

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: Parts I and II

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

**For reporting on
School Year 2011-12**

MONTANA



**PART I DUE THURSDAY, DECEMBER 20, 2012
PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 2013**

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

INTRODUCTION

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

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

The *ESEA* Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2011-12 consists of two Parts, Part I and Part II.

PART I

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

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

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

PART II

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

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

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 2011-12 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Thursday, December 20, 2012**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 15, 2013**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2011-12, unless otherwise noted.

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

TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

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

Initially, a state user will log onto EDEN and be provided with an option that takes him or her to the "SY 2011-12 CSPR". The main CSPR screen will allow the user to select the section of the CSPR that he or she needs to either view or enter data. After selecting a section of the CSPR, the user will be presented with a screen or set of screens where the user can input the data for that section of the CSPR. A user can only select one section of the CSPR at a time. After a state has included all available data in the designated sections of a particular CSPR Part, a lead state user will certify that Part and transmit it to the Department. Once a Part has been transmitted, ED will have access to the data. States may still make changes or additions to the transmitted data, by creating an updated version of the CSPR. Detailed instructions for transmitting the SY 2011-12 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART I**

For reporting on
School Year 2011-12



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 20, 2012
5PM EST**

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

STANDARDS OF ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

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

1.1.1 Academic Content Standards

Indicate below whether your state has made or is planning to make revisions to or change the State's academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science since the State's content standards were most recently approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. If yes, indicate specifically in what school year your State implemented or will implement the revisions or changes.

<u>State has revised or changed</u>	No revisions or changes to academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science made or planned.		
	State has revised or changed its academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science or is planning to make revisions to or change its academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Indicate below the year these changes were or will be implemented or GÇ£Not ApplicableGÇ¥ to indicate that changes were not made or will not be made in the subject area.		
Acceptable responses are a school year (e.g., 2011-12) or Not Applicable.			
	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Academic Content Standards	2011-12	2011-12	Not Applicable

If the responses above do not fully describe revisions or changes to your State's academic achievement standards, describe the revisions or changes below.

The response is limited to 1,000 characters

Pursuant to Administrative Rules of Montana 10.53.104 Standards Review Schedule (1) Montana's content standards shall be reviewed and revised on a recurring schedule. (2) A schedule for review of content standards shall be established as a collaborative process with the Office of Public Instruction and the Board of Public Education with input from representatives of accredited schools. The schedule shall ensure that each program area is reviewed and revised at regular intervals.(3)The standards review process shall use context information, criteria, processes, and procedures identified by the Office of Public Instruction with input from representatives of accredited schools. In September 2011 the Board of Public Education (BPE) adopted Montana's Common Core Standards for English Language Arts and Literacy in History/Social Studies, Science and Technical Subjects. In November 2011 the BPE adopted Montana's Common Core Standards for Mathematics and Mathematical Practices. Implemented 2011.

1.1.1.1 Academic Achievement Standards in Mathematics, Reading/Language Arts and Science

Indicate below whether your state has changed or is planning to change the State's academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science since the State's academic achievement standards were most recently approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. If yes, indicate specifically in what school year your State implemented or will implement the changes.

As applicable, include changes to academic achievement standards based on any assessments (e.g., alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards, alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards, native language assessments, or others) implemented to meet the assessment requirements under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA.

	No revisions or changes to academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science made or planned.
	State has changed its academic achievement standards or is planning to change its academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Indicate below either the school year in which these changes were or will be implemented or GÇ£Not ApplicableGÇ¥ to indicate that changes were not made or will not be made in the subject area.

Acceptable responses are a school year (e.g., 2011-12) or Not Applicable.

Academic Achievement Standards for	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Regular Assessments in Grades 3-8	2014-15	2014-15	Not applicable
Regular Assessments in High School	2014-15	2014-15	Not applicable
Alternate Assessments Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards (if applicable)	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable
Alternate Assessments Based on Modified Achievement Standards (if applicable)	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable
Alternate Assessments Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	2014-15	2014-15	Not applicable

If the responses above do not fully describe revisions or changes to your State's academic achievement standards, describe the revisions or changes below.

The response is limited to 1,000 characters

1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts and Science

Indicate below whether your state has changed or is planning to change the State's academic assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts or science since the State's academic assessments were most recently approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. If yes, indicate specifically in what school year your State implemented or will implement the changes.

As applicable, include any assessments (e.g., alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards, alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards, native language assessments, or others) implemented to meet the assessment requirements under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA.

	No changes to assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts or science made or planned.
<u>State has revised or changed</u>	State has changed or is planning to change its assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Indicate below the year these changes were implemented or GÇ£Not ApplicableGÇ¥ to indicate that changes were not made or will not be made in the subject area.

Acceptable responses are a school year (e.g., 2011-12) or Not Applicable.

Academic Assessments	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Regular Assessments in Grades 3-8	2014-2015	2014-2015	Not Applicable
Regular Assessments in High School	2014-2015	2014-2015	Not Applicable
Alternate Assessments Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards (if applicable)	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Alternate Assessments Based on Modified Achievement Standards (if applicable)	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Alternate Assessments Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	2014-2015	2014-2015	Not Applicable

If the responses above do not fully describe revisions or changes to your State's academic achievement standards, describe the revisions or changes below.

The response is limited to 1,000 characters

Changes for Math and Reading / Language Arts / Literacy are planned for the transition to the Montana Common Core State Standards and the implementation of the Smarter Balanced developed assessments in 2014-15.

1.1.3 Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities

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

For funds your State had available under *ESEA* section 6111 (Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities) during SY 2011-12, estimate what percentage of the funds your State used for the following (round to the nearest ten percent).

Purpose	Percentage (rounded to the nearest ten percent)
To pay the costs of the development of the State assessments and standards required by section 1111(b)	70.00
To administer assessments required by section 1111(b) or to carry out other activities described in section 6111 and other activities related to ensuring that the State's schools and local educational agencies are held accountable for the results	30.00
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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

For funds your State had available under *ESEA* section 6111 (Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities) during SY 2011-12 that were used for purposes other than the costs of the development of the State assessments and standards required by section 1111(b), for what purposes did your State use the funds? (Enter "yes" for all that apply and "no" for all that do not apply).

