CALIFORNIA'S 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

SUBMITTED JUNE 30, 2004

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202

OMB Number: 1810-0614
Expiration Date: 10/31/2004

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:

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Address:
1430 "N" Street
Suite 5602
Sacramento, CA 95814

Person to contact about this report:

Name: **CAMILLE MABEN, NCLB Coordinator**

Telephone: (**916) 319-0582**

Fax: (**916) 319-0102**

E-mail: **cmaben@cde.ca.gov**

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

GAVIN PAYNE, Chief Deputy Superintendent of Public Instruction

Signature

June 30, 2004
Date

I. Improving Basic Programs
Operated by Local Educational Agencies (Title I, Part A)

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.

4,536

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.

4,538

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 **5,894**

2. Total Number of Title I Targeted Assistance Schools in the State **2,691**

3. Total Number of Title I Schoolwide Program Schools in the State **3,203**

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.

Student Participation in Title I, A by Special Services or Programs	
	Number of Students Served
Students with Disabilities	**4,626**
Limited English Proficient	**1,136,677**
Homeless	**1,647**
Migrant	**2,455**

Student Participation in Title I, A by Racial or Ethnic Group	
	Number of Students Served
American Indian or Alaskan Native	**24,270**
Asian	**222,441**
Black or African American	**297,202**
Hispanic or Latino	**1,743,088**
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	*
White	**488,760**

This data was not required in the 2001-02 report. California will integrate it into its report for the 2004-05 school year. As in California's December 2003 submission, Native Hawaiians and Pacific Islanders are reported in the Asian category.

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 TAS	**Public SWP**	**Private**	**Local Neglected**	**Total**	**Percent of Total**
Age 0-2	*	*	*	*	*	*
Age 3-5	18	948	1	6	973	2.79%
K	1,133	2,299	78	36	3,546	10.16%
1	1,500	2,330	122	48	4,000	11.46%
2	1,618	2,337	134	51	4,140	11.87%
3	1,659	2,350	138	60	4,207	12.06%
4	1,634	2,327	125	57	4,143	11.87%
5	1,614	2,304	113	60	4,091	11.72%
6	1,134	1,490	77	64	2,765	7.92%
7	765	720	58	61	1,604	4.60%
8	722	719	55	65	1,561	4.47%
9	417	302	21	59	799	2.29%
10	497	302	21	62	882	2.53%
11	416	297	18	53	784	2.25%
12	364	281	15	50	710	2.03%
Ungraded	214	467	6	0	687	1.97%
TOTALS	13,705	19,473	982	732	34,892	100.00%

Currently California does not have a program for this age group.

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.

Student Participation in Title I, A Targeted Assistance (TAS) Programs by Instructional and Support Services	
Instructional Services	
	Number of Students Served
Mathematics	**2,062**
Reading/Language Arts	**2,513**
Science	**452**
Social Studies	**446**
Vocational/Career	*****
Other (specify)	**105**
Support Services	
Health, Dental, and Eye Care	**306**
Supporting Guidance/Advocacy	**483**
Other (specify)	**48**

**** This data was not required in the 2001-02 report; California will integrate it into its report for the 2004-05 school year.***

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.

Staff Information for Title I, A Targeted Assistance Programs	
	Number of Title I Targeted Assistance Program FTE Staff
Administrators (non-clerical)	**285**
Teachers	**1,382**
Teacher Aides	**1,495**
Support Staff (clerical and non-clerical)	**437**
Other (specify)	**122**

II. William F. Goodling Even Start Family Literacy Programs (Title I, Part B, Subpart 3)

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	**107**

2. Even Start Families Served

a. Total number of families served	**4,107**
b. Total number of adults participating	**4,424**
c. Total number of adults who are English language learners	**3,571**
d. Total number of children participating	**6,360**

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

a. Number of newly enrolled families	**2,131**
b. Number of newly enrolled adult participants	**2,297**
c. Percent of newly enrolled families at or below the Federal Poverty level	**89.60%**
d. Percent of newly enrolled adult participants without a high school diploma or GED	**80.95%**
e. Percent of newly enrolled adult participants who have not gone beyond the 9th grade	**62.82%**

4. Percent of families that have remained in the program

a. Less than 3 months: 462 families, or 21.68% of the total families in the project

b. From 4 to 6 months: 698 families, or 32.75% of the total families in the project

c. From 7 to 12 months: 971 families, or 45.57% of the total families in the project

d. More than 12 months: CDE will add this new item to the annual evaluation report for 2004-05.

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 indictors 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.

Graphs illustrating the 2002-03 results for the California Even Start Performance Indicators are available upon request.

Adult Basic Education (Excluding English as Second Language Learners) Performance Indicators 1.1a-c

Indicator *Name of required or optional indicator*	**Target or Standards** *Description of target or standard set by State of desired performance on indicator*	**Measure** *Measurement tool used to assess progress for indicator*	**Result** *Data for the current reporting year and trend data where available*	**Assessment of Progress** *Status of progress on indicator (1) Target met (2) Target not met*	**Explanation of Progress** *Description of why results were obtained*
Performance Indicator 1.1a: Adult Basic Education	Fifty percent of adult learners enrolled in Adult Basic Education (ABE) classes who achieve pretest scale score of 210 or below on the Comprehensive Adult Student Assessment System (CASAS) Reading and Math Tests will demonstrate a 5-point posttest gain in each subject area after a minimum of 100 hours of instruction.	CASAS Reading and Math Tests	READING **71.23 percent** (52 of 73) adults with matched pre and post test scores demonstrated a 5-point gain. The mean gain for adults was 9.96 scale score points. This gain is statistically significant (p<.01). 92.86 percent (13 of the 14) projects who offered ABE and provided matched pre and post test information achieved the indicator. MATH **68 percent** (34 of 50) adults with matched pre and post test scores demonstrated a 5-point gain. The mean gain for adults was 10.10 scale score points. This gain is statistically significant (p<.01). 58.33 percent (7 of the 12) projects who offered ABE and provided matched pre and post test information achieved the indicator. **2001-2002 Trend Data** Reading: 64.97 percent (161 of 247 adults)* Math: 56.25 (109 of 195 adults)*	Targets met Reading and Math	Analysis for the reading indicator was based on the 14 projects that entered 73 matched pre and post CASAS reading scores. Analysis for the math indicator was based on the 12 projects that entered 50 matched pre and post CASAS math scores Weighted means were obtained and a non-parametric test of significance was used.

