on the strengths and values of the Indigenous people and their culture. (2) Develop an agency plan on how we use American Indian student data to monitor that the work we are doing with American Indian students is successful and addresses the opportunity gap.

Establish a Data Use Culture at the SEA and LEA level.

Throughout the reporting year, professional development opportunities have been provided to establish a data use culture for both the SEA and LEA Level. During the Summer Institute two sessions were offered related to using data: 1. Data Equipped & Data Informed: The Montana Early Warning System and 2. Using Your Local Data: The Montana Statewide Longitudinal Data System. Professional development was also offered through the Montana Teacher Learning Hub, the SEA's digital repository of educational-based modules across all PreK-12 topics. The self-based virtual course was titled: Building the Foundation of Data Literacy.

One of the most direct tools for effective data use in Montana is the custom-made Early Warning System hosted on the Growth and Enhancement of Montana Students (GEMS) website platform. The Early Warning System (EWS) is a system that uses live student-level data to determine the chance of a student dropping out in grades 3-12, as well as the reasons why the student is at risk. This system is free to any Montana public school and may be used at any time during the school year. Montana schools have taken advantage of the tool and utilized it to improve graduation/completion rates of students, including American Indian students with disabilities.

The SEA also offered a professional development session unique to special educators. The course was titled Data Collection – Skill Acquisition (3 hours/3 PD Units). The course content included: Why collect data? What is a task analysis and when do you need one? What are the different types of data collection and their advantages/disadvantages? When should you use or not use a specific type of data collection? Four types of prompts and how/why to record prompt data? What is "chaining" and when should you use it? How do you teach students to maintain and generalize the skills they have learned?

Provide Professional Development and Technical Assistance to implement EBPs.

The targeted TA/PD, through mentorship for one particular SSIP School District (Frazer) continued to be delivered through a collaborative partnership with the SEA's Special Education staff. District special education staff at this school district also willingly engaged in professional learning opportunities outside of the monthly TA calls, taking advantage of the SEA offerings via the Teacher Learning Hub.

Through collaboration, the special education team of a second SSIP school district (Ronan) and the Montana SSIP Director focused on content standards for computer literacy/digital competencies. The collaborative team supplemented student learning with digital exploration of math/science skills.

Introductory coding to advanced coding (dependent on student interest and skill development); digital games used to introduce, enhance, or increase math/science skills; and Invention Literacy provided the students enriching opportunities with content standards. Through this approach, students demonstrated a grasp of content standards that had previously been noted as deficiencies on their IEPs and school Special Education staff found higher rates of student engagement.

Promote American Indian Youth and Family Empowerment.

Partnering with our Tribal Relations and Resiliency Unit has brought tribal leaders, tribal education departments, tribal colleges, youth leaders, and tribal knowledge keepers to the table to gain a deeper understanding of traditional Indigenous ways of 1. Being; 2. Teaching and Learning; 3. Connecting to cultural roots/heritage; along with 4. Walking in both worlds. Gaining guidance from our Montana Tribal Nations through their leaders and knowledge keepers is the impetus for emergent steps to have their voice front and center on educational matters. The work was intentionally designed to reconnect Indigenous Youth to their self-identity while empowering staff at our schools on or near Montana reservations to immerse in traditional teachings and approaches from the communities themselves. The Tribal Relations and Resiliency Unit has connected and will continue to build relationships and understandings within the SEA and Montana school districts to incorporate tribal voice, share resources, and build connections through consultation on educational matters affecting American Indian students.

Because youth are primary collaborative partners in the Montana SSIP, SEA staff regularly seek youth input and elevate student voice through the Resilience In Something Else (RISE) youth group. RISE continues to address students' need for support and connection. This group fosters relationships across the state of Montana and continues to offer invaluable opportunities for leadership development and relationship building. Meetings are held every other week with schools across the state and the meeting agendas are youth designed and youth led. Additionally, TRRU staff provide opportunities for RISE youth to speak at major venues hosted by the SEA.

Describe the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved for each infrastructure improvement strategy during the reporting period including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Please relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up.