Purpose	Used for Purpose (yes/no)
Administering assessments required by section 1111(b)	<u>Yes</u>
Developing challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards and aligned assessments in academic subjects for which standards and assessments are not required by section 1111 (b)	<u>No</u>
Developing or improving assessments of English language proficiency necessary to comply with section 1111(b)(7)	<u>Yes</u>
Ensuring the continued validity and reliability of State assessments, and/or refining State assessments to ensure their continued alignment with the State's academic content standards and to improve the alignment of curricula and instructional materials	<u>Yes</u>
Developing multiple measures to increase the reliability and validity of State assessment systems	<u>No</u>
Strengthening the capacity of local educational agencies and schools to provide all students the opportunity to increase educational achievement, including carrying out professional development activities aligned with State student academic achievement standards and assessments	<u>Yes</u>
Expanding the range of accommodations available to students with limited English proficiency and students with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) to improve the rates of inclusion of such students, including professional development activities aligned with State academic achievement standards and assessments	<u>Yes</u>
Improving the dissemination of information on student achievement and school performance to parents and the community, including the development of information and reporting systems designed to identify best educational practices based on scientifically based research or to assist in linking records of student achievement, length of enrollment, and graduation over time	<u>Yes</u>
Other	<u>No</u>
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

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

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

1.2.1 Participation of all Students in Mathematics Assessment

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

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	74,646	74,117	99.29
American Indian or Alaska Native	9,322	9,205	98.74
Asian	759	754	99.34
Black or African American	994	987	99.30
Hispanic or Latino	2,778	2,756	99.21
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	247	243	98.38
White	60,546	60,172	99.38
Two or more races	0	0	0.00
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	8,664	8,413	97.10
Limited English proficient (<i>LEP</i>) students	1,953	1,922	98.41
Economically disadvantaged students	32,548	32,253	99.09
Migratory students	190	190	100.00
Male	38,460	38,152	99.20
Female	36,186	35,965	99.39

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Mathematics Assessment

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	2,673	31.77
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	5,006	59.50
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	734	8.72
Total	8,413	
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	74,632	74,093	99.28
American Indian or Alaska Native	9,324	9,216	98.84
Asian	753	746	99.07
Black or African American	989	976	98.69
Hispanic or Latino	2,776	2,751	99.10
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	246	242	98.37
White	60,544	60,162	99.37
Two or more races	0	0	0.00
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	8,665	8,386	96.78
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,936	1,901	98.19
Economically disadvantaged students	32,542	32,228	99.04
Migratory students	190	190	100.00
Male	38,458	38,149	99.20
Female	36,174	35,944	99.36
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. For the purposes of AYP, Montana does not use a multiracial, 2 or more, races.			

1.2.3.1 Recently Arrived LEP Students Taking ELP Assessments in Lieu of Reading/Language Arts Assessments

In the table below, provide the number of recently arrived LEP students (as defined in 34 C.F.R. Part 200.6(b)(4)) included in the participation counts in 1.2.3 and 1.3.2.1 who took an assessment of English language proficiency in lieu of the State's reading/language arts assessment, as permitted under 34 C.F.R. Part 200.20.

Recently arrived LEP students who took an assessment of English language proficiency in lieu of the State's reading/language arts assessment	17
--	----

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

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

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	2,688	32.05
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	4,964	59.19
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	734	8.75
LEP < 12 months, took ELP	1	0.01
Total	8,387	
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Since we exclude First Year LEP students from the reading assessment for the purposes of AYP, we did not include the single first year LEP student as a participant.		

1.2.5 Participation of All Students in the Science Assessment

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	31,817	31,539	99.13
American Indian or Alaska Native	3,784	3,705	97.91
Asian	316	315	99.68
Black or African American	380	377	99.21
Hispanic or Latino	1,137	1,127	99.12
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	109	108	99.08
White	26,091	25,907	99.29
Two or more races	0	0	0.00
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	3,541	3,473	98.08
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	747	730	97.72
Economically disadvantaged students	13,037	12,879	98.79
Migratory students	69	69	100.00
Male	16,365	16,206	99.03
Female	15,452	15,333	99.23
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. For the purposes of AYP, Montana does not use a multiracial, 2 or more, races.			

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

1.2.6 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Science Assessment

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	1,237	35.62
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	1,918	55.23
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	318	9.16
Total	3,473	
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

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

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

1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics

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

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

1.3.1.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	10,730	7,756	72.28
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,454	663	45.60
Asian	116	89	76.72
Black or African American	153	94	61.44
Hispanic or Latino	416	258	62.02
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	30	24	80.00
White	8,561	6,628	77.42
Two or more races	0	0	0.00
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,341	583	43.48
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	390	113	28.97
Economically disadvantaged students	5,205	3,207	61.61
Migratory students	28	16	57.14
Male	5,521	4,027	72.94
Female	5,209	3,729	71.59
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Districts update their AIM data at any time to reflect changes in student status, such as LEP to former LEP, newly identified students, etc., which may not allow time for the AIM snapshot data to be correctly adjusted, resulting in students listed as LEP who don't take the ELP assessment, and students not listed as LEP taking the ELP.			

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

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	10,694	9,025	84.39
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,452	954	65.70
Asian	113	100	88.50
Black or African American	148	123	83.11
Hispanic or Latino	415	322	77.59
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	30	27	90.00
White	8,536	7,499	87.85
Two or more races	0	0	0.00
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,310	747	57.02
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	381	190	49.87
Economically disadvantaged students	5,176	3,982	76.93
Migratory students	28	22	78.57
Male	5,499	4,527	82.32
Female	5,195	4,498	86.58
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Districts update their AIM data at any time to reflect changes in student status, such as LEP to former LEP, newly identified students, etc., which may not allow time for the AIM snapshot data to be correctly adjusted, resulting in students listed as LEP who don't take the ELP assessment, and students not listed as LEP taking the ELP.			

1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Montana does not collect these data.			