Indicator *Name of required or optional indicator*	**Target or Standards** *Description of target or standard set by State of desired performance on indicator*	**Measure** *Measurement tool used to assess progress for indicator*	**Result** *Data for the current reporting year and trend data where available*	**Assessment of Progress** *Status of progress on indicator (1) Target met (2) Target not met*	**Explanation of Progress** *Description of why results were obtained*
Performance Indicator 1.1b. Adult Basic Education	Fifty percent of adult learners enrolled in Adult Basic Education classes who achieve pretest scale score of 211 or higher on the Comprehensive Adult Student Assessment System (CASAS) Reading and Math Tests will demonstrate a 3-point posttest gain in each subject area after a minimum of 100 hours of instruction.	CASAS Reading and Math Tests	READING **68.75 percent** (121 of the 176) adults with matched pre and post test scores demonstrated a 3-point gain. The mean gain for adults was 4.46 scale score points. This gain is statistically significant (p<.01). 83.33 percent (15 of the 18) projects who offered ABE and provided matched pre and post test information achieved the indicator. MATH **71.19 percent** (126 of 177) adults with matched pre and post test scores demonstrated a 3-point gain. The mean gain for adults was 5.86 scale score points. This gain is statistically significant (p<.01). 89.47 percent (17 of the 19) projects who offered ABE and provided matched pre and post test information achieved the indicator. **2001-2002 Trend Data** Reading: 53.13 percent (165 of 310 adults)* Math: 49.40 percent (104 of 210 adults)* * Figures include duplicate counts; some participants were counted in both ABE and English as a Second Language (ESL) classes.	Target met Reading and Math	Analysis for the reading indicator was based on the 18 projects that entered 176 matched pre and post CASAS reading scores. Analysis for the math indicator was based on the 19 projects that entered 177 matched pre and post CASAS math scores Weighted means were obtained and a non-parametric test of significance was used.

Indicator *Name of required or optional indicator*	**Target or Standards** *Description of target or standard set by State of desired performance on indicator*	**Measure** *Measurement tool used to assess progress for indicator*	**Result** *Data for the current reporting year and trend data where available*	**Assessment of Progress** *Status of progress on indicator (1) Target met (2) Target not met*	**Explanation of Progress** *Description of why results were obtained*
Performance Indicator 1.1c Adult Basic Education	Fifty percent of adult learners enrolled in Adult Basic Education classes will show improvement in their writing skills as measured by higher posttest scores or proficiency levels on a project selected writing assessment after a minimum of 100 hours of instruction.	Writing assessment – chosen locally by each project.	**81.85 percent** (185 of the 226) adults demonstrated improvement in their writing skills as measured by higher posttest scores or proficiency levels on a local project selected writing assessment. **100 percent** of the 15 projects who offered ABE and provided matched pre and post test information achieved the indicator. **2001-2002 Trend Data** Writing: 59.90 percent (580 of 968 adults)* * Scores from the writing assessments were combined for ABE and ESL participants.	Target met.	Analysis was based on the 15 projects that entered 226 adults who took the writing assessment.

Indicator *Name of required or optional indicator*	**Target or Standards** *Description of target or standard set by State of desired performance on indicator*	**Measure** *Measurement tool used to assess progress for indicator*	**Result** *Data for the current reporting year and trend data where available*	**Assessment of Progress** *Status of progress on indicator (1) Target met (2) Target not met*	**Explanation of Progress** *Description of why results were obtained*
English as a Second Language Performance Indicators 1.2 a-c					
Performance Indicator 1.2: English as a Second Language Acquisition (ESL)	Fifty percent of adult learners enrolled in ESL classes who 1) pass the CASAS oral screen and 2) achieve a pretest scale score of 210 or below on the Comprehensive Adult Student Assessment System (CASAS) Reading Test will demonstrate a 5-point posttest gain after a minimum of 100 hours of instruction.	CASAS Reading Test	**73.17 percent** (889 of the 1215) adults with matched pre and post test scores demonstrated a 5-point gain. The mean gain for adults was 10.97 scale score points. This gain is statistically significant (p<.01). **84.27 percent** (75 of the 89) projects who offered ESL and provided matched pre and post test information achieved the indicator. **2001-2002 Trend Data** Reading: 68.41percent (545 of 797 adults)	Target met.	Analysis for the reading indicator was based on the 89 projects that entered 1215 matched pre and post CASAS reading scores. Weighted means were obtained and a non-parametric test of significance was used.
Performance Indicator 1.2: English as a Second Language	Fifty percent of adult learners enrolled in ESL classes who achieve a pretest scale score of 211 or higher on the CASAS Reading Test will demonstrate a three-point posttest gain after a minimum of 100 hours of instruction.	CASAS Reading Test	**64.38 percent** (526 of the 817) adults with matched pre and post test scores demonstrated a three-point gain. The mean gain for adults was 4.33 scale score points. This gain is statistically significant (p<.01). **81.48 percent** (66 of the 81) projects who offered ESL and provided matched pre and post test information achieved the indicator. **2001-2002 Trend Data** Reading: 65.14 percent (284 of 436 adults)	Target met.	Analysis for the reading indicator was based on the 81 projects that entered 817 matched pre and post CASAS reading scores. Weighted means were obtained and a non-parametric test of significance was used.

Indicator *Name of required or optional indicator*	**Target or Standards** *Description of target or standard set by State of desired performance on indicator*	**Measure** *Measurement tool used to assess progress for indicator*	**Result** *Data for the current reporting year and trend data where available*	**Assessment of Progress** *Status of progress on indicator (1) Target met (2) Target not met*	**Explanation of Progress** *Description of why results were obtained*
Performance Indicator 1.2: English as a Second Language – Writing	Each year, 50 percent of adult learners enrolled in ESL classes will show improvement in their writing skills as measured by higher posttest scores or proficiency levels on a project selected.	Writing assessment – chosen locally by each project.	**71.44 percent** (1073 of the 1502) adults demonstrated improvement in their writing skills as measured by higher posttest scores or proficiency levels on a project selected writing assessment. **80 percent** (56 of the 70) projects who offered ESL and provided matched pre and post test information achieved the indicator. **2001-2002 Trend Data** Writing: 59.90 percent (580 of 968 adults)* * Scores from the writing assessments were combined for ABE and ESL participants.	Target met.	Analysis was based on the 70 projects that entered 1502 adults who took a writing assessment.