Redesign Internal SEA Infrastructure to Support Intra-agency Collaboration and Coordination.

Survey results from the Youth Conference between the Knowledge Keepers of Indigenous Nations (KKIN) and students, communities, and school district staff illustrate the SEA intra-agency collaboration and coordination efforts. Survey results from two questions were:

• 86.7% respondents agreed or strongly agreed that the Tribal Education Summitt provided them new ideas, resources, or strategies for supporting Montana's American Indian youth.
•　　　　93.4% agreed or strongly agreed that school(s) in their community use data in a way that is relevant to their culture and values.

　　　The SEA's AISA Taskforce was held six times for 1.5 hours during the reporting period. In attendance were on average 17 SEA staff representing various units—Special Education; Assessment; Fiscal; Teaching and Learning; AISA, TRRU; Federal Programs; School Improvement, and Health Enhancement and Safety. Professional learning and collaboration during the task force sessions, lead to SEA staff reporting an increase in their capacity to support Indigenous youth/families and the educators who serve them.

Establish a Data Use Culture at the SEA and LEA level.
　　　At the LEA level, the use of the Montana Early Warning System (EWS) enabled high school staff from two SSIP participating districts (Wolf Point and Rocky Boy), to have live data to identify students who are at-risk of dropping out of school before the drop out. The use of the EWS system is directly connected to the state SiMR to increase completion and graduation rates of American Indian students served with an IEP.

Provide Professional Development and Technical Assistance to implement EBPs.
　　　In June 2023, at the SEA sponsored Summer Institute, SSIP participating educators from Frazer, Poplar, Rocky Boy, and Wolf Point were in attendance. Sessions ranged across all aspects of holistic support for students and/or educators in both academic and behavior evidence-based practices. Special Education professional development courses were successfully completed on the Montana Learn Hub by staff from four of the SSIP participating high schools (Brockton (2), Hays/Lodge Pole (3), Poplar (9), Wolf Point (8), and Frazer (2)).

Promote American Indian Youth and Family Empowerment.
　　　RISE meetings were held every other week and attended by youth from SSIP participating high schools. The RISE group has an ongoing communication thread with over 227 participants. Through the meetings and ongoing communication, American Indian Youth are encouraged and encourage each other to pursue educational goals. The Tribal Student Achievement, Relations, and Resiliency Unit or TSARR has worked throughout the reporting period to build relationships and understandings within the SEA and Montana school districts to incorporate Tribal voice, share resources and build connections through consultation on matters affecting American Indian students.

Did the State implement any <u>new</u> (newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategies during the reporting period? (yes/no)
NO

Provide a summary of the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.
Based on observations, experiences, and data within the four infrastructure improvement strategies, next steps include:
1. Interagency stakeholders incorporating the local resources of tribal communities into educational programs for students.
2.　　　Increasing the use of the Early Warning System among high schools predominantly serving American Indian students. The use of EWS allows district staff to identify students at risk in a timely manner to prevent drop-out and improve the likelihood of high school completion.
3.　　　Increasing the capacity of Montana tribal leaders, knowledge keepers, LEA leadership, and students to understand and use data to make informed decisions for American Indian students with disabilities.
4. Continuing to provide training opportunities that develop cultural perspectives of historical Indigenous Restorative Justice practice efforts.
5.　　　Continuing to develop the Professional Learning Communities (PLC) and Personalized Learning Networks (PLN) that seek to build and strengthen the capacity of special education teachers to meet the needs of students.
6. Through collaboration and communication infrastructure efforts, building awareness and the need to empower American Indian students to reconnect to their identity and build pathways to high school completion.