1.3.1.2 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	10,658	7,382	69.26
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,465	599	40.89
Asian	108	89	82.41
Black or African American	141	86	60.99
Hispanic or Latino	402	253	62.94
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	46	34	73.91
White	8,496	6,321	74.40
Two or more races	0	0	0.00
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,280	481	37.58
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	339	82	24.19
Economically disadvantaged students	5,152	2,985	57.94
Migratory students	27	14	51.85
Male	5,457	3,780	69.27
Female	5,201	3,602	69.26
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Districts update their AIM data at any time to reflect changes in student status, such as LEP to former LEP, newly identified students, etc., which may not allow time for the AIM snapshot data to be correctly adjusted, resulting in students listed as LEP who don't take the ELP assessment, and students not listed as LEP taking the ELP.			

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

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	10,646	9,095	85.43
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,463	943	64.46
Asian	109	98	89.91
Black or African American	140	112	80.00
Hispanic or Latino	399	324	81.20
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	45	36	80.00
White	8,490	7,582	89.31
Two or more races	0	0	0.00
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,269	728	57.37
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	335	136	40.60
Economically disadvantaged students	5,146	3,987	77.48
Migratory students	27	18	66.67
Male	5,448	4,574	83.96
Female	5,198	4,521	86.98
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Districts update their AIM data at any time to reflect changes in student status, such as LEP to former LEP, newly identified students, etc., which may not allow time for the AIM snapshot data to be correctly adjusted, resulting in students listed as LEP who don't take the ELP assessment, and students not listed as LEP taking the ELP.			

1.3.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	10,659	7,259	68.10
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,466	566	38.61
Asian	109	84	77.06
Black or African American	141	79	56.03
Hispanic or Latino	399	217	54.39
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	46	29	63.04
White	8,498	6,284	73.95
Two or more races	0	0	0.00
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,290	581	45.04
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	339	67	19.76
Economically disadvantaged students	5,154	2,885	55.98
Migratory students	27	16	59.26
Male	5,457	3,794	69.53
Female	5,202	3,465	66.61
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Districts update their AIM data at any time to reflect changes in student status, such as LEP to former LEP, newly identified students, etc., which may not allow time for the AIM snapshot data to be correctly adjusted, resulting in students listed as LEP who don't take the ELP assessment, and students not listed as LEP taking the ELP.			

1.3.1.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	10,695	7,853	73.43
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,354	598	44.17
Asian	115	93	80.87
Black or African American	161	96	59.63
Hispanic or Latino	426	272	63.85
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	42	35	83.33
White	8,597	6,759	78.62
Two or more races	0	0	0.00
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,295	467	36.06
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	266	60	22.56
Economically disadvantaged students	4,959	3,080	62.11
Migratory students	32	19	59.38
Male	5,445	4,008	73.61
Female	5,250	3,845	73.24

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Changing and moving student populations affect the outcome of these students.

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

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	10,676	9,431	88.34
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,353	920	68.00
Asian	111	102	91.89
Black or African American	159	131	82.39
Hispanic or Latino	425	365	85.88
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	43	38	88.37
White	8,585	7,875	91.73
Two or more races	0	0	0.00
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,278	743	58.14
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	260	119	45.77
Economically disadvantaged students	4,949	4,023	81.29
Migratory students	32	28	87.50
Male	5,437	4,675	85.98
Female	5,239	4,756	90.78

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Changing and moving student populations affect the outcome of these students.

1.3.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Montana does not collect these data.			

1.3.1.4 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	10,472	7,240	69.14
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,338	587	43.87
Asian	108	85	78.70
Black or African American	130	77	59.23
Hispanic or Latino	393	221	56.23
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	31	22	70.97
White	8,472	6,248	73.75
Two or more races	0	0	0.00
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,198	323	26.96
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	274	64	23.36
Economically disadvantaged students	4,630	2,648	57.19
Migratory students	39	22	56.41
Male	5,438	3,785	69.60
Female	5,034	3,455	68.63
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Districts update their AIM data at any time to reflect changes in student status, such as LEP to former LEP, newly identified students, etc., which may not allow time for the AIM snapshot data to be correctly adjusted, resulting in students listed as LEP who don't take the ELP assessment, and students not listed as LEP taking the ELP.			

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

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	10,463	9,301	88.89
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,337	961	71.88
Asian	108	102	94.44
Black or African American	128	105	82.03
Hispanic or Latino	391	325	83.12
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	31	29	93.55
White	8,468	7,779	91.86
Two or more races	0	0	0.00
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,194	683	57.20
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	271	131	48.34
Economically disadvantaged students	4,619	3,804	82.36
Migratory students	39	31	79.49
Male	5,436	4,679	86.07
Female	5,027	4,622	91.94
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Districts update their AIM data at any time to reflect changes in student status, such as LEP to former LEP, newly identified students, etc., which may not allow time for the AIM snapshot data to be correctly adjusted, resulting in students listed as LEP who don't take the ELP assessment, and students not listed as LEP taking the ELP.			

1.3.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Montana does not collect these data.			

1.3.1.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	10,709	7,232	67.53
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,355	539	39.78
Asian	101	77	76.24
Black or African American	166	88	53.01
Hispanic or Latino	396	233	58.84
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	32	23	71.88
White	8,659	6,272	72.43
Two or more races	0	0	0.00
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,175	299	25.45
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	264	48	18.18
Economically disadvantaged students	4,601	2,517	54.71
Migratory students	22	12	54.55
Male	5,558	3,663	65.91
Female	5,151	3,569	69.29

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Changing and moving student populations affect the outcome of these students.

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

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	10,723	9,601	89.54
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,359	985	72.48
Asian	99	93	93.94
Black or African American	166	139	83.73
Hispanic or Latino	395	350	88.61
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	32	28	87.50
White	8,672	8,006	92.32
Two or more races	0	0	0.00
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,176	704	59.86
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	261	118	45.21
Economically disadvantaged students	4,604	3,831	83.21
Migratory students	22	19	86.36
Male	5,571	4,808	86.30
Female	5,152	4,793	93.03

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Changing and moving student populations affect the outcome of these students.

1.3.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Montana does not collect these data.			