Indicator *Name of required or optional indicator*	**Target or Standards** *Description of target or standard set by State of desired performance on indicator*	**Measure** *Measurement tool used to assess progress for indicator*	**Result** *Data for the current reporting year and trend data where available* **The data provided below represents the 2002-03 project year. Trend data are not available given changes in indicators and assessments**	**Assessment of Progress** *Status of progress on indicator (1) Target met (2) Target not met*	**Explanation of Progress** *Description of why results were obtained*
Performance Indicator I.3 Adult Secondary Education Receipt of High School Diploma or General Equivalency Diploma (GED).	50 percent of adults who are 1) enrolled in a course of study to earn a high school diploma or prepare for the GED and (2) have achieved scale scores of 236 or higher on the CASAS Reading and Math Test will earn a diploma or pass the English GED exam after three years of continuous enrollment in GED preparation classes.	Percentage of students gaining their high school diploma or GED	**GED** **60.66 percent** (37 of 61) of the eligible adults in a GED program passed the GED exam this year. **72.22 percent** (13 of the 18) projects that reported GED data achieved the indicator. **High School Diploma** **60.87 percent** (42 of 69) of the adults in high school diploma programs received their high school diploma this year. **64.29 percent** (9 of the 14) projects reporting data achieved the indicator.	Target met. Adults: GED and high school diploma	In response to this indicator, 18 projects reported GED data, and 14 projects reported data on high school diploma program.

Indicator *Name of required or optional indicator*	**Target or Standards** *Description of target or standard set by State of desired performance on indicator*	**Measure** *Measurement tool used to assess progress for indicator*	**Result** *Data for the current reporting year and trend data where available* **The data provided below represents the 2002-03 project year. Trend data are not available given changes in indicators and assessments**	**Assessment of Progress** *Status of progress on indicator (1) Target met (2) Target not met*	**Explanation of Progress** *Description of why results were obtained*
Teen Parents enrolled in an Alternative Program.	Each year 50 percent of the teen parents who are enrolled in an alternative educational program for a minimum of 100 days (specialized program for teen parents excluding regular high school, GED, ABE, or ESL programs) will demonstrate grade level proficiency in reading, mathematics, and language arts as measured by the district's standardized achievement test.	Grade level proficiency in reading, mathematics, and language arts as measured by the district's standardized achievement test.	**52.47 percent** (53 of 101) of the teen parents demonstrated grade level proficiency on standardized test. **80 percent** (8 of the 10) projects serving teen parents achieved the indicator.	Target met	10 projects reported data for 101 teen parents in response to this indicator.
Performance Indicator 1.3: Spanish GED Preparation	Fifty percent of the adults who are enrolled in a Spanish GED preparation course of study will pass the Spanish GED exam after two years of continuous enrollment.	Percentage of students gaining GED in Spanish.	**64.44 percent** (29 of 45) of the adults in Spanish GED programs passed the Spanish GED exam this year.	Target met	9 projects reported data for 45 adults in response to this indicator.

Indicator *Name of required or optional indicator*	**Target or Standards** *Description of target or standard set by State of desired performance on indicator*	**Measure** *Measurement tool used to assess progress for indicator*	**Result** *Data for the current reporting year and trend data where available* **The data provided below represents the 2002-03 project year. Trend data are not available given changes in indicators and assessments**	**Assessment of Progress** *Status of progress on indicator (1) Target met (2) Target not met*	**Explanation of Progress** *Description of why results were obtained*
Performance Indicator 1.4: Entry into a Post-Secondary School, Job Training Program, Employment, and Military	Each year, 50 percent of adults will meet their goals of post-secondary education, employment or military, or career advancement.	Percentage of students meeting their goals of post-secondary school, job training program, employment, and military.	Post-secondary school **85.84 percent**: (194 of 226) adults met their goal of post-secondary school Job training **92.75 percent**: (192 of 207) of the adults met their goal of job training Employment **71.81 percent**: (326 of 454) of the adults met their goal of employment Military employment **100 percent** (1 of 1) of the adults met their goal of military employment	Target met	74 projects provided data on this indicator.

Performance Indicator 2.1: Reading/School Readiness Indicator for Birth to Three Months					
Indicator *Name of required or optional indicator*	**Target or Standards** *Description of target or standard set by State of desired performance on indicator*	**Measure** *Measurement tool used to assess progress for indicator*	**Result** *Data for the current reporting year and trend data where available* **The data provided below represents the 2002-03 project year. Trend data are not available given changes in indicators and assessments**	**Assessment of Progress** *Status of progress on indicator (1) Target met (2) Target not met*	**Explanation of Progress** *Description of why results were obtained*
Performance Indicator 2.1: Reading/ School Readiness Indicator for Birth to Three	When all Even Start children turn seven months, seventeen months, or thirty-five months, they will be expected to have "fully mastered" or "almost mastered" behaviors specified on the Desired Results Developmental Profile (DRDP) appropriate for their age after completing at least 200 hours of early childhood education within a project year.	Desired Results Developmental Profile (DRDP)	**53.90 percent** (304 of 564) of the children (ages birth to 3) reported by projects achieved the standard described in the indicator. **53.13 percent** (34 of the 64) projects that served children ages birth to 3 and provided data on eligible children achieved the indicator.	Target not met.	Analysis was based on the 64 projects that entered data for 564 children. 2002-03 was the first year that the DRDP was used state-wide as an assessment of children's progress. Staff are in the process of being trained on child observation and standards for rating student behaviors.

Performance Indicator 2.2 Reading/School Readiness Indicator for Three to Pre-Kindergarten					
Indicator *Name of required or optional indicator*	**Target or Standards** *Description of target or standard set by State of desired performance on indicator*	**Measure** *Measurement tool used to assess progress for indicator*	**Result** *Data for the current reporting year and trend data where available* **The data provided below represents the 2002-03 project year. Trend data are not available given changes in indicators and assessments**	**Assessment of Progress** *Status of progress on indicator (1) Target met (2) Target not met*	**Explanation of Progress** *Description of why results were obtained*
Performance Indicator 2.2 Reading/School Readiness Indicator for Three to Pre-Kindergarten (Pre-Kindergarten --ages four or five years who have not entered kindergarten)	For each reading readiness measure assessed with the Desired Results Developmental Profile (DRDP) or Desired Result Developmental Profile Plus (DRDP+), the Even Start children who were not rated as having "fully mastered" that behavior at pre-testing will progress one or more ratings in that behavior after a minimum of 200 hours of early childhood education during the project year.	Desired Results Developmental Profile (DRDP) or Desired Result Developmental Profile Plus (DRDP+)	**47.73 percent** (410 of 859) of the children (ages 3-5) reported by projects achieved the standard described in the indicator. **40.74 percent** (33 of the 81) projects that served children (ages 3 to 5) and provided data on eligible children achieved the indicator.	Target not met.	Analysis was based on the 81 projects, which entered data for 859 children.