List the selected evidence-based practices implement in the reporting period:
Professional Learning Community (PLC)

Provide a summary of each evidence-based practices.
Montana utilizes a Professional Learning Community (PLC) combined with a Professional Learning Network (PLN) to coach educators through technology within the SSIP target schools. The identified PLC/PLN was developed by the SEA based on research from Rock (2019) in his The eCoaching Continuum for Educators: Using Technology to Enrich Professional Development and Improve Students Outcomes (2019). Montana has called their PLC/PLN the Critical Friends' Network (CFN). The PLC is based on the premise that professional development offered through a Professional Learning Community (PLC) or Personalized Learning Network (PLN) provides the reciprocity for educators to share and learn strategies to support their students with special needs. Five features of effective professional development are utilized in the PLC: content focus (studying subject matter); active learning (observing, reviewing, discussing); coherence (demonstrating consistency with knowledge, beliefs, policies, and reforms); duration (engaging in 20 or more hours of contact time spread over a semester); and collective participation (interacting and conversing with colleagues). (Rock, 2019)
　　　The Critical Friends' Network (CFN) started in the NE Region of Montana in March of 2021. The NE Region is comprised of the following school districts: Wolf Point, Frazer, Poplar, Brockton (all within the Fort Peck Reservation), Hays/Lodge Pole (within

the Fort Belknap Reservation), and Rocky Boy (within the Rocky Boy Reservation). In October of 2022, a district in the Western region became a Montana SSIP site, Ronan School District (Flathead Reservation).

Rock, M. (2019). The eCoaching Continuum for Educators: Using Technology to Enrich Professional

Development and Improve Student Outcomes. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

Provide a summary of how each evidence-based practice and activities or strategies that support its use, is intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (e.g. behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes, and/or child /outcomes.

The CFN enhances the capacity of educators to utilize high impact strategies, practices, and interventions which increases educator effectiveness to improve teaching and learning strategies. This includes improved intentional planning of culturally relevant curriculum, instructional practices, use of formative and summative data to guide instruction, and building pathways to post-secondary readiness. Ultimately, these educators will have schoolwide practices, teaching, and learning that are responsive to students needs and culture, leading to increased completion rates of American Indian students with disabilities. The CFN will also strengthen the capacity of educators to cultivate and maintain positive, inclusive, safe, and empowering school environments. It will emphasize the importance of elevating student voice, youth leadership and advocacy, as well as promote the use of MTSS to ensure the school structure addresses the needs of American Indian students with disabilities. This will enable educators to utilize restorative approaches to build strong relationships and learning environments. The CFN will help students have improved attendance rates, participation in school activities, reduce discipline rates. Ultimately educators will have a systematic approach to identify students at risk of dropping out of school, applying targeted interventions based on student needs and tracking interventions over time to determine if they are working.

The chosen content of inclusion is the guiding topic for Critical Friends' Network (CFN) discussions. To encourage transformational skill building and learning for Indigenous students with disabilities, the subtopic of Invention Literacy is also offered to MT SSIP schools as a TA/PD focus area. Aligning with SEA priorities, the MT SSIP began introducing TA/PD focused on math instructional practices, particularly in the development of Number Sense and the 8 mathematical themes identified in the NAEP research (Wu, et. al., 2020). While all TA/PD offered focuses on best practices for special education identified Indigenous youth, these practices cross over to all youth served in a school setting.

The basic structure of the CFN remains the same: invitation only, regionally based, and composed of special education teachers in SSIP schools residing on or near Montana reservations with a primary student population of Indigenous youth. The delivery method is virtual and occurs monthly for 1-hour.

Wu, K., Chaphalker, R., Hecker, M., & Lask, E. (2020). Hidden Strengths of American Indian and Alaska
Native Students in Mathematics as Measured by the National Assessment of   Educational Progress. Journal of American Indian Education, 59(2–3), 7–32.

Describe the data collected to monitor fidelity of implementation and to assess practice change.

Survey questions aligned to rubrics are utilized to monitor the fidelity of implementation of the CFN. The rubrics are adapted from Killion's (2008) book, Assessing Impact: Evaluating Staff Development (2nd Ed.). Rubric selection is based on the following criteria: 1) it is a continuum of growth; 2) doesn't require administering on a regular basis but at random check points; 3) demonstrates a partnership in the process as well as an opt out; 4) and it is qualitative in nature staying clear of quantifying professional relationships and growing together to better serve students.

