

# **CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: Part 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 2002-2003**



**DUE JUNE 30, 2004**

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

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| Introduction   | ii  |
| General Instructions and Timelines   | vi  |
| Cover Page for Submission  | vii |
| Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies (Title I, Part A)                                      | 1   |
| William F. Goodling Even Start Family Literacy Programs (Title I, Part B, Subpart 3)                                   | 5   |
| Education of Migratory Children (Title I, Part C)  | 10  |
| Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent or At-Risk (Title I, Part D) | 21  |
| Comprehensive School Reform (Title I, Part F)  | 22  |
| Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Teacher and Principal and Recruiting Fund) Title II, Part A)                   | 23  |
| Enhancing Education Through Technology (Title II, Part D)  | 24  |
| English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement (Title III, Part A)                       | 25  |
| Safe and Drug Free Schools and Communities Act (Title IV, Part A)  | 27  |
| 21 <sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Centers (Title IV, Part B)   | 31  |
| Innovative Programs (Title V, Part A)  | 32  |
| Rural Education Achievement Program (REAP) (Title VI, Part B)  | 34  |
| Funding Transferability for State and Local Educational Agencies (Title VI, Part A, Subpart 2)                         | 35  |

# 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 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 – *21<sup>st</sup> 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*

The NCLB Consolidated State Performance Report for the 2002-2003 school year consists of two information collections. Part I of the Consolidated State Report, which States submitted to the Department on December 22, 2003, requested 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 NCLB. Through the September 2003 Consolidated State Application submissions and through Part I of the Consolidated State Performance Report, States have already submitted the following 2002-2003 school year data related to the five ESEA goals.

- **Performance goal 1:** By 2013-2014, all students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.

In Part I of the Consolidated State Performance Report, States reported the percentage of students proficient or advanced in reading/language arts and mathematics, based on assessments administered in the 2002-2003 school year. States reported achievement data for the following subgroups of students: all students, major racial/ethnic groups, students with disabilities, limited English proficient students, economically disadvantaged students, migrant students, and gender.

- **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.

In the September 2003 Consolidated State Application submission, States provided the following: (1) the status of the State's efforts to establish English language proficiency (ELP) standards that relate to the development and attainment of English proficiency by limited English proficient students; (2) English language proficiency (ELP) data from the 2002-2003 school year test administration; (3) Information on the total number of students assessed for English language proficiency on State-selected ELP assessment(s); (4) Information on the total number of students identified as LEP on State-selected ELP assessment(s); and (5) performance targets/annual measurable achievement objectives for the percentage or number of LEP students who will make progress in learning English and the percentage or number of LEP students who will attain English language proficiency.

- **Performance goal 3:** By 2005-2006, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.

In the September 2003 Consolidated State Application submission and Part I of the Consolidated State Performance Report, States provided the following information from the 2002-2003 school year: (1) the percentage of classes in core academic subjects taught by "highly qualified" teachers both in the aggregate for the State and for high and low-poverty schools in the State; (2) the percentage of teachers who received "high-quality professional development;" and (3) the percentage of Title I paraprofessionals (excluding those with sole duties as translators and parental involvement assistants) who are qualified.

- **Performance goal 4:** All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free, and conducive to learning.

In the September 2003 Consolidated State Application submission, States provided the number of schools identified as persistently dangerous by the start of the 2003-2004 school year.

- **Performance Goal 5:** All students will graduate from high school.

In the September 2003 Consolidated State Application submission, States provided baseline graduation rate and dropout rate data from the 2001-2002 school year for the following subgroups of students: all students, major racial/ethnic groups, students with disabilities, limited English proficient students, economically disadvantaged students, migrant students, and gender.

This Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report consists of information related to State activities and outcomes of specific ESEA programs for the 2002-2003 school year. Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report is due to the Department on **June 30, 2004**. The information requested in Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report for the 2002-2003 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.

Also, this report is limited to information that States should have available by Spring, 2004.

Consistent with these criteria, Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report for the 2002-2003 school year does not request additional data for the programs listed below.

- Title I, Part D: Neglected or Delinquent - The first year for which States are asked to submit data on program results is the 2003-2004 school year. This data will not be available in Spring 2004, but will be requested for the next Consolidated State Performance Report which will cover the results of school year 2003-2004 activities.
- Title I, Part F: Comprehensive School Reform – Performance data needed for this program will be available from another source. The Department will implement a national evaluation and data reporting system to provide essential data needed to measure program performance. States will be notified and are requested to participate in these activities once they are implemented.
- Title II, Part A: Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund (Improving Teacher Quality State Grants) – Performance data needed for this program will be available from another source. The Department will implement a national evaluation and data reporting system to provide essential data needed to measure program performance. States will be notified and are requested to participate in these activities once they are implemented. Additionally, in the September 2003 Consolidated State Application and in Part I of the Consolidated State Performance Report for the 2002-2003 school year, States reported information related to teacher and paraprofessional quality, including the percentage of classes taught by high-qualified teachers, the percentage of teachers receiving high-quality professional development, and the percentage of highly-qualified Title I paraprofessionals.
- Title II, Part D: Enhancing Education Through Technology – The first school year in which LEA projects were implemented is the 2003-2004 school year. Therefore performance data for this program will not be available until next year when the next Consolidated State Performance Report will be due.

- Title IV, Part B: 21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Centers – Performance data needed for this program will be available from another source. The Department will implement a national evaluation and data reporting system to provide essential data needed to measure program performance. States will be notified and are requested to participate in these activities once they are implemented.

The Department is continuing to work with the Performance-Based Data Management Initiative (PBDMI) to streamline data collections for the 2003-2004 school year and beyond.

## GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the 2002-2003 school year must respond to this Part II of Consolidated State Performance Report. Reports are due to the Department on **June 30, 2004**, and should reflect data from the 2002-2003 school year. If needed, States should include for each section an explanation of the data provided (e.g., data irregularities). Throughout the report, States should use their definition of a school year, unless noted otherwise.

## TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

To expedite the receipt of this report, please send your report via the Internet as a .doc file, pdf file, rtf or .txt file to [conreport@ed.gov](mailto:conreport@ed.gov), or provide the URL for the site where your submission is posted on the Internet. Please send a follow-up, signed paper copy of "Consolidated State Performance Report Signature Page" via an express courier to the address below.

A State that submits only a paper report should mail the submission by express courier to:

Daisy Greenfield  
U.S. Department of Education  
Room 3E307  
400 Maryland Avenue, S.W.  
Washington, DC 20202-6400

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 2.32 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) or suggestions for improving this form, please write directly to Consolidated State Performance Report, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW, Room 3E307, Washington, DC 20202-6400.

OMB Number: 1810-0614

Expiration Date: 10/31/04

Consolidated State Performance Report  
For  
State Formula Grant Programs  
under the  
Elementary And Secondary Education Act  
as amended by the  
No Child Left Behind Act of 2001

Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report:

Colorado Department of Education

Address:

201 E. Colfax Ave.  
Denver, CO 80203

Person to contact about this report:

Name: Patrick Chapman

Telephone: 303-866-6780

Fax: 303-866-6637

e-mail: chapman\_p@cde.state.co.us

Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type):

William J. Moloney  
Commissioner of Education

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date



|   |
|---|
| <p style="text-align: center;"><b>I. Improving Basic Programs</b><br/><b>Operated by Local Educational Agencies (Title I, Part A)</b></p> |
|---|

**A. Student Achievement and High-Poverty Schools**

1. Please provide the number of public schools with poverty rates of 40% or greater reporting an increase in the number of students performing at the proficient or advanced levels of student achievement in **reading/language arts** as measured by State assessments administered in the 2002-2003 school year as compared to assessments administered in the 2001-2002 school year. 279

2. Please provide the number of public schools with poverty rates of 40% or greater reporting an increase in the number of students performing at the proficient or advanced levels of student achievement in **mathematics** as measured by State assessments administered in the 2002-2003 school year as compared to assessments administered in the 2001-2002 school year. 240

**B. Title I, Part A Schools by Type of Program**

For the 2002-2003 school year, please provide the following:

- |   |            |
|---|------------|
| 1. Total Number of Title I schools in the State                     | <u>545</u> |
| 2. Total Number of Title I Targeted Assistance Schools in the State | <u>314</u> |
| 3. Total Number of Title I Schoolwide Program Schools in the State  | <u>231</u> |

### **C. Title I, Part A Student Participation**

#### **1. Student Participation in Title I, Part A by Special Services/Programs and Racial/Ethnic Groups**

In the following tables, please provide the *unduplicated* number of children participating in Title I, Part A in the State by special services/programs and racial/ethnic groups. Count a child only once (*unduplicated* count) in each category even if the child participated during more than one term or in more than one school or district in the State during the reporting period. Include students in both Title I schoolwide and targeted assistance programs.

| <b>Student Participation in Title I, A by Special Services or Programs</b> |                                       |
|--|---------------------------------------|
|  | Number of Students Served             |
| Students with Disabilities   | 8557                                  |
| Limited English Proficient   | 15,388                                |
| Homeless   | We do not currently collect this data |
| Migrant  | 1728                                  |

| <b>Student Participation in Title I, A by Racial or Ethnic Group</b> |                           |
|--|---------------------------|
|  | Number of Students Served |
| American Indian or Alaskan Native                                    | 1,306                     |
| Asian  | 1,276                     |
| Black or African American  | 6,494                     |
| Hispanic or Latino   | 36,947                    |
| Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander                                  | N/A                       |
| White  | 23,547                    |

## 2. Student Participation in Title I, Part A by Grade Level

Title I, Part A student participation counts by grade and by public, private and local neglected should be reported as *unduplicated* counts. Please enter the number of participants by grade in Title I public targeted assistance programs (TAS), Title I schoolwide *programs* (SWP), private school students participating in Title I programs, and students served in Part A local neglected programs.