Performance Indicator 2.3 Reading/School Readiness Indicator for Entering Kindergarten					
Performance Indicators *Name of required or optional indicator*	**Target or Standard** *Description of target or standard set by state of desired performance on indicator*	**Measure** *Measurement tool to be used to assess progress for indicator*	**Result** *Data for the current reporting year; trend data if available* **The data provided below represents the 2002-03-project year. Trend data are not available given changes in Indicators and assessments**.	**Assessment of Progress** *Status of progress on the indicator (1) Target met (2) Target not met*	**Explanation of Progress** *Description of why results were obtained*
Performance Indicator 2.3: Reading/School Readiness Indicator for Entering Kindergarten (age five years who are entering Kindergarten)	For each reading/ school readiness measure assessed with the Desired Results Developmental Profile (DRDP) or Desired Results Developmental Profile Plus (DRDP+), the Even Start children who transition to kindergarten will be rated as having "fully mastered" or "almost mastered" all behaviors on the DRDP (ages 3 to pre-kindergarten) after a minimum of 200 hours of early childhood education during the project year.	Desired Results Developmental Profile (DRDP) or Desired Results Developmental Profile Plus (DRDP+)	**67.02 percent** (317 of 473) of the pre-kindergarten children reported by projects achieved the standard described in the indicator. **73.33 percent** (55 of the 75) projects that served pre-kindergarten children and provided data on eligible children achieved the indicator.	Target not met.	Analysis was based on the 75 projects that entered data for 473 children.

Performance Indicator 2.4 School Attendance for Grades Kindergarten through Grade Two					
Indicator *Name of required or optional indicator*	**Target or Standards** *Description of target or standard set by State of desired performance on indicator*	**Measure** *Measurement tool used to assess progress for indicator*	**Result** *Data for the current reporting year and trend data where available* **The data provided below represents the 2002-03 project year. Trend data are not available given changes in indicators and assessments**	**Assessment of Progress** *Status of progress on indicator (1) Target met (2) Target not met*	**Explanation of Progress** *Description of why results were obtained*
Performance Indicator 2.4 School Attendance for Grades Kindergarten through Grade 2	Ninety percent of the children enrolled in the Even Start program for a minimum of 100 hours will have an attendance rate of 95 percent of their possible school days from date of enrollment in Even Start.	School Attendance Numbers	**82.84 percent** (917 of 1107) of the K-2 children reported by projects attended school 95 percent of their possible school days. **90.24 percent** (74 of the 82) projects that served K-2 children and provided data on eligible children achieved the indicator.	Target not met.	Analysis was based on the 82 projects that entered data for 1107 children.
Performance Indicator 2.5 Grade Level Promotion for Grades Kindergarten through Grade Two					
Performance Indicator 2.5 Grade Level Promotion for Grades Kindergarten through Grade 2	Ninety percent of the Even Start children enrolled in kindergarten through grade 2 who received academic support beyond the regular instructional program for a minimum of 100 hours will advance to the next grade level as reported by the child's school records.	Grade Promotion Numbers -This indicator is limited to those Even Start school-age children who were provided additional assistance.	**97.66 percent (**1170 of 1198) of the K-2 children reported by the projects advanced to the next grade level. **100 percent** of the 83 of the projects that served K-2 children and provided data on eligible children achieved the indicator.	Target met.	Analysis was based on the 83 projects that entered data for 1198 children.

Performance Indicator 2.6 Reading and Math Content Standards Progress for Grade Kindergarten Through Grade Two					
Indicator *Name of required or optional indicator*	**Target or Standards** *Description of target or standard set by State of desired performance on indicator*	**Measure** *Measurement tool used to assess progress for indicator*	**Result** *Data for the current reporting year and trend data where available* **The data provided below represents the 2002-03 project year. Trend data are not available given changes in indicators and assessments**	**Assessment of Progress** *Status of progress on indicator (1) Target met (2) Target not met*	**Explanation of Progress** *Description of why results were obtained*
Performance Indicator 2.6 Reading and Math Content Standards Progress for Grade Kindergarten Through Grade 2	Each year, 50 percent of the Even Start children enrolled in kindergarten through grade 2 who received academic support beyond the regular instructional program for a minimum of 100 hours will show improvement in meeting grade level content standards as assessed in reading and math.	Grade level content standards – district measures, and/or California Standards Test, and/or the California Achievement Test – Version 6	**64.38 percent** (573 of 890) of the K-2 children reported by the projects met their grade level content standards in reading and math. **80 percent** (60 of the 77) projects who served K-2 children and provided data on eligible children achieved the indicator.	Target met.	77 projects with 890 children provided data on achievement of content standards.

Performance Indicator 2.7 Kindergarten through Grade Two English Learners:					
Indicator *Name of required or optional indicator*	**Target or Standards** *Description of target or standard set by State of desired performance on indicator*	**Measure** *Measurement tool used to assess progress for indicator*	**Result** *Data for the current reporting year and trend data where available* **The data provided below represents the 2002-03 project year. Trend data are not available given changes in indicators and assessments**	**Assessment of Progress** *Status of progress on indicator (1) Target met (2) Target not met*	**Explanation of Progress** *Description of why results were obtained*
Performance Indicator 2.7 Kindergarten through Grade 2 English Learners:	Each year, 50 percent of the English learners enrolled in kindergarten through grade 2 who received English Language Development (ELD) and Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English (SDAIE) instruction for a minimum of one school year will show progress as measured by State Board-adopted ELD curriculum assessments and by the California English Language Development Test (CELDT).	California English Language Development Test (CELDT)	**69.70 percent** (375 of 538) of the K-2 English learners reported by the projects made progress in their English language skills. **81.97 percent** (50 of the 61) projects that served K-2 English learners and provided data on eligible children achieved the indicator.	Target met.	61 projects with 538 children provided data on K-2 English learners.

Performance Indicator 3.1: Parent's Support for Children's Learning in the Home Environment					
Indicator *Name of required or optional indicator*	**Target or Standards** *Description of target or standard set by State of desired performance on indicator*	**Measure** *Measurement tool used to assess progress for indicator*	**Result** *Data for the current reporting year and trend data where available* **The data provided below represents the 2002-03 project year. Trend data are not available given changes in indicators and assessments**	**Assessment of Progress** *Status of progress on indicator (1) Target met (2) Target not met*	**Explanation of Progress** *Description of why results were obtained*
Performance Indicator 3.1: Parent's Support for Children's Learning in the Home Environment	By the conclusion of each project year, 70 percent of parents who participated in a minimum of 50 hours of family literacy instruction will report that they support their child's learning at home by 1) providing a variety of age-appropriate literacy materials for children, 2) possess a library card, 3) bringing home children's books on a weekly basis, 4) maintaining a home library consisting of a minimum of 25 children's books, and 5) using television as a learning tool as measured by the pretest/posttest California-Even Start Performance Information Reporting System (CA-ESPIRS) Survey.	California-Even Start Performance Information Reporting System (CA-ESPIRS) Survey.	*Percentage of Parents Achieving Each Indicator Item by Post-testing* **93.71** percent of parents reading 2+ types of reading materials (Target met) **85.96** percent of parents writing 2+ types of writing activities (Target met) **89.85** percent of books: Has minimum of 11 children's books in home (Target met) **85.12** percent of parents who have a library card (Target met) **75.49** percent of parents who visit the library at least once a month (Target met) **78.20** percent of parents who brought a book home in the past week (Target met) **93.56** percent of parents who have 3+ types of materials at home (Target met) **70.35** percent of children who watch less than 2-3 hours of TV daily (Target met) **81.38** percent of parents responding "sometimes" or "yes" to all 3 TV items- (Target met)	Target met.	Analysis was based on the 99 projects that entered, on average, over 2,300 matched parent ESPIRS response for each sub-item. Weighted means were used.