Past reporting periods indicated the CFN participants had a comfort level with inclusionary practices at 2s, 3s, and 4s. Past reporting periods open-ended responses indicated the lower comfort level with inclusionary practices was due to a lack of understanding inclusionary practices across school staff. The rubric responses this reporting year show growth on the continuum with comfort level with inclusionary practices being noted at 2, 4, and 7. The current open-ended response indicates certified staff, including reading coaches and counselors, have enhanced their ability to utilize more inclusionary practices.

Reference: Killion, J. (2008). Assessing Impact: Evaluating Staff Development (2nd Ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Describe any additional data (e.g. progress monitoring) that was collected that supports the decision to continue the ongoing use of each evidence-based practice.
N/A

Provide a summary of the next steps for each evidence-based practices and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.
The SEA plans to use the next steps during the next reporting period:
1. Expand outreach of the CFN beginning in the fall of 2023.
2. Realign the focus of the CFN to build capacity with the LEAs as described above.
3. Provide targeted professional learning to SSIP schools on how to utilize the Early Warning System to gather data on risk factors leading to drop-out.
4. Strengthen and utilize tribal consultations for district and school leaders to expand engagement efforts to ensure students, families, communities, and tribal councils are invested partners in increasing the completion rates of American Indian students with

disabilities.
5. Work towards implementation of the differentiated monitoring process to help the SEA and LEAs use the data from the monitoring process to determine next steps aligned to the SiMR.

Does the State intend to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications? (yes/no)

NO

If no, describe any changes to the activities, strategies or timelines described in the previous submission and include a rationale or justification for the changes.

Based on continual achievement of the targets in the MT SiMR, the SEA intends to utilize the SSIP process to address other indicators and areas of need. The SEA has initiated the process to establish a new SiMR and SSIP with both the advisory panel and OSEP TA providers. In May of 2023, during a joint stakeholder session, data was reviewed, and areas of improvement were considered to begin establishing a new SiMR. The SEA intends to have the new SiMR identified and SSIP drafted during the next reporting cycle.

Section C: Stakeholder Engagement

Description of Stakeholder Input

Discussions and Stakeholder input of the State's Performance Plan (SPP), Annual Performance Report (APR), State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), and Results Driven Accountability (RDA)/Results Based Accountability (RBA) began in 2013 with our State Special Education Advisory Panel. The Panel is fully vested and broadly representative of Montana. Additionally, many of the panel members as well as SEA staff serve in other agency or organization leadership positions or on advisory groups in the disability community. This enables MT to draw insight and advice from a broad group of stakeholders with an understanding of Montana's unique needs, strengths, and potential weaknesses.

Other stakeholder groups we sponsor and/or engage include:
1) Our Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD) includes both regional and state councils that regularly meet to assess APR data and to evaluate professional development priorities and results.
2) The State Education Agency (SEA) staff has developed strong working relationships with other Montana agencies that serve youth and adults with disabilities. The SEA staff participate as members of advisory councils for early childhood, vocational rehabilitation, low incidence disabilities, developmental disabilities, and the state independent living council. This has strengthened the commitments of the agencies working with Montana's youth to facilitate smooth transitions from birth to adulthood.
3) Working with the Technical Assistance for Excellence in Special Education (TAESE) staff, the SEA has facilitated the Montana Higher Education Consortium (HEC). The HEC provides a mechanism for collaboration, networking, discussion, and advising of critical issues among Montana Institutes of Higher Education. The consortium works towards encouraging a more seamless educational system and merging general and special education into one unified system; understanding and promoting the use of evidence-based academic and behavioral strategies; and closely linking Montana teacher training and educational leadership programs to early childhood programs, K-12 education, and the SEA.
4) The SEA staff is engaged with the Schools Administrators of Montana (SAM) which include affiliates for Superintendents, Principals, Special Education Administrators, and Information Technology (IT) Directors. This partnership gives the SEA the opportunity to develop collaborative partnerships with the Local Education Agencies (LEAs). The SEA also provides SAM with a grant to help fund the Montana Recruitment Project. This program focuses on recruiting hard to fill positions such as speech/language pathologists, special education teachers, occupational therapists, and school psychologists for our districts.
5) Annually, the SEA brings together representatives from various stakeholder groups for a joint meeting facilitated by TAESE. This meeting brings stakeholders together to share up-dates and gather input from each other. There is a comprehensive representation of the Montana disability community, families and parents of children and students with and without disabilities.