| Student Participation in Title I, Part A by Grade Level |               |               |                  |                    |         |                     |
|---|---------------|---------------|------------------|--------------------|---------|---------------------|
|   | Public<br>TAS | Public<br>SWP | Private          | Local<br>Neglected | Total   | Percent<br>of Total |
| Age 0-2   |               |               |                  |                    |         |                     |
| Age 3-5   | 710           | 2991          |                  |                    |         |                     |
| K   |               |               |                  |                    |         |                     |
| 1   |               |               |                  |                    |         |                     |
| 2   |               |               |                  |                    |         |                     |
| 3   | 16,481        |               |                  |                    |         |                     |
| 4   | 16,246        |               |                  |                    |         |                     |
| 5   | 15,497        |               |                  |                    |         |                     |
| 6   | 7,054         |               |                  |                    |         |                     |
| 7   | 5,461         |               |                  |                    |         |                     |
| 8   | 4,809         |               |                  |                    |         |                     |
| 9   | 2,519         |               |                  |                    |         |                     |
| 10  | 1,504         |               |                  |                    |         |                     |
| 11  |               |               |                  |                    |         |                     |
| 12  |               |               |                  |                    |         |                     |
| Ungraded  |               |               |                  |                    |         |                     |
| TOTALS  | 19,638        | 89,734        | Not<br>available | 714                | 110,086 | 14.62%              |

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

In the following chart, please provide the number of students receiving instructional and support services funded by Title I, A in targeted assistance (TAS) programs during the 2002-2003 school year.

| <b>Student Participation in Title I, A Targeted Assistance (TAS) Programs by Instructional and Support Services</b> |                           |
|---|---------------------------|
| <b>Instructional Services</b>   |                           |
|   | Number of Students Served |
| Mathematics   | 5,243                     |
| Reading/Language Arts   | 12,534                    |
| Science   |                           |
| Social Studies  |                           |
| Vocational/Career   |                           |
| Other (specify)   |                           |
| <b>Support Services</b>   |                           |
| Health, Dental, and Eye Care  |                           |
| Supporting Guidance/Advocacy  |                           |
| Other (specify)   |                           |

### C. Staff Information for Title I, Part A Targeted Assistance Programs

In the following chart, please provide the number of full-time equivalent (FTE) staff funded through Title I, A targeted assistance (TAS) programs during the 2002-2003 school year by job category. For administrators and supervisors who service both targeted assistance and schoolwide programs, report the FTE attributable to their TAS duties only.

| <b>Staff Information for Title I, A Targeted Assistance Programs</b> |   |
|--|---|
|  | Number of Title I Targeted Assistance Program FTE Staff |
| Administrators (non-clerical)  | Not Available   |
| Teachers   | Not Available   |
| Teacher Aides  | Not Available   |
| Support Staff (clerical and non-clerical)                            | Not Available   |
| Other (specify)  | Not Available   |

|   |
|---|
| <b>II. William F. Goodling Even Start Family Literacy Programs<br/>(Title I, Part B, Subpart 3)</b> |
|---|

**A. Subgrants and Even Start Program Participants**

For the 2002-2003 school year, please provide the following information:

**1. Federally Funded Even Start Subgrants in the State**

a. Number of federally funded Even Start subgrants in the State 13

**2. Even Start Families Served**

a. Total number of families served 427

b. Total number of adults participating 442

c. Total number of adults who are English language learners 267

d. Total number of children participating 667

**3. Characteristics of newly enrolled families at the time of enrollment**

a. Number of newly enrolled families not collected

b. Number of newly enrolled adult participants not collected

c. Percent of newly enrolled families at or below the  
Federal Poverty level not collected

d. Percent of newly enrolled adult participants without a  
high school diploma or GED not collected

Percent of currently enrolled adult participants working  
toward a high school diploma or GED 43%

e. Percent of newly enrolled adult participants who have  
not gone beyond the 9th grade not collected

**4. Percent of families that have remained in the program**

a. Less than 3 months not collected

b. From 4 to 6 months not collected

- |                        |                      |
|------------------------|----------------------|
| c. From 7 to 12 months | <u>not collected</u> |
| d. More than 12 months | <u>not collected</u> |

Data are collected on families who have completed 30 hours, 200 hours, and 300 hours or more of programming

|  |            |
|--|------------|
| Number of families who participated in 30 hours (baseline) | <u>427</u> |
|--|------------|

|  |                  |
|--|------------------|
| Number and percent of families who participated in 200 hours | <u>278 (65%)</u> |
|--|------------------|

|  |                  |
|--|------------------|
| Number and percent of families who participated in 300 hours or more<br>(approximately 12 months of service) | <u>213 (50%)</u> |
|--|------------------|

## B. State Even Start Performance Indicators

Using the format of the table below, describe the State's progress in meeting its performance indicators developed under section 1240 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). Include all State indicators, as developed under section 1240, including both required and optional indicators. Provide any targets set, measures used and results for each indicator, as well as an assessment and explanation of progress. For targets with no set targets or standards, provide a descriptive assessment of progress. For indicators with more than one year of available data, please note the data in the results column and include trend information in the assessment of progress. Please indicate where data are not yet available.

| <b>Indicator</b><br><i>Name of required or optional indicator</i>   | <b>Target or Standards</b><br><i>Description of target or standard set by State of desired performance on indicator</i>  | <b>Measure</b><br><i>Measurement tool used to assess progress for indicator</i> | <b>Result</b><br><i>Data for the current reporting year and trend data where available</i>  | <b>Assessment of Progress</b><br><i>Status of progress on indicator (1)<br/>Target met (2)<br/>Target not met</i>          | <b>Explanation of Progress</b><br><i>Description of why results were obtained</i>  |
|---|--|---|---|--|--|
| EXAMPLE:<br>Adult achievement in reading, writing, English language acquisition, problem solving and numeracy | EXAMPLE:<br>75% of adult learners will make a grade-level gain over a program year   | EXAMPLE:<br>Tests of Adult Basic Education (TABE)                               | EXAMPLE:<br>2001-2002: 45% of adult participants met target<br><br>2002-2003: 50% of adult participants met target  | EXAMPLE:<br>Target was not met in 2002-2003, but positive movement toward target was seen between 2001-2002 and 2002-2003. | EXAMPLE:<br>Information on participation showed that only 50% of adult participants stayed in the program for 12 months. Participants who remained in the program for at least one full year were more likely to meet target. Of participants who remained in program for one full year, 70% met target as compared to only 40% of participants who remained in program for less than 12 months. |
| 1.1 Program services will include four components.  | 100% of programs will provide the following four components of service in a well-integrated, intensive manner of substantial duration, which facilitates change in families, as measured by local evaluation | Local program evaluation reports, monitoring visits                             | <b>2000-2001:</b> 100% of programs provided four components of service<br><br><b>2001-2002:</b> 100% of programs provided four components of service<br><br><b>2002-2003:</b> 100% of | Target met for past three years  | All of Colorado's Even Start programs are providing adult education, early childhood education, parent education, and interactive literacy activities for parents and children (PACT).   |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
|  | reports and monitoring visits.   |  | programs provided four components of service   |  |  |
| 1.2 Programs will offer year-round services.   | 100% of programs will offer year-round services, as measured by program records and local evaluation reports.  | Program records, local program evaluation reports                    | <p><b>2000-2001:</b> programs offered an average of 42 weeks of service</p> <p><b>2001-2002:</b> programs offered an average of 42.5 weeks of service</p> <p><b>2002-2003:</b> programs offered an average of 40 weeks of service</p>  | Target met for past three years                                      | Colorado programs are required to provide 40 weeks of service per year. Eleven of the thirteen programs met the requirement for 2002-2003. One program was new and did not begin services in September; the other program stopped services for several weeks in order to move to a new facility. |
| 1.3 Programs will collaborate with public schools through coordination with Title I. | 100% of programs will collaborate with public schools through coordination with Title I programs, and through participation with school staff in implementing Individual literacy Plans (ILPs) for primary-grade children who are reading below grade level, as measured by local evaluation and monitoring visits and by program records. | Program records, local program evaluation reports, monitoring visits | <p><b>2000-2001:</b> 92% of programs coordinated with Title I; 75% of programs participated with school staff in implementing ILPs</p> <p><b>2001-2002:</b> 92% of programs coordinated with Title I; 93% of programs participated with school staff in implementing ILPs</p> <p><b>2002-2003:</b> 100% of programs coordinated with Title I; 100% of programs participated with school staff in implementing ILPs</p> | Target not met for 2000-2001 and 2001-2002, target met for 2002-2003 | State technical assistance efforts have focused on school collaborations for the past several years, resulting in a steady increase in the number of programs working with schools.  |
| 2.1 Adults will achieve their short-term education goals.                            | After 100 hours of participation in the adult education program, 75% of parents will achieve   | Progress on family education plans as                                | <b>2000-2001:</b> 79% of parents met their adult education goal (N=148)  | Target met for past three years with improved results each year      | Results for this indicator have increased each year for the past three years.  |



|   |   |   |  |                             |   |
|---|---|---|--|-----------------------------|---|
|   | their short-term education goals as outlined in their family education plan, as measured by staff assessment.   | measured by staff, participation records                                    | <b>2001-2002:</b> 86% of parents met their adult education goal (N=286)<br><br><b>2002-2003:</b> 87% of parents met their adult education goal (N=256) |                             |   |
| 2.2 Parents in the ABE/ASE program will progress through one level.   | After 100 hours of participation in the adult education program, 75% of parents in the ABE/ASE program will progress through one level, as measured by CASAS or TABE scores, or achieve adequate yearly progress as measured by appropriate assessment. | CASAS, TABE, adequate yearly progress as measured by appropriate assessment | <b>2002-2003:</b> 90% of parents in the ABE/ASE program met target (N=96)  | Target met in 2002-2003     | Six of the thirteen programs in the state had 100% of the parents in the ABE/ASE component progress through one level.  |
| 2.3 Parents in the ESL program will progress through one level.   | After 100 hours of participation in the adult education program, 75% of parents in the ESL program will progress through one level, as measured by Oral BEST, BEST PLUS, or CASAS scores.   | Oral BEST, BEST PLUS, CASAS   | <b>2002-2003:</b> 88% of parents in the ESL program met target (N=163)   | Target met in 2002-2003     | Six of the thirteen programs had over 85% of parents in the ESL component progress through one level.   |
| 2.4 Parents in the ASE program or enrolled in high school will pass the GED exam or earn a high school diploma. | After 100 hours of participation in adult education, 50% of parents in the ASE program will pass the GED exam, or high school seniors will earn a high school diploma, as measured by program records.  | Program or high school records  | <b>2002-2003:</b> 48% of eligible parents met target (N=96)  | Target not met in 2002-2003 | Programs had a wide range of results on this indicator. Three programs had no adults graduate or earn a GED. Three programs had 66% or more parents graduate or earn a GED. All the programs with 0% results serve only English Language Learners. These parents progressed enough in their English language acquisition to begin studying in English for the GED exam. |