Performance Indicator 3.2: Parent's Role in Interactive Literacy Activities					
Indicator *Name of required or optional indicator*	**Target or Standards** *Description of target or standard set by State of desired performance on indicator*	**Measure** *Measurement tool used to assess progress for indicator*	**Result** *Data for the current reporting year and trend data where available* **The data provided below represents the 2002-03 project year. Trend data are not available given changes in indicators and assessments**	**Assessment of Progress** *Status of progress on indicator (1) Target met (2) Target not met*	**Explanation of Progress** *Description of why results were obtained*
Performance Indicator 3.2: Parent's Role in Interactive Literacy Activities	By the conclusion of each project year, 70 percent of parents who participated in a minimum of 50 hours of family literacy instruction will report that they engage in interactive literacy activities as demonstrated by parents 1) read to child at least three times per week, 2) using interactive reading strategies, and 3) telling children stories at least three times per week, as measured by the pretest/posttest of the CA-ESPIRS Survey. Reading: item 3 Reading: item 4 Stories: item 8	California-Even Start Performance Information Reporting System (CA-ESPIRS) Survey	Percentage of Parents Achieving Each Indicator Item by Post-testing **86.79** percent of parents who read books/stories to their children 3+ times a week (Target met) **88.37** percent of parents who engage in 3-5 interactive reading behaviors when they read to their children (Target met) **49.26** percent of parents who tell stories to their children 3+ times a week (Target not met)	Target not met.	Analysis was based on the 99 projects that entered, on average, over 2,300 matched parent ESPIRS response for each sub-item.

Performance Indicator 3.3: Parent's Role in Supporting Child's Learning in Formal Educational Settings					
Indicator *Name of required or optional indicator*	**Target or Standards** *Description of target or standard set by State of desired performance on indicator*	**Measure** *Measurement tool used to assess progress for indicator*	**Result** *Data for the current reporting year and trend data where available* **The data provided below represents the 2002-03 project year. Trend data are not available given changes in indicators and assessments**	**Assessment of Progress** *Status of progress on indicator (1) Target met (2) Target not met*	**Explanation of Progress** *Description of why results were obtained*
Performance Indicator 3.3: Parent's Role in Supporting Child's Learning in Formal Educational Settings	By the conclusion of each project year, 70 percent of parents who participated in a minimum of 50 hours of family literacy instruction will report that, on at least one occasion during the past, parents have 1) participated in a conference with the child's teacher; 2) attended a school event; 3) observed classroom activities; and 4) volunteered for a school project or trip as measured by the pretest/posttest of the CA-ESPIRS Survey.	California-Even Start Performance Information Reporting System (CA-ESPIRS) Survey.	Percentage of Parents Achieving Each Indicator Item by Post-testing **87.73** percent of parents who attended a parent/teacher conference (Target met) **79.96** percent of parents who attended a school event (Target met) **82.92** percent of parents who observed a classroom activity (Target met) **69.46** percent of parents who volunteered for a school project/trip (Target met)	Target met.	Analysis was based on the 100 projects that entered, on average, over 2,300 matched parent ESPIRS response for each sub-item.

C. Federal Even Start Performance Indicators

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

Indicator	**Target** *Baseline data will be set with the 2002-2003 data*	**Measure** *Measurement tool used to assess progress for indicator*	**Cohort** Number of participants who have this goal	**Result** *Number and Percentage of participants who met this goal*	**Assessment of Progress** *Status of progress on indicator (1) Target met (2) Target not met*	**Explanation of Progress** *Description of why results were obtained*
A. Percentage if adults showing significant learning gains on measures of reading	50 percent will make a 3 or 5 point scale score gain (depending on pretest score).	CASAS reading test	249 participants with matched pretest/posttest scores	69.47 percent	Target met.	Improved CASAS test administration procedures (n=173); Emphasis on collecting pretest data and post-testing all participants who completed 100+ hours of instruction (n=160); Almost half (49 percent) of newly enrolled participants remained in program for 7-12 months (n=1415)
B. Percentage of adults showing significant learning gains on measures of mathematics	50 percent will make a 3 or 5 point scale score gain (depending on pretest score).	CASAS math test	227 participants with matched pretest/posttest scores	70.48 percent	Target met.	
C. Percentage of LEP adults showing significant learning gains on measures of English language acquisition	50 percent will make a 3 or 5 point scale score gain (depending on pretest score).	CASAS reading test	2032 participants with matched pretest/posttest scores	69.63 percent	Target met.	
D. Percentage of school age adults who earn a high school diploma or GED	50 percent of teen parents will demonstrate grade level proficiency after minimum 100 days of alternative education.	District's standardized achievement tests in reading, mathematics, and language arts	101 teen parents	52 percent	Target met based on state performance indicator.	The data describing the number of participants awarded a high school diploma have not been disaggregated by age of adult (i.e., school age vs. non school age) (n=53)

Indicator	**Target** *Baseline data will be set with the 2002-2003 data*	**Measure** *Measurement tool used to assess progress for indicator*	**Cohort** Number of participants who have this goal	**Result** *Number and Percentage of participants who met this goal*	**Assessment of Progress** *Status of progress on indicator (1) Target met (2) Target not met*	**Explanation of Progress** *Description of why results were obtained*
E. Percentage of non- school age adults who earn a high school diploma or GED	50 percent will earn a high school diploma or GED after 3 years of continuous enrollment	High School Diploma or GED certification (Spanish or English)	69 High School Diploma 61 English GED 45 Spanish GED	60.87 percent High School Diploma 60.66 percent English GED 64.44 percent Spanish GED	Target met	(n=42) (n=37) (n=29)
F. Percentage of children entering kindergarten who are achieving significant learning gains on measures of language development	**Not currently assessed. CDE will add this new item to the annual evaluation report for 2004-05.**	**Not currently assessed. CDE will add this new item to the annual evaluation report for 2004-05.**	**Not currently assessed. CDE will add this new item to the annual evaluation report for 2004-05.**	**Not currently assessed. CDE will add this new item to the annual evaluation report for 2004-05.**	**Not currently assessed. CDE will add this new item to the annual evaluation report for 2004-05.**	**Not currently assessed. CDE will add this new item to the annual evaluation report for 2004-05.**