During the FFY22 reporting period, the Student Support Services Senior Manager met with the parents and community members of the Montana School for the Deaf & Blind (MSDB) to start creating a graduate profile. In addition, our Early Assistance Program (EAP) Director presented to the parents of MSDB on the IDEA Framework (state purposes), general supervisory responsibilities and OPI's role as an SEA. The EAP Director also provided information on dispute resolution options and where at the OPI parents could go for technical assistance.

The Montana Empowerment Center and the OPI conducted various virtual presentations for parents of students with disabilities birth through age 21 and LEA staff. During the reporting period, the OPI presented on Present Levels of Academic Achievement Functional Performance (PLAAFPs), Measurable Annual Goals (MAGs), Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS), transitions, early childhood, and extended school year. Superintendent Arntzen hosted multiple community events in four geographically diverse cities across the state in December of 2022. Parents listened to the goals of legislators for education and then had the opportunity to ask questions of the legislators. Throughout the reporting period, OPI provided numerous virtual trainings for parents regarding student and school safety and supporting youth with ASD and other developmental disorders.

Annually, the OPI assists with the Montana Youth Transitions (MYT) Conference. The OPI team works in conjunction with MYT to present, coach, and mentor educators, parents, and students. This conference brings together the transition team of youth, parents, and professionals to learn strategies and resources to build a seamless transition plan from high school to the adult world. One parent stated the following, "This was my first time at the conference, and I had no idea there were so many things out there to help my son. The sessions on parenting techniques and educational tools were eye-opening, and I feel more equipped to support my child's learning journey."

In May of 2023, the SEA brought together the Special Education Advisory Panel along with stakeholders from other agencies, parents, Montana Empowerment Center, Disability Rights Montana, and school district and cooperative special education directors. The State Director of Special Education presented the 17 indicators and asked for feedback on all of them. In particular, the stakeholders wanted to include math. Aligning with the SEA and stakeholder input, the MT SSIP began introducing TA/PD focused on math instructional practices, particularly in the development of Number Sense and the 8 mathematical themes identified in the NAEP research.

Describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts.

A presentation of all indicators was presented to the stakeholders during our Joint Stakeholders meeting in May of 2023. The SEA showed past indicator results and compared them to current results. Once the information was shared, the stakeholders broke into small table discussions. They were tasked with reviewing all the data again, asked to discuss the data provided, and as a group write down one to two areas of improvement the SEA could work on. As a facilitator, TAESE gathered all information and provided it back to the State Special Education Director in a summary. Once all feedback was received, the Director determined adding math instructional practices to the SSIP was an area the SEA could work on to improve completion rates for Native American Students with disabilities.

Were there any concerns expressed by stakeholders during engagement activities? (yes/no)

YES

Describe how the State addressed the concerns expressed by stakeholders.

The stakeholders were primarily concerned with the math assessment scores among our Native American population. These concerns were addressed by adding training and professional development in math instructional strategies among our SSIP schools.

Additional Implementation Activities

List any activities not already described that the State intends to implement in the next fiscal year that are related to the SiMR.

N/A

Provide a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes for these activities that are related to the SiMR.

N/A

Describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).

17 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

17 - OSEP Response

17 - Required Actions

Certification

Instructions

Choose the appropriate selection and complete all the certification information fields. Then click the "Submit" button to submit your APR.

Certify

I certify that I am the Chief State School Officer of the State, or his or her designee, and that the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report is accurate.

Select the certifier's role:

Designated by the Chief State School Officer to certify

Name and title of the individual certifying the accuracy of the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report.

Name:

Danni McCarthy

Title:

State Special Education Director

Email:

dmccarthy@mt.gov

Phone:

406-594-3610

Submitted on:

04/25/24 6:36:54 PM