|  |  |  |  |                                 |   |
|--|--|--|--|---------------------------------|---|
| 2.5 Eligible parents will enroll in higher education or training.  | After 100 hours of participation in adult education, 60% of eligible parents will enroll in higher education or training.  | Program records  | <b>2002-2003:</b> 84% of eligible parents met target (N=32)  | Target met in 2002-2003         | Six of the thirteen programs had 100% of their eligible parents enroll in higher education or training.                                 |
| 3.1 Parents will achieve their parenting goals.  | After 300 hours of family participation in the program, 75% of parents will achieve parenting goals according to their family education plans, as measured by staff assessment.  | Family education plans, as measured by staff assessment                                | <b>2000-2001:</b> 95% of parents met their parenting goals (N=139)<br><b>2001-2002:</b> 84% of parents met their parenting goals (N=237)<br><b>2002-2003:</b> 90% of parents met their parenting goals (N=213) | Target met for past three years | Only two programs had results less than 60% in 2002-2003.   |
| 3.2 Parents with infants will use simple verbal stimulation, frequent eye contact, and responsiveness to child's cues and language attempts. | After 300 hours of family participation in the program, 85% parents with infants will demonstrate sustained use of simple verbal stimulation, frequent eye contact, and responsiveness to child's cues and language attempts, as measured by staff assessment. | Staff assessment based on observations, anecdotal records, and home visitation records | <b>2002-2003:</b> 82% of parents with infants met target (N=56)  | Target not met in 2002-2003     | The total number of parents in this category is small. Thus, 10 of the 56 parents did not demonstrate the desired behaviors.            |
| 3.3 Parents with infants will provide exposure to age-appropriate books.   | After 300 hours of participation in the program, 85% of parents with infants will provide sustained exposure to age-appropriate books, as measured by staff assessment.  | Staff assessment based on observations, anecdotal records, and home visitation         | <b>2002-2003:</b> 87% of parents with infants met target (N=56)  | Target met in 2002-2003         | The total number of parents in this category is small. Seven parents of the total 56 were not providing book exposure to their infants. |

|   |  |  |   |                             |  |
|---|--|--|---|-----------------------------|--|
|   |  | records  |   |                             |  |
| 3.4 Parents with toddlers will participate in frequent and complex verbal interactions.     | After 300 hours of participation in the program, 85% of parents with toddlers will participate in sustained, frequent, and complex verbal interactions, as measured by staff assessment.                             | Staff assessment based on observations, anecdotal records, and home visitation records | <b>2002-2003:</b> 74% of parents with toddlers met target (N=59)      | Target not met in 2202-2003 | One large program had a result of 53% on this indicator (9 out of 17 parents met target). All other programs had results above 77%.  |
| 3.5 Parents with toddlers will provide involvement with reading.                            | After 300 hours of participation in the program, 85% of parents with toddlers will provide involvement in sustained, active, shared reading of a variety of high quality books, as measured by staff assessment.     | Staff assessment based on observations, anecdotal records, and home visitation records | <b>2002-2003:</b> 90% of parents met target (N=59)                    | Target met in 2002-2003     | Twelve of the thirteen programs had results of 100% on this indicator.   |
| 3.6 Parents with preschoolers will participate in frequent and complex verbal interactions. | After 300 hours of participation in the program, 85% of parents with preschoolers will participate in sustained, frequent, and complex verbal interactions, as measured by staff assessment.                         | Staff assessment based on observations, anecdotal records, and home visitation records | <b>2002-2003:</b> 79% of parents with preschoolers met target (N=127) | Target not met in 2002-2003 | One large program's result brought down the total for this indicator. Not including this program, the state average would have been 88%. For the large program with the low parenting results, parenting education was a focus of the local evaluation conducted in Fall 2003. |
| 3.7 Parents with preschoolers will provide involvement in shared reading.                   | After 300 hours of participation in the program, 85% of parents with preschoolers will provide involvement in sustained, active, shared reading of a variety of high quality books, as measured by staff assessment. | Staff assessment based on observations, anecdotal records, and home visitation records | <b>2002-2003:</b> 72% of parents met target (N=127)                   | Target not met in 2002-2003 | Another large program had a low percent of parents meet this target (38%). Not including this program, the state average would have been 80%, which also falls below the target of 85%.  |
| 3.8 Parents with primary-grade  | After 300 hours of participation in the  | Staff assessment   | <b>2002-2003:</b> 86% of parents met target                           | Target met in 2002-2003     | All indicators for parents with primary grade children (3.8-3.10)  |

|  |  |  |   |                                 |  |
|--|--|--|---|---------------------------------|--|
| children will participate in homework help.  | program, 85% of parents with primary-grade children will participate in sustained homework help, as measured by staff assessment.  | based on observations, anecdotal records, and home visitation records                                  | (N=59)  |                                 | were met this year. This is an area of strength for the Colorado programs, perhaps due to the state's emphasis on collaboration with public schools.   |
| 3.9 Parents with primary-grade children will demonstrate school involvement.             | After 300 hours of participation in the program, 80% of parents with primary-grade children will demonstrate sustained school involvement, as documented by school records and staff assessment.   | School records, staff assessment based on observations, anecdotal records, and home visitation records | <b>2002-2003:</b> 83% of parents met target (N=59)  | Target met in 2002-2003         | See comment above.   |
| 3.10 Parents with primary-grade children will participate in shared reading.             | After 300 hours of participation in the program, 85% of parents with primary-grade children will participate in sustained, active, shared reading, as measured by staff assessment.  | Staff assessment based on observations, anecdotal records, and home visitation records                 | <b>2002-2003:</b> 85% of parents met target (N=59)  | Target met in 2002-2003         | See comment above.   |
| 4.1 Preschool-age children will be functioning at age-appropriate levels of development. | After 300 hours of family participation in the program, 85% of preschool-age children will be functioning at age-appropriate levels of development; or preschoolers will demonstrate one year's growth in reading readiness skills within one year, as measured by age-appropriate assessment instruments. | Developmental assessments  | <b>2000-2001:</b> 86% of children met target (N=71)<br><b>2001-2002:</b> 93% of children met target (N=110)<br><b>2002-2003:</b> 89% of children met target (N=141) | Target met for past three years | Seven of the thirteen programs had 100% of preschoolers functioning at age-appropriate levels of development. This statistic could relate to the fact that Even Start programs in Colorado are required to serve families with infants and toddlers. By the time families have preschool-age children, the children have benefited from program interventions. |

|  |   |                           |  |   |   |
|--|---|---------------------------|--|---|---|
| 4.2 Primary-grade children will read at grade level or demonstrate one year's growth in literacy skills.           | After 300 hours of family participation in the program and 90% school attendance, 80% of primary-grade children will be reading at grade level; or primary-grade children will demonstrate one year's growth in literacy skills within one year, as measured by age-appropriate assessment instruments. | School records            | <p><b>2000-2001:</b> 85% of children met target (N=27)</p> <p><b>2001-2002:</b> 86% of children met target (N=57)</p> <p><b>2002-2003:</b> 96% of children met target (N=48)</p> | Target met for past three years with a 10% increase from 2001-2002 to 2002-2003 | Eight of the thirteen programs had 100% of the primary-grade children reading at grade level. This result may also relate to the reason stated above.   |
| 4.3 Primary grade children with an Individual Literacy Plan will demonstrate one year's growth in literacy skills. | After 300 hours of family participation in the program, 80% of primary-grade children with an Individual Literacy Plan at the beginning of the school year will demonstrate one year's growth in literacy skills within one year, as measured by age-appropriate assessment instruments.                | School records            | Indicator developed in 2003 – data not yet available   |   |   |
| 4.4 Primary-grade children will demonstrate consistent school attendance.  | After 300 hours of family participation in the program, 75% of primary-grade children will attend public school 90% of the time, as documented by school records.   | School attendance records | <p><b>2000-2001:</b> 54% of children met target (N=50)</p> <p><b>2001-2002:</b> 69% of children met target (N=83)</p> <p><b>2002-2003:</b> 71% of children met target (N=66)</p> | Target not met for past three years, but percentage has increased each year.    | This indicator has the consistently lowest results of all the indicators. Anecdotally, staff report that program families commonly do not see their children's school attendance as a priority. |
| 4.5 Primary-grade children will be promoted  | After 300 hours of family participation in the program, 90% of primary-   | School records            | <b>2000-2001:</b> 100% of children met target (N=50)   | Target met for past three years   | This indicator has the consistently highest results of all the indicators. Some program school districts  |

|  |   |   |   |                                 |  |
|--|---|---|---|---------------------------------|--|
| to the next grade level.                               | grade children will be promoted to the next grade level, as documented by school records.   |   | <p><b>2001-2002:</b> 97% of children met target (N=83)</p> <p><b>2002-2003:</b> 97% of children met target (N=66)</p>   |                                 | promote all children, but not all districts do so,   |
| 5.1 Parents will achieve their self-sufficiency goals. | <p>After 300 hours of family participation in the program, 75% of parents will achieve self-sufficiency goals according to their family education plan, as documented by program records and staff assessment.</p> <p><b>Self-sufficiency Goals</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Keeping a job for six months</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Securing improved housing</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Remaining in one residence for one school year</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Reducing or stopping public assistance</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Sustaining an increase in community participation</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Following a budget for six months</li> </ul> | Family education plans, as measured by staff assessment | <p><b>2000-2001:</b> 81% of families met target (N=139)</p> <p><b>2001-2002:</b> 80% of families met target (N=237)</p> <p><b>2002-2003:</b> 85% of families met target (N=213)</p> | Target met for past three years | These goals are self-selected by families. Self-selection could make accomplishment easier, especially with the guidance staff members provide to set realistic goals. |
| 5.2 Parents seeking employment will obtain a job.      | After 300 hours of family participation in the program, 50% of parents seeking employment will obtain a job, as   | Program records   | Indicator developed in 2003 – data not yet available  |                                 |  |

|  |  |                  |   |                             |  |
|--|--|------------------|---|-----------------------------|--|
|  | documented by program records.   |                  |   |                             |  |
| 5.3 Parents seeking employment will hold a job for six months.       | After 300 hours of family participation in the program, 40% of parents seeking employment will hold a job for six months during the program year, as documented by program records.    | Program records  | Indicator developed in 2003 – data not yet available            |                             |  |
| 5.4 Employed parents will improve their employment status.           | After 300 hours of family participation in the program, 25% of employed parents will improve their employment status, as documented by program records.                                | Program records  | <b>2002-2003:</b> 24% of parents met target (N=110)             | Target not met in 2002-2003 | Program coordinators report that results for this indicator are associated with the health of the economy in the communities they serve.   |
| 5.5 Parents learning English will use the language in the community. | After 300 hours of family participation in the program, 50% of parents learning English will demonstrate a sustained use of English in the community, as measured by staff assessment. | Staff assessment | <b>2002-2003:</b> 63% of parents met target (N=165)             | Target met in 2002-2003     | It has been difficult for Colorado programs to identify indicators of self-sufficiency for English language learners, because these individuals often are not eligible for TANF or other public assistance; their ability to obtain and improve employment may be limited by their legal status. |
| 5.6 Parents will enter the military.                                 | After 300 hours of family participation in the program, 100% of eligible parents who want to enter the military will do so, as documented by program records.                          | Program records  | <b>2002-2003:</b> No parents wanted to enter the military (N=0) |                             |  |

### C. Federal Even Start Performance Indicators

Using the format of the table below, describe the State's progress in meeting the federal performance indicators listed for Even Start participants in your State.

| <b>Indicator</b>  | <b>Target</b><br><i>Baseline data will be set with the 2002-2003 data</i>   | <b>Measure</b><br><i>Measurement tool used to assess progress for indicator</i> | <b>Cohort</b><br>Number of participants who have this goal | <b>Result</b><br><i>Number and Percentage of participants who met this goal</i> | <b>Assessment of Progress</b><br><i>Status of progress on indicator (1)<br/>Target met (2)<br/>Target not met</i> | <b>Explanation of Progress</b><br><i>Description of why results were obtained</i>                                      |
|---|---|---|--|---|---|--|
| A. Percentage of adults showing significant learning gains on measures of reading     | 2.2 After 100 hours of participation in the adult education program, 75% of parents in the ABE/ASE program will progress through one level, as measured by CASAS or TABE scores, or achieve adequate yearly progress as measured by appropriate assessment. | CASAS, TABE, adequate yearly progress as measured by appropriate assessment     | 96 ABE/ASE parents   | 96 parents or 90% met target  | Target met in 2002-2003   | Six of the thirteen programs in the state had 100% of the parents in the ABE/ASE component progress through one level. |
| B. Percentage of adults showing significant learning gains on measures of mathematics | 2.2 After 100 hours of participation in the adult education program, 75% of parents in the ABE/ASE program will progress through one level, as measured by CASAS or TABE scores, or achieve adequate yearly progress as                                     | CASAS, TABE, adequate yearly progress as measured by appropriate assessment     | 96 ABE/ASE parents   | 96 parents or 90% met target  | Target met in 2002-2003   | Six of the thirteen programs in the state had 100% of the parents in the ABE/ASE component progress through one level. |



| <b>Indicator</b>   | <b>Target</b><br><i>Baseline data will be set with the 2002-2003 data</i>  | <b>Measure</b><br><i>Measurement tool used to assess progress for indicator</i> | <b>Cohort</b><br><i>Number of participants who have this goal</i> | <b>Result</b><br><i>Number and Percentage of participants who met this goal</i> | <b>Assessment of Progress</b><br><i>Status of progress on indicator (1)<br/>Target met (2)<br/>Target not met</i> | <b>Explanation of Progress</b><br><i>Description of why results were obtained</i>                 |
|--|--|---|---|---|---|---|
|  | measured by appropriate assessment.  |   |   |   |   |   |
| C. Percentage of LEP adults showing significant learning gains on measures of English language acquisition | 2.3 After 100 hours of participation in the adult education program, 75% of parents in the ESL program will progress through one learning level. | Oral BEST, BEST PLUS, CASAS   | 163 LEP parents   | 143 parents or 88% met target   | Target met in 2002-2003   | Six of the thirteen programs had over 85% of parents in ESL component progress through one level. |
| D. Percentage of school age adults who earn a high school diploma or GED                                   | This indicator is not a performance measure in Colorado; consequently, no baseline has been set, but the data are collected.                     | High school records   | 19 parents who were seniors                                       | 14 parents who were seniors or 74% met target                                   |   |   |

| <b>Indicator</b>   | <b>Target</b><br><i>Baseline data will be set with the 2002-2003 data</i>   | <b>Measure</b><br><i>Measurement tool used to assess progress for indicator</i> | <b>Cohort</b><br><i>Number of participants who have this goal</i>           | <b>Result</b><br><i>Number and Percentage of participants who met this goal</i>                       | <b>Assessment of Progress</b><br><i>Status of progress on indicator (1)<br/>Target met (2)<br/>Target not met</i> | <b>Explanation of Progress</b><br><i>Description of why results were obtained</i>   |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| E. Percentage of non-school-age adults who earn a high school diploma or GED   | 2.4 After 100 hours of participation in adult education, 50% of the parents in the Adult Secondary Education program will pass the GED exam, or high school seniors will earn a high school diploma (Note: This indicator includes school-age parents enrolled in high school.) | High school and program records   | 96 school-age and non-school age parents<br><br>[77 non-school-age parents] | 46 parents or 48% passed the GED exam or graduated from high school<br><br>[32 passed the GED or 41%] | Target not met  | When these data are separated out for high school diplomas and GED, it is the parents studying for the GED exam who pull the percentage down (74% of high school seniors graduated). Data collected from the previous two years on this same indicator were 44% graduated or passed the GED (2000-2001), and 34% graduated or passed the GED (2001-2002). Consequently, this year's statistic is the highest it has been for three years. |
| F. Percentage of children entering kindergarten who are achieving significant learning gains on measures of language development | Not collected   |   |   |   |   |   |
| G. Percentage of children entering kindergarten who are achieving  | Not collected   |   |   |   |   |   |

| <b>Indicator</b>   | <b>Target</b><br><i>Baseline data will be set with the 2002-2003 data</i>  | <b>Measure</b><br><i>Measurement tool used to assess progress for indicator</i> | <b>Cohort</b><br><i>Number of participants who have this goal</i> | <b>Result</b><br><i>Number and Percentage of participants who met this goal</i>                                   | <b>Assessment of Progress</b><br><i>Status of progress on indicator (1)<br/>Target met (2)<br/>Target not met</i> | <b>Explanation of Progress</b><br><i>Description of why results were obtained</i>   |
|--|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| significant learning gains on measures of reading readiness          |  |   |   |   |   |   |
| H. Percentage of school-aged children who are reading on grade level | 4.2 After 300 hours of family participation in the program and 90% school attendance, 80% of primary-grade children will be reading at grade level; or primary-grade children will demonstrate one year's growth in literacy skills. | Age-appropriate assessment instruments  | 48 primary-grade children with 90% school attendance              | 46 primary-grade children or 96% were reading at grade level or demonstrated one year's growth in literacy skills | Target met  | This indicator includes a subset of primary-grade children served because of the 90% attendance requirement (During 2002-2003, 72% of primary-grade children had families who attained 300 hours of participation). This result is up 10% from last year's 86%. |

| <b>Indicator</b>   | <b>Target</b><br><i>Baseline data will be set with the 2002-2003 data</i>   | <b>Measure</b><br><i>Measurement tool used to assess progress for indicator</i>        | <b>Cohort</b><br><i>Number of participants who have this goal</i> | <b>Result</b><br><i>Number and Percentage of participants who met this goal</i>  | <b>Assessment of Progress</b><br><i>Status of progress on indicator (1)<br/>Target met (2)<br/>Target not met</i> | <b>Explanation of Progress</b><br><i>Description of why results were obtained</i>   |
|--|---|--|---|--|---|---|
| I. Percentage of parents who show improvement on measures of parental support for children's learning in the home, school environment, and through interactive learning activities | This indicator is divided across nine separate indicators in Colorado (see Table B, indicators 3.2 – 3.10), according to the age of the child and according to specific parenting behaviors (Desirable skills vary according to the age of the child). Averaged together the target would read: After 300 hours of participation in the program, 84% of parents will demonstrate behaviors associated with educational benefits for their children. | Staff assessment based on observations, anecdotal records, and home visitation records | 213 parents   | Result of each of the nine indicators averaged together is 82%; a number is not calculable because parents with multiple children were counted more than once for the appropriate indicator. | Target not met (82% rather than 84% of parents demonstrated behaviors.)   | See results for specific behaviors in Table B, indicators 3.2 through 3.10. This year parents of toddlers and preschoolers demonstrated a lower level of desired behaviors as compared to parents of infants and primary-grade children. Colorado programs have decided to pilot the Parent Education Profile (PEP) during 2004-2005. If the PEP is adopted, performance indicators will be revised for 2005-2006 to align with the PEP scales. |

|   |
|---|
| <b>III. Education of Migratory Children<br/>(Title I, Part C)</b> |
|---|

Please complete the following charts for the Title I, Part C program.

**General Data Reporting Information**

1. The tables in this section contain annual performance report requirements for the Title I, Part C, Migrant Education Program (MEP) for reporting year 2002-2003. The Reporting Period for these data is September 1, 2002, to August 31, 2003.
2. Instructions for each table are provided just before the table.

## INSTRUCTIONS: TABLE I. POPULATION DATA

In Table I States are to report the statewide *unduplicated* number of *eligible* migrant children by age/grade according to several descriptive categories. Include only *eligible* migrant children in the cells in this table. Within each row, count a child only once statewide (*unduplicated* count). Include children who changed ages (e.g., from 2 years to 3 years of age) or grades during the 2002-2003 reporting period in only the higher age/grade cell. For example, a child who turns three during the reporting year would only be counted in the Ages 3 – 5 cell. In all cases, the Total is the sum of the cells in a row.

| <b>TABLE I. POPULATION DATA</b>   | Ages<br>0-2 | Ages<br>3-5 | K   | 1    | 2    | 3    | 4    | 5    | 6   | 7   | 8   | 9   | 10  | 11  | 12  | Un-<br>grad-<br>ed | Out-<br>of-<br>school | Total        |
|---|-------------|-------------|-----|------|------|------|------|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|--------------------|-----------------------|--------------|
| <b>A. ELIGIBLE MIGRANT CHILDREN</b>   |             |             |     |      |      |      |      |      |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |                    |                       |              |
| 1. All Migrant Children Eligible for the MEP  |             |             |     |      |      |      |      |      |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |                    |                       |              |
| Regular Year  | 827         | 2731        | 984 | 1214 | 1183 | 1117 | 1030 | 1013 | 924 | 847 | 678 | 732 | 556 | 409 | 320 | 0                  | 5214                  | <b>19779</b> |
| Summer Year   | 0           | 810         | 284 | 352  | 361  | 342  | 338  | 250  | 243 | 178 | 152 | 264 | 115 | 64  | 19  | 0                  | 2625                  | <b>6397</b>  |
| <b>B. PRIORITY FOR SERVICES</b>   |             |             |     |      |      |      |      |      |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |                    |                       |              |
| 1. All Migrant Children Eligible for MEP<br>classified as having "Priority for<br>Services" Sep. 1, 220 – Aug. 31, 2203 | 10          | 476         | 268 | 434  | 424  | 374  | 312  | 293  | 302 | 278 | 270 | 217 | 165 | 147 | 86  | 0                  | 967                   | <b>5023</b>  |
| <b>C. LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT (LEP)</b>  |             |             |     |      |      |      |      |      |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |                    |                       |              |
| 1. Migrant Children who are ELL   | 208         | 849         | 631 | 844  | 866  | 796  | 826  | 741  | 707 | 635 | 544 | 525 | 387 | 262 | 176 | 0                  | 462                   | <b>9459</b>  |
| <b>D. CHILDREN ENROLLED IN SPECIAL EDUCATION</b>  |             |             |     |      |      |      |      |      |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |                    |                       |              |
| 1. Migrant Children with an IEP   | 0           | 63          | 65  | 83   | 114  | 121  | 116  | 109  | 90  | 107 | 62  | 28  | 12  | 12  | 2   | 0                  | 0                     | <b>984</b>   |
| <b>E. MOBILITY</b>  |             |             |     |      |      |      |      |      |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |                    |                       |              |
| 1. Last Qualifying Move within previous 12<br>Months  | 648         | 705         | 304 | 336  | 318  | 315  | 304  | 283  | 252 | 261 | 222 | 215 | 162 | 89  | 74  | 0                  | 1117                  | <b>5605</b>  |
| 2. Last Qualifying Move within Previous 13<br>– 24 Months 2001-2002   | 388         | 764         | 270 | 342  | 344  | 309  | 263  | 298  | 285 | 241 | 229 | 227 | 161 | 124 | 87  | 0                  | 1021                  | <b>5353</b>  |

| <b>TABLE I. POPULATION DATA</b>   | Ages<br>0-2 | Ages<br>3-5 | K   | 1    | 2   | 3   | 4   | 5   | 6   | 7   | 8   | 9   | 10  | 11  | 12  | Un-<br>grad-<br>ed | Out-<br>of-<br>school | Total |
|---|-------------|-------------|-----|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|--------------------|-----------------------|-------|
| 3. Last Qualifying Move within Previous 25 – 36 Months (Counting back from the Last Day of the Reporting Period)                    | 110         | 783         | 231 | 330  | 335 | 327 | 320 | 298 | 313 | 268 | 213 | 246 | 177 | 150 | 122 | 0                  | 902                   | 5125  |
| 4. Migrant Children with any Qualifying Move within a Regular School Year (Count any Qualifying Move within the Previous 36 Months) | 1146        | 2252        | 805 | 1008 | 997 | 951 | 887 | 879 | 850 | 770 | 664 | 688 | 500 | 363 | 283 | 0                  | 3040                  | 16083 |

## INSTRUCTIONS: TABLE II. ACADEMIC STATUS

Table II asks for the statewide *unduplicated* number of *eligible* migrant children by age/grade according to several descriptive categories. Include only *eligible* migrant children in the cells in this table. Within each row, count a child only once statewide (*unduplicated* count).

Include children who changed grades during the 2002-2003 reporting period in only the higher age/grade cell. In all cases, the Total is the sum of the cells in a row.

| TABLE II. ACADEMIC STATUS  | Ages<br>0-2 | Ages<br>3-5 | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7  | 8  | 9  | 10 | 11 | 12  | Un-<br>grad-<br>ed | Out-<br>of-<br>school | Total      |
|--|-------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|-----|--------------------|-----------------------|------------|
| <b>F. HIGH SCHOOL COMPLETION</b> -- (Note: Data on the high school graduation <u>rate</u> and school dropout <u>rate</u> for migrant students has been collected through Part I of the Consolidated State Performance Report.) |             |             |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |    |    |     |                    |                       |            |
| 1. Dropped out of school   | 0           | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 64 | 68 | 57 | 73 | 69 | 175 | 0                  | 1                     | <b>507</b> |
| 2. Obtained GED  | 0           | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 2  | 1   | 0                  | 10                    | <b>13</b>  |
| <b>ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT</b> -- (Note: The results of migrant students on State assessments in mathematics and reading/ language arts have been collected in Part I of the Consolidated State Performance Report.)              |             |             |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |    |    |     |                    |                       |            |



### **INSTRUCTION: TABLE III. G. MEP PARTICIPATION – REGULAR SCHOOL YEAR**

Table III G. asks for the statewide, *unduplicated* number of children who were served by the MEP in the regular school year by age/grade according to several descriptive categories. Within each row, count a child only once statewide (*unduplicated* count).

Participation information is required for children who *received instructional or support services* funded in whole or in part with MEP funds. *DO NOT count migrant children served through any schoolwide programs (SWP), even if they combined MEP funds, in any row of this table.*

Include children who changed ages, e.g., from 2 years to 3 years of age, or grades during the 2002-2003 reporting period in only the higher age/grade cell. In all cases, the total is the sum of the cells in a row.

*Count only those children who were actually served; do not count children not served. Include in this table all children who received a MEP-funded service, even those children continuing to receive services in the year after their eligibility ended, and those children previously eligible in secondary school and receiving credit-accrual services.*

Served in a Regular School Year Project. Enter the number of children who participated in MEP-funded instructional or supportive service only. DO NOT include children who were served only by a “referred” service. Count a child only once statewide by age/grade in row 1 if he/she received any type of MEP-funded instructional or supportive service. Do not count the number of times an individual child received an instructional intervention.

Instructional Services. For each listed instructional service, enter the number of children who participated in MEP-funded services. Count a child only once statewide by age/grade in row 4 if he/she received any type of MEP-funded instructional service. Count each child only once statewide in row 5, once in row 6, and once in row 7 if he/she received the specific MEP instructional service noted. Do not count the number of times an individual child received an instructional intervention.

Support Services. For each listed support service, enter the number of children who participated in MEP-funded services. Count a child only once statewide by age/grade in row 8 if he/she received any type of MEP-funded supportive service. Count a child only once statewide in row 9 if he/she received the specific MEP supportive service noted (*i.e.*, do not count the number of service interventions per child).

Referred Services. Count a child only once statewide by age/grade in row 10 if he/she received any type of referred service (*i.e.*, do not count the number of service interventions per child). This is NOT a count of the referrals themselves, but instead represents the number of children who are placed in an educational or educationally-related service that they would not have otherwise obtained without the efforts of MEP personnel.

Data for the following table is not available.

| TABLE III. MEP PARTICIPATION                |   | Ages<br>0-2 | Ages<br>3-5 | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Un-<br>grad-<br>ed | Out-<br>of-<br>school | Total |
|---|---|-------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|--------------------|-----------------------|-------|
| <b>G. PARTICIPATION—REGULAR SCHOOL YEAR</b> |   |             |             |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |                    |                       |       |
| 1.  | Served in MEP (with an Instructional or Supportive Service Only -- do not include children served in any SWPs even if MEP funds are combined) |             |             |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |                    |                       |       |
| 2.  | Priority for Service  |             |             |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |                    |                       |       |
| 3.  | Continuation of Service   |             |             |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |                    |                       |       |
| 4.  | Any Instructional Service   |             |             |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |                    |                       |       |
| 5.  | Reading Instruction   |             |             |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |                    |                       |       |
| 6.  | Mathematics Instruction   |             |             |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |                    |                       |       |
| 7.  | High School Credit Accrual  |             |             |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |                    |                       |       |
| 8.  | Any Support Service   |             |             |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |                    |                       |       |
| 9.  | Counseling Service  |             |             |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |                    |                       |       |
| 10.   | Any Referred Service  |             |             |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |                    |                       |       |

### INSTRUCTIONS: TABLE III. H. MEP PARTICIPATION –SUMMER/INTERSESSION TERM

Table III H. asks for the statewide unduplicated number of children who were served by the MEP in a summer or intersession term by age/grade according to several descriptive categories. Within each row, count a child only once statewide (*unduplicated* count).

Participation information is required for children who *received instructional or support services* funded in whole or in part with MEP funds.

Include children who changed ages, e.g., from 2 years to 3 years of age in only in the higher age cell. Count summer/intersession students in the appropriate grade based on the promotion date definition used in your state. In all cases, the Total is the sum of the cells in a row.

*Count only those children who were actually served; do not count children not served. Include in this table all children who received a MEP funded service, even children continuing to receive services in the year after their eligibility ended, and those children previously eligible in secondary school and receiving credit-accrual services.*

Served in a Summer or Intersession Project. Enter the number of children who participated in MEP-funded instructional or supportive service only. DO NOT include children who were served only by a “referred” service. Count a child only once statewide by age/grade in row 1 if he/she received any type of MEP-funded instructional or supportive service. Do not count the number of times an individual child received an instructional intervention.

Instructional Services. For each listed instructional service, enter the number of children who participated in MEP-funded services. Count a child only once statewide by age/grade in row 4 if he/she received any type of MEP-funded instructional service. Count each child only once statewide in row 5, once in row 6, and once in row 7 if he/she received the specific MEP instructional service noted. Do not count the number of times an individual child received an instructional intervention.

Support Services. For each listed support service, enter the number of children who participated in MEP-funded services. Count a child only once statewide by age/grade in row 8 if he/she received any type of MEP-funded supportive service. Count a child only once statewide in row 9 if he/she received the specific MEP supportive service noted (*i.e.*, do not count the number of service interventions per child).

Referred Services. Count a child only once statewide by age/grade in row 10 if he/she received any type of referred service (*i.e.*, do not count the number of service interventions per child). This is NOT a count of the referrals themselves, but instead represents the number of children who are placed in an educational or educationally-related service that they would not have otherwise obtained without the efforts of MEP personnel.

Data for the following table is not available.

| <b>TABLE III. MEP PARTICIPATION</b>                 |   | Ages<br>0-2 | Ages<br>3-5 | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Un-<br>grad-<br>ed | Out-<br>of-<br>school | Total |
|---|---|-------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|--------------------|-----------------------|-------|
| <b>H. PARTICIPATION—SUMMER TERM OR INTERSESSION</b> |   |             |             |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |                    |                       |       |
| 1.  | Served in MEP Summer or Intersession Project (with an Instructional or Supportive Service Only) |             |             |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |                    |                       |       |
| 2.  | Priority for Service  |             |             |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |                    |                       |       |
| 3.  | Continuation of Service   |             |             |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |                    |                       |       |
| 4.  | Any Instructional Service   |             |             |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |                    |                       |       |
| 5.  | Reading Instruction   |             |             |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |                    |                       |       |
| 6.  | Mathematics Instruction   |             |             |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |                    |                       |       |
| 7.  | High School Credit Accrual  |             |             |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |                    |                       |       |
| 8.  | Any Support Service   |             |             |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |                    |                       |       |
| 9.  | Counseling Service  |             |             |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |                    |                       |       |
| 10.   | Any Referred Service  |             |             |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |                    |                       |       |

**INSTRUCTIONS: TABLE IV. SCHOOL DATA**

Table IV asks for information on the number of schools and number of *eligible* migrant children who were enrolled in these schools and who received the special services noted below according to the descriptive categories.

In the first column of Table IV, enter the number of schools that enroll *eligible* migrant children. In the second column, enter the number of *eligible* migrant children who were enrolled in these schools. In the second column, since more than one school in a State may enroll the same migrant child, the count of eligible children enrolled will be duplicated statewide.

| TABLE IV. SCHOOL DATA                             |                   |                                     |
|---|-------------------|-------------------------------------|
| I. STUDENT ENROLLMENT                             | NUMBER OF SCHOOLS | NUMBER OF MIGRANT CHILDREN ENROLLED |
| 1. Schools Enrolling Migrant Children             | a. 207            | b. 1776                             |
| 2. Schools in Which MEP Funds are Combined in SWP | a. 76             | b. 1367                             |

**INSTRUCTIONS: TABLE V. J. MEP PROJECT DATA – TYPE OF MEP PROJECT**

Enter the number of projects that are funded in whole or in part with MEP funds. DO NOT include *schoolwide* programs that were supported with MEP funds in any row of this table.

| TABLE V. MEP PROJECT DATA  |                        |                                     |
|--|------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| J. TYPE OF MEP PROJECT   | NUMBER OF MEP PROJECTS | NUMBER OF MIGRANT CHILDREN ENROLLED |
| 1. MEP Projects: Regular School Year (Services Provided During the School Day Only)                              | a. 445                 | b. 9639                             |
| 2. MEP Projects: Regular School Year (Some or All Services Provided During an Extended Day/Week)                 | a. 10                  | b. 816                              |
| 3. MEP Projects: Summer/Intersession Only  | a. 150                 | b. 2802                             |
| 4. MEP Projects: Year Round (Services Provided throughout the Regular School Year and Summer/Intersession Terms) | a. 1                   | b. 485                              |

**INSTRUCTIONS: TABLE V. K. MEP PROJECT DATA – KEY MEP PERSONNEL**

For each school term, enter the number of *full-time-equivalent* staff whose salaries are paid by the MEP. Report FTE units by job classification. Define how many full-time days constitute one *FTE* for each term in your state. 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, and one *intersession* FTE may equal 45 full-time work days split between three 15-day non-contiguous blocks throughout the year.

DO NOT include staff employed in *schoolwide* programs that combined MEP funds/services with those of other programs.

| TABLE V. MEP PROJECT DATA        |   |   |
|----------------------------------|---|---|
| K. KEY MEP PERSONNEL             | REGULAR-TERM FTE<br>1 FTE = <u>185</u> Days | SUMMER-TERM /INTERSESSION FTE<br>1 FTE = <u>30</u> Days |
| 1. State Director                | a. 10.38                                    | b. 13.25  |
| 2. Teachers                      | a. 21.105                                   | b. 110.292  |
| 3. Counselors                    | a. 0  | b. 0  |
| 4. All Paraprofessionals         | a. 16.263                                   | b. 70   |
| 5. “Qualified” Paraprofessionals | a. not available                            | b. not available  |
| 6. Recruiters                    | a. 39.314                                   | b. 23.3   |
| 7. Records Transfer Staff        | a. 12.14                                    | b. 9  |

**IV. Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth  
Who Are Neglected, Delinquent or At-Risk (Title I, Part D)**

The first year for which States are asked to submit data on program results is the 2003-2004 school year. These data will not be available in Spring 2004, but will be requested for the next Consolidated State Performance Report which will cover the results of school year 2003-2004 activities.



**V. Comprehensive School Reform  
(Title I, Part F)**

Performance data needed for this program will be available from another source. The Department will implement a national evaluation and data reporting system to provide essential data needed to measure program performance. States will be notified and are requested to participate in these activities once they are implemented.

|  |
|--|
| <b>VI. Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Teacher and Principal and Recruiting Fund) (Title II, Part A)</b> |
|--|

In the September 2003 Consolidated State Application submission and Part I of the Consolidated State Performance Report, States provided the following teacher quality information from the 2002-2003 school year: (1) the percentage of classes in core academic subjects taught by “highly qualified” teachers both in the aggregate for the State and for high and low-poverty schools in the State; (2) the percentage of teachers who received “high-quality professional development;” and (3) the percentage of Title I paraprofessionals (excluding those with sole duties as translators and parental involvement assistants) who are qualified.

Performance data needed for this program will be available from another source. The Department will implement a national evaluation and data reporting system to provide essential data needed to measure program performance. States will be notified and are requested to participate in these activities once they are implemented.

|   |
|---|
| <b>VII. Enhancing Education through Technology<br/>(Title II, Part D)</b> |
|---|

The first school year in which LEA projects were implemented is the 2003-2004 school year. Therefore performance data for this program will not be available until next year when the next Consolidated State Performance Report will be due.

## **VIII. English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement (Title III, Part A)**

States are not required to report any additional data for the 2002-2003 school year in this Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report. States reported data for the 2002-2003 school year for the Title III program in the September 2003 Consolidated State Application. Specifically, in the September 2003 Consolidated State Application, States reported the information listed below.

**1.** A description of the status of the State's efforts to establish English language proficiency (ELP) standards that relate to the development and attainment of English proficiency by limited English proficient students. Specifically, describing how the State's ELP standards:

- Address grades K through 12
- Address the four domains of listening, speaking, reading, and writing
- Are linked to the academic content and achievement standards in reading/language arts and mathematics, and in science (by 2005-2006).

**2.** English language proficiency (ELP) baseline data from the 2002-2003 school year test administration. ELP baseline data included all students in the State who were identified as limited English proficient by State-selected English language proficiency assessments, regardless of student participation in Title III supported programs.

A. The ELP baseline data included the following:

- Total number of students identified as LEP by each State-selected ELP assessment(s);
- Total number and percentage of LEP students at each level of English language proficiency as defined by State ELP standards and ELP assessments; and
- A list of each of the ELP assessment(s) used to determine level of English language proficiency.

B. The baseline data should:

- Indicate all levels of English language proficiency; and
- Be aggregated at the State level.
- If a State was reporting data using an ELP composite score (e.g., a total score that consists of a sum or average of scores in the domains of listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension), the State must:
  - Describe how the composite score was derived;
  - Describe how all five domains of English language proficiency were incorporated into the composite score; and
  - Describe how the domains were weighted to develop the composite score.

**3.** Information on the total number of students assessed for English language proficiency on State-selected ELP assessment(s) (number of students referred for assessment and evaluated using State-selected ELP assessments).

**4.** Information on the total number of students identified as LEP on State-selected ELP assessment(s) (number of students determined to be LEP on State-selected ELP assessment(s)).

**5.** Section 3122(a)(3) requires that States' annual measurable achievement objectives for English language proficiency include annual increases in the number or percentage of children attaining English proficiency. In September 2003, States provided performance targets/annual measurable achievement objectives for:

- The percentage or number of LEP students who will make progress in learning English
- The percentage or number of LEP students who will attain English language proficiency

Through the Consolidated State Performance Report for the 2003-2004 school year and future years and through the Biennial Performance Report for Title III, States will be required to report information similar to that reported for the September 2003 Consolidated State Application.

|  |
|--|
| <b>IX. Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act<br/>(Title IV, Part A)</b> |
|--|

**General Instructions**

Words that appear underlined throughout (for example, “physical fighting”) should be defined in accordance with State policy or based on the instrument the State uses to collect the information. States are asked to submit their definition of these terms.

If your State does not collect data in the same format requested on this form, the State may provide data from a similar question. If that occurs, please include a footnote for those data that explains the differences between the data requested on the form and the data the State is able to supply.

**A.** In the following chart, please identify each of your State indicators as submitted by the State in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application and provide the following:

- a. the instrument or data source used to measure the indicator
- b. the frequency with which the data are collected (annually, semi-annually, biennially) and year of the most recent collection
- c. 2002-2003 baseline data
- d. targets for the years in which your State has established targets

## A. 1 State Performance Indicators for Title IV, A - Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities

| Indicator   | Instrument/<br>Data Source                              | Frequency of<br>collection and<br>year of most<br>recent<br>collection | 2002-2003<br>Baseline                         | Targets   |     |
|---|---|--|---|-----------|-----|
| Percent of districts showing a reduction in <i>weapons</i> incidence.               | Reports from each LEA - Safety and Discipline Incidents | Collected annually<br>Most recent – 2003-2004 school year              | 15% reduction from the 2000-2001 school year. | 2003-2004 | 20% |
|   |   |  |   | 2004-2005 |     |
|   |   |  |   | 2005-2006 |     |
|   |   |  |   | 2006-2007 |     |
| Percent of districts showing a reduction in <i>assaults/fights</i> incidence.       | Reports from each LEA - Safety and Discipline Incidents | Collected annually<br>Most recent – 2003-2004 school year              | 15% reduction from the 2000-2001 school year. | 2003-2004 | 20% |
|   |   |  |   | 2004-2005 |     |
|   |   |  |   | 2005-2006 |     |
|   |   |  |   | 2006-2007 |     |
| Percent of districts showing a reduction in <i>drug</i> incidence.                  | Reports from each LEA - Safety and Discipline Incidents | Collected annually<br>Most recent – 2003-2004 school year              | 15% reduction from the 2000-2001 school year. | 2003-2004 | 20% |
|   |   |  |   | 2004-2005 |     |
|   |   |  |   | 2005-2006 |     |
|   |   |  |   | 2006-2007 |     |
| Percent of districts showing a reduction in <i>alcohol</i> incidence.               | Reports from each LEA - Safety and Discipline Incidents | Collected annually<br>Most recent – 2003-2004 school year              | 15% reduction from the 2000-2001 school year. | 2003-2004 | 20% |
|   |   |  |   | 2004-2005 |     |
|   |   |  |   | 2005-2006 |     |
|   |   |  |   | 2006-2007 |     |
| Percent of districts showing a reduction in <i>tobacco</i> incidence.               | Reports from each LEA - Safety and Discipline Incidents | Collected annually<br>Most recent – 2003-2004 school year              | 15% reduction from the 2000-2001 school year. | 2003-2004 | 20% |
|   |   |  |   | 2004-2005 |     |
|   |   |  |   | 2005-2006 |     |
|   |   |  |   | 2006-2007 |     |
| Percent of districts showing a reduction in <i>robbery</i> incidence.               | Reports from each LEA - Safety and Discipline Incidents | Collected annually<br>Most recent – 2003-2004 school year              | 15% reduction from the 2000-2001 school year. | 2003-2004 | 20% |
|   |   |  |   | 2004-2005 |     |
|   |   |  |   | 2005-2006 |     |
|   |   |  |   | 2006-2007 |     |
| Percent of districts showing a reduction in <i>other felonies</i> incidence.        | Reports from each LEA - Safety and Discipline Incidents | Collected annually<br>Most recent – 2003-2004 school year              | 15% reduction from the 2000-2001 school year. | 2003-2004 | 20% |
|   |   |  |   | 2004-2005 |     |
|   |   |  |   | 2005-2006 |     |
|   |   |  |   | 2006-2007 |     |
| Percent of districts showing a reduction in <i>other code of conduct</i> incidence. | Reports from each LEA - Safety and Discipline Incidents | Collected annually<br>Most recent – 2003-2004 school year              | 15% reduction from the 2000-2001 school year. | 2003-2004 | 20% |
|   |   |  |   | 2004-2005 |     |
|   |   |  |   | 2005-2006 |     |
|   |   |  |   | 2006-2007 |     |
| Percent of schools decreasing <i>truancy</i> incidence.                             | Reports from each LEA - Safety and Discipline Incidents | Collection is to begin at the end of the '04-'05 school year           | Baseline begins '04-'05.                      | 2003-2004 |     |
|   |   |  |   | 2004-2005 |     |
|   |   |  |   | 2005-2006 |     |
|   |   |  |   | 2006-2007 |     |

## **A.2 Provide an explanation of the data provided in the table (A.1).**

According to Colorado's "Safe School Act", each school must annually submit safety- and discipline-related incident data to its district. The district then reports the school level data to the Colorado Department of Education according to procedures in the "Automated Data Exchange" reporting system. (Some of this data appears on the individual schools' "Accountability Report" which is released to all parents and available to the broader public on the Department's Web site.)

SDFSC program staff annually aggregate the data for each district to compare the data to the baseline year.

Colorado's baseline year was established at the onset of having the school level data available per the automated data exchange, which was the 2000-2001 school year. Therefore, the baseline year requested in this Consolidated State Report reflects our target of a 15% reduction from the 2000-2001 school year.

As the 2003-2004 school year has adjourned, and this is the last year for which CDE has set targets, a new baseline will be established. More multi-year targets will be established during a SDFSC staff strategic planning session, scheduled to be held in late July, 2004.

### **State definitions used to complete tables B. 1-4 on the next page include:**

**Assaults/Fights.** Student behavior on school grounds that if committed by an adult would be considered criminal assault. This category includes acts considered first and second degree assault, as defined by state statutes or municipal ordinances, but does not include acts considered third degree assault. If fights and other third degree assaults violate the local code of conduct, they are reported in the "other violation" category.

**Dangerous Weapons.** A firearm, whether loaded or unloaded, or a firearm facsimile that could reasonably be mistaken for an actual firearm; any pellet or BB gun or other device, whether operational or not designed to propel projectiles by spring action or compressed air; a fixed blade knife with a blade that measures longer than three inches in length or a spring-loaded knife or a pocket knife with a blade longer than three and one-half inches; or any object, device, instrument, material, or substance, whether animate or inanimate, used or intended to be used to inflict death or serious bodily injury.

**Alcohol Violations.** Use, possession or sale of alcohol on school grounds, in school vehicles, or at school activities or sanctioned events.

**Drug Violations.** Use, possession or sale of drugs or controlled substances on school grounds, in school vehicles, or at school activities or sanctioned events.



## Governor's Office Program

The Governor's Office, in collaboration with The Fund for Colorado's Future, provided assistance for safe and enriching activities for middle-school aged students in the hours after school – when they are most at risk for getting into trouble. Emphasis was placed on partnerships between schools and community groups – schools provided the facility and community groups provided the staff and programming. The after school programs provided students with safe places where they were engaged in fun and enriching activities.

Schools were held to the following four principles:

- Grantees will base their programs on a thorough assessment of objective data about the drug use, violence and related problems in the schools and communities served.
- Grantees will establish a set of measurable goals and objectives and design its program to meet those goals and objectives.
- Grantees will design and implement programs for youth based on research or evaluation that provides evidence that the programs used to prevent or reduce drug use, violence or other negative and disruptive behavior among youth.
- Grantees will evaluate programs periodically to assess the progress toward achieving their goals and objectives, and use the results to refine, improve and strengthen their programs.

Through the Safe and Drug Free Schools distribution for the 2002/2003 school year, the Governor's programs were able to accomplish the following:

- 16 participating schools
- 3,782 children served by programs
  - 18 children younger than age 5
  - 979 children from 5-9 years old
  - 1,489 children from 10-12 years old
  - 1,544 children from 13-15 years old
  - 25 children from 16-18 years old
  - 402 children 19 and older
- 48 community collaborations
- 5,254 total volunteer hours
- Children scoring proficient and advanced on the CSAP in 7<sup>th</sup> grade reading increased 19 percentage points

## Community Service Grant Program (for Expelled Students)

The Department contracted with 7 entities (school districts and youth serving organizations) for the 2002-2003 school year. This began the first year of a 2-year project year.

**B.** In the following charts, indicate the number of out-of-school suspensions or expulsions for elementary, middle, and high school students. States should use their definition of elementary, middle, and high school and provide those definitions in the report.

**1. The number of out-of-school suspensions and expulsions for physical fighting.**

|             | Number for 2002-2003<br>school year | Number of LEAs reporting      |
|-------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Elementary  | 423                                 | 58 LEAs of all 185 reporting  |
| Middle      | 1224                                | 64 LEAs of all 185 reporting  |
| High School | 1633                                | 101 LEAs of all 185 reporting |

**2. The number of out-of-school suspensions and expulsions for weapons possession**

|             | Number for 2002-2003<br>school year | Number of LEAs reporting     |
|-------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Elementary  | 270                                 | 47 LEAs of all 185 reporting |
| Middle      | 425                                 | 47 LEAs of all 185 reporting |
| High School | 435                                 | 65 LEAs of all 185 reporting |

**3. The number of alcohol-related out-of-school suspensions and expulsions.**

|             | Number for 2002-2003<br>school year | Number of LEAs reporting     |
|-------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Elementary  | 18                                  | 11 LEAs of all 185 reporting |
| Middle      | 191                                 | 42 LEAs of all 185 reporting |
| High School | 1067                                | 93 LEAs of all 185 reporting |

**4. The number of illicit drug-related out-of-school suspensions and expulsions.**

|             | Number for 2002-2003<br>school year | Number of LEAs reporting     |
|-------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Elementary  | 95                                  | 21 LEAs of all 185 reporting |
| Middle      | 1018                                | 72 LEAs of all 185 reporting |
| High School | 2852                                | 95 LEAs of all 185 reporting |

Colorado Note: "In-school Suspensions" and "Out of Classroom Suspensions" are also collected so the data reported above does not reflect all suspensions that occurred.

**Definitions:**

An *elementary school* is "a school composed of any span of grades not above Grade 6."

A *middle school* is "a separately organized and administered school intermediate between *elementary* and *senior high schools*, which might also be called a junior high school, usually including Grades 7, 8, and 9; Grades 7 and 8; or Grades 6, 7, and 8."

A *senior high school* is "a school offering the final years of school work necessary for graduation, usually including Grades 10, 11, and 12; or Grades 9, 10, 11, and 12."

**C. Describe the outcomes of the State's efforts to inform parents of and include parents in drug and violence prevention efforts.**

The Colorado Department of Education SDFSC program staff has made parent involvement a priority. The following efforts have been made to encourage parent involvement at both the local and state levels:

Parent representatives were recruited to serve on the state SDFSC advisory council for a two-year term (2002-2003 through 2003-2004).

Parents were recruited to participate in the "Safe School Forum." The Forum provided both school and community representatives an avenue for providing input to the State for defining "persistently dangerous" schools. At least one parent was included in each of the eight small group discussion groups, from diverse geographic areas of the State.

"Safety and Discipline Incident" data is displayed in a table on each School Accountability Report that is sent to each parent's home. All of these Reports are also available at CDE's Web site for availability to the general public. This keeps parents informed of their specific school's incidents for code of conduct violations for tobacco, alcohol, drugs, weapons, assaults/fights, habitually disruptive students, felonies, and all remaining violations in one sum. The data also discloses the dispositions of incidents in the way of classroom suspensions, in-school suspensions, out-of-school suspensions, expulsions, and referral to law enforcement.

Each SDFSC consultant is listed by name, phone number and e-mail link on the Web site. This allows parents to contact staff for technical assistance and consultations. Numerous consultations take place throughout the year with parents who have located us through the Web site.

A workshop session was conducted at the School Resource Officer annual summer training conference regarding how SROs and parents can more effectively work together in partnership. SDFSC program staff arranged for the presenter.

SDFSC staff conducted a workshop on Joyce Epstein's "Six Types of Parent Involvement" at the annual Parent Involvement Conference implemented by CDE's Title I staff. Various presentations similar to this are made via other workshops throughout the year.

LEAs must describe in the local Consolidated Application for Federal (NCLB) funds how they have included parents in the local planning and designing of the local application for SDFSC programming. As this is one of the Principles of Effectiveness, applications are not approved if this information is missing.

**X. 21st Century Community Learning Centers  
(Title IV, Part B)**

Performance data needed for this program will be available from another source. The Department will implement a national evaluation and data reporting system to provide essential data needed to measure program performance. States will be notified and are requested to participate in these activities once they are implemented.

## **XI. Innovative Programs (Title V, Part A)**

**A.** Please describe **major** results to date of State-level Title V, Part A funded activities to improve student achievement and the quality of education for students. Please use quantitative data if available (e.g., increases in the number of highly qualified teachers).

Title V has been instrumental in enabling CDE to move ahead with a comprehensive implementation of NCLB. A measure of the effectiveness of Title V funding in supporting Colorado's efforts can be found in examining the progress of the State toward NCLB's goals. What follows, is a listing of the progress Colorado has made toward selected NCLB goals utilizing Title V staff and funds in support of these efforts:

- ❑ Colorado has incorporated nearly all of the required NCLB data elements into its Automated Data Exchange project
- ❑ Colorado has implemented all of the Title I accountability system provisions including adequate yearly progress determinations of schools and districts, school improvement identifications, school choice, and supplemental services
- ❑ Colorado has operationalized the definition of highly qualified teachers and paraprofessionals and is working with districts to meet the 2006 requirement that all teachers in the core academic areas be highly qualified
- ❑ Colorado has set its annual measurable achievement objectives for English language proficiency
- ❑ Colorado is providing support to its schools identified for Improvement through School Support Teams and opportunities for high quality professional development
- ❑ Colorado has improved its Consolidated Federal Programs application materials and procedures and technical assistance in support of the process
- ❑ Colorado has all required standards in place
- ❑ Colorado will have all of the required assessments in place during the 2004-05 school year
- ❑ Colorado supports charter schools and increased school choice using federal funds
- ❑ Colorado identifies distinguished Title I schools and teachers and utilizes them in the school support process
- ❑ Colorado is working toward identifying the most effective instructional practices in reading and math and supports schools in implementing these effective practices
- ❑ Colorado fully supports the goals of Title V and utilizes Title V funding to increase public awareness of the status of education in Colorado and the status of education in Colorado relative to the NCLB goals.

**B.** The table below requests data on student achievement outcomes of **Title V, Part A - funded** LEAs that use **20%** or more of Title V, Part A funds and funds transferred from other programs for **strategic priorities including: (1)** student achievement in reading and math, **(2)** teacher quality, **(3)** safe and drug free schools, **(4)** access for all students to a quality education. Complete the table below using aggregated data from all LEA evaluations of school year 2002-2003 activities funded in whole or in part from Title V, Part A - Innovative Programs funds.

| Priority Activity/Area <sup>1</sup>   | Number of LEAs that used <b>20%</b> or more Title V, Part A, including funds transferred into Title V, Part A (see Note) for: | Number of these LEAs that met AYP | Total Number of Students Served |
|---|---|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Area 1: <b>Student Achievement in Reading and Math</b>  | 105   | 55                                | 36477                           |
| Area 2: <b>Teacher Quality</b>  | 51  | 31                                | 12653                           |
| Area 3: <b>Safe and Drug Free Schools</b>   | 26  | 14                                | 7018                            |
| Area 4: <b>Increase Access for all Students</b>   | 27  | 11                                | 8261                            |
| Note: Funds from REAP and Local Flex (Section 6152) that are used for Title V, Part A purposes and funds transferred into Title V, Part A under the transferability option under section 6132(b). |   |                                   |                                 |

**B.1** Indicate the number of Title V, Part A funded LEAs that did not use, in school year 2002-2003, 20% or more of Title V, Part A funds including funds transferred from other programs into Title V, Part A, for any of the priority activities/areas listed in the table under B above. 13

**B.2** Indicate the number of LEAs shown in B.1 that met AYP in school year 2002-2003. 10

<sup>1</sup> In completing this table, States should include activities described in Section 5131 of the ESEA as follows: Area 1 (activities 3, 9,12,16,19,20,22,26,27), Area 2 (activity 1,2), Area 3 (activity 14,25), Area 4 (activities 4,5,7,8,15,17)

## XII. Rural Education Achievement Program (REAP) (Title VI, Part B)

### A. Small Rural School Achievement Program (Title VI, Part B, Subpart 1)

Please indicate the number of eligible LEAs that notified the State of the LEA's intention to use the Alternative Uses of Funding authority under section 6211 during the 2002-2003 school year.

40

### B. Rural and Low-Income School Program (Title VI, Part B, Subpart 2)

1. LEAs that receive Rural and Low-Income School (RLIS) Program grants may use these funds for any of the purposes listed in the following table. Please indicate in the table the total number of eligible LEAs that used funds for each of the listed purposes during the 2002-2003 school year.

| Purpose  | Number of 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 | 5                                   |
| Educational technology, including software and hardware as described in Title II, Part D   | 5                                   |
| Parental involvement activities  | 0- (Probably covered under Title I) |
| Activities authorized under the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program (Title IV, Part A)  | 3                                   |
| Activities authorized under Title I, Part A  | 7                                   |
| Activities authorized under Title III (Language instruction for LEP and immigrant students)  | 1                                   |

**Note:** For the 2002-2003 School Year, Colorado had 15 eligible districts for the Rural, Low-Income program. The figures above add to 21 because some districts used funds for more than one program area, though most dedicated 100% to a more singular program focus.

**2. Describe the progress the State has made in meeting the goals and objectives for the Rural Low-Income Schools Programs as described in its June 2002 Consolidated State application. Provide quantitative data where available.**

The goals and objectives for the Rural, Low-Income program are identical to the five primary goals required of all states by NCLB. Those goals are synopsized below:

- Performance Goal 1 – High Standards in Reading/Language Arts and Mathematics
- Performance Goal 2 – English Proficiency in Reading/Language Arts and Mathematics
- Performance Goal 3 – Highly Qualified Teachers
- Performance Goal 4 – Safe and Drug Free
- Performance Goal 5 – Graduation from High School

The progress for goals and state performance indicators have either already been reported to the US Department of Education in the reports submitted in September and December, 2003, or contained elsewhere in this report due June 30, 2004. Due to the volume of detail and pages contained in the previous submission or other sections of this report (which would be duplicative), the data will not be displayed here.

For copies of the September and December 2003 reports, refer to the Department Website at:

<http://www.cde.state.co.us/cdeunified/consapp.htm>



|   |
|---|
| <b>XIII. Funding Transferability for State and Local Educational Agencies (Title VI, Part A, Subpart 2)</b> |
|---|

**A. State Transferability of Funds**

Did the State transfer funds under the State Transferability authority of section 6123(a) during the 2002-2003 school year? \_\_\_\_No\_\_\_\_

**B. Local Educational Agency Transferability of Funds**

1. Please indicate the total number of LEAs that notified the State that they were transferring funds under the LEA Transferability authority of section 6123(b) during the 2002-2003 school year. \_\_\_\_19\_\_\_\_
2. In the charts below, please indicate below the total number of LEAs that transferred funds TO and FROM each eligible program and the total amount of funds transferred TO and FROM each eligible program.

| <b>Program</b>  | <b>Total Number of LEAs transferring funds <u>TO</u> eligible program</b> | <b>Total amount of funds transferred <u>TO</u> eligible program</b> |
|---|---|---|
| Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (section 2121)           | <b>6</b>  | <b>\$468,265</b>  |
| Educational Technology State Grants (section 2412(a)(2)(A))     | <b>3</b>  | <b>\$11,151</b>   |
| Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (section 4112(b)(1)) | <b>2</b>  | <b>\$27,147</b>   |
| State Grants for Innovative Programs (section 5112(a))          | <b>5</b>  | <b>\$166,681</b>  |
| Title I, Part A, Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs      | <b>12</b>   | <b>\$482,622</b>  |

| <b>Program</b>  | <b>Total Number of LEAs transferring funds <u>FROM</u> eligible program</b> | <b>Total amount of funds transferred <u>FROM</u> eligible program</b> |
|---|---|---|
| Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (section 2121)           | <b>10</b>   | <b>\$580,612</b>  |
| Educational Technology State Grants (section 2412(a)(2)(A))     | <b>5</b>  | <b>\$371,995</b>  |
| Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (section 4112(b)(1)) | <b>10</b>   | <b>\$142,787</b>  |
| State Grants for Innovative Programs (section 5112(a))          | <b>4</b>  | <b>\$60,472</b>   |

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