1.3.1.6 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	10,608	6,968	65.69
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,192	414	34.73
Asian	94	70	74.47
Black or African American	118	50	42.37
Hispanic or Latino	397	203	51.13
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	32	24	75.00
White	8,775	6,207	70.74
Two or more races	0	0	0.00
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,178	267	22.67
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	240	30	12.50
Economically disadvantaged students	4,262	2,178	51.10
Migratory students	22	10	45.45
Male	5,439	3,537	65.03
Female	5,169	3,431	66.38

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Changing and moving student populations affect the outcome of these students.

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

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	10,628	9,295	87.46
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,199	791	65.97
Asian	94	81	86.17
Black or African American	118	99	83.90
Hispanic or Latino	398	335	84.17
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	32	28	87.50
White	8,787	7,961	90.60
Two or more races	0	0	0.00
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,195	603	50.46
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	243	70	28.81
Economically disadvantaged students	4,275	3,386	79.20
Migratory students	22	18	81.82
Male	5,451	4,593	84.26
Female	5,177	4,702	90.82

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

1.3.3.6 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	10,621	7,093	66.78
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,196	420	35.12
Asian	94	68	72.34
Black or African American	118	60	50.85
Hispanic or Latino	397	206	51.89
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	32	20	62.50
White	8,784	6,319	71.94
Two or more races	0	0	0.00
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,205	348	28.88
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	241	24	9.96
Economically disadvantaged students	4,271	2,240	52.45
Migratory students	22	12	54.55
Male	5,446	3,648	66.98
Female	5,175	3,445	66.57
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Data not available.			

1.3.1.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - High School

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	10,245	6,189	60.41
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,047	325	31.04
Asian	112	86	76.79
Black or African American	118	44	37.29
Hispanic or Latino	326	149	45.71
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	30	10	33.33
White	8,612	5,575	64.74
Two or more races	0	0	0.00
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	946	219	23.15
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	149	9	6.04
Economically disadvantaged students	3,444	1,563	45.38
Migratory students	20	11	55.00
Male	5,294	3,242	61.24
Female	4,951	2,947	59.52

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Changing and moving student populations affect the outcome of these students.

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

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	10,263	8,605	83.84
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,053	693	65.81
Asian	112	100	89.29
Black or African American	117	91	77.78
Hispanic or Latino	328	254	77.44
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	29	25	86.21
White	8,624	7,442	86.29
Two or more races	0	0	0.00
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	964	442	45.85
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	150	42	28.00
Economically disadvantaged students	3,459	2,589	74.85
Migratory students	20	16	80.00
Male	5,307	4,280	80.65
Female	4,956	4,325	87.27

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Changing and moving student populations affect the outcome of these students.

1.3.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Science - High School

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	10,259	4,733	46.14
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,043	210	20.13
Asian	112	72	64.29
Black or African American	118	37	31.36
Hispanic or Latino	331	108	32.63
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	30	13	43.33
White	8,625	4,293	49.77
Two or more races	0	0	0.00
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	978	176	18.00
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	150	6	4.00
Economically disadvantaged students	3,454	1,115	32.28
Migratory students	20	7	35.00
Male	5,303	2,602	49.07
Female	4,956	2,131	43.00

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Changing and moving student populations affect the outcome of these students. Data not available.

1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY

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

1.4.1 All Schools and Districts Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public elementary and secondary schools and districts in the State, including charters, and the total number of those schools and districts that made AYP based on data for SY 2011-12. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2011-12	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2011-12
Schools	820	608	74.15
Districts	414	287	69.32

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

1.4.2 Title I School Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public Title I schools by type and the total number of those schools that made AYP based on data for SY 2011-12. Include only public Title I schools. Do not include Title I programs operated by local educational agencies in private schools. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2011-12	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2011-12
All Title I schools	670	479	71.49
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	235	120	51.06
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	435	359	82.53

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

1.4.3 Accountability of Districts That Received Title I Funds

In the table below, provide the total number of districts that received Title I funds and the total number of those districts that made AYP based on data for SY 2011-12. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds in SY 2011-12	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2011-12	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2011-12
337	214	63.50

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

1.4.4.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for schools in corrective action, provide the number of schools for which the listed corrective actions under *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2011-12 (based on SY 2010-11 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2011-12
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	28
Extension of the school year or school day	
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	
Replacement of the principal	
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2

In the table below, for schools in restructuring – year 2 (implementation year), provide the number of schools for which the listed restructuring actions under *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2011-12 (based on SY 2010-11 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Restructuring Action	# of Title I Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	
Reopening the school as a public charter school	
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	
Takeover the school by the State	
Other major restructuring of the school governance	9
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

School Support Unit - The unit consists of a Director, one Specialist, and a Coordinator. These positions were created at the Montana Office of Public Instruction (OPI) to continue the design and implementation of all the components of the statewide system of support. They work collaboratively with the Instructional Innovations Unit with that Director and a Specialist. Together, the four full-time staff oversees regionally the rest of these components described below. The coordinator handles all logistics and scheduling of the various components and ensures reports are proofed, finalized, and disseminated.

Scholastic Review Teams (SRT) - These teams are made up of distinguished educators who are short-term workers of the OPI. They conduct a comprehensive review and evaluation of district and school operations using the Montana Correlates and Indicators of Effective Schools (adapted from Kentucky and incorporating language from Creating Sacred Places, Beyond the Seventh Generation, an OERI funded project conducted by the National Indian School Board Association). The SRT writes a report that is then delivered in person by the OPI School Support System Specialist, with findings and recommendations that are to form the basis of the district and school continuous improvement process (and plans). All schools that have been or are currently in correction action year two (and several in corrective action year one and Improvement year one or two) have received a Scholastic Review, some of them a second follow-up review. Many of these districts are extremely high poverty and located on or near the seven American Indian reservations in Montana.

School Improvement Consultants - These are ten distinguished educators who are part-time state employees of the OPI who will spend three to five days per month on-site in the schools that are in corrective action year two or higher. They receive on-going training from the Unit Directors and Specialists at OPI plus periodic training from selected external providers. They carry out dual roles. 1) They are change facilitators who assist the district superintendent, school principals, and staff to implement the recommendations of the SRT. 2) They work directly with principals and teachers to improve instructional methodology, classroom discipline, and assist in developing professional learning communities in the school.

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

1.4.5.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for districts in corrective action, provide the number of districts in corrective action in which the listed corrective actions under ESEA were implemented in SY 2011-12 (based on SY 2010-11 assessments under Section 1111 of ESEA).

Corrective Action	# of Districts receiving Title I funds in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2011-12
Implemented a new curriculum based on State standards	73
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	0
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	0
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	0
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	0
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	0
Restructured the district	0
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2010-11 and beginning of SY 2011-12 as a corrective action)	0
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.4.7 Appeal of AYP and Identification Determinations

In the table below, provide the number of districts and schools that appealed their AYP designations based on SY 2011-12 data and the results of those appeals.

	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts	7	2
Schools	7	4
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2011-12 data was complete	08/03/12
---	----------

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

In the section below, "schools in improvement" means Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of *ESEA* for SY 2011-12.

1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2011 (SY 2011-12) Title I, Part A allocation that the SEA reserved in accordance with Section 1003(a) of *ESEA* and §200.100(a) of ED's regulations governing the reservation of funds for school improvement under Section 1003(a) of *ESEA*: 4.00 %

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

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

For SY 2011-12 there is no need to upload a spreadsheet to answer this question in the CSPR.

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

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

Section 1003(g)(8) of *ESEA* allows States to reserve up to five percent of Section 1003(g) funds for administration and to meet the evaluation and technical assistance requirements for this program. In the space below, identify and describe the specific Section 1003(g) evaluation and technical assistance activities that your State conducted during SY 2011-12.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Monitoring and oversight activities were conducted to ensure districts were expending funds according to their stated improvement strategies and action plans. Advice and assistance was provided where districts had deviated from their approved plans and spending timelines. Evaluation activities were on-going and included data on leading indicators. Funds covered salary, benefits, and travel of SIG Director (for Sec. 1003(g) funds).

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

In the space below, describe actions (if any) taken by your State in SY 2011-12 that were supported by **funds other than Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) funds** to address the achievement problems of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of *ESEA*.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Indian Education Achievement funds, appropriated by the Montana Legislature in the 2009+ session, have been used to fund "After School Grants" which included grants for two districts (four Tier I schools) with SIG funding.

1.4.9 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

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

1.4.9.1 Public School Choice

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

1.4.9.1.2 Public School Choice – Students

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

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

The number of students who applied to transfer should include:

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

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

	# Students
Eligible for public school choice	52,411
Applied to transfer	35
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	9
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.4.9.1.3 Funds Spent on Public School Choice

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

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$ 0

1.4.9.1.4 Availability of Public School Choice Options

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

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

	# LEAs
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	86

FAQs about public school choice:

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

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

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

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

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

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

1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

1.4.9.2.2 Supplemental Educational Services – Students

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

	# Students
Eligible for supplemental educational services	26,580
Applied for supplemental educational services	476
Received supplemental educational services	280
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services

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

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$ 489,577
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.5 TEACHER QUALITY

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

1.5.1 Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified

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

	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified
All classes	23,042	22,923	99.48	119	0.52
All elementary classes	12,108	12,044	99.47	64	0.53
All secondary classes	10,934	10,879	99.50	55	0.50

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

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

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

--

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

FAQs about highly qualified teachers and core academic subjects:

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

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

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

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

	Percentage
Elementary School Classes	
Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	
Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	0.10
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	99.90
Other (please explain in comment box below)	
Total	100.00

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

	Percentage
Secondary School Classes	
Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	0.10
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	99.90
Other (please explain in comment box below)	
Total	100.00

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

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

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

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

School Type	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified
Elementary Schools			
High Poverty Elementary Schools	2,509	2,504	99.80
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	2,477	2,471	99.76
Secondary Schools			
High Poverty secondary Schools	1,422	1,394	98.03
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	4,386	4,378	99.82

1.5.3.1 Poverty Quartile Breaks

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

	High-Poverty Schools (more than what %)	Low-Poverty Schools (less than what %)
Elementary schools	57.70	24.10
Poverty metric used	Free and reduced lunch percentage.	
Secondary schools	47.50	22.30
Poverty metric used	Free and reduced lunch percentage.	

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

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

1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

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

1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

1. **Types of Programs** = Types of programs described in the subgrantee's local plan (as submitted to the State or as implemented) that is closest to the descriptions in http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/files/rcd/BE021775/Glossary_of_Terms.pdf.
2. **Other Language** = Name of the language of instruction, other than English, used in the programs.

Check Types of Programs	Type of Program	Other Language
No <input type="checkbox"/>	Dual language	
No <input type="checkbox"/>	Two-way immersion	
No <input type="checkbox"/>	Transitional bilingual programs	
No <input type="checkbox"/>	Developmental bilingual	
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Heritage language	Crow; Dakota
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Sheltered English instruction	
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Structured English immersion	
No <input type="checkbox"/>	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)	
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Content-based ESL	
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Pull-out ESL	
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Other (explain in comment box below)	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Supplemental reading support.

1.6.2 Student Demographic Data

1.6.2.1 Number of ALL LEP Students in the State

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

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

Number of ALL LEP students in the State	3,319
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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

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

	#
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	2,449
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.6.2.3 Most Commonly Spoken Languages in the State

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

Language	# LEP Students
German	273
North American Indian	148
Spanish; Castilian	116
Russian	40
Uncoded languages	29

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

1.6.3 Student Performance Data

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

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

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

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	2,694
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	625
Total	3,319
<p>Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The figure of 2,694 is the LEP count taken the first Monday of October, approximately 2 months before the opening of the ELP assessment window. During that time district personnel are updating their data files, some students are no longer identified as LEP upon consideration of current data. Montana changed to a new assessment last year, the WIDA ACCESS. With the previous assessment, voided bar code labels for students who were not tested were included. We assumed that a similar process was in place to provide reasons why a student wasn't tested, but that is not part of WIDA's protocol so we were not able to capture that information. We have developed a process for collecting the information this year.</p>	

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

	#
Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	169
Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	6.27
<p>Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.</p>	

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

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

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	2,040
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	409
Total	2,449
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The figure of 2,040 is the LEP count taken the first Monday of October, approximately 2 months before the opening of the ELP assessment window. During that time district personnel are updating their data files, some students are no longer identified as LEP upon consideration of current data. Montana changed to a new assessment last year, the WIDA ACCESS. With the previous assessment, voided bar code labels for students who were not tested were included. We assumed that a similar process was in place to provide reasons why a student wasn't tested, but that is not part of WIDA's protocol so we were not able to capture that information. We have developed a process for collecting the information this year.	
In the table below, provide the number of Title III students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time and whose progress cannot be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO 1. Report this number ONLY if the State did not include these students in establishing AMAO 1/ making progress target and did not include them in the calculations for AMAO 1/ making progress (# and % making progress).	
	#
Number of Title III students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time whose progress cannot be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO 1.	435

1.6.3.2.2 Title III LEP English Language Proficiency Results

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

Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:

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

In the table below, provide the State targets for the number and percent of students making progress and attaining English proficiency for this reporting period. Additionally, provide the results from the annual State English language proficiency assessment for Title III-served LEP students who participated in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12. If your State uses cohorts, provide us with the range of targets, (i.e., indicate the lowest target among the cohorts, e.g., 10% and the highest target among a cohort, e.g., 70%).

	Results		Targets	
	#	%	#	%
Making progress	345	21.50	881	36.00
Attained proficiency	112	5.49	49	2.00
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.				

1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments

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

1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language

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

State offers the State reading/language arts content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
State offers the State mathematics content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
State offers the State science content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.6.3.5.2 Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given

In the table below, report the language(s) in which native language assessments are given for *ESEA* accountability determinations for mathematics.

Language(s)
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students

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

1.6.3.6.1 Title III Served MFLEP Students by Year Monitored

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

Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) students include:

- Students who have transitioned out of a language instruction educational program.
- Students who are no longer receiving LEP services and who are being monitored for academic content achievement for 2 years after the transition.

Table 1.6.3.6.1 Definitions:

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

# Year One	# Year Two	Total
31	11	42
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

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

Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
13	1	7.69	12
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.6.3.6.3 MFLEP Students Results for Reading/Language Arts

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

Table 1.6.3.6.3 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
13	6	46.15	7
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.6.3.6.4 MFLEP Students Results for Science

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

Table 1.6.3.6.4 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
10	1	10.00	9
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.6.4 Title III Subgrantees

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

1.6.4.1 Title III Subgrantee Performance

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

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

	#
# - Total number of subgrantees for the year	62
# - Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	1
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	16
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	30
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	2
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	7
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2010-11 and 2011-12)	2
# - Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2011-12 for not meeting Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years	0
# - Number of subgrantees that have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2008-09, 2009-10, 2010-11, and 2011-12)	0

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

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. 7 Consortia members have individual AMAO determinations.

1.6.4.2 State Accountability

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

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

State met <u>all</u> three Title III AMAOs	<u>No</u>
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.6.4.3 Termination of Title III Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

Were any Title III language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> activities terminated for failure to reach program goals?	<u>No</u>
If yes, provide the number of language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> activities for immigrant children and youth terminated.	
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students

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

Note: All immigrant students are not LEP students.

1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students

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

Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:

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

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants
170	99	3

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development

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

1.6.6.1 Teacher Information

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

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

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

	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	338
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	5

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

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

Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:

1. **Professional Development Topics** = Subgrantee professional development topics required under Title III.
2. **#Subgrantees** = Number of subgrantees who conducted each type of professional development activity. A subgrantee may conduct more than one professional development activity. (Use the same method of counting subgrantees, including consortia, as in 1.6.1 and 1.6.4.)
3. **Total Number of Participants** = Number of teachers, administrators and other personnel who participated in each type of the professional development activities reported.
4. **Total** = Number of all participants in professional development (PD) activities.

Type of Professional Development Activity	# Subgrantees	
Instructional strategies for LEP students	29	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	1	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	6	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards		
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	8	
Other (Explain in comment box)		
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	13	824
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	11	164
PD provided to principals	12	98
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	9	29
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	11	182
PD provided to community based organization personnel	6	52
Total	62	1,349

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities

This section collects data on State grant activities.

1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process

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

Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:

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

Example: State received SY 2011-12 funds July 1, 2011, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2011, for SY 2011-12 programs. Then the "# of days/\$\$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
07/01/11	07/01/11	0
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

1.6.7.2 Steps To Shorten the Distribution of Title III Funds to Subgrantees

In the comment box below, describe how your State can shorten the process of distributing Title III funds to subgrantees.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The e-grant system NCLB application opened June 29, 2011.

1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS

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

	#
Persistently Dangerous Schools	0
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS PROGRAM

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

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

	#	# LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	408	408
LEAs with subgrants	10	10
Total	418	418
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

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

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

1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youths

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

Age/Grade	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	3	7
K	66	125
1	50	135
2	36	148
3	49	108
4	41	94
5	27	99
6	29	88
7	23	83
8	28	78
9	28	99
10	27	67
11	23	57
12	42	102
Ungraded		
Total	472	1,290

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Montana does not have ungraded students.

1.9.1.2 Primary Nighttime Residence of Homeless Children and Youths

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

	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	50	291
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	250	733
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	131	49
Hotels/Motels	41	217
Total	472	1,290

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

1.9.2.1 Homeless Children and Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

Age/Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by Subgrants
Age Birth Through 2	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	7
K	130
1	141
2	153
3	114
4	101
5	101
6	90
7	84
8	81
9	99
10	66
11	56
12	106
Ungraded	0
Total	1,329

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

1.9.2.2 Subgroups of Homeless Students Served

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

	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied homeless youth	116
Migratory children/youth	0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	299
Limited English Proficient (LEP) students	125

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

1.9.3 Academic Achievement of Homeless Students

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

1.9.3.1 Reading Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient
3	98	57
4	80	53
5	82	60
6	76	54
7	70	50
8	65	53
High School	52	32

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

1.9.3.2 Mathematics Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient
3	98	42
4	80	43
5	82	36
6	76	36
7	70	31
8	65	28
High School	52	14

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

1.9.3.3 Science Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient
3		
4	80	36
5		
6		
7		
8	65	29
High School	52	8

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

1.10 MIGRANT CHILD COUNTS

This section collects the Title I, Part C, Migrant Education Program (MEP) child counts which States are required to provide and may be used to determine the annual State allocations under Title I, Part C. The child counts should reflect the reporting period of September 1, 2011 through August 31, 2012. This section also collects a report on the procedures used by States to produce true, accurate, and valid child counts.

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

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

FAQs on Child Count:

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

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

1.10.1 Category 1 Child Count

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number by age/grade of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, resided in your State for one or more days during the reporting period of September 1, 2011 through August 31, 2012. This figure includes all eligible migrant children who may or may not have participated in MEP services. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

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

Age/Grade	12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	139
K	69
1	57
2	46
3	68
4	66
5	76
6	75
7	71
8	62
9	60
10	60
11	64
12	31
Ungraded	1
Out-of-school	23
Total	968
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.10.1.1 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Category 1 Child Count represents 43 more children identified in the 2011-12 Child Count compared with the previous year, for a total of 968 or 4.65% increase.

1.10.2 Category 2 Child Count

In the table below, enter by age/grade the unduplicated statewide number of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, were served for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods that occurred within the reporting period of September 1, 2011 through August 31, 2012. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. Count a child who moved to different schools within the State and who was served in both traditional summer and year-round school intersession programs only once. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

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

Age/Grade	Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	136
K	59
1	50
2	36
3	58
4	59
5	63
6	61
7	66
8	54
9	56
10	52
11	59
12	10
Ungraded	1
Out-of-school	18
Total	838
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.10.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Category 2 Child Count represents a 7.30% increase (57 children more than the previous year) in the number of children identified and served during the summer session. This is due primarily to a larger and longer cherry harvest.

1.10.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures

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

1.10.3.1 Student Information System

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The state of Montana utilizes the New Generation System (NGS) as its primary source of Child Count data compilation. The NGS was the primary source used for the previous year Child Count (2010-11); it was used for both the Category 1 and Category 2 Child Count for the 2011-12 submission.

1.10.3.2 Data Collection and Management Procedures

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The data for the Category 2 count were collected and maintained in the same manner that the data for the Category 1 count were collected and maintained. That is, core eligibility, family history and demographic data is collected by trained recruiters through a direct family interview and documented on a Certificate of Eligibility (COE) which complies with all of the National COE requirements. Data is collected throughout the reporting period between September 1, 2011 and August 31, 2012. Data are then entered into the NGS database by trained data entry personnel and reviewed by local and state data administrators. Project Sites also use NGS to run data checks and various reports throughout the reporting period prior to submitting final data to the SEA. The data are organized within NGS to reflect all eligibility information required by statute and obtained during the interview which has been documented on the COE. Each COE is validated and checked for accuracy by the local project director and the SEA Data Administrator.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

The SEA Data Administrator is the only person who can enter a Migrant Status designation in the Montana student information system, Achievement in Montana (AIM), during the regular school term. In this way, only students with a valid COE on file at the SEA can be designated as migrant during the regular school term, when migrant children are spread throughout the state in more than 50 LOAs. The academic achievement information from AIM regarding migrant students enrolled during the regular term is then entered into NGS by the State Data Administrator.

All required demographic, academic and health files for students enrolled in the Montana MEP are contained in NGS and uploaded into MSIX.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

1.10.3.3 Methods Used To Count Children

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

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

SELECTION CRITERIA

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

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

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

- For the summer/intersession (Category 2) counts, the report includes enrollments with a summer or intersession type of enrollment.

Below is an example of the criteria used to gather the data from the database: For these examples, the YR1 and YR2 are used to represent the school year selection. For example, for the 2011-12 school year option, YR1=2011 and YR2=2012. For the QAD criteria, YR3 represents a date three years prior to the school year date. In order for a student to be eligible for this count, he/she must have made a move within three years. For example, if we are using the school year 2011-12, Yr3=2009. The data for the count is retrieved using the following criteria:

Enrollment Date Information:

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

Birthdate Information:

- The student must be between 3 and 21 years 11 months old to be counted.
- If the student turns 3 during the school year and the enrollment date is greater than birthdate or enrollment is less than birthdate and withdrawal date is greater than birthdate or residency verification date between 9/1/YR1 and 8/31/YR2 and greater than birthdate.

- The Maximum History ID or most current History ID for students meeting above criteria is used.

Criteria for Selecting the Summer Session Students:

- The students are selected by the State, Region or District.

Enrollment Date Information:

- The Enrollment Date is NOT null (no data entered) and Enrollment Type is equal to "I" (intersession) and the difference between the QAD and Enrollment Date is less than or equal to three years and Enrollment Date is between 9/1/YR1 and 8/31/YR2 OR
- The Enrollment Type is equal to 'S' (Summer) and the QAD is greater than 5/14/YR3 and the Enrollment Date is between 5/15/YR2 and 8/31/YR2.
- The child must have an instructional or supplemental service.
- The Termination Reason does not equal 'G' (Graduated), 'E' (GED) or 'D' (Deceased) and the Termination Date is greater than 8/31/YR2.

Birthdate Information:

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The same system was used to generate both counts, NGS as described above.

1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

As part of the on-going quality control process that the SEA has crafted to ensure the accuracy of the state's MEP eligibility determinations, policy was established which conforms with the Prospective Re-Interviewing regulation (Section 200.89(b))

(2) which states that these re-interviews are conducted annually on current year eligibility determinations using a small sample size of approximately 50 randomly selected COEs. The actual number of COEs selected for re-interviewing depends upon the number of children in the project and the type of mobility patterns to which the families conform according to the guidance provided. Last year the Montana MEP contracted with an out of state independent contractor to perform a comprehensive re-interviewing of children migrating between Washington and Montana; no eligibility errors were reported by the contractor.

Following is a summary report which presents an overview of the process used by the MT MEP for 2011-12:

TIMELINE and PROCESSES

Following procedures outlined in the Technical Assistance Guide on Re-Interviewing, the Data Quality Team determined that it would complete a two prong approach which would include migrant students identified in a particular district program within the last 36 months and who comprised that district's regular term and summer term migrant child counts. The regular term re-interviews were conducted at the end of May, 2012 by the state recruiter who is not associated in any way with the particular district selected. The state recruiter is highly trained in Identification and Recruitment and has worked in Migrant Education for over 30 years. In addition, he is trained in the re-interviewing process and familiar with both the geographical and cultural aspects of the district. It was the hope of the team, that in as many instances as possible, face to face re-interviews would be conducted. However, due to the large geographical area which makes up this district, some telephone re-interviews were conducted. Parents throughout the state were informed of the possibility of re-interviewing at the time of the initial interview as suggested in the Guide to Re-Interviewing provided by OME. A random sample of COEs from that district's summer program were also selected for prospective re-interviewing and completed by the state recruiter at the close of the summer program. The unique student counts for the district selected for prospective re-interviewing were 188 children identified during the regular term and 148 children identified during the summer term. It was the Data Team's objective to complete 20 re-interviews in total using a stratified random sample which allowed for non-responses. Students were randomly selected through a sequence generator using the resources of random.org and the MT COE numbers for each of the families. Below is a detail of the District's Migrant Child Counts:

Huntley, Unique student count Huntley, Unique student count
for Regular School Year 2011-12 for Summer 2011-12

Grade/Age Regular Count Grade/Age Summer Count

3-5 20 3-5 18

K 13 K 12

1 11 1 9

2 9 2 8

3 15 3 10

4 19 4 16

5 13 5 12

6 17 6 15

7 13 7 11

8 10 8 9

9 12 9 11

10 10 10 6

11 10 11 8

12 11 12 1

UG 0 UG 0

OS 5 OS 2

Total 188 Total 148

The state recruiter conducted re-interviews for the target set of 20 unduplicated COEs by August of 2012. His findings included only 1 error in eligibility concerning a qualifying activity on a horse farm that was found to be primarily recreational, rather than agricultural in nature, though at the initial time of the interview some of the horses were used in the herding of cattle. The worker's role changed by the time of the re-interview and it was decided to remove the child from the migrant count. All of the 20 interviews were done in person except for two replacement re-interviews which were conducted by phone. The confidence rate of this sample is well within the 95% range. As a result of the error, training regarding qualifying activities was conducted at the annual Summer Institute and it was clarified that horses used for recreational purposes do not constitute a qualifying activity. The second part of the MT MEP's two-prong approach to re-interviewing and data quality control, once again concentrated on the MT MEP's most mobile population with current qualifying moves. This approach includes sending copies of MT COES for all Washington based migrant children to the Washington State Migrant Student Data and Records (MSDR) office for Washington. Washington state trained recruiters use data from these COEs in locating families in Washington and conducting their initial interviewing process. A total of 543 children who were recruited in the 2012 Flathead Valley Migrant Project were from Washington State. Breakdowns of the statistics are below:

States/Districts of Migration to Flathead Valley

CA 16
Brewster 2
Magdoel 3
Porterville 11
CO 4
Denver 4
MI 2
West Plains 2
MT 6
Kalispell 4
Dayton 2
NE 1
Omaha 1
Oregon 1
The Dalles 1
Texas 1
Atascosa 1
WA 543
Benton City 5
Beverly 4
Buena 1
Ephrata 10
Grandview 85
Granger 29
Harrah 2
Hood river 4
Kennewick 24
Mabton 23
Mattawa 13
Moses Lake 2
Moveo 1
Moxee 2
Outlook 31
Pasco 7
Prosser 24
Royal City 1
Schawana 3
Selah 6
Spokane 4
Sunnyside 151
Toppenish 14
Union Gap 1
Wapato 59
Yakima 31
Zillah 6
Grand Total 574

Washington State trained recruiters fluent in Spanish were used to conduct a second tier of interviews for MT COEs from the 2012 summer program. The results of each of those interviews were recorded in the WA MSDR system. To date, no substantive differences were reported between information recorded on the original MT COE and the information found in subsequent WA MEP interviews. In the past, if discrepancies were found, they were immediately reported to the MT SEA by WA MSDR staff, investigated and, when necessary, acted upon. This methodology is the most transparent, cost-effective, and efficient method for re-interviewing that a state like Montana is able to implement given the shortness of the harvesting season and the interstate nature of the moves. It is also an excellent example of interstate coordination and student information exchange.

RE-INTERVIEWING QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Did you or your family (or part of your family) leave your home temporarily (move) to do agricultural work during the last three years?
2. If yes, what kind of agricultural work were you looking for?
3. What kind of agricultural work did you obtain?
4. If you were unable to find agricultural work, what was the reason?

5. Where did you move from? (City, State)
6. Where did you move to? (City, State)
7. When did you move? (approx. Month/Day/Year)
8. Who made the move? (List all family members who moved)
9. Does/Did this work in agriculture play an important part in providing a living for you or your family?

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

At all project areas with significant numbers of eligible children, data is entered into NGS by trained data entry specialists; for those with fewer than 30 children, data is entered by the state Migrant Data Specialist who works closely with the state recruiter regarding these children and all others. NGS provides discrete and aggregate data on individual identification, age, residency dates, qualifying move dates, and other information pertinent to defining terms of eligibility. NGS also provides each student with a unique identification number, pertinent school history, academic information and/or supportive services (s) information. These NGS electronic records are then transmitted via the Internet to the succeeding school districts within the NGS consortium for use with placement, credit accrual, testing, and/or health information. Additionally data checks are performed when data is entered into AIM (state student information system) No consolidation of data occurs. Checks are also completed when data is uploaded and consolidated in MSIX. A comprehensive ID and R manual has been updated and distributed to all sub-grantees and recruiters.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Montana MEP will seek to correct any errors in identification, recruitment and the subsequent Child Count process by continuous and on-going recruiter training, quality control checks at the local and state level which include random sampling

and re-interviewing. A zero level defect rate is sought as the Identification and Recruitment goal and every effort toward that end is and continues to be made. If any errors are detected, an immediate termination of the student data in question is made, notifications to parents and schools are immediately sent and migrant program services are terminated.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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