Indicator	**Target** *Baseline data will be set with the 2002-2003 data*	**Measure** *Measurement tool used to assess progress for indicator*	**Cohort** Number of participants who have this goal	**Result** *Number and Percentage of participants who met this goal*	**Assessment of Progress** *Status of progress on indicator (1) Target met (2) Target not met*	**Explanation of Progress** *Description of why results were obtained*
G. Percentage of children entering kindergarten who are achieving significant learning gains on measures of reading readiness	100 percent of pre-kindergarten will "master" or "almost master" DRDP items related to reading skills, interest in books and writing skills after 200 hours.	Desired Results Developmental Profile (ages 3 year to 5 years)	473 pre-kindergarten students with at least 200 hours of instruction	67.02 percent pre-kindergarten students "mastered" or "almost mastered" DRDP reading readiness items after 200 hours of instruction.	Target not met.	California mandates the use of the Desired Results Developmental Profile (a non-standardized, observation-based measure of child development) by early childhood education programs that receive state child development funds. The DRDP includes items related to reading readiness behaviors. 2002-03 was the first year that the DRDP was used state-wide as an assessment of student progress. Staff are in the process of being trained on child observation and standards for rating student behaviors. (n=317)
H. Percentage of school-aged children who are reading on grade level	50 percent of K-2+ will meet grade level content standards in reading	Standards-based Progress Report Cards; CA Standards Test and/or CAT/6	890 K-2+ students with 100 hours academic support beyond regular school year	64.38 percent K-2+ students met grade level content standards in reading	Target met	Projects used a variety of measures including standards -based progress report cards, district proficiency tests, and standardized tests. (n=573)

Indicator	**Target** *Baseline data will be set with the 2002-2003 data*	**Measure** *Measurement tool used to assess progress for indicator*	**Cohort** Number of participants who have this goal	**Result** *Number and Percentage of participants who met this goal*	**Assessment of Progress** *Status of progress on indicator (1) Target met (2) Target not met*	**Explanation of Progress** *Description of why results were obtained*
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.	70 percent of parents will demonstrate support for children's learning (implement 16 assessed behaviors) after 50 hours of family literacy instruction.	California – Even Start Performance Information Reporting System (CA-ESPIRS) Parent Interview	2,300 participants with matched pre-test/post-test CA-ESPIRS scores	70 percent or more of parents reported that they implemented 15 of the 16 assessed behaviors	Target met for 15 of the 16 parenting behaviors.	Fewer than 70 percent of the parents reported engaging in the following behavior: "Parent tells child stories 3+ times a week." (49.26 percent)

III. Education of Migratory Children
(Title I, Part C)

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.

PLEASE REFER TO THE ATTACHMENT, "CSPR II ATTACHMENT MIGRATORY CHILDREN" FOR COMPLETED TABLES.

PLEASE REFER TO THE ATTACHMENT, "CSPR II ATTACHMENT MIGRATORY CHILDREN."

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.

TABLE I. POPULATION DATA	Ages 0-2	Ages 3-5	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Un-grad-ed	Out-of-school	Total
A. ELIGIBLE MIGRANT CHILDREN																		
1. All Migrant Children Eligible for the MEP																		
B. PRIORITY FOR SERVICES																		
1. All Migrant Children Eligible for MEP classified as having "Priority for Services"																		
C. LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT (LEP)																		
1. Migrant Children who are LEP																		
D. CHILDREN ENROLLED IN SPECIAL EDUCATON																		
1. Migrant Children Enrolled in Special Education																		
E. MOBILITY																		
1. Migrant Children with a Last Qualifying Move within 12 Months (Counting back from the Last Day of the Reporting Period)																		

TABLE I. POPULATION DATA	Ages 0-2	Ages 3-5	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Un-grad-ed	Out-of-school	Total
2. Migrant Children with a Last Qualifying Move within Previous 13 – 24 Months (Counting back from the Last Day of the Reporting Period)																		
3. Migrant Children with a Last Qualifying Move within Previous 25 – 36 Months (Counting back from the Last Day of the Reporting Period)																		
4. Migrant Children with any Qualifying Move within a Regular School Year (Count any Qualifying Move within the Previous 36 Months)																		

PLEASE REFER TO THE ATTACHMENT, "CSPR II ATTACHMENT MIGRATORY CHILDREN."

PLEASE REFER TO THE ATTACHMENT, "CSPR II ATTACHMENT MIGRATORY CHILDREN."

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 0-2	Ages 3-5	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Un-grad-ed	Out-of-school	Total
F. HIGH SCHOOL COMPLETION -- (Note: Data on the high school graduation rate and school dropout rate for migrant students has been collected through Part I of the Consolidated State Performance Report.)																		
1. Dropped out of school																		
2. Obtained GED																		
ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT -- (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.)																		

PLEASE REFER TO THE ATTACHMENT, "CSPR II ATTACHMENT MIGRATORY CHILDREN."

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.

PLEASE REFER TO THE ATTACHMENT, "CSPR II ATTACHMENT MIGRATORY CHILDREN."

TABLE III. MEP PARTICIPATION	Ages 0-2	Ages 3-5	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Un-grad-ed	Out-of-school	Total
G. PARTICIPATION—REGULAR SCHOOL YEAR																		
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																		

PLEASE REFER TO THE ATTACHMENT, "CSPR II ATTACHMENT MIGRATORY CHILDREN."

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.

PLEASE REFER TO THE ATTACHMENT, "CSPR II ATTACHMENT MIGRATORY CHILDREN."

TABLE III. MEP PARTICIPATION	Ages 0-2	Ages 3-5	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Un-grad-ed	Out-of-school	Total
H. PARTICIPATION—SUMMER TERM OR INTERSESSION																		
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																		

PLEASE REFER TO THE ATTACHMENT, "CSPR II ATTACHMENT MIGRATORY CHILDREN."

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.	b.
2. Schools in Which MEP Funds are Combined in SWP	a.	b.

PLEASE REFER TO THE ATTACHMENT, "CSPR II ATTACHMENT MIGRATORY CHILDREN."

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 <u>any</u> 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.	b.
2. MEP Projects: Regular School Year (Some or All Services Provided During an Extended Day/Week)	a.	b.
3. MEP Projects: Summer/Intersession Only	a.	b.
4. MEP Projects: Year Round (Services Provided throughout the Regular School Year and Summer/Intersession Terms)	a.	b.

PLEASE REFER TO THE ATTACHMENT, "CSPR II ATTACHMENT MIGRATORY CHILDREN."

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 1 FTE = _____ Days	SUMMER-TERM /INTERSESSION FTE 1 FTE = _____ Days
1. State Director	a.	b.
2. Teachers	a.	b.
3. Counselors	a.	b.
4. All Paraprofessionals	a.	b.
5. "Qualified" Paraprofessionals	a.	b.
6. Recruiters	a.	b.
7. Records Transfer Staff	a.	b.

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.

THE CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION EXPECTS TO PROVIDE THIS DATA IN A FUTURE REPORT.

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.

THE CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION EXPECTS TO PARTICIPATE IN THESE ACTIVITIES ONCE THEY ARE IMPLEMENTED.

VI. Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Teacher and Principal and Recruiting Fund) (Title II, Part A)

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.

THE CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION EXPECTS TO PARTICIPATE IN THESE ACTIVITIES ONCE THEY ARE IMPLEMENTED.

VII. Enhancing Education through Technology (Title II, Part D)

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.

THE CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION EXPECTS TO PROVIDE THIS INFORMATION IN A FUTURE REPORT.

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.

THE CALLFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION EXPECTS TO PROVIDE THIS INFORMATION IN A FUTURE REPORT.

IX. Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act (Title IV, Part A)

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

In response to NCLB Title IV UMIRS requirements, the State of California has implemented a data collection system that collects student suspension and expulsion data according to the California *Education Code* section under which the action was taken. These *Code* sections do not always contain categories identical to those requested in the charts on pages 44-50. Further, as the system is collecting data for the first time for 2003-04, the 2002-03 data requested is not often available.

We are providing an attachment, "CSPR II Attachment Safe and Drug-Free Schools: California *Education Code* Sections Authorizing Suspensions and Expulsions" which contains definitions of the suspension and expulsion categories that will be used in the 2003-04 data.

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

Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of collection and year of most recent collection	2002-2003 Baseline	Targets			
The percentage of students that think frequent use of marijuana is extremely harmful	California Student Survey	Biennial collection 9th Biennial (2001/02)	by Grade: 7th – 82.0% 9th – 66.6% 11th – 56.6%	Grade:	7th	9th	11th
				2003-2004	+1.0%	+1.0%	+1.0%
				2004-2005	+1.0%	+1.0%	+1.0%
				2005-2006	+1.0%	+1.0%	+1.0%
				2006-2007	+1.0%	+1.0%	+1.0%
The percentage of students that have used marijuana within the past 30 days	California Student Survey	Biennial collection 9th Biennial (2001/02)	by Grade: 7th – 4.0% 9th – 13.4 11th – 23.0%	Grade:	7th	9th	11th
				2003-2004	-0.5%	-1.0%	-1.0%
				2004-2005	-0.5%	-1.0%	-1.0%
				2005-2006	-0.5%	-1.0%	-1.0%
				2006-2007	-0.5%	-1.0%	-1.0%
The percentage of students that have ever been drunk or high at school	California Student Survey	Biennial collection 9th Biennial (2001/02)	by Grade: 7th – 3.3% 9th – 13.5% 11th – 26.9%	Grade:	7th	9th	11th
				2003-2004	-0.5%	-1.0%	-2.0%
				2004-2005	-0.5%	-1.0%	-2.0%
				2005-2006	-0.5%	-1.0%	-2.0%
				2006-2007	-0.5%	-1.0%	-2.0%
The percentage of students that have used alcohol within the past 30 days	California Student Survey	Biennial collection 9th Biennial (2001/02)	by Grade: 7th – 10.4% 9th – 29.3% 11th – 40.7%	Grade:	7th	9th	11th
				2003-2004	-1.0%	-2.0%	-2.0%
				2004-2005	-1.0%	-2.0%	-2.0%
				2005-2006	-1.0%	-2.0%	-2.0%
				2006-2007	-1.0%	-2.0%	-2.0%
The percentage of students that have ever used marijuana	California Student Survey	Biennial collection 9th Biennial (2001/02)	by Grade: 7th – 8.5% 9th – 24.1% 11th – 44.0%	Grade:	7th	9th	11th
				2003-2004	-0.5%	-1.0%	-2.0%
				2004-2005	-0.5%	-1.0%	-2.0%
				2005-2006	-0.5%	-1.0%	-2.0%
				2006-2007	-0.5%	-1.0%	-2.0%

Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of collection and year of most recent collection	2002-2003 Baseline	Targets			
The percentage of students that have ever used inhalants	California Student Survey	Biennial collection 9th Biennial (2001/02)	by Grade: 7th – 6.3% 9th – 9.4% 11th – 12.6%	Grade:	7th	9th	11th
				2003-2004	-0.5%	-0.5%	-0.5%
				2004-2005	-0.5%	-0.5%	-0.5%
				2005-2006	-0.5%	-0.5%	-0.5%
				2006-2007	-0.5%	-0.5%	-0.5%
The percentage of students that think frequent use of cigarettes is extremely harmful	California Student Survey	Biennial collection 9th Biennial (2001/02)	by Grade: 7th – 63.6% 9th – 61.6% 11th – 66.1%	Grade:	7th	9th	11th
				2003-2004	+1.0%	+1.0%	+1.0%
				2004-2005	+1.0%	+1.0%	+1.0%
				2005-2006	+1.0%	+1.0%	+1.0%
				2006-2007	+1.0%	+1.0%	+1.0%
The percentage of students that have used cigarettes at school within the past 30 days	California Student Survey	Biennial collection 9th Biennial (2001/02)	by Grade: 7th – 1.8% 9th – 4.3% 11th – 6.1%	Grade:	7th	9th	11th
				2003-2004	-0.5%	-0.5%	-.05%
				2004-2005	-0.5%	-0.5%	-.05%
				2005-2006	-0.5%	-0.5%	-.05%
				2006-2007	-0.5%	-0.5%	-.05%
The percentage of students that have used cigarettes within the past 30 days	California Student Survey	Biennial collection 9th Biennial (2001/02)	by Grade: 7th – 4.3% 9th – 11.1% 11th – 18.9%	Grade:	7th	9th	11th
				2003-2004	-0.5%	-1.0%	-1.0%
				2004-2005	-0.5%	-1.0%	-1.0%
				2005-2006	-0.5%	-1.0%	--1.0%
				2006-2007	-0.5%	-1.0%	-1.0%
The percentage of students that have used smokeless tobacco within the past 30 days	California Student Survey	Biennial collection 9th Biennial (2001/02)	by Grade: 7th – 0.8% 9th – 1.4% 11th – 2.8%	Grade:	7th	9th	11th
				2003-2004	-0.1%	-0.2%	-.03%
				2004-2005	-0.1%	-0.2%	-.03%
				2005-2006	-0.1%	-0.2%	-.03%
				2006-2007	-0.1%	-0.2%	-.03%

Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of collection and year of most recent collection	2002-2003 Baseline	Targets
The percentage of students that have ever used cigarettes	California Student Survey	Biennial collection 9th Biennial (2001/02)	by Grade: 7th – 6.9% 9th – 20.7% 11th – 35.7%	Grade: 7th 9th 11th 2003-2004 -0.5% -1.0% -2.0% 2004-2005 -0.5% -1.0% -2.0% 2005-2006 -0.5% -1.0% -2.0% 2006-2007 -0.5% -1.0% -2.0%
The percentage of students that have ever used smokeless tobacco	California Student Survey	Biennial collection 9th Biennial (2001/02)	by Grade: 7th – 2.4% 9th – 4.8% 11th – 8.6%	Grade: 7th 9th 11th 2003-2004 -0.5% -0.5% -0.5% 2004-2005 -0.5% -0.5% -0.5% 2005-2006 -0.5% -0.5% -0.5% 2006-2007 -0.5% -0.5% -0.5%
The percentage of students that have been in a physical fight in the past 12 months	California Student Survey	Biennial collection 9th Biennial (2001/02)	by Grade: 7th – 27.1% 9th – 23.7% 11th – 19.0%	Grade: 7th 9th 11th 2003-2004 -1.0% -1.0% -1.0% 2004-2005 -1.0% -1.0% -1.0% 2005-2006 -1.0% -1.0% -1.0% 2006-2007 -1.0% -1.0% -1.0%
The rate of violent criminal incidents occurring on campus	The data source (California Safe Schools Assessment) has been discontinued and this data is no longer collected.	**See page 43 regarding new data collection process beginning 2003-04.**	**See page 43 regarding new data collection process beginning 2003-04.**	**See page 43 regarding new data collection process beginning 2003-04.**

The number of weapons confiscated from students at school	The data source (California Safe Schools Assessment) has been discontinued and this data is no longer collected.	**See page 43 regarding new data collection process beginning 2003-04.**	**See page 43 regarding new data collection process beginning 2003-04.**	**See page 43 regarding new data collection process beginning 2003-04.**
The rate of violent incidents (crimes against persons) occurring on campus with certificated employees	The data source (California Safe Schools Assessment) has been discontinued and this data is no longer collected.	**See page 43 regarding new data collection process beginning 2003-04.**	**See page 43 regarding new data collection process beginning 2003-04.**	**See page 43 regarding new data collection process beginning 2003-04.**

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

Statewide indicators are available from the 9th Biennial California Student Survey. This survey was completed by 8,238 randomly selected students in grades 7, 9, and 11 in 113 middle and high schools between November 2110 and February 2002. The sample was selected to be representative of the state with differences controlled by weighting. The indicators in this report correspond to items in the CSS and prevalence rates are provided for each grade level surveyed. Targets are expressed as percentage point increases or decreases in the prevalence rates.

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.

Response:

*Only aggregate statewide district level expulsion data are available as shown for each item. Data collection for 2003-04 will include school level suspension and expulsion data in accordance with UMIRS requirements. See page 43 for a more complete description of this system. **(Note: The total number of ordered expulsions reported are for each education code violation committed by students for various offenses. In some instances a student may be expelled for more than one offense for a single incident. The extent of expulsions for multiple offenses committed by individual students cannot be determined based on the existing data reporting system).**

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

*8,528 total number of ***Education Code sections cited*** in orders of expulsions for fighting. See separate attachment.

	Number for 2002-2003 school year	Number of LEAs reporting
Elementary	Not available	Not available
Middle	Not available	Not available
High School	Not available	Not available

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

*6,659 total number of ***Education Code sections cited*** in orders of expulsions for weapons possession. See separate attachment.

	Number for 2002-2003 school year	Number of LEAs reporting
Elementary	Not available	Not available
Middle	Not available	Not available
High School	Not available	Not available

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

5,113 total number of ***Education Code sections cited in orders of expulsions for alcohol-related offenses (includes intoxicants and controlled substances). See separate attachment.

	Number for 2002-2003 school year	Number of LEAs reporting
Elementary	Not available	Not available
Middle	Not available	Not available
High School	Not available	Not available

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

*7,189 the total number of ***Education Code sections cited*** in orders of expulsions for illicit drug-related offenses (includes alcoholic beverages and intoxicants). See separate attachment.

	Number for 2002-2003 school year	Number of LEAs reporting
Elementary	Not available	Not available
Middle	Not available	Not available
High School	Not available	Not available

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

1. CDE promoted parent involvement through our Coordinated Compliance Review (CCR) system**. Two of 15 compliance items in our CCR system directly address parent involvement. A consultant from the Safe and Healthy Kids Program Office (SHKPO) prepared a CCR guide, provided it to all LEAs including school districts and county offices of education, provided training workshops statewide, and trained CDE staff and field colleagues on how to conduct onsite reviews for the items related to parent involvement. The following are the two specific items:**
   a. **Item S&DATE 8 (Safe Schools & Drugs, Alcohol, and Tobacco Education 8)** ***The LEA developed its application through timely and meaningful consultation with****….parents****…and others*****. Reviewers checked to make sure parents were consulted when the LEAP was developed. In the 2003-04 CCR period one local educational agency (LEA) was found noncompliant. The LEA has taken action and resolved the issue.**
   b. **Item S&DATE 10):** ***The LEA includes activities to promote the involvement of*** *parents* ***and community groups and agencies*****. Reviewers checked to make sure that parents were involved in activities at school and in the community. All LEAs that were reviewed were found compliant for this item.**

2. CDE staff provided parent involvement workshops**. In the last 10 years consultants from the SHKPO have annually provided workshops for parents in the Los Angeles Unified School district as an added service when providing CCR training. County offices of education have also provided training specific to promoting parent involvement through out the state as a way to help meet the CCR guidelines.**

3. CDE staff from the SHKPO collected articles and resource information on parent involvement and education and disseminated the materials statewide through an email list serve system. **CDE staff collected materials, during the last year, to use as resources for parents. These resources have been disseminated to our county coordinators for SDFSC and TUPE. County coordