

**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 2014-15



PART I DUE THURSDAY, DECEMBER 17, 2015
PART II DUE THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 11, 2016

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202

PRIVACY PROTECTED VERSION

SOME DATA IN THIS REPORT HAVE BEEN SUPPRESSED OR BLURRED TO PROTECT STUDENT PRIVACY.

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) 2014-15 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 2014-15 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Thursday, December 17, 2015**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Thursday, February 11, 2016**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2014-15, 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 2014-15 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 2014-15 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | | OMB Number: 1810-0724 |
| | | Expiration Date: 5/31/2018 |
| Consolidated State Performance Report For State Formula Grant Programs under the Elementary And Secondary Education Act as amended in 2001 | | |
| Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: <input type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2014-15 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2014-15 | | |
| Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report: Montana Office of Public Instruction | | |
| Address: PO Box 202501 Helena, MT 59620-2501 | | |
| Person to contact about this report: | | |
| Name: Nancy Coopersmith | | |
| Telephone: (406) 444-5541 | | |
| Fax: (406) 444-1373 | | |
| e-mail: ncoopersmith@mt.gov | | |
| Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Denise Juneau, State Superintendent | | |
| | | Thursday, February 11, 2016, 6:19:27 PM |
| Signature _____ | | Date |

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART II**

For reporting on
School Year 2014-15



**PART II DUE FEBRUARY 11, 2016
5PM EST**

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

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

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

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

2.1.1.1 Student Achievement in Mathematics in Schoolwide Schools (SWP)

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

| Grade | # Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or above Proficient | Percentage at or above Proficient |
|-------------|---|---|-----------------------------------|
| 3 | 3,699 | S | 40.6 |
| 4 | 3,457 | S | 35.1 |
| 5 | 3,465 | S | 31.4 |
| 6 | 2,919 | S | 29 |
| 7 | 2,727 | S | 31 |
| 8 | 2,737 | S | 28 |
| High School | 1,449 | S | 25 |
| Total | 20,453 | S | 32.3 |

Comments: We entered data for Student Achievement in Mathematics in Schoolwide Schools (SWP) for CSPR Part II; however, the corresponding information is empty in CSPR Part I because the data was not available when we submitted the CSPR Part I on January 16, 2015. The data was available for the CSPR Part II. We will enter the missing data in CSPR Part I when it reopens in February 2016.

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

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

| Grade | # Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or above Proficient | Percentage at or above Proficient |
|-------------|---|---|-----------------------------------|
| 3 | 3,073 | S | 37.7 |
| 4 | 3,050 | S | 39.3 |
| 5 | 3,148 | S | 44.2 |
| 6 | 2,742 | S | 38 |
| 7 | 2,544 | S | 38 |
| 8 | 2,583 | S | 40 |
| High School | 1,309 | S | 51 |
| Total | 18,449 | S | 40.5 |

Comments: We entered data for Student Achievement in Reading/Language Arts in Schoolwide Schools (SWP) for CSPR Part II; however, the corresponding information is empty in CSPR Part I because the data was not available when we submitted the CSPR Part I on January 16, 2015. The data was available for the CSPR Part II. We will enter the missing data in CSPR Part I when it reopens in February 2016.

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

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

| Grade | # Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or above Proficient | Percentage at or above Proficient |
|-------------|---|---|-----------------------------------|
| 3 | 3,012 | S | 55.6 |
| 4 | 2,874 | S | 42 |
| 5 | 2,838 | S | 39 |
| 6 | 3,178 | S | 37.5 |
| 7 | 3,003 | S | 41.1 |
| 8 | 3,301 | S | 37.7 |
| High School | 3,059 | S | 36.9 |
| Total | 21,265 | S | 41.4 |

Comments: We entered data for Student Achievement in Mathematics in Targeted Assistance Schools (TAS) for CSPR Part II; however, the corresponding information is empty in CSPR Part I because the data was not available when we submitted the CSPR Part I on January 16, 2015. That data was available for the CSPR Part II. We will enter the missing data in CSPR Part I when it reopens in February 2016.

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

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

| Grade | # Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or above Proficient | Percentage at or above Proficient |
|-------------|---|---|-----------------------------------|
| 3 | 2,570 | S | 51 |
| 4 | 2,588 | S | 46 |
| 5 | 2,598 | S | 54 |
| 6 | 2,962 | S | 48 |
| 7 | 2,819 | S | 51 |
| 8 | 2,910 | S | 47 |
| High School | 2,832 | S | 60 |
| Total | 19,279 | S | 50.9 |

Comments: We entered data for Student Achievement in Reading/Language Arts in Targeted Assistance Schools (TAS) for CSPR Part II; however, the corresponding information is empty in CSPR Part I because the data was not available when we submitted the CSPR Part I on January 16, 2015. That data was available for the CSPR Part II. We will enter the missing data in CSPR Part I when it reopens in February 2016.

2.1.2 Title I, Part A Student Participation

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

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

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

| Special Services or Programs | # Students Served |
|--|--------------------------|
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 7,732 |
| Limited English proficient students | 2,681 |
| Students who are homeless | 1,277 |
| Migratory students | 148 |
| Comments: | |

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

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

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

| Race/Ethnicity | # Students Served |
|---|--------------------------|
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 13,224 |
| Asian | 377 |
| Black or African American | 585 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 2,718 |
| Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander | 163 |
| White | 40,172 |
| Two or more races | 2,096 |
| Total | 59,335 |
| Comments: | |

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

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

| Age/Grade | Public TAS | Public SWP | Private | Local Neglected | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|----------------|------------------------|---------------|
| Age Birth through 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Age 3- through 5 (not Kindergarten) | 8 | 903 | 0 | 0 | 911 |
| K | 706 | 4,814 | 34 | 16 | 5,570 |
| 1 | 925 | 4,833 | 36 | 25 | 5,819 |
| 2 | 1,004 | 4,683 | 32 | 38 | 5,757 |
| 3 | 897 | 4,615 | 32 | 27 | 5,571 |
| 4 | 794 | 4,402 | 44 | 32 | 5,272 |
| 5 | 741 | 4,276 | 42 | 37 | 5,096 |
| 6 | 775 | 3,812 | 52 | 44 | 4,683 |
| 7 | 815 | 3,432 | 33 | 51 | 4,331 |
| 8 | 754 | 3,301 | 29 | 57 | 4,141 |
| 9 | 860 | 2,719 | 6 | 51 | 3,636 |
| 10 | 785 | 2,710 | 14 | 61 | 3,570 |
| 11 | 618 | 2,403 | 4 | 32 | 3,057 |
| 12 | 401 | 2,349 | 7 | 15 | 2,772 |
| Ungraded | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| TOTALS | 10,083 | 49,252 | 365 | 486 | 60,186 |
| Comments: | | | | | |

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

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

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

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

| TAS instructional service | # Students Served |
|----------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Mathematics | 6,475 |
| Reading/language arts | 6,774 |
| Science | 342 |
| Social studies | 137 |
| Vocational/career | 14 |
| Other instructional services | 420 |
| Comments: | |

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

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

| TAS Support Service | # Students Served |
|------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Health, dental, and eye care | 0 |
| Supporting guidance/advocacy | 205 |
| Other support services | 35 |
| Comments: | |

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

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

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

See the FAQs following the table for additional information.

| Staff Category | Staff FTE | Percentage Qualified |
|---|-----------|----------------------|
| Teachers | 223.62 | |
| Paraprofessionals ¹ | 205.05 | 96.50 |
| Other paraprofessionals (translators, parental involvement, computer assistance) ² | 9.45 | |
| Clerical support staff | 4.28 | |
| Administrators (non-clerical) | 5.05 | |
| Comments: | | |

FAQs on staff information

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

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

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

2.1.3.1 Paraprofessional Information for Title I, Part A Schoolwide Programs

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

| Paraprofessional Information | Paraprofessionals FTE | Percentage Qualified |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|
| Paraprofessionals ³ | 1,067.00 | 93.40 |
| Comments: | | |

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

2.1.4 Parental Involvement Reservation Under Title I, Part A

In the table below provide information on the amount of Title I, Part A funds reserved by LEAs for parental involvement activities under Section 1118 (a)(3) of the ESEA. The percentage of LEAs FY 2014 Title I Part A allocations reserved for parental involvement will be automatically calculated from the data entered in Rows 2 and 3.

| Parental Involvement Reservation | LEAs that Received a Federal Fiscal Year (FY) 2014 (School Year 2014-15) Title I, Part A Allocation of \$500,000 or less | LEAs that Received a Federal fiscal year (FY) 2014 (School Year 2014-15) Title I, Part A Allocation of more than \$500,000 |
|---|---|---|
| Number of LEAs* | 391 | 17 |
| Sum of the amount reserved by LEAs for parental Involvement | 98,830 | 185,109 |
| Sum of LEA's FY 2014 Title I, Part A allocations | 25,307,790 | 17,423,218 |
| Percentage of LEA's FY 2014 Title I, Part A allocations reserved for parental involvement | 0.39 | 1.06 |

*The sum of Column 2 and Column 3 should equal the number of LEAs that received an FY 2014 Title I, Part A allocation.

In the comment box below, provide examples of how LEAs in your State used their Title I Part A, set-aside for parental involvement during SY 2014–2015.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

This section collects data on the Migrant Education Program (Title I, Part C) for the performance period of September 1, 2014 through August 31, 2015. This section is composed of the following subsections:

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

Where the table collects data by age/grade, report children in the highest age/grade that they attained during the performance period. For example, a child who turns 3 during the performance period would only be performance in the "Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)" row.

2.3.1 Migrant Child Counts

This section collects the Title I, Part C, Migrant Education Program (MEP) child counts which States are required to provide and may be used to determine the annual State allocations under Title I, Part C. The child counts should reflect the performance period of September 1, 2014 through August 31, 2015. This section also collects a report on the procedures used by States to produce true, reliable, and valid child counts.

To provide the child counts, each SEA should have sufficient procedures in place to ensure that it is counting only those children who are eligible for the MEP. Such procedures are important to protecting the integrity of the State's MEP because they permit the early discovery and correction of eligibility problems and thus help to ensure that only eligible migrant children are counted for funding purposes and are served. If an SEA has reservations about the accuracy of its child counts, it must inform the Department of its concerns and explain how and when it will resolve them in the box below, which precedes Section 2.3.1.1 *Category 1 Child Count*.

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

FAQs on Child Count:

1. *How is "out-of-school" defined?* Out-of-school means children up through age 21 who are entitled to a free public education in the State but are not currently enrolled in a K-12 institution. This could include students who have dropped out of school in the previous performance period (September 1, 2013 - August 31, 2014), youth who are working on a HSED outside of a K-12 institution, and youth who are "here-to-work" only. It does not include preschoolers, who are counted by age grouping. Children who were enrolled in school for at least one day, but dropped out of school during the performance period should be counted in the highest age/grade level attained during the performance period.
2. *How is "ungraded" defined?* Ungraded means the children are served in an educational unit that has no separate grades. For example, some schools have primary grade groupings that are not traditionally graded, or ungraded groupings for children with learning disabilities. In some cases, ungraded students may also include special education children, transitional bilingual students, students working on a HSED through a K-12 institution, or those in a correctional setting. (Students working on a HSED outside of a K-12 institution are counted as out-of-school youth.)

In the space below, discuss any concerns about the accuracy of the reported child counts or the underlying eligibility determinations on which the counts are based and how and when these concerns will be resolved.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Comments:

2.3.1.1 Category 1 Child Count (Eligible Migrant Children)

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number by age/grade of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, resided in your State for one or more days during the performance period of September 1, 2014 through August 31, 2015. This figure includes all eligible migrant children who may or may not have received MEP services. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the performance period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the performance 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 | Eligible Migrant Children |
|------------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten) | 127 |
| K | 51 |
| 1 | 65 |
| 2 | 71 |
| 3 | 71 |
| 4 | 65 |
| 5 | 56 |
| 6 | 68 |
| 7 | 81 |
| 8 | 58 |

| | |
|---------------|-----|
| 9 | 63 |
| 10 | 85 |
| 11 | 50 |
| 12 | 23 |
| Ungraded | 0 |
| Out-of-school | 20 |
| Total | 954 |

Comments: The 2014-2015 Category 1 MEP Child Count represents an 11.67 percent decrease from the 2. There were 1,080 children identified in 2013-2014 and 954 children identified in 2014-2015, which is an 11.67 percent decrease, or 126 fewer children. This decrease is attributed to the record-breaking heat/drought in June of 2015, which seriously damaged the Flathead Valley cherry crop, shortening the season and lessening the need for harvest workers.

2.3.1.1.1 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Comments: The 2014-2015 Category 1 MEP Child Count represents an 11.67 percent decrease from the 2. There were 1,080 children identified in 2013-2014 and 954 children identified in 2014-2015, which is an 11.67 percent decrease, or 126 fewer children. This decrease is attributed to the record-breaking heat/drought in June of 2015, which seriously damaged the Flathead Valley cherry crop, shortening the season and lessening the need for harvest workers.

2.3.1.1.2 Birth through Two Child Count

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number of eligible migrant children from birth through age 2 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, resided in your State for one or more days during the performance period of September 1, 2014 through August 31, 2015.

| Age/Grade | Eligible Migrant Children |
|---------------------|---------------------------|
| Age birth through 2 | 47 |
| Comments: | |

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

In the table below, enter by age/grade the unduplicated statewide number of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, were **served** for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods that occurred within the performance period of September 1, 2014 through August 31, 2015. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the performance period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the performance period. Count a child who moved to different schools within the State and who was served in both traditional summer and year-round school intersession programs only once. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

- ┆ Children age birth through 2 years
- ┆ Children 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).
- ┆ Children who received only referred services (non-MEP funded).

| Age/Grade | Eligible Migrant Children Served by the MEP During the Summer/Intersession Term |
|--|---|
| Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten) | 113 |
| K | 44 |
| 1 | 52 |
| 2 | 45 |
| 3 | 54 |
| 4 | 46 |
| 5 | 40 |
| 6 | 45 |
| 7 | 65 |
| 8 | 46 |
| 9 | 48 |
| 10 | 69 |
| 11 | 41 |
| 12 | 3 |
| Ungraded | 0 |
| Out-of-school | 13 |
| Total | 724 |
| Comments: | |

2.3.1.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Comments: The 2014-2015 MEP Category 2 Child Count of 724 children is an 11.71 percent decrease from the 820 children served in 2013-2014. This decrease is attributed to the record-breaking heat/drought in June of 2015, which seriously damaged the Flathead Valley cherry crop, shortening the season and lessening the need for harvest workers.

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

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number of eligible migrant children from age birth through 2 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, were served for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods that occurred within the performance period of September 1, 2014 through August 31, 2015. Count a child who moved to different schools within the State and who was served in both traditional summer and year-round school intersession programs only once.

Do not include:

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

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

2.3.1.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures

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

2.3.1.3.1 Student Information System

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

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

2.3.1.3.3 Methods Used To Count Children

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

- l The unduplicated count of eligible migrant children, ages 3-21. Include children two years of age whose residency in the state has been verified after turning three.
- l Children who met the program eligibility criteria (e.g., were within 3 years of a qualifying move, had a qualifying activity)
- l Children who were resident in your State for at least 1 day during the performance period (September 1 through August 31)
- l Children who – in the case of Category 2 – were served for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods
- l Children once per age/grade level for each child count category

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Core eligibility, family history, and demographic data is collected by recruiters (trained by SEA personnel or consultants on an annual basis) through a direct family interview and documented on the Certificate of Eligibility (COE), which complies with all of the National COE requirements. Data is collected throughout the reporting period between September 1, 2014, and August 31, 2015.

Data are entered into the NGS database by trained data entry personnel and reviewed by local and state data administrators. Project sites use NGS to run data checks and various reports throughout the reporting period prior to submitting final data to the SEA. The data are organized within NGS to reflect all eligibility information required by statute and obtained during the interview, which has been documented on the COE. Each COE is validated and checked for accuracy by the local project director and the SEA Data Administrator. The NGS query is programmed to count a student only once statewide in the Category 1 and Category 2 counts. In order to avoid duplication and to assure correct student identification, NGS creates a unique student identification (USID) number for each new student entered into the NGS centralized 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 checked against additional fields, such as first name, birth date, 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, it is 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/performance period and federal eligibility criteria. This report counts each student once, based upon a unique USID, even if the student has multiple enrollment records within the reporting time period.

Selection Criteria

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

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

Below is an example of the criteria used to gather the data from the database. For these examples, the YR1 and YR2 are used to represent the school year selection. For example, for the 2014-2015 school year option, YR1=2014 and YR2=2015. 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 2014-2015, Yr3=2012. 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/HSED) or 'D' (Deceased) and the termination date is greater than 8/31/YR1. The QAD greater than or equal to 9/2/YR3.

Birth date Information:

- The student must be between 3 and 21 years 11 months old to be counted

In the case of Category 2 children, only those in attendance or who are served by a mobile or in-orchard tutorial are counted as eligible children served. Children who are identified but who do not participate in any MEP-funded services are not counted as part of the Category 2 count and considered to be residency-only students.

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

The New Generation System (NGS) is a Web-based interstate information network that communicates demographic, educational and health data on migrant students to educators and stake holders throughout the nation. The NGS system is designed to capture educational and health data on migrant students. The system allows educators to record the movement of migrant students through the educational process by producing online records of a student's educational progress and health profile. Educators can generate a student transfer document to facilitate academic placement as the student transfers schools. NGS also allows educators to generate various student-level, management and Office of Migrant Education performance reports, and MSIX uploads. Highly trained staff understand the file specifications for EDEN and the CSPR so that member states' data can be transmitted flawlessly to state data contacts during the performance reporting period. In addition to reports and functions designed to ease day-to-day migrant data activities, the NGS also has an extensive management level report section dedicated solely to assist in preparing the CSPR. It provides complete student level reports used to account for all the migrant children in the ED Facts data files. Our experienced state staff reviews these reports periodically during the year and again before the CSPR is finalized to ensure the accuracy of the Eden file submission. The Consortia States of NGS also have an active advisory committee that addresses ongoing changes or requirements for the system in addition to the management team of Consortia State Directors, who ensure that the overall system requirements are met by the NGS Contractor. The management team provides the office space, servers, and upgrades to the system throughout the performance period in addition to a help desk for users and training of Consortia State users.

| | |
|---|-----------------|
| Use of MSIX to Verify Data Quality | (Yes/No) |
|---|-----------------|

Does the State use data in the Migrant Student Information Exchange (MSIX) to verify the quality of migrant data?

No

If MSIX is utilized, please explain how.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

We do not use MSIX to verify data quality at this time because of our intense interstate follow-up with Washington and Texas, where we have access to source data. To that point, no significant issues of MTMEP data quality were found in our prospective re-interviewing process, our interstate COE sharing with Washington State in 2014-2015, or in our missed enrollment follow-up procedures for 2014 2015. Using the MSIX missed enrollment report this year, we were unable to verify with potential families their residency in Montana for qualifying work. We could not locate these families at their last known addresses and so could not conduct face-to-face interviews or phone interviews with them. Either families had resettled to another location or state or they had moved from one residency to another that was unknown to us.

While the MSIX missed enrollment process did not help us with verification of data quality this year, it does help us to be comprehensive in the methods we use to assess our identification and recruitment procedures. Last year, we were able to locate families who were in MSIX and who had traveled to Montana, which further enabled us to: (1) identify new isolated, rural areas in our state where we do not have continual ID and R going on, as well as the period of time when we might anticipate that happening again and (2) work with sending states to ensure the quality of their data in MSIX. Again, this process does not serve to look at the actual quality of the MTMEP COE data, per se, but rather helps us to refine our ID and R practices. Data quality verification at the local level by MEP administrators, the state recruiter and the SEA data administrative staff by checking data entered in MSIX against data entered in NGS and AIM help to ensure that only the most accurate, current, and complete data regarding migrant students has been entered in these systems.

2.3.1.3.4 Quality Control Processes

In the space below, respond to the following questions :

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

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

| Results | # |
|---|----|
| The number of eligibility determinations sampled. | 30 |
| The number of eligibility determinations sampled for which a re-interview was completed. | 29 |
| The number of eligibility determinations sampled for which a re-interview was completed and the child was found eligible. | 29 |

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

One family could not be located.

| Procedures | Yes/No |
|--|------------------|
| What was the most recent year that the MEP conducted independent prospective re-interviews (i.e., interviewers were neither SEA or LEA staff members responsible for administering or operating the MEP, nor any other persons who worked on the initial eligibility determinations being tested)? | <u>SY2014-15</u> |
| Was the sampling of eligible children random? | <u>Yes</u> |
| Was the sampling statewide? | <u>Yes</u> |

FAQ on independent prospective reinterviews:

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

If the sampling was stratified by group/area please describe the procedures.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

As part of the ongoing quality control process that the SEA has crafted to ensure the accuracy of the state's MEP eligibility determinations, policy was established that conforms with the Prospective Re-Interviewing Regulation (Section 200.89(b)(2)) that states these re-interviews are to be conducted on current year eligibility determinations using a small sample size of randomly selected COEs. The actual number of COEs selected for re-interviewing depends upon the number of children in the project and the type of mobility patterns to which the families conform according to the guidance provided. For the 2012-2013 performance period, the data quality team determined that a stratified random sample COEs selected through a sequence generator using the resources of random.org and the Montana COE numbers for each of the families would be completed for children residing in a particular geographical area in Washington and would be performed by a paid outside contractor who was fluent in Spanish and trained in re-interviewing protocols. This process found all eligibility determinations documented by MTMEP recruitment staff to be valid. For the 2013-2014 performance period, in order to further ensure data completeness and accuracy, the SEA once again engaged an outside expert to follow-up on missed enrollments for 70 students found residing in Washington and Texas. There were over 100 students initially identified in MSIX as having been in Montana due to qualifying work activity. This group was further stratified by area to include those students from Washington and Texas. That number totaled 70 students. The contractor successfully interviewed the parent/guardians of 36 students from WA and 14 student/families from Texas. These students had not been identified in Montana for a variety of reasons. Montana is the fourth largest state geographically, and while every effort is made to find all eligible students, some are missed as a result of their leaving prior to our recruiters locating them. We found the missed enrollment follow-up process helpful to us in refining our ID and R practices and identifying locations in our state that we had not been previously aware of. This follow-up was not specifically tied to data quality initiatives, but rather data completeness and improved identification and recruitment practices. It also helped to confirm data quality in the sending states due to the collaborative nature of the process.

In 2014-2015, thirty randomly chosen COES were selected for additional review by state data staff as a part of ongoing quality assurance. Data on four COEs was found to be incomplete. Further examination determined that a new recruiter had omitted phone numbers and/or addresses on four COEs. Further training was provided to the recruiter who was able to obtain the missing information in all cases, except one. Twenty-nine families were re-interviewed by an independent state consultant and all twenty-nine eligibility determinations were found to be sound. One family could not be located.

In the interest of interstate coordination and collaboration, the MTMEP in 2014-2015 again provided copies of all Washington-based students identified on Montana COEs to the WA MSDR in order for their recruiters to follow up on children identified in Montana during 2014-2015 performance period. In this way, we help to ensure that currently mobile, shared students are identified and served in Washington. This process also serves as an informal re-interviewing strategy during which the quality of Montana data is checked for accuracy by Washington recruiters. No eligibility issues or data quality issues were reported as a result of that process, providing yet another layer of data scrutiny by the MTMEP.

Please describe the sampling replacement by the State.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The MTMEP conducted its formal, prospective re-interviewing process during the 2012-2013 performance year and each year since utilizing a randomly generated replacement sample methodology as necessary. We conduct annual data quality reviews internally by verifying data in NGS, AIM (the Montana Student Data Base system that contain assessment and other disaggregated data), and MSIX in an ongoing, weekly manner. We also send actual copies of our COEs to sending states for data verification as was detailed earlier.

| Obtaining Data From Families | |
|---|-------------|
| Check the applicable box to indicate how the re-interviews were conducted | |
| Face-to-face re-interviews | <u>Both</u> |
| Phone Interviews | |
| Both | |
| Obtaining Data From Families | |
| | |
| Was there a protocol for verifying all information used in making the original eligibility determination? | <u>Yes</u> |
| Were re-interviewers independent from the original interviewers? | <u>Yes</u> |

If you did conduct independent re-interviews in this reporting period, describe how you ensured that the process was independent.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

An out-of-state independent contractor was hired to perform the re-interviews in 2012-2013. The contractor was given and understood the MTMEP protocols for re-interviewing and the maintenance of independent findings and confidentiality. No SEA or LOA staff or anyone responsible for administering the MTMEP or making the initial determinations was part of the re-interviewing process. In the 2014-2015 performance year, an independent contractor was retained for missed enrollment follow-up and re-interviewing. In 2014-2015 independent state staff reviewed 29 randomly selected COEs and found no issues other than incomplete data cells. A new recruiter responsible for the data omissions was provided with further training.

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

No migrant children were found to be ineligible. However, one new recruiter was cited for incomplete data and recommended for further training. The recruiter did not obtain the most recent address and phone numbers for six families out of 41 reviewed.

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

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

2.3.2 Eligible Migrant Children

2.3.2.1 Priority for Services

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

| Age/Grade | Priority for Services During the Performance Period |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten) | 65 |
| K | 31 |
| 1 | 39 |
| 2 | 36 |
| 3 | 35 |
| 4 | 34 |
| 5 | 34 |
| 6 | 29 |
| 7 | 47 |
| 8 | 36 |
| 9 | 35 |
| 10 | 49 |
| 11 | 31 |
| 12 | 6 |
| Ungraded | 0 |
| Out-of-school | 12 |
| Total | 519 |

Comments: Changes in migrant student population from year to year are based on the number of students identified who have traveled with their parents working in seasonal or temporary agriculture to or within Montana within the performance period. Changes in agricultural work from year to year are dependent on weather, crop harvest and various trends in Montana's agricultural patterns. Mobile children result in changing population statistics. This year, fewer children were identified as a result of the hottest June and shortest harvest on record for our state.

FAQ on priority for services:

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

2.3.2.2 Limited English Proficient

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

| Age/Grade | Limited English Proficient (LEP) During the Performance Period |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten) | 79 |
| K | 28 |
| 1 | 40 |
| 2 | 32 |
| 3 | 33 |
| 4 | 30 |
| 5 | 30 |
| 6 | 24 |
| 7 | 44 |
| 8 | 35 |
| 9 | 32 |
| 10 | 48 |
| 11 | 30 |
| 12 | 6 |
| Ungraded | 0 |
| Out-of-school | 10 |
| Total | 501 |
| Comments: | |

2.3.2.3 Children with Disabilities (IDEA)

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

| Age/Grade | Children with Disabilities (IDEA) During the Performance Period |
|------------------------------------|--|
| Age Birth through 2 | 1 |
| Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten) | 4 |
| K | 2 |
| 1 | 0 |
| 2 | 2 |
| 3 | 1 |
| 4 | 6 |
| 5 | 4 |
| 6 | 2 |
| 7 | 3 |
| 8 | 2 |
| 9 | 6 |
| 10 | 3 |
| 11 | 2 |
| 12 | 0 |
| Ungraded | 0 |
| Out-of-school | 0 |
| Total | 38 |
| Comments: | |

2.3.2.4 Qualifying Arrival Date (QAD)

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children whose qualifying arrival date (QAD) occurred within 12 months from the last day of the performance period, August 31, 2015 (i.e., QAD during the performance period). The total is calculated automatically.

| Age/Grade | Qualifying Arrival Date During the Performance Period |
|------------------------------------|--|
| Age Birth through 2 | 38 |
| Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten) | 75 |
| K | 25 |
| 1 | 32 |
| 2 | 32 |
| 3 | 44 |
| 4 | 28 |
| 5 | 23 |
| 6 | 29 |
| 7 | 42 |
| 8 | 35 |
| 9 | 34 |
| 10 | 50 |
| 11 | 29 |
| 12 | 7 |
| Ungraded | 0 |
| Out-of-school | 6 |
| Total | 529 |

Comments: Changes in migrant student population from year to year are based on the number of students identified who have traveled with their parents working in seasonal or temporary agriculture to or within Montana within the performance period. Changes in agricultural work from year to year are dependent on weather, crop harvest and various trends in Montana's agricultural patterns. Mobile children result in changing population statistics. This year, fewer children were identified as a result of the hottest June and shortest harvest on record for our state.

2.3.2.5 Qualifying Arrival Date During the Regular School Year

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children whose qualifying arrival date occurred during the performance period's regular school year (i.e., QAD during the 2014-15 regular school year). The total is calculated automatically.

| Age/Grade | Qualifying Arrival Date During the Regular School Year |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Age Birth through 2 | 9 |
| Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten) | 17 |
| K | 9 |
| 1 | 7 |
| 2 | 8 |
| 3 | 17 |
| 4 | 9 |
| 5 | 6 |
| 6 | 13 |
| 7 | 6 |
| 8 | 7 |
| 9 | 11 |
| 10 | 12 |
| 11 | 8 |
| 12 | 4 |
| Ungraded | 0 |
| Out-of-school | 3 |
| Total | 146 |
| Comments: | |

2.3.2.6 Referrals — During the Performance Period

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

| Age/Grade | Referrals During the Performance Period |
|------------------------------------|--|
| Age Birth through 2 | 28 |
| Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten) | 57 |
| K | 15 |
| 1 | 25 |
| 2 | 23 |
| 3 | 25 |
| 4 | 20 |
| 5 | 17 |
| 6 | 17 |
| 7 | 36 |
| 8 | 26 |
| 9 | 24 |
| 10 | 37 |
| 11 | 21 |
| 12 | 3 |
| Ungraded | 0 |
| Out-of-school | 4 |
| Total | 378 |
| Comments: | |

2.3.2.8 Academic Status

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

2.3.2.8.1 Dropouts

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

| Grade | Dropouts During the Performance Period |
|----------|--|
| 7 | S |
| 8 | S |
| 9 | S |
| 10 | S |
| 11 | S |
| 12 | S |
| Ungraded | S |
| Total | S |

Comments: Last year we had two students complete the HSET through the Migrant Education Program; we had zero drop out.

FAQ on Dropouts:

How is "drop outs" defined? The term used for students, who, during the reporting period, were enrolled in a public school for at least one day, but who subsequently left school with no plans on returning to enroll in a school and continue toward a high school diploma. Students who dropped out-of-school prior to the 2014-15 reporting period should be classified NOT as "drop-outs" but as "out-of-school youth."

2.3.2.8.2 HSED (High School Equivalency Diploma)

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

| Obtained HSED | # |
|---|---|
| Obtained a HSED in your State During the Performance Period | S |

Comments:

2.3.3 Services for Eligible Migrant Children

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

Eligible migrant children who are served include:

- Migrant children who were eligible for and received instructional or support services funded in whole or in part with MEP funds.
- Children who continued to receive MEP-funded services during the term their eligibility ended.

Do not include:

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

FAQ on Services:

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

2.3.3.2 Priority for Services – During the Regular School Year

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

| Age/Grade | Priority for Services During the Regular School Year |
|------------------------------------|--|
| Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten) | 8 |
| K | 17 |
| 1 | 15 |
| 2 | 14 |
| 3 | 10 |
| 4 | 14 |
| 5 | 17 |
| 6 | 13 |
| 7 | 11 |
| 8 | 10 |
| 9 | 10 |
| 10 | 12 |
| 11 | 10 |
| 12 | 3 |
| Ungraded | 0 |
| Out-of-school | 10 |
| Total | 174 |
| Comments: | |

2.3.4.2 Priority for Services – During the Summer/Intersession Term

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

| Age/Grade | Priority for Services During the Summer/Intersession Term |
|------------------------------------|--|
| Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten) | 60 |
| K | 29 |
| 1 | 35 |
| 2 | 34 |
| 3 | 34 |
| 4 | 31 |
| 5 | 30 |
| 6 | 24 |
| 7 | 42 |
| 8 | 33 |
| 9 | 29 |
| 10 | 45 |
| 11 | 26 |
| 12 | 3 |
| Ungraded | 0 |
| Out-of-school | 5 |
| Total | 460 |
| Comments: | |

2.3.5 MEP Services – During the Performance Period

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

| Age/Grade | Served During the Performance Period |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Age Birth through 2 | 33 |
| Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten) | 122 |
| K | 51 |
| 1 | 64 |
| 2 | 71 |
| 3 | 68 |
| 4 | 64 |
| 5 | 54 |
| 6 | 67 |
| 7 | 78 |
| 8 | 54 |
| 9 | 61 |
| 10 | 82 |
| 11 | 49 |
| 12 | 22 |
| Ungraded | 0 |
| Out-of-school | 19 |
| Total | 959 |
| Comments: | |

2.3.5.1 Priority for Services – During the Performance Period

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

| Age/Grade | Priority for Services During the Performance Period |
|------------------------------------|--|
| Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten) | 65 |
| K | 31 |
| 1 | 39 |
| 2 | 36 |
| 3 | 35 |
| 4 | 34 |
| 5 | 34 |
| 6 | 29 |
| 7 | 47 |
| 8 | 36 |
| 9 | 34 |
| 10 | 49 |
| 11 | 31 |
| 12 | 6 |
| Ungraded | 0 |
| Out-of-school | 12 |
| Total | 518 |
| Comments: | |

2.3.5.2 Continuation of Services – During the Performance Period

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

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

2.3.5.3 Instructional Service – During the Performance Period

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

| Age/Grade | Instructional Service During the Performance Period |
|------------------------------------|--|
| Age Birth through 2 | 1 |
| Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten) | 63 |
| K | 38 |
| 1 | 50 |
| 2 | 55 |
| 3 | 51 |
| 4 | 52 |
| 5 | 44 |
| 6 | 55 |
| 7 | 51 |
| 8 | 36 |
| 9 | 41 |
| 10 | 48 |
| 11 | 31 |
| 12 | 19 |
| Ungraded | 0 |
| Out-of-school | 9 |
| Total | 644 |
| Comments: | |

2.3.5.3.1 Type of Instructional Service – During the Performance Period

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

| Age/Grade | Reading Instruction During the Performance Period | Mathematics Instruction During the Performance Period | High School Credit Accrual During the Performance Period |
|------------------------------------|---|---|--|
| Age Birth through 2 | 1 | 1 | //////////////////////////////////// |
| Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten) | 5 | 23 | //////////////////////////////////// |
| K | 16 | 19 | //////////////////////////////////// |
| 1 | 23 | 24 | //////////////////////////////////// |
| 2 | 17 | 21 | //////////////////////////////////// |
| 3 | 25 | 26 | //////////////////////////////////// |
| 4 | 16 | 21 | //////////////////////////////////// |
| 5 | 16 | 19 | //////////////////////////////////// |
| 6 | 15 | 19 | //////////////////////////////////// |
| 7 | 17 | 23 | //////////////////////////////////// |
| 8 | 10 | 13 | //////////////////////////////////// |
| 9 | 7 | 9 | 25 |
| 10 | 9 | 14 | 26 |
| 11 | 4 | 5 | 18 |
| 12 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Ungraded | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Out-of-school | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| Total | 184 | 240 | 73 |
| Comments: | | | |

FAQ on Types of Instructional Services:

What is "high school credit accrual"? Instruction in courses that accrue credits needed for high school graduation provided by a teacher for students on a regular or systematic basis, usually for a predetermined period of time. Includes correspondence courses taken by a student under the supervision of a teacher.

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

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

| Age/Grade | Support Services During the Performance Period | Breakout of Counseling Service During the Performance Period |
|------------------------------------|--|--|
| Age Birth through 2 | 33 | 0 |
| Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten) | 122 | 0 |
| K | 51 | 0 |
| 1 | 63 | 0 |
| 2 | 68 | 0 |
| 3 | 66 | 0 |
| 4 | 62 | 0 |
| 5 | 51 | 0 |
| 6 | 64 | 0 |
| 7 | 77 | 0 |
| 8 | 52 | 0 |
| 9 | 59 | 0 |
| 10 | 79 | 0 |
| 11 | 49 | 1 |
| 12 | 21 | 0 |
| Ungraded | 0 | 0 |
| Out-of-school | 19 | 7 |
| Total | 936 | 8 |

Comments: Changes in migrant student population from year to year are based on the number of students identified who have traveled with their parents working in seasonal or temporary agriculture to or within Montana within the performance period. Changes in agricultural work from year to year are dependent on weather, crop harvest and various trends in Montana's agricultural patterns. Mobile children result in changing population statistics. This year, fewer children were identified as a result of the hottest June and shortest harvest on record for our state.

FAQs on Support Services:

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

2.3.6 School Data - During the Regular School Year

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

2.3.6.1 Schools and Enrollment - During the Regular School Year

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

| Schools | # |
|---|-----|
| Number of schools that enrolled eligible migrant children | 164 |
| Number of eligible migrant children enrolled in those schools | 534 |
| Comments: | |

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

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

| Schools | # |
|---|---|
| Number of schools where MEP funds were consolidated in a schoolwide program | |
| Number of eligible migrant children enrolled in those schools | |
| Comments: N/A | |

2.3.7 MEP Project Data

The following questions collect data on MEP projects.

2.3.7.1 Type of MEP Project

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

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

| Type of MEP Project | Number of MEP Projects | Number of Migrant Children Served in the Projects |
|---|------------------------|---|
| Regular school year - school day only | 0 | 0 |
| Regular school year - school day/extended day | 0 | 0 |
| Summer/intersession only | 2 | 425 |
| Year round | 3 | 579 |
| Comments: | | |

FAQs on type of MEP project:

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

2.3.8 MEP Personnel Data

The following questions collect data on MEP personnel data.

2.3.8.1 MEP State Director

In the table below, provide the FTE amount of time the State director performs MEP duties (regardless of whether the director is funded by State, MEP, or other funds) during the performance period (e.g., September 1 through August 31).

| | |
|---------------------------|------|
| State Director FTE | 1.00 |
| Comments: | |

FAQs on the MEP State director

- a. *How is the FTE calculated for the State director?* Calculate the FTE using the number of days worked for the MEP. To do so, first define how many full-time days constitute one *FTE* for the State director in your State for the performance period. To calculate the FTE number, sum the total days the State director worked for the MEP during the performance period and divide this sum by the number of full-time days that constitute one FTE in the reporting period.
- b. *Who is the State director?* The manager within the SEA who administers the MEP on a statewide basis.

2.3.8.2 MEP Staff

In the table below, provide the headcount and FTE by job classification of the staff funded by the MEP. Do **not** include staff employed in SWP where MEP funds were combined with those of other programs.

| Job Classification | Regular School Year | | Summer/Intersession Term | | Performance Period |
|---------------------------------|---------------------|------|--------------------------|-------|--------------------|
| | Headcount | FTE | Headcount | FTE | Headcount |
| Teachers | 3 | 1.75 | 26 | 25.75 | 29 |
| Counselors | 1 | 0.50 | 1 | 0.75 | 2 |
| Non-qualified paraprofessionals | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Qualified paraprofessionals | 5 | 3.00 | 26 | 26.00 | 31 |
| Recruiters | 3 | 2.00 | 6 | 5.75 | 9 |
| Records transfer staff | 4 | 1.50 | 7 | 3.80 | 11 |
| Administrators | 3 | 1.25 | 4 | 4.00 | 7 |
| Comments: | | | | | |

Note: The Headcount value displayed represents the greatest whole number submitted in file specification N/X065 for the corresponding Job Classification. For example, an ESS submitted value of 9.8 will be represented in your CSPR as 9.

FAQs on MEP staff:

- a. *How is the FTE calculated?* The FTE may be calculated using one of two methods:
 1. To calculate the FTE, in each job category, sum the percentage of time that staff were funded by the MEP and enter the total FTE for that category.
 2. Calculate the FTE using the number of days worked. To do so, first define how many full-time days constitute one FTE for each job classification in your State for each term. (For example, one regular-term FTE may equal 180 full-time (8 hour) work days; one summer term FTE may equal 30 full-time work days; or one intersession FTE may equal 45 full-time work days split between three 15-day non-contiguous blocks throughout the year.) To calculate the FTE number, sum the total days the individuals worked in a particular job classification for a term and divide this sum by the number of full-time days that constitute one FTE in that term.
- b. *Who is a teacher?* A classroom instructor who is licensed and meets any other teaching requirements in the State.
- c. *Who is a counselor?* A professional staff member who guides individuals, families, groups, and communities by assisting them in problem-solving, decision-making, discovering meaning, and articulating goals related to personal, educational, and career development.
- d. *Who is a paraprofessional?* An individual who: (1) provides one-on-one tutoring if such tutoring is scheduled at a time when a student would not otherwise receive instruction from a teacher; (2) assists with classroom management, such as organizing instructional and other materials; (3) provides instructional assistance in a computer laboratory; (4) conducts parental involvement activities; (5) provides support in a library or media center; (6) acts as a translator; or (7) provides instructional support services under the direct supervision of a teacher (Title I, Section 1119(g)(2)). Because a paraprofessional provides instructional support, he/she should not be providing planned direct instruction or introducing to students new skills, concepts, or academic content. Individuals who work in food services, cafeteria or playground supervision, personal care services, non-instructional computer assistance, and similar positions are not considered paraprofessionals under Title I.
- e. *Who is a qualified paraprofessional?* A qualified paraprofessional must have a secondary school diploma or its recognized equivalent and have (1) completed 2 years of study at an institution of higher education; (2) obtained an associate's (or higher) degree; or (3) met a rigorous standard of quality and be able to demonstrate, through a formal State or local academic assessment, knowledge of and the ability to assist in instructing reading, writing, and mathematics (or, as appropriate, reading readiness, writing readiness, and mathematics readiness) (Section 1119(c) and (d) of ESEA).
- f. *Who is a recruiter?* A staff person responsible for identifying and recruiting children as eligible for the MEP and documenting their eligibility on the Certificate of Eligibility.
- g. *Who is a record transfer staffer?* An individual who is responsible for entering, retrieving, or sending student records from or to another school or student records system.
- h. *Who is an administrator?* A professional staff member, including the project director or regional director. The SEA MEP Director should not be included.

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

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

Throughout this section:

- | Report data for the program year of July 1, 2014 through June 30, 2015.
- | Count programs/facilities based on how the program was classified to ED for funding purposes.
- | Do not include programs funded solely through Title I, Part A.
- | Use the definitions listed below:
 - | **Adult Corrections:** An adult correctional institution is a facility in which persons, including persons 21 or under, are confined as a result of conviction for a criminal offense.
 - | **At-Risk Programs:** Programs operated (through LEAs) that target students who are at risk of academic failure, have a drug or alcohol problem, are pregnant or parenting, have been in contact with the juvenile justice system in the past, are at least 1 year behind the expected age/grade level, have limited English proficiency, are gang members, have dropped out of school in the past, or have a high absenteeism rate at school.
 - | **Juvenile Corrections:** An institution for delinquent children and youth is a public or private residential facility other than a foster home that is operated for the care of children and youth who have been adjudicated delinquent or in need of supervision. Include any programs serving adjudicated youth (including non-secure facilities and group homes) in this category.
 - | **Juvenile Detention Facilities:** Detention facilities are shorter-term institutions that provide care to children who require secure custody pending court adjudication, court disposition, or execution of a court order, or care to children after commitment.
 - | **Neglected Programs:** An institution for neglected children and youth is a public or private residential facility, other than a foster home, that is operated primarily for the care of children who have been committed to the institution or voluntarily placed under applicable State law due to abandonment, neglect, or death of their parents or guardians.
 - | **Other:** Any other programs, not defined above, which receive Title I, Part D funds and serve non-adjudicated children and youth.

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

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

2.4.1.1 Programs and Facilities - Subpart 1

In the table below, provide the number of State agency Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 programs and facilities that serve neglected and delinquent students and the average length of stay by program/facility type, for these students.

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

| State Program/Facility Type | # Programs/Facilities | Average Length of Stay in Days |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------------|
| Neglected programs | 0 | 0 |
| Juvenile detention | 0 | 0 |
| Juvenile corrections | 2 | 116 |
| Adult corrections | 1 | 200 |
| Other | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 3 | //////////////////// |
| Comments: | | |

FAQ on Programs and Facilities - Subpart I:

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

2.4.1.1.1 Programs and Facilities That Reported - Subpart 1

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

The total row will be automatically calculated.

| State Program/Facility Type | # Reporting Data |
|-----------------------------|------------------|
| Neglected Programs | 0 |
| Juvenile Detention | 0 |
| Juvenile Corrections | 2 |
| Adult Corrections | 1 |
| Other | 0 |
| Total | 3 |
| Comments: | |

2.4.1.2 Students Served – Subpart 1

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

| # of Students Served | Neglected Programs | Juvenile Detention | Juvenile Corrections | Adult Corrections | Other Programs |
|------------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|----------------------|-------------------|----------------|
| Total Unduplicated Students Served | | | 118 | 64 | |
| Total Long Term Students Served | | | 6 | 32 | |

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

| Race/Ethnicity | Neglected Programs | Juvenile Detention | Juvenile Corrections | Adult Corrections | Other Programs |
|---|--------------------|--------------------|----------------------|-------------------|----------------|
| American Indian or Alaskan Native | | | 13 | 13 | |
| Asian | | | 0 | 0 | |
| Black or African American | | | 1 | 2 | |
| Hispanic or Latino | | | 12 | 16 | |
| Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander | | | 2 | 1 | |
| White | | | 84 | 24 | |
| Two or more races | | | 6 | 8 | |
| Total | | | 118 | 64 | |

| Sex | Neglected Programs | Juvenile Detention | Juvenile Corrections | Adult Corrections | Other Programs |
|--------|--------------------|--------------------|----------------------|-------------------|----------------|
| Male | | | 107 | 64 | |
| Female | | | 11 | 0 | |
| Total | | | 118 | 64 | |

| Age | Neglected Programs | Juvenile Detention | Juvenile Corrections | Adult Corrections | Other Programs |
|-------------|--------------------|--------------------|----------------------|-------------------|----------------|
| 3 through 5 | | | 0 | 0 | |
| 6 | | | 0 | 0 | |
| 7 | | | 0 | 0 | |
| 8 | | | 0 | 0 | |
| 9 | | | 0 | 0 | |
| 10 | | | 0 | 0 | |
| 11 | | | 0 | 0 | |
| 12 | | | 0 | 0 | |
| 13 | | | 0 | 0 | |
| 14 | | | 3 | 0 | |
| 15 | | | 22 | 0 | |
| 16 | | | 29 | 0 | |
| 17 | | | 39 | 0 | |
| 18 | | | 25 | 17 | |
| 19 | | | 0 | 16 | |
| 20 | | | 0 | 22 | |
| 21 | | | 0 | 9 | |
| Total | | | 118 | 64 | |

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

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Comments:

FAQ on Unduplicated Count:

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

FAQ on long-term:

What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2014 through June 30, 2015.

2.4.1.3.1 Transition Services in Subpart 1

In the first row of the table below indicate whether programs/facilities receiving Subpart 1 funds within the State are legally permitted to track student outcomes after leaving the program or facility by entering Yes or No. In the second row, provide the unduplicated count of students receiving transition services that specifically target planning for further schooling and/or employment. If not, provide more information in the comment field.

| Transition Services | Neglected Programs | Juvenile Detention | Juvenile Corrections | Adult Corrections | Other Programs |
|---|--------------------|--------------------|----------------------|-------------------|----------------|
| Are facilities in your state permitted to collect data on student outcomes after exit ? (Yes or No) | No | No | No | No | No |
| Number of students receiving transition services that address further schooling and/or employment. | | | 118 | 64 | |

This response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments: Montana state law prohibits collection of data on student outcomes after exit.

FAQ on facilities collecting data on student outcomes after exit:

If only some, but not all, facilities in the State are legally permitted to collect data on student outcomes after exit, enter 'yes' for the first question and provide a comment indicating why some facilities are unable to collect these data.

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

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

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

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

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

| Outcomes (once per student, only after exit) | Neglected Programs | | Juvenile Detention | | Juvenile Corrections | | Adult Corrections | | Other Programs | |
|--|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|----------------------|--------------------|-------------------|--------------------|----------------|--------------------|
| # of Students Who Enrolled in their local district school 90 days after exit | | | | | S | | S | | | |
| Outcomes (once per student) | Neglected Programs | | Juvenile Detention | | Juvenile Corrections | | Adult Corrections | | Other Programs | |
| # of Students Who | In fac. | 90 days after exit | In fac. | 90 days after exit | In fac. | 90 days after exit | In fac. | 90 days after exit | In fac. | 90 days after exit |
| Earned a GED | | | | | 5 | S | 25 | S | | |
| Obtained high school diploma | | | | | 10 | S | 5 | S | | |
| Outcomes (once per student per time period) | Neglected Programs | | Juvenile Detention | | Juvenile Corrections | | Adult Corrections | | Other Programs | |
| # of Students Who | In fac. | 90 days after exit | In fac. | 90 days after exit | In fac. | 90 days after exit | In fac. | 90 days after exit | In fac. | 90 days after exit |
| Earned high school course credits | | | | | 63 | S | 5 | S | | |
| Enrolled in a GED program | | | | | 8 | S | 59 | S | | |
| Accepted and/or enrolled into post-secondary education | | | | | S | S | S | S | | |
| Enrolled in job training courses/programs | | | | | 6 | S | 64 | S | | |
| Obtained employment | | | | | S | S | 35 | S | | |

This response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments:

2.4.1.6 Academic Performance – Subpart 1

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

2.4.1.6.1 Academic Performance in Reading – Subpart 1

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

Report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Students who were pre-tested prior to July 1, 2014, may be included if their post-test was administered during the reporting year. Students who were post-tested after the reporting year ended should be counted in the following year. Below the table is an FAQ about the data collected in this table.

| Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data) | Neglected Programs | Juvenile Detention | Juvenile Corrections | Adult Corrections | Other Programs |
|--|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Long-term students with negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams | | | 0 | S | |
| Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams | | | 0 | S | |
| Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams | | | 6 | 17 | |
| Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams | | | 0 | 14 | |
| Comments: | | | | | |

FAQ on long-term students:

What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2014 through June 30, 2015.

2.4.1.6.2 Academic Performance in Mathematics – Subpart 1

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

| Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data) | Neglected Programs | Juvenile Detention | Juvenile Corrections | Adult Corrections | Other Programs |
|--|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Long-term students with negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams | | | 0 | 0 | |
| Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams | | | 0 | S | |
| Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams | | | 6 | 19 | |
| Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams | | | 0 | 12 | |
| Comments: | | | | | |

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

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

2.4.2.1 Programs and Facilities – Subpart 2

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

| LEA Program/Facility Type | # Programs/Facilities | Average Length of Stay (# days) |
|---------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------------------|
| At-risk programs | 5 | 36 |
| Neglected programs | 0 | 0 |
| Juvenile detention | 2 | 12 |
| Juvenile corrections | 1 | 105 |
| Other | 8 | 28 |
| Total | 16 | //////////////////////////////////// |
| Comments: | | |

FAQ on average length of stay:

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

2.4.2.1.1 Programs and Facilities That Reported - Subpart 2

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

The total row will be automatically calculated.

| LEA Program/Facility Type | # Reporting Data |
|---------------------------|------------------|
| At-risk programs | 5 |
| Neglected programs | 0 |
| Juvenile detention | 2 |
| Juvenile corrections | 1 |
| Other | 8 |
| Total | 16 |
| Comments: | |

2.4.2.2 Students Served – Subpart 2

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

| # of Students Served | At-Risk Programs | Neglected Programs | Juvenile Detention | Juvenile Corrections | Other Programs |
|------------------------------------|------------------|--------------------|--------------------|----------------------|----------------|
| Total Unduplicated Students Served | 357 | | 380 | 132 | 192 |
| Total Long Term Students Served | 243 | | 7 | 17 | 61 |

| Student Subgroups | At-Risk Programs | Neglected Programs | Juvenile Detention | Juvenile Corrections | Other Programs |
|--|------------------|--------------------|--------------------|----------------------|----------------|
| Students with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 33 | | 32 | 5 | 12 |
| LEP Students | 2 | | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| Race/Ethnicity | At-Risk Programs | Neglected Programs | Juvenile Detention | Juvenile Corrections | Other Programs |
|---|------------------|--------------------|--------------------|----------------------|----------------|
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 42 | | 174 | 55 | 61 |
| Asian | 4 | | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Black or African American | 10 | | 19 | 0 | 3 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 9 | | 13 | 5 | 2 |
| Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander | 15 | | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| White | 276 | | 171 | 72 | 115 |
| Two or more races | 1 | | 2 | 0 | 10 |
| Total | 357 | | 380 | 132 | 192 |

| Sex | At-Risk Programs | Neglected Programs | Juvenile Detention | Juvenile Corrections | Other Programs |
|--------|------------------|--------------------|--------------------|----------------------|----------------|
| Male | 209 | | 254 | 109 | 114 |
| Female | 141 | | 126 | 23 | 78 |
| Total | 350 | | 380 | 132 | 192 |

| Age | At-Risk Programs | Neglected Programs | Juvenile Detention | Juvenile Corrections | Other Programs |
|--------------|------------------|--------------------|--------------------|----------------------|----------------|
| 3- through 5 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| 6 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 7 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8 | 1 | | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 9 | 2 | | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 10 | 0 | | 13 | 0 | 1 |
| 11 | 3 | | 12 | 0 | 0 |
| 12 | 4 | | 8 | 0 | 4 |
| 13 | 9 | | 38 | 2 | 12 |
| 14 | 43 | | 37 | 10 | 18 |
| 15 | 79 | | 66 | 9 | 45 |
| 16 | 101 | | 65 | 27 | 40 |
| 17 | 67 | | 96 | 54 | 39 |
| 18 | 44 | | 45 | 13 | 17 |
| 19 | 4 | | 0 | 5 | 2 |
| 20 | 0 | | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| 21 | 0 | | 0 | 7 | 0 |
| Total | 357 | | 380 | 132 | 191 |

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

| |
|---|
| LEA data submitted to us was in error as they did not report the proper number of children by sex or age in at-risk and other programs. |
|---|

FAQ on Unduplicated Count:

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

FAQ on long-term:

What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2014 through June 30, 2015.

2.4.2.3.1 Transition Services in Subpart 2

In the first row of the table below indicate whether programs/facilities receiving Subpart 2 funds within the State are legally permitted to track student outcomes after leaving the program or facility by entering Yes or No. In the second row, provide the unduplicated count of students receiving transition services that specifically target planning for further schooling and/or employment. If not, provide more information in the comment field.

| Transition Services | At-Risk Programs | Neglected Programs | Juvenile Detention | Juvenile Corrections | Other Programs |
|---|------------------|--------------------|--------------------|----------------------|----------------|
| Are facilities in your state permitted to collect data on student outcomes after exit ? (Yes or No) | No | No | No | No | No |
| Number of students receiving transition services that address further schooling and/or employment. | 27 | | 333 | | 39 |

This response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments: Montana state law prohibits the collection of data on student outcomes after exit.
We do not have these programs and, therefore, do not collect data for them.

FAQ on facilities collecting data on student outcomes after exit:

If only some, but not all, facilities in the State are legally permitted to collect data on student outcomes after exit, enter 'yes' for the first question and provide a comment indicating why some facilities are unable to collect these data.

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

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

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

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

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

| Outcomes (once per student), only after exit | At-Risk Programs | | Neglected Programs | | Juvenile Detention | | Juvenile Corrections | | Other Programs | |
|--|------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|----------------------|--------------------|----------------|--------------------|
| # of Students Who Enrolled in their local district school 90 days after exit | S | | | | S | | S | | S | |
| Outcomes (once per student) | At-Risk Programs | | Neglected Programs | | Juvenile Detention | | Juvenile Corrections | | Other Programs | |
| # of Students Who Earned a GED | In fac. | 90 days after exit | In fac. | 90 days after exit | In fac. | 90 days after exit | In fac. | 90 days after exit | In fac. | 90 days after exit |
| Obtained high school diploma | S | S | 0 | | S | S | S | S | S | S |
| Obtained high school diploma | 9 | S | 0 | | S | S | S | S | 4 | S |
| Outcomes (once per student per time period) | At-Risk Programs | | Neglected Programs | | Juvenile Detention | | Juvenile Corrections | | Other Programs | |
| # of Students Who Earned high school course credits | In fac. | 90 days after exit | In fac. | 90 days after exit | In fac. | 90 days after exit | In fac. | 90 days after exit | In fac. | 90 days after exit |
| Enrolled in a GED program | 302 | | 0 | | 22 | | 48 | S | 108 | |
| Accepted and/or enrolled into post-secondary education | 7 | S | 0 | | 4 | | 25 | S | 8 | |
| Enrolled in job training courses/programs | S | S | 0 | | S | S | S | S | S | S |
| Obtained employment | S | S | 0 | | S | S | S | S | 8 | |

This response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments: Program data may have been collected on students who enrolled in local LEAs through the state student information system.
Montana is running into errors on the CSPR Part II regarding zero values reported in EDFacts files C181 SEA and C181 LEA. We were advised by Partner

Support to resubmit these files excluding the zero values. However, if we remove the zero values we will not have any data to report. (The LEA-level file was submitted with a few greater-than-zero values, but it has been determined these are invalid and should not have been reported.)

We do not have these programs and, therefore, do not collect data for them.

Although Montana is not allowed to track students after exit, many students do stay in contact with educational staff from the facility. Some students exiting the program remain in the same school district as this is their home district.

Program staff also have contact with the receiving school districts regarding transfer of records and educationally-related information requests from school counselors or classroom teachers attempting to smoothly transition students back into the regular classroom.

At Risk and Juvenile Detention programs are of a short term nature. Students would not have time to enroll in post-secondary educational programs, or complete a GED or High School diploma program. Due to the short term nature of these programs, there are no job training courses or programs and students are unable to leave the facilities to obtain employment.

2.4.2.6 Academic Performance – Subpart 2

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

2.4.2.6.1 Academic Performance in Reading – Subpart 2

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

Report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Students who were pre-tested prior to July 1, 2014, may be included if their post-test was administered during the reporting year. Students who were post-tested after the reporting year ended should be counted in the following year. Below the table is an FAQ about the data collected in this table.

| Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data) | At-Risk Programs | Neglected Programs | Juvenile Detention | Juvenile Corrections | Other Programs |
|--|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Long-term students with negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams | 27 | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams | 14 | | 0 | 0 | 20 |
| Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams | 28 | | 7 | 9 | S |
| Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams | 41 | | 0 | 8 | 35 |
| Comments: | | | | | |

FAQ on long-term:

What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2014, through June 30, 2015.

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

2.4.2.6.2 Academic Performance in Mathematics – Subpart 2

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

| Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data) | At-Risk Programs | Neglected Programs | Juvenile Detention Facilities | Juvenile Corrections Facilities | Other Programs |
|--|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|--|--|---------------------------|
| Long-term students with negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams | 25 | | S | S | S |
| Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams | 22 | | S | S | 36 |
| Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams | 27 | | 5 | 7 | 19 |
| Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams | 38 | | S | 6 | S |
| Comments: | | | | | |

FAQ on long-term:

What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2014, through June 30, 2015.

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

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

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

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

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

| Purpose | # LEAs |
|--|---------------|
| Teacher recruitment and retention, including the use of signing bonuses and other financial incentives | 0 |
| Teacher professional development, including programs that train teachers to utilize technology to improve teaching and to train special needs teachers | 1 |
| Educational technology, including software and hardware as described in Title II, Part D | 2 |
| Parental involvement activities | 0 |
| Activities authorized under the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program (Title IV, Part A) | 0 |
| Activities authorized under Title I, Part A | 18 |
| Activities authorized under Title III (Language instruction for LEP and immigrant students) | 0 |
| Comments: | |

2.9.2.1 Goals and Objectives

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Montana funds all RLIS-eligible districts by formula and every year the number and names of those districts change.

In order to find commonality, only those who were consistently in the RLIS program are reported here. Although other LEAs were funded in 2014-2015, they were only in the program for a short time so no trend line is evident.

Since 2004, there have been five LEAs consistently eligible for the RLIS program and these are reported below.

GOAL 1: ALL STUDENTS WILL ATTAIN PROFICIENCY OR BETTER IN READING AND MATHEMATICS.

Montana began using a new statewide assessment in the spring of 2015. These scores represent a baseline due to: (1) this is a new test; (2) this is the first year that students were tested on the computer and not on paper; and, (3) the fact that the contractor experienced many problems delivering the tests. For these reasons, these scores cannot be compared to scores on the previously used state test.

Cut Bank Elementary has 45 percent proficient or better in reading and 25.5 percent proficient or better in mathematics in 2015.

Hardin Elementary has 22.6 percent proficient or better in reading and 24 percent proficient or better in mathematics in 2015.

Libby K-12 Schools has 33 percent proficient or better in reading and 56 percent proficient or better in mathematics in 2015.

Ronan Elementary has 10 percent proficient or better in reading and 26.3 percent proficient or better in mathematics in 2015.

Wolf Point Elementary has 12 percent proficient or better in reading and 14.3 percent proficient or better in mathematics in 2015.

GOAL 3: ALL STUDENTS WILL BE TAUGHT BY HIGHLY QUALIFIED TEACHERS.

During the school year 2014-2015, all of the five LEAs had nearly 100 percent HQT. These are the numbers: Cut Bank Elementary, 96.6 percent; Hardin Elementary, 100 percent; Libby K-12, 100 percent; Ronan Elementary, 92.6 percent; and Wolf Point Elementary 96.8 percent.

GOAL 5: ALL STUDENTS WILL GRADUATE FROM HIGH SCHOOL.

For the first three years, drop out data was self-reported. Then, in 2007, the SEA contracted for a student information system that tracks individual students.

Cut Bank Elementary decreased the dropout rate from 1.2 percent in 2004 to 0 percent in 2015.

Hardin Elementary decreased the dropout rate from 1.2 percent in 2004 to 0 percent in 2015.

Libby K-12 Schools decreased the dropout rate from 6.1 percent in 2004 to 2.7 percent in 2015.

Ronan Elementary decreased the dropout rate from 1.2 percent in 2004 to 0.5 percent in 2015.

Wolf Point Elementary increased their dropout rate from 0.0 percent in 2004 to 5.1 percent in 2015. Their dropout rate fluctuates with the make-up of the student body and has been as low as 0.97 percent in 2010-2011.

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

2.10.1 State Transferability of Funds

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

| State Transferability of Funds | Yes/No |
|--|-----------|
| Did the State transfer funds under the State Transferability authority of Section 6123(a) during SY 2014-15? | <u>No</u> |
| Comments: | |

2.10.2 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Transferability of Funds

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

| LEA Transferability of Funds | # |
|--|---|
| LEAs that notified the State that they were transferring funds under the LEA Transferability authority of Section 6123(b). | 1 |
| Comments: | |

2.10.2.1 LEA Funds Transfers

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

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

In the table below provide the total amount of FY 2014 appropriated funds transferred from and to each eligible program.

| Program | Total Amount of Funds Transferred FROM Eligible Program | Total Amount of Funds Transferred TO Eligible Program |
|---|---|---|
| Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Section 2121) | 24,834.00 | 0.00 |
| Educational Technology State Grants (Section 2412(a)(2)(A)) | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (Section 4112(b)(1)) | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| State Grants for Innovative Programs (Section 5112(a)) | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Title I, Part A, Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs | | 24,834.00 |
| Total | 24,834.00 | 24,834.00 |
| Comments: | | |

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

2.11 GRADUATION RATES⁴

This section collects graduation rates.

2.11.1 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rates

In the table below, provide the graduation rates calculated using the methodology that was approved as part of the State's accountability plan for the **current school year** (SY 2014-15). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

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

| Student Group | # Students in Cohort | # of Graduates | Graduation Rate |
|--|----------------------|----------------|-----------------|
| All Students | 10,647 | S | 86.0 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 1,163 | S | 67 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 149 | S | 95 |
| <i>Asian</i> | 116 | S | S |
| <i>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</i> | 33 | S | >=90 |
| Black or African American | 148 | S | 82 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 400 | S | 83 |
| White | 8,787 | S | 88.7 |
| Two or more races | | | |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 1,284 | S | 75 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 381 | S | 62 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 4,778 | S | 76.9 |

FAQs on graduation rates:

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

The response is limited to 500 characters.

Our graduation rate has improved due to the Montana Graduation Initiative encouraging students to stay in school.

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

2.12 LISTS OF SCHOOLS AND DISTRICTS

This section contains data on school statuses. States with approved *ESEA* Flexibility requests should follow the instructions in sections 2.12.1 and 2.12.3. All other states should follow the instructions in sections 2.12.2 and 2.12.4. These tables will be generated based on data submitted to *EDFacts* and included as part of each state's certified report; states will no longer upload their lists separately. Data will be generated into separate reports for each question listed below.

2.12.1 List of Schools for *ESEA* Flexibility States

2.12.1.1 List of Reward Schools

Instructions for States that identified reward schools⁵ under *ESEA* flexibility for SY 2015-16 : Provide the information listed in the bullets below for those schools.

- | District Name
- | District NCES ID Code
- | School Name
- | School NCES ID Code
- | Whether the school met the proficiency target in reading/language arts in accordance with the State's approved *ESEA* flexibility request
- | Whether the school met the 95 percent participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- | Whether the school met the proficiency target in mathematics in accordance with the State's approved *ESEA* flexibility request
- | Whether the school met the 95 percent participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- | Whether the school met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) in accordance with the State's approved *ESEA* flexibility request
- | Whether the school met the graduation rate goal or target for high schools (if applicable) in accordance with the State's approved *ESEA* flexibility request
- | If applicable, State-specific status in addition to reward (e.g., grade, star, or level)
- | Whether the school was identified as a high progress or high performing reward school
- | Whether (yes or no) the school is a Title I school (*This information must be provided by all States.*)
- | Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003(a).
- | Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003(g).

The data for this question are reported through *EDFacts* files and compiled in the EDEN030 "List of Reward Schools" report in the *EDFacts* Reporting System (ERS). The *EDFacts* files and data groups used in this report are listed in the CSPR Crosswalk. The CSPR Data Key contains more detailed information on how the data are populated into the report.

Before certifying Part II of the CSPR, a state user must run the EDEN030 report in ERS and verify that the state's data are correct . The final, certified data from this report will be made publicly available alongside the state's certified CSPR PDF.

Comments:

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

2.12.1.2 List of Priority and Focus Schools

Instructions for States that identified priority and focus schools⁶ under ESEA flexibility for SY 2015-16 : Provide the information listed in the bullets below for those schools.

- | District Name
- | District NCES ID Code
- | School Name
- | School NCES ID Code
- | Whether the school met the proficiency target in reading/language arts in accordance with the State's approved ESEA flexibility request
- | Whether the school met the 95 percent participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- | Whether the school met the proficiency target in mathematics in accordance with the State's approved ESEA flexibility request
- | Whether the school met the 95 percent participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- | Whether the school met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) in accordance with the State's approved ESEA flexibility request
- | Whether the school met the graduation rate goal or target for high schools (if applicable) in accordance with the State's approved ESEA flexibility request
- | Status for SY 2015-16 (Use one of the following status designations: priority or focus)
- | If applicable, State-specific status in addition to priority or focus (e.g., grade, star, or level)
- | Whether (yes or no) the school is a Title I school (*This information must be provided by all States.*)
- | Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through Section 1003(a).
- | Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through Section 1003(g).

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

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

Comments:

⁶ The definitions of priority and focus schools are provided in the document titled, *ESEA Flexibility*. This document may be accessed on the Department's Web page at <http://www.ed.gov/esea/flexibility/documents/esea-flexibility.doc>

2.12.1.3 List of Other Identified Schools

Instructions for States that identified non- priority, focus, or reward schools⁷ with State-specific statuses under ESEA flexibility for SY 2015-16 : Provide the information listed in the bullets below for those schools.

- | District Name
- | District NCES ID Code
- | School Name
- | School NCES ID Code
- | Whether the school met the proficiency target in reading/language arts in accordance with the State's approved ESEA flexibility request
- | Whether the school met the 95 percent participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- | Whether the school met the proficiency target in mathematics in accordance with the State's approved ESEA flexibility request
- | Whether the school met the 95 percent participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- | Whether the school met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) in accordance with the State's approved ESEA flexibility request
- | Whether the school met the graduation rate goal or target for high schools (if applicable) in accordance with the State's approved ESEA flexibility request
- | State-specific designation (e.g., grade, star, or level)
- | Whether (yes or no) the school is a Title I school (*This information must be provided by all States.*)
- | Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through Section 1003(a).
- | Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through Section 1003(g).

The data for this question are reported through EDFacts files and compiled in the EDEN032 "List of Other Identified Schools" report in the EDFacts Reporting System (ERS). The EDFacts files and data groups used in this report are listed in the CSPR Crosswalk. The CSPR Data Key contains more detailed information on how the data are populated into the report.

Before certifying Part II of the CSPR, a state user must run the EDEN032 report in ERS and verify that the state's data are correct . The final, certified data from this report will be made publicly available alongside the state's certified CSPR PDF.

Comments:

⁷ The definitions of reward, priority, and focus schools are provided in the document titled, ESEA Flexibility. This document may be accessed on the Department's Web page at <http://www.ed.gov/esea/flexibility/documents/esea-flexibility.doc>.

2.12.2 List of Schools for All Other States

2.12.2.1 List of Schools Identified for Improvement

Instructions for States that identified schools for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under *ESEA* section 1116 for SY 2015-16: Provide the information listed in the bullets below for those schools.

- | District Name
- | District NCES ID Code
- | School Name
- | School NCES ID Code
- | Whether the school met the proficiency target in reading/language arts in accordance with the State's Accountability Plan
- | Whether the school met the 95 percent participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- | Whether the school met the proficiency target in mathematics in accordance with the State's Accountability Plan
- | Whether the school met the 95 percent participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- | Whether the school met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) in accordance with the State's Accountability Plan
- | Whether the school met the graduation rate target for high schools (if applicable) in accordance with the State's Accountability Plan
- | Status for SY 2015-16 (Use one of the following status designations: School Improvement – Year 1, School Improvement – Year 2, Corrective Action, Restructuring Year 1 (planning), or Restructuring Year 2 (implementing))⁸
- | Whether (yes or no) the school is a Title I school (*This information must be provided by all States.*)
- | Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through Section 1003(a).
- | Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through Section 1003(g).

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

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

Comments:

⁸ The school improvement statuses are defined in *LEA and School Improvement Non-Regulatory Guidance*. This document may be accessed on the Department's Web page at <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/schoolimprovementguid.doc>.

2.12.3 List of Districts for ESEA Flexibility States

2.12.3.1 List of Identified Districts with State Specific Statuses

Instructions for States that identified school districts with State-specific statuses under *ESEA* flexibility for SY 2015-16: Provide the information listed in the bullets below for those districts.

- | District name
- | District NCES ID code
- | Whether the district met the proficiency target in reading/language arts in accordance with the State's approved *ESEA* flexibility request
- | Whether the district met the 95 percent participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- | Whether the district met the proficiency target in mathematics in accordance with the State's approved *ESEA* flexibility request
- | Whether the district met the 95 percent participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- | Whether the district met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) in accordance with the State's approved *ESEA* flexibility request
- | Whether the district met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) in accordance with the State's approved *ESEA* flexibility request
- | State-specific status for SY 2015-16 (e.g., grade, star, or level)
- | Whether the district received Title I funds.

The data for this question are reported through ED Facts files and compiled in the EDEN030 "List of Reward Schools" report in the ED Facts Reporting System (ERS). The ED Facts files and data groups used in this report are listed in the CSPR Crosswalk. The CSPR Data Key contains more detailed information on how the data are populated into the report.

Before certifying Part II of the CSPR, a state user must run the EDEN030 report in ERS and verify that the state's data are correct. The final, certified data from this report will be made publicly available alongside the state's certified CSPR PDF.

Comments:

2.12.4 List of Districts for All Other States

2.12.4.1 List of Districts Identified for Improvement

Instructions for States that identified school districts for improvement or corrective action⁹ under *ESEA* section 1116 for SY 2015-16: Provide the information listed in the bullets below for those districts.

- | District Name
- | District NCES ID Code
- | Whether the district met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- | Whether the district met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- | Whether the district met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- | Whether the district met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- | Whether the district met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- | Whether the district met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- | Improvement status for SY 2015-16 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: Improvement or Corrective Action)
- | Whether the district received Title I funds.

The data for this question are reported through EDFacts files and compiled in the EDEN035 "List of Districts Identified for Improvement" report in the EDFacts Reporting System (ERS). The EDFacts files and data groups used in this report are listed in the CSPR Crosswalk. The CSPR Data Key contains more detailed information on how the data are populated into the report.

Before certifying Part II of the CSPR, a state user must run the EDEN035 report in ERS and verify that the state's data are correct. The final, certified data from this report will be made publicly available alongside the state's certified CSPR PDF.

Comments:

⁹ The district improvement statuses are defined in *LEA and School Improvement Non-Regulatory Guidance*. This document may be accessed on the Department's Web page at <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/schoolimprovementguid.doc>.