

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

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

For reporting on
School Year 2005-2006



PART I DUE DECEMBER 1, 2006
PART II DUE FEBRUARY 1, 2007

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON DC 20202

INTRODUCTION

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

The Consolidated State Application and Report includes the following ESEA programs:

- Title I, Part A – *Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies.*
- Title I, Part B, Subpart 3 – *William F. Goodling Even Start Family Literacy Programs.*
- Title I, Part C – *Education of Migratory Children.*
- Title I, Part D – *Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk.*
- Title I, Part F – *Comprehensive School Reform.*
- Title II, Part A – *Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund).*
- Title II, Part D – *Enhancing Education through Technology.*
- 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 IV, Part B – *21st Century Community Learning Centers.*
- 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.*

In addition to the programs cited above, the Title X, Part C - *Education for Homeless Children and Youths* program data will be incorporated in the CSPR for 2005-2006.

The NCLB Consolidated State Performance Report for the 2005-2006 school year consists of two information collections. Part I of this report is due to the Department by December 1, 2006 . Part II is due to the Department by February 1, 2007.

PART I

Part I of the Consolidated State Report, which States must submit to the Department by **December 1, 2006**, 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 ESEA. The five ESEA Goals established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application are as follows:

- **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.

PART II

Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report consists of information related to State activities and outcomes of specific ESEA programs for the 2005-2006 school year. Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report is due to the Department by **February 1, 2007**. The information requested in Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report for the 2005-2006 school year necessarily varies from program to program. However, for all programs, 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.
3. The information will provide valid evidence of program outcomes or results.
4. The Consolidated State Performance Report is the best vehicle for collection of the data.

The Department is continuing to work with the Performance-Based Data Management Initiative (PBDMI) to streamline data collections for the 2005-2006 school year and beyond.

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the 2005-2006 school year must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **December 1, 2007**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **February 1, 2007**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the 2005-2006 school year, unless otherwise noted.

The format states will use to submit the Consolidated State Performance Report has changed to an online submission. 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 "2005-06 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 2005-2006 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

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

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART I

For reporting on
School Year 2005-2006



PART I DUE DECEMBER 1, 2006

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

Section 1111(b)(1) of ESEA requires States to adopt challenging academic content and achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science and to develop assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(3) in the required grade levels. In the following sections, States are asked to provide a detailed description of their progress in meeting the NCLB standards and assessments requirements.

1.1.1 Please provide a detailed description of the State's progress in adopting challenging academic content standards in science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(1).

State Response

Pursuant to Administrative Rules of Montana, 10.54.2503 Standards Review Schedule (1) Montana's Content and Performance Standards shall be reviewed and revised on a five-year cycle beginning July 1, 2005. (2) A schedule for review of specific programs shall be established as a collaborative process with the Office of Public Instruction and the Board of Public Education with input from representatives of accredited schools. (3) The standards review process shall use context information, criteria, processes, and procedures identified by the Office of Public Instruction with input from representatives of accredited schools.

The 1999 K-12 Science Standards were reviewed and revised during a year-long process from 2005-2006. A 15-member K-16 writing team followed the standards revision guidelines, as outlined by the Board of Public Education, making recommended amendments to the standards. In compliance with the Montana Association of Presidential Awardees (MAPA) rules, the recommended amendments were reviewed by Montana citizens and a public hearing was held October 31, 2006. In November 2006, the K-12 Science Content Standards and Performance Descriptors were adopted as amended into Administrative Rules of Montana by the Board of Public Education.

The Montana Standards process remains as stated below.

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

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

1.1.2 Please provide a detailed description of the State's progress in developing and implementing, in consultation with LEAs, assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(3) in the required grade levels. Please provide in your response a description of the State's progress in developing alternate assessments for students with disabilities, including alternate assessments aligned to alternate achievement standards and those aligned to grade-level achievement standards.

State Response

Prior to school year 2003-2004

Developed criterion-referenced tests (CRT) in reading and math for grades 4, 8, and 10.

Developed alternate achievement standards and assessments (CRT-Alt) based on those standard in reading and math in grades 4, 8, and 10

School year 2003-2004

Administered CRT and CRT-Alt in reading and math in grades 4, 8, and 10.

School year 2004-2005

Administered CRT and CRT-Alt in reading and math in grades 4, 8, and 10.

Prior to school year 2005-2006

Developed criterion-referenced tests (CRT) in reading and math for grades 3, 5, 6 and 7.

Developed alternate achievement standards and assessments (CRT-Alt) based on those standards in reading and math in grades 3, 5, 6 and 7.

School year 2005-2006

Administered CRT and CRT-Alt in reading and math in grades 3-8 and 10.

School year 2006-2007

Administer CRT and CRT-Alt in reading and math in grades 3-8 and 10.

Prior to school year 2007-2008

Develop criterion-referenced tests (CRT) in science for grades 4, 8, and 10.

Develop alternate achievement standards and assessments (CRT-Alt) based on those standard science in grades 4, 8, and 10

School year 2007-2008

Administer CRT and CRT-Alt in reading and math in grades 3-8 and 10.

Administer CRT and CRT-Alt in science in grades 4, 8, and 10.

1.1.3 Please provide a detailed description of the State's progress in setting, in consultation with LEAs, academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(1). If applicable, please provide in your response a description of the State's progress in developing alternate achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.

State Response

For the timeline on the progress of the development of alternate achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, please refer to section 1.1.2 above.

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS**Participation of All Students in 2005-2006 State Assessments**

In the following tables, please provide the total number and percentage for each of the listed subgroups of students who participated in the State's 2005-2006 school year academic assessments.

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

1.2.1 Student Participation in 2005-2006 School Year Test Administration**1.2.1.1 2005-2006 School Year Mathematics Assessment**

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Tested
All Students	76681	99.40
American Indian or Alaska Native	8503	98.40
Asian or Pacific Islander	909	99.70
Black, non-Hispanic	680	99.60
Hispanic	1807	99.30
White, non-Hispanic	64782	99.50
Students with Disabilities	9619	98.40
Limited English Proficient	3410	98.00
Economically Disadvantaged	27531	99.10
Migrant	216	100.00
Male	39366	99.30
Female	37315	99.50

Comments:

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.2.1.2 2005-2006 School Year Reading/Language Arts Assessment

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Tested
All Students	76685	99.40
American Indian or Alaska Native	8512	98.50
Asian or Pacific Islander	896	98.30
Black, non-Hispanic	680	99.60
Hispanic	1797	98.80
White, non-Hispanic	64800	99.60
Students with Disabilities	9631	98.60
Limited English Proficient	3397	97.60
Economically Disadvantaged	27535	99.10
Migrant	214	99.10
Male	39372	99.30
Female	37313	99.50

Comments:

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in State Assessment System

Students with disabilities (as defined under IDEA) participate in the State's assessment system either by taking the regular State assessment, with or without accommodations, by taking an alternate assessment aligned to grade-level standards, or by taking an alternate assessment aligned to alternate achievement standards. In the following table, please provide the total number and percentage of students with disabilities who participated in these various assessments.

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

1.2.2

1.2.2.1 Participation of Students with Disabilities the in 2005-2006 School Year Test Administration -- Math Assessment

	Total Number of Students with Disabilities Tested	Percent of Students with Disabilities Tested
Regular Assessment, with or without accommodations	9021	99.00
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	616	95.00

Comments:

1.2.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities the in 2005-2006 School Year Test Administration -- Reading/Language Arts Assessment

	Total Number of Students with Disabilities Tested	Percent of Students with Disabilities Tested
Regular Assessment, with or without accommodations	9010	99.00
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	615	95.00

Comments: 1.2.2.1 Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards is N/A

1.2.2.2 Alternate Assessment aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards is N/A

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

In the following charts, please provide student achievement data from the 2005-2006 school year test administration. Charts have been provided for each of grades 3 through 8 and high school to accommodate the varied State assessment systems in mathematics and reading/language arts during the 2005-2006 school year. States should provide data on the total number of students tested as well as the percentage of students scoring at the proficient or advanced levels for those grades in which the State administered mathematics and reading/language arts assessments during the 2005-2006 school year.

The data for students with disabilities should include participation results from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, including results from alternate assessments, and do not include results from students covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

1.3.1 Grade 3 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	10676	65.20
American Indian or Alaska Native	1319	42.70
Asian or Pacific Islander	116	72.40
Black, non-Hispanic	126	56.40
Hispanic	295	54.20
White, non-Hispanic	8820	68.90
Students with Disabilities	1407	37.50
Limited English Proficient	537	28.70
Economically Disadvantaged	4381	52.90
Migrant	38	57.90
Male	5526	66.10
Female	5150	64.10

Comments:

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.2 Grade 3 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	10676	80.10
American Indian or Alaska Native	1319	62.10
Asian or Pacific Islander	116	81.90
Black, non-Hispanic	126	77.00
Hispanic	295	69.50
White, non-Hispanic	8820	83.10
Students with Disabilities	1407	49.90
Limited English Proficient	537	44.90
Economically Disadvantaged	4381	70.20
Migrant	38	79.00
Male	5526	77.10
Female	5150	83.30

Comments:

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.3 Grade 4 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	10954	63.20
American Indian or Alaska Native	1335	39.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	145	77.20
Black, non-Hispanic	115	40.90
Hispanic	297	51.20
White, non-Hispanic	9062	67.20
Students with Disabilities	1482	31.90
Limited English Proficient	498	24.50
Economically Disadvantaged	4393	50.10
Migrant	42	59.50
Male	5606	63.30
Female	5348	63.00

Comments: Percent change is due to small numbers of students and different cohorts from year to year.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.4 Grade 4 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	10954	79.30
American Indian or Alaska Native	1335	57.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	145	84.80
Black, non-Hispanic	115	73.90
Hispanic	297	74.40
White, non-Hispanic	9062	82.80
Students with Disabilities	1482	44.40
Limited English Proficient	498	37.60
Economically Disadvantaged	4393	69.00
Migrant	42	83.30
Male	5606	77.30
Female	5348	81.50

Comments: Percent change is due to small numbers of students and different cohorts from year to year.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.5 Grade 5 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	10999	61.60
American Indian or Alaska Native	1274	33.60
Asian or Pacific Islander	131	70.20
Black, non-Hispanic	110	53.60
Hispanic	259	53.70
White, non-Hispanic	9225	65.60
Students with Disabilities	1408	28.50
Limited English Proficient	440	18.90
Economically Disadvantaged	4298	47.70
Migrant	36	47.20
Male	5688	62.30
Female	5311	60.70

Comments:

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.6 Grade 5 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	10999	78.70
American Indian or Alaska Native	1274	53.50
Asian or Pacific Islander	131	88.60
Black, non-Hispanic	110	78.20
Hispanic	259	69.10
White, non-Hispanic	9225	82.30
Students with Disabilities	1408	41.60
Limited English Proficient	440	33.90
Economically Disadvantaged	4298	67.20
Migrant	36	61.10
Male	5688	76.20
Female	5311	81.40

Comments:

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.7 Grade 6 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	11421	61.30
American Indian or Alaska Native	1327	33.50
Asian or Pacific Islander	143	73.40
Black, non-Hispanic	121	46.30
Hispanic	281	57.70
White, non-Hispanic	9549	65.30
Students with Disabilities	1483	24.10
Limited English Proficient	531	21.50
Economically Disadvantaged	4419	47.00
Migrant	39	59.00
Male	5928	61.80
Female	5493	60.80

Comments:

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.8 Grade 6 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	11421	77.70
American Indian or Alaska Native	1327	52.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	143	83.20
Black, non-Hispanic	121	71.90
Hispanic	281	71.90
White, non-Hispanic	9549	81.40
Students with Disabilities	1483	36.70
Limited English Proficient	531	32.20
Economically Disadvantaged	4419	65.40
Migrant	39	66.70
Male	5928	74.60
Female	5493	80.90

Comments:

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.9 Grade 7 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	11730	60.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	1435	30.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	113	64.60
Black, non-Hispanic	92	62.00
Hispanic	265	53.60
White, non-Hispanic	9825	64.50
Students with Disabilities	1578	18.40
Limited English Proficient	583	14.90
Economically Disadvantaged	4405	43.80
Migrant	28	39.30
Male	6060	59.50
Female	5670	60.60

Comments:

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.10 Grade 7 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	11730	76.30
American Indian or Alaska Native	1435	49.90
Asian or Pacific Islander	113	84.10
Black, non-Hispanic	92	81.50
Hispanic	265	72.80
White, non-Hispanic	9825	80.10
Students with Disabilities	1578	33.10
Limited English Proficient	583	29.20
Economically Disadvantaged	4405	63.00
Migrant	28	75.00
Male	6060	72.50
Female	5670	80.40

Comments:

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.11 Grade 8 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	12498	56.60
American Indian or Alaska Native	1508	25.50
Asian or Pacific Islander	139	66.90
Black, non-Hispanic	92	46.70
Hispanic	270	34.40
White, non-Hispanic	10489	61.50
Students with Disabilities	1674	17.60
Limited English Proficient	636	15.30
Economically Disadvantaged	4505	39.30
Migrant	42	35.70
Male	6416	56.80
Female	6082	56.30

Comments: Percent change is due to small numbers of students and different cohorts from year to year.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.12 Grade 8 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	12498	74.80
American Indian or Alaska Native	1508	45.50
Asian or Pacific Islander	139	79.90
Black, non-Hispanic	92	59.80
Hispanic	270	55.20
White, non-Hispanic	10489	79.50
Students with Disabilities	1674	32.80
Limited English Proficient	636	28.80
Economically Disadvantaged	4505	60.10
Migrant	42	54.80
Male	6416	70.10
Female	6082	79.70

Comments: Percent change is due to small numbers of students and different cohorts from year to year.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.13 High School - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	12176	53.60
American Indian or Alaska Native	1263	22.70
Asian or Pacific Islander	130	69.20
Black, non-Hispanic	76	30.30
Hispanic	249	47.40
White, non-Hispanic	10458	57.40
Students with Disabilities	1327	14.50
Limited English Proficient	494	10.50
Economically Disadvantaged	3198	36.90
Migrant	11	36.40
Male	6173	54.30
Female	6003	52.80

Comments: Percent change is due to small numbers of students and different cohorts from year to year.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.14 High School - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	12176	74.70
American Indian or Alaska Native	1263	47.40
Asian or Pacific Islander	130	82.30
Black, non-Hispanic	76	61.80
Hispanic	249	66.70
White, non-Hispanic	10458	78.20
Students with Disabilities	1327	29.50
Limited English Proficient	494	27.10
Economically Disadvantaged	3198	60.30
Migrant	11	81.80
Male	6173	69.40
Female	6003	80.10

Comments: Percent change is due to small numbers of students and different cohorts from year to year.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY

1.4.1 For all public elementary and secondary schools and districts in the State (Title I and non-Title I), please provide the total number and percentage of all schools and districts that made adequate yearly progress (AYP), based on data from the 2005-2006 school year.

School Accountability	Total number of public elementary and secondary schools (Title I and non-Title I) in State	Total number of public elementary and secondary schools (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP	Percentage of public elementary and secondary schools (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP
Based on 2005-2006 School Year Data	834	752	90.20

Comments:

District Accountability	Total number of public elementary and secondary districts (Title I and non-Title I) in State	Total number of public elementary and secondary districts (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP	Percentage of public elementary and secondary districts (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP
Based on 2005-2006 School Year Data	430	361	84.00

Comments:

1.4.2 For all Title I schools and districts in the State, please provide the total number and percentage of all Title I schools and districts that made AYP, based on data from the 2005-2006 school year.

Title I School Accountability	Total number of Title I schools in State	Total number of Title I schools in State that made AYP	Percentage of Title I schools in State that made AYP
Based on 2005-2006 School Year Data	664	590	88.90

Comments:

Title I District Accountability	Total number of Title I districts in State	Total number of Title I districts in State that made AYP	Percentage of Title I districts in State that made AYP
Based on 2005-2006 School Year Data	334	266	79.60

Comments:

1.4.3 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

1.4.3.1 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement, Corrective Action, and Restructuring (in 2006-2007 based on the data from 2005-2006)

1.4.3.2 Briefly describe the measures being taken to address the achievement problems of **schools** identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring.

The Title I staff at the Montana Office of Public Instruction have worked with the identified schools in the following ways. Where district-level staff are available, they have assisted in these efforts and added their own initiatives:

- 1) Mailed AYP Reports giving details on requirements for schools in each improvements status;
- 2) Peer Review of Improvement Plans;
- 3) Call to Greatness I Institute for Restructuring Schools and Corrective Action Districts;
- 4) High Priority for Restructuring Schools and Corrective Action Districts (Call to Greatness II);
- 5) Priority status for on-site technical assistance visits and reviews;
- 6) Regular teleconferencing and telephone calls from either a Support Team Leader or OPI staff assigned to district;
- 7) High-Risk District Status and on-site technical assistance in three districts;
- 8) School Support Teams conduct Scholastic Reviews using Montana Office of Public Instruction Correlates of Effective Schools (specific correlates are designated for district level accountability) followed by comprehensive written report with findings for 90 plus indicators and recommendations for each of 9 correlates;
- 9) Team leaders conduct periodic follow-up calls and on-site visits to continue assistance.

1.4.4 Title I Districts Identified For Improvement.

1.4.4.1 Title I Districts Identified for Improvement and Corrective Action (in 2006-2007 based on the data from 2005-2006)

1.4.4.2 Briefly describe the measures being taken to address the achievement problems of districts identified for improvement and corrective action.

The Title I staff at the Montana Office of Public Instruction have worked with the identified districts in the following ways. Where district-level staff are available, they have assisted in these efforts and added their own initiatives:

- 1) Mailed AYP Reports giving details on requirements for schools in each improvements status;
- 2) Peer Review of Improvement Plans;
- 3) Call to Greatness I Institute for Restructuring Schools and Corrective Action Districts;
- 4) High Priority for Restructuring Schools and Corrective Action Districts (Call to Greatness II);
- 5) Priority status for on-site technical assistance visits and reviews;
- 6) Regular teleconferencing and telephone calls from either a Support Team Leader or OPI staff assigned to district;
- 7) High-Risk District Status and on-site technical assistance in three districts;
- 8) School Support Teams conduct Scholastic Reviews using Montana Office of Public Instruction Correlates of Effective Schools (specific correlates are designated for district level accountability) followed by comprehensive written report with findings for 90 plus indicators and recommendations for each of 9 correlates;
- 9) Team leaders conduct periodic follow-up calls and on-site visits to continue assistance.

1.4.5.1 Public School Choice	
	Number
1. Please provide the number of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring from which students transferred under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	2
2. Please provide the number of public schools to which students transferred under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year. How many of these schools were charter schools?	2
3. Please provide the number of students who transferred to another public school under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	<n
4. Please provide the number of students who were eligible to transfer to another public school under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	5376
Optional Information:	
5. If the State has the following data, the Department would be interested in knowing the following:	
6. The number of students who applied to transfer to another public school under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	
7. The number of students, among those who applied to transfer to another public school under the Title I public school choice provisions, who were actually offered the opportunity to transfer by their LEAs, during the 2005-2006 school year.	
Comments: Optional Information: N/A	

1.4.5.2 Supplemental Educational Services	
	Number
1. Please provide the number of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring whose students received supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	7
2. Please provide the number of students who received supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	28
3. Please provide the number of students who were eligible to receive supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	4664
Optional Information:	
If the State has the following data, the Department would be interested in knowing the following:	
4. The number of students who applied to receive supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	
Comments: Optional Information: N/A	

1.5 TEACHER AND PARAPROFESSIONAL QUALITY

1.5.1 In the following table, please provide data from the 2005-2006 school year for classes in the core academic subjects being taught by "highly qualified" teachers (as the term is defined in Section 9101(23) of the ESEA), in the aggregate for all schools and in "high-poverty" and "low-poverty" elementary schools (as the terms are defined in Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) of the ESEA). Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "high-poverty" schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State and "low-poverty" schools as schools in the bottom quartile of poverty in the State. Additionally, please provide information on classes being taught by highly qualified teachers by the elementary and secondary school level.

School Type	Total Number of Core Academic Classes	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers
All Schools in State	23883	23646	99.00
Elementary Level			
High-Poverty Schools	2630	2592	98.60
Low-Poverty Schools	1538	1532	99.60
All Elementary Schools	12433	12339	99.20
Secondary Level			
High-Poverty Schools	1491	1442	96.70
Low-Poverty Schools	5062	5030	99.40
All Secondary Schools	11450	11307	98.80
Comments:			

Definitions and Instructions

What are the core academic subjects?

English, reading or language arts, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, and geography [Title IX, Section 9101(11)]. While the statute includes the arts in the core academic subjects, it does not specify which of the arts are core academic subjects; therefore, States must make this determination.

How is a teacher defined?

An individual who provides instruction in the core academic areas to kindergarten, grades 1 through 12, or un-graded classes, or individuals who teach in an environment other than a classroom setting (and who maintain daily student attendance records) [from NCES, CCD, 2001-02]

How is a class defined?

A class is a setting in which organized instruction of core academic course content is provided to one or more students (including cross-age groupings) for a given period of time. (A course may be offered to more than one class). Instruction, provided by one or more teachers or other staff members, may be delivered in person or via a different medium. Classes that share space should be considered as separate classes if they function as separate units for more than 50 percent of the time [from NCES Non-fiscal Data Handbook for Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education, 2003].

Should 6th, 7th, and 8th grade classes be reported in the elementary or secondary category?

States are responsible for determining whether the content taught at the middle school level meets the competency requirements for elementary or secondary instruction. See Question A-14 in the August 3, 2006, Non-Regulatory Guidance for additional information. Report classes in grade 6 through 8 consistent with how teachers have been classified to determine their highly qualified status, regardless if their schools are configured as elementary or middle schools.

How should States count teachers (including specialists or resource teachers) in elementary classes?

States that count self-contained classrooms as one class should, to avoid over-representation, also count subject-area specialists (e.g., mathematics or music teachers) or resource teachers as teaching one class.

On the other hand, States using a departmentalized approach to instruction where a self-contained classroom is counted multiple times (once for each subject taught) should also count subject-area specialists or resource teachers as teaching multiple classes.

How should States count teachers in self-contained multiple-subject secondary classes?

Each core academic subject taught for which students are receiving credit toward graduation should be counted in the numerator and the denominator. For example, if English, calculus, history, and science are taught in a self-contained classroom by the same teacher, count these as four classes in the denominator. If the teacher is Highly Qualified in English and history, he/she would be counted as Highly Qualified in two of the four subjects in the numerator.

1.5.2 For those classes in core academic subjects being taught by teachers who are **not highly qualified** as reported in Question 1.5.1, estimate the percentages of those classes in the following categories (Note: Percentages should add to 100 percent of classes taught by not highly qualified teachers for each level).

Reason For Being Classified as Not Highly Qualified	Percentage
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL CLASSES	
a) Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	60.60
b) Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	0.00
c) Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	39.40
d) Other (please explain)	0.00
SECONDARY SCHOOL CLASSES	
a) Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	63.60
b) Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	0.00
c) Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	36.40
d) Other (please explain)	0.00
Comments:	

1.5.3 Please report the State poverty quartile breaks for high- and low-poverty elementary and secondary schools used in the table in Question 1.5.1.

	High-Poverty Schools (more than what %)	Low-Poverty Schools (less than what %)
Elementary Schools	51.90	20.40
Poverty Metric Used	Free/Reduced Lunch	
Secondary Schools	46.10	20.70
Poverty Metric Used	Free/Reduced Lunch	

Comments:

Definitions and Instructions

How are the poverty quartiles determined?

Separately rank order elementary and secondary schools from highest to lowest on your percent poverty measure. Divide the list into 4 equal groups. Schools in the first (highest group) are high-poverty schools. Schools in the last group (lowest group) are the low-poverty schools. Generally, states use the percentage of students who qualify for the free or reduced price lunch program for this calculation.

Since the poverty data are collected at the school and not classroom level, how do we classify schools as either elementary or secondary for this purpose?

States may include as elementary schools all schools that serve children in grades K-5 (including K-8 or K-12 schools) and would therefore include as secondary schools those that exclusively serve children in grades 6 and higher.

1.5.4 Paraprofessional Quality. NCLB defines a qualified paraprofessional as an employee who provides instructional support in a program supported by Title I, Part A funds who has (1) completed two 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).) 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>

In the following chart, please provide data from the 2005-2006 school year for the percentage of Title I paraprofessionals (excluding those with sole duties as translators and parental involvement assistants) who are qualified.

School Year	Percentage of Qualified Title I Paraprofessionals
2005-2006 School Year	56.00

Comments:

1.6 ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY**1.6.1.1 English Language Proficiency (ELP) Standards**

Has the State developed ELP standards (k-12) as required under Section 3113(b)(2) and are these ELP standards fully approved, adopted, or sanctioned by the State governing body?

Developed	<u>Yes</u>
Approved, adopted, sanctioned	<u>No</u>
Operationalized (e.g., Are standards being used by district and school teachers?)	<u>No</u>

Please provide a detailed description of the State's progress in establishing, implementing, and operationalizing English Language Proficiency (ELP) standards for raising the level of ELP, that are derived from the four domains of speaking, listening, reading, and writing, and that are aligned with achievement of the challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards described in section 1111(b)(1).

STATE RESPONSE

The ELP standards were developed as part of the process for developing the new English language proficiency assessment through an enhanced assessment grant from the U.S. Department of Education. They serve as the basis for the ELP assessment. The development, purpose and use of the standards have been discussed with the Title III programs.

1.6.1.2 Alignment of Standards

Please provide a detailed description of the State's progress for linking/aligning the State English Proficiency Standards to the State academic content and student academic achievement standards in English language arts/reading and mathematics.

STATE RESPONSE

The Montana content standards were created in a process that spanned 1998-2000. They are scheduled to be revised on a graduated timeline beginning with science in 2006. The ELP standards are currently aligned to the Communication Arts standards; through vocabulary, structure and theme the MWAC assessment was linked to the math standards. It was our original understanding that the ELP assessment had to be aligned to the Communication Arts standards, linked to other content area academic standards such as social studies, science and math. The math standards are to be revised in 2008. With appropriate technical assistance and clarification from the U.S. Department of Education, Montana will align the ELP standards to the math standards at that time.

1.6.2 English Language Proficiency (ELP) Assessments
1. The expectation for the full administration of the new or enhanced ELP assessment(s) that are aligned with the State's English language proficiency (ELP) standards as required under Section 3113 (b)(2) is spring 2007. Please indicate if the State has conducted any of the following:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An independent alignment study <u> No Response </u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other evidence of alignment <u> Yes </u>
2. Provide an updated description of the State's progress in developing and implementing the new or enhanced ELP assessments. Specifically describe how the State ensures:
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The annual assessment of all LEP students in the State in grades k-12; 2. The ELP assessment(s) which address the five domains of listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension; 3. ELP assessments are based on ELP standards; 4. Technical quality (validity, reliability, etc.)
STATE RESPONSE
<p>Montana is conducting the first administration of the new ELP assessment this fall. The testing window has been established from November 28 to December 19. The new assessment based on the ELP standards provides for the assessment of the domains of listening, speaking, reading and writing. From the baseline data obtained in the first administration, standards will be set, proficiency levels established in accordance with current standards of psychometry to ensure technical quality. An independent alignment study will be conducted after the first administration.</p> <p>Comment: For Item 1.6.2, Step 1, Bullet 2 "Other": The initial alignment was conducted by Measured Progress as part of the test development.</p>

1.6.3.2 Data Reflecting the Most Common Languages Spoken in the State		
2005-2006 Data of the Most Common Languages Spoken by LEPs		
Language	Number of ALL LEP Students in the State	Percentage of ALL LEP Students in the State
1. Blackfeet	1301	19.10
2. Crow	1273	18.70
3. Sioux/Dakota	720	10.60
4. German	581	8.50
5. Cree	496	7.30
6. Cheyenne	449	6.60
7. Salish	441	6.50
8. Assiniboine	289	4.20
9. Spanish	277	4.10
10. Gros Ventre	131	2.00
Comments:		

- In the above chart, list the ten most commonly spoken languages in your State. Indicate the number and percentage of LEP students that speak each of the languages listed in table 1.6.3.2.

1.6.4 Immigrant Children and Youth Data

Programs and activities for immigrant children and youth

Definitions:

- **# immigrants enrolled in the State** = number of students, who meet the definition of immigrant children and youth in Section 3301(6), enrolled in the elementary or secondary schools in the State
- **# immigrants served by Title III** = number of immigrant students who participated in programs for immigrant children and youth funded under Section 3114(d)(1), using the funds reserved for immigrant education programs/activities
- **# of immigrants subgrants** = number of subgrants made in the State under Section 3114(d)(1), with the funds reserved for immigrant education programs/activities

**Table 1.6.4 Education Programs for Immigrant Students
2005-2006**

# Immigrants enrolled in the State	# Immigrants served by Title III	# Immigrant subgrants
319	165	5

Comments:

STATE RESPONSE: (Provide information on what has changed, e.g., sudden influx of large number of immigrant children and youth, increase/change of minority language groups, sudden population change in school districts that are less experienced with education services for immigrant students in the State during the 2 previous years.)

There has been no major change in the numbers of immigrant students in Montana in the last two years.

1.6.5 Definition of Proficient

If the State has made changes since the last Consolidated State Performance Report submission (for school year 2004-2005), please provide the State's definition of "proficient" in English as defined by the State's English language proficiency standards and assessments under Section 3122(a)(3). Please include the following in your response:

1. The test score range or cut scores for each of the State's ELP assessments;
2. A description of how the five domains of listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension are incorporated or weighted in the State's definition of "proficient" in English;
3. Other criteria used to determine attaining proficiency in English.

STATE RESPONSE

No changes have been made at this time. After the first administration of the new ELP assessment, a new definition of proficiency will be developed.

1.6.6 Definition of Making Progress

If the State has made changes since the last Consolidated State Performance Report submission (for school year 2004-2005), please provide the State's definition of "making progress" in learning English as defined by the State's English language proficiency standards and assessment(s) in Section 3122(a)(3).

Please include the following in your response:

1. A description of the English language proficiency levels and any sub-levels as defined by the State's English language proficiency standards and assessments;
2. A description of the criteria students must meet to progress from one proficiency level to the next (e.g., narrative descriptions, cut scores, formula, data from multiple sources).

STATE RESPONSE

There has been no change. After the first administration of the new ELP assessment, a group of educators will be convened to establish cut scores, proficiency levels and determine how students will progress across domains from one level to the next, along with an examination of how proficiency is to be defined.

1.6.7 Definition of Cohort

If the State has made changes since the last Consolidated State Performance Report submission (for school year 2004-2005), please provide the State's definition of "cohort." Include a description of the specific characteristics of the cohort(s) in the State, e.g., grade/grade span or other characteristics.

STATE RESPONSE

No change has been made. After the administration of the new assessment, cohorts will be determined for the new AMAOs.

1.6.8 Information on the Acquisition of English Language Proficiency for ALL Limited English Proficient Students in the State.

Please provide information on the progress made by **ALL LEP students in your State** in learning English and attaining English language proficiency.

Did your State apply the Title III English language proficiency annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) to **ALL LEP** students in the State? No

If yes, you may use the format provided below to report the requested information.

English Language Proficiency	Percent and Number of ALL LEP Students in the State Who Made Progress in Learning English				Percent and Number of ALL LEP Students in the State Who Attained English Proficiency			
	Projected AMAO Target		Actual		Projected AMAO Target		Actual	
2005-2006 School Year	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#

If no, please describe the different evaluation mechanism used by the State to measure both the progress of ALL LEP students in learning English and in attaining English language proficiency and provide the data from that evaluation.

There has not been a mechanism in place to collect this data due to the lack of a student data system.

1.6.9 Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs) for English Language Proficiency for Title III Participants

Critical synthesis of data reported by Title III subgrantees

[SEC. 3121(a) p. 1701, 3123(b)(1, 3) p.1704]

Provide the results of Title III LEP students in meeting the State English language proficiency (ELP) annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) for making progress and attainment of English language proficiency as required in Table 1.6.9.

TABLE 1.6.9 INSTRUCTIONS:

Report **ONLY** the results from State English language proficiency assessment(s) for LEP students who participate in Title III English language instruction educational programs in grades K-12.

Blackened cells in this form indicate information which, each SEA should collect and maintain, but which is not being collected at this time.

Definitions:

1. **MAKING PROGRESS** = as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
2. **DID NOT MAKE PROGRESS** = The number and percentage of Title III LEP students who did not meet the State definition of "Making Progress."
3. **ATTAINED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY** = as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
4. **TOTAL** = the total number of students from **making progress**, **not making progress**, and **attainment**, for each year in the table. The figure reported in this cell should be an unduplicated count of LEP students who participate in Title III English language instruction educational programs in grades K-12.
5. **AMAO TARGET** = the AMAO target for the year as established by State and submitted to OELA in the CSA (September 2003 submission), or as amended and approved, for each objective for "Making progress" and "Attainment" of English language proficiency.
6. **ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS** = The number and percentage of Title III LEP students who met/did not meet the State definitions of "Making Progress" and the number and percentage of Title III LEP students who met the definition for "Attainment" of English language proficiency.

1.6.9 Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs) for English Language Proficiency for Title III Participants			
	2005-2006		
	AMAO TARGET	ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS	
	%	#	%
MAKING PROGRESS			
DID NOT MAKE PROGRESS			
ATTAINED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY			
TOTAL			

Explanation of data for Table

Check the answer to the following question.

Are monitored* LEP students reflected in the Table "Attainment" "Achievement Results"? No Response

* Monitored LEP students are those who

- have achieved "proficient" on the State ELP assessment
- have transitioned into classrooms that are not designed for LEP students
- are no longer receiving Title III services, and who are being monitored for academic content achievement for 2 years after transition

1.6.10 Title III program effectiveness in assisting LEP students to meet State English language proficiency and student academic achievement standards

[SEC. 3122(b)(2) p. 1703, 3123(b)(1, 4) p.1704-5, 3121(b)(2) p. 1701,]

Provide the count for each year.

It is not necessary to respond to the items in this form, which reference other collections. The information provided by each SEA to those other collections will be collected by OELA and utilized to produce the Biennial Report.

Title III Subgrantee Information	
	2005-2006
Total number of Title III subgrantees for each year	16
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for making progress	
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for attaining English proficiency	
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for AYP	
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs*	
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met 2 AMAOs	
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met 1 AMAO	
Total number of Title III subgrantees that did not meet any AMAO	
Total number of Title III subgrantees that did not meet AMAOs for two consecutive years	
Total number of Title III subgrantees with an improvement plan for not meeting Title III AMAOs	
Total number of Title III subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (beginning in 2007-08)	
Did the State meet all three Title III AMAOs? *	<u>No</u>

Comments: CSPR 1.6.9: English language proficiency (AMAO results) Montana has been unable to develop administration of our new ELP assessment which is taking place November 28-December 19, 2006. CSPR 1.6.10: Total number of sub-grantees that met all two and three AMAOs: Because of the addition of grades 4-7 to the statewide assessment, Montana has been given permission to delay making AYP determinations until January 2007. * Meeting all three Title III AMAOs means meeting each State set target for each objective: Making Progress, Attaining Proficiency and making AYP.

1.6.11 On the following tables for 2005-2006, please provide data regarding the academic achievement of monitored LEP students who transitioned into classrooms not designated for LEP students and who are no longer receiving services under Title III. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned in 2005-2006 school year.

1.6.11.1 Number and percent of former Title III served, monitored LEP students scoring at the proficient and advanced levels on the State reading language arts assessments

Grade/Grade Span	Students Proficient & Advanced	
	#	%
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
H.S.		

Comments:

1.6.11.2 Number and percent of former Title III served, monitored LEP students scoring at the proficient and advanced levels on the State mathematics assessments

Grade/Grade Span	Students Proficient & Advanced	
	#	%
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
H.S.		

Comments: Montana has been given permission to delay making AYP determinations until January 2007 to allow for the standard setting for the new grade levels included in the spring '06 statewide assessment. Because of the work currently being done on the AYP determinations, this data is not available at this time. We will be able to send the data at a later time.

1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS

1.7.1 In the following chart, please provide data for the number of schools identified as persistently dangerous as determined by the State by the start of the 2006-2007 school year. For further guidance on persistently dangerous schools, please refer to the Unsafe School Choice Option Non-Regulatory Guidance, available at:

	Number of Persistently Dangerous Schools
2006-2007 School Year	0

Comments:

1.8 GRADUATION AND DROPOUT RATES

1.8.1 Graduation Rates

Section 200.19 of the Title I regulations issued under the No Child Left Behind Act on December 2, 2002, defines graduation rate to mean:

- The percentage of students, measured from the beginning of high school, who graduate from public high school with a regular diploma (not including a GED or any other diploma not fully aligned with the State's academic standards) in the standard number of years; or,
- Another more accurate definition developed by the State and approved by the Secretary in the State plan that more accurately measures the rate of students who graduate from high school with a regular diploma; and
- Avoids counting a dropout as a transfer.

1. The Secretary approved each State's definition of the graduation rate, consistent with section 200.19 of the Title I regulations, as part of each State's accountability plan. Using the definition of the graduation rate that was approved as part of your State's accountability plan, in the following chart please provide graduation rate data for the 2004-2005 school year.

2. For those States that are reporting transitional graduation rate data and are working to put into place data collection systems that will allow the State to calculate the graduation rate in accordance with Section 200.19 for all the required subgroups, please provide a detailed progress report on the status of those efforts.

1.8.1 Graduation Rates	
High School Graduates	Graduation Rate
Student Group	2004-2005 School Year
All Students	84.80
American Indian or Alaska Native	63.60
Asian or Pacific Islander	90.80
Black, non-Hispanic	76.90
Hispanic	81.10
White, non-Hispanic	87.30
Students with Disabilities	
Limited English Proficient	
Economically Disadvantaged	
Migrant	
Male	83.60
Female	86.00
Comments: Montana doesn't have enough years of dropout information for these categories yet: Students with Disabilities; Limited English Proficient; Economically Disadvantaged, Migrant	
Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.	

1.8.2 Dropout Rate

For purposes of calculating and reporting a dropout rate for this performance indicator, States should use the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistics' (NCES) Common Core of Data

Consistent with this requirement, States must use NCES' definition of "high school dropout," An individual who: 1) was enrolled in school at some time during the previous school year; and 2) was not enrolled at the beginning of the current school year; and 3) has not graduated from high school or completed a state- or district-approved educational program; and 4) does not meet any of the following exclusionary conditions: a) transfer to another public school district, private school, or state- or district approved educational program (including correctional or health facility programs); b) temporary absence due to suspension or school-excused illness; or c) death.

In the following chart, please provide data for the 2004-2005 school year for the percentage of students who drop out of high school, disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged.

1.8.2 Dropout Rate	
Dropouts	Dropout Rate
Student Group	2004-2005 School Year
All Students	3.30
American Indian or Alaska Native	8.40
Asian or Pacific Islander	2.00
Black, non-Hispanic	2.20
Hispanic	4.30
White, non-Hispanic	2.70
Students with Disabilities	4.60
Limited English Proficient	9.40
Economically Disadvantaged	5.20
Migrant	0.00
Male	3.60
Female	3.10
Comments: Migrant: Non reported for FY05.	
Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.	

Provide the following information for homeless children and youth in your State for the 2005-2006 school year (as defined by your State). To complete this form, compile data for LEAs with and without subgrants.

1.9.1 DATA FROM ALL LEAs WITH AND WITHOUT MCKINNEY-VENTO SUBGRANTS

1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTH PROGRAM

1.9.1.1 How does your State define the period that constitutes a school year? (e.g., "The school year shall begin on the first day of July and end on the thirtieth day of June" or "A total of 175 instructional days").

STATE RESPONSE

Montana Code Annotated (MCA) 20-1-301: School fiscal year is July 1 through June 30. At least 180 school days of pupil instruction must be conducted during each fiscal school year.

1.9.1.2 What are the totals in your State as follows:

	Total Number in State	Total Number LEAs Reporting
LEAs without Subgrants	331	331
LEAs with Subgrants	4	4

Comments:

1.9.1.3 Number of Homeless Children And Youth In The State

Provide the number of homeless children and youth in your State enrolled in public school (compulsory grades--excluding pre-school) during the 2005-2006 school year according to grade level groups below:

Grade Level	Number of homeless children/youth enrolled in public school in LEAs without subgrants	Number of homeless children/youth enrolled in public school in LEAs with subgrants
K	99	43
1	112	53
2	118	58
3	120	66
4	144	50
5	136	39
6	123	46
7	118	52
8	101	43
9	87	45
10	91	29
11	71	18
12	69	21

Comments:

1.9.1.4 Primary Nighttime Residence Of Homeless Children And Youth

Of the total number of homeless children and youth (excluding preschoolers), provide the numbers who had the following as their primary nighttime residence at the time of initial identification by LEAs.

Primary nighttime residence	* Number of homeless children/ youth-- excluding preschoolers LEAs without subgrants	* Number of homeless children/ youth-- excluding preschoolers LEAs with subgrants
Shelters	672	235
Doubled-up	438	172
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, etc.)	120	50
Hotels/Motels	140	78
Unknown	19	28

Comments:

* The primary nighttime residence is the basis for identifying homeless children and youth. The totals should match the totals in item #3 above.

1.9.2 DATA FROM LEAs WITH MCKINNEY-VENTO SUBGRANTS

1.9.2.1 Number Of Homeless Children And Youths Served By McKinney-Vento Subgrants

Provide the number of homeless children and youth that were served by McKinney-Vento subgrants in your State during the 2005-2006 academic school year disaggregated by grade level groups

Grade levels of homeless children and youth served by subgrants in 2005-2006	Number of homeless children and youth <i>served</i> by subgrants enrolled in school by grade level
K	43
1	53
2	58
3	66
4	50
5	39
6	46
7	52
8	43
9	45
10	29
11	18
12	21

Comments:

1.9.2.2 Number of homeless preschool-age children

Provide the number of homeless preschool-age children in your State in districts with subgrants attending public preschool programs during the 2005-2006 school year (i.e., from birth through pre-K).

Number of homeless preschool-age children enrolled in public preschool in LEAs with subgrants in 2005-2006

54

Comments:

1.9.2.3 Unaccompanied Youths

Provide the number of unaccompanied youths served by subgrants during the 2005-2006 school year.

Number of homeless unaccompanied youths enrolled in public schools in LEAs with subgrants in 2005-2006

40

Comments:

1.9.2.4 Migrant Children/Youth Served

Provide the number of homeless migrant children/youth served by subgrants during the 2005-2006 school year.

Number of homeless migrant children/youth enrolled in public schools (Total for LEAs with subgrants)

39

Comments:

1.9.2.5 Number of Children Receiving Educational and School Support Services

Provide the number of homeless children and youth served by subgrants and enrolled in school during the 2005-2006 school year that received the following educational and school support services from the LEA

Educational and school related activities and services	Number of homeless students in subgrantee programs that received educational and support services
Special Education (IDEA)	92
English Language Learners (ELL)	<n
Gifted and Talented	<n
Vocational Education	<n

Comments:

1.9.2.6 Educational Support Services

Provide the number of subgrantee programs that provided the following educational support services with McKinney-Vento funds.

Services and Activities Provided by the McKinney-Vento subgrant program	Number of your State's subgrantees that offer these services
Tutoring or other instructional support	4
Expedited evaluations	2
Staff professional development and awareness	3
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	3
Transportation	4
Early childhood programs	1
Assistance with participation in school programs	4
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	3
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	2
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	3
Coordination between schools and agencies	4
Counseling	2
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	3
Clothing to meet a school requirement	3
School supplies	3
Referral to other programs and services	4
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	3
Other (optional)	1

Comments:

1.9.2.7 Barriers To The Education Of Homeless Children And Youth

Provide the number of subgrantees that reported the following barriers to the enrollment and success of homeless children and youth during the 2005-2006 school year.

Barriers	List number of subgrantees reporting each barrier
Eligibility for homeless services	0
School selection	1
Transportation	0
School records	0
Immunizations or other medical records	1
Other enrollment issues	2

Comments:

1.9.2.8 Additional Barriers (Optional)

Note any other barriers not listed above that were frequently reported:

List other barriers	List number of subgrantees reporting each barrier
Guardianship	3
Unaccompanied Youth	2

Comments:

1.9.2.9 Academic Progress of Homeless Students

In order to ensure that homeless children and youth have access to education and other services needed to meet the State's challenging academic standards:

a) Check the grade levels in which your State administered a statewide assessment in reading or mathematics; b) note the number of homeless children and youth served by subgrants in 2005-2006 that were included in statewide assessments in reading or mathematics; and c) note the number of homeless children and youth that met or exceeded the State's proficiency level or standard on the reading or mathematics assessment.

Reading Assessment:

School Grade Levels *	a) Reading assessment by grade level (check boxes where appropriate; indicate "DNA" if assessment is required and data is not available for reporting; indicate "N/A" for grade not assessed by State)	b) Number of homeless children/youth taking reading assessment test.	c) Number of homeless children/youth that met or exceeded state proficiency.
Grade 3	DNA		
Grade 4	Yes	40	19
Grade 5	DNA		
Grade 6	DNA		
Grade 7	DNA		
Grade 8	Yes	36	13
Grade 9	N/A		
Grade 10	Yes	13	<n
Grade 11	N/A		
Grade 12	N/A		

Comments:**Mathematics Assessment:**

School Grade Levels *	a) Mathematics assessment by grade level (check boxes where appropriate; indicate "DNA" if assessment is required and data is not available for reporting; indicate "N/A" for grade not assessed by State)	b) Number of homeless children/youth taking mathematics assessment test.	c) Number of homeless children/youth that met or exceeded state proficiency.
Grade 3	DNA		
Grade 4	Yes	40	20
Grade 5	DNA		
Grade 6	DNA		
Grade 7	DNA		
Grade 8	Yes	36	14
Grade 9	N/A		
Grade 10	Yes	13	11
Grade 11	N/A		
Grade 12	N/A		

Comments: In Section 1.9.2.9: Not all subgrantees had data available to report so there is an indication of DNA in Reading and Mathematics, grades 3, 5, 6 and 7.

* Note: State assessments in grades 3-8 and one year of high school are NCLB requirements. However, States may assess students in other grades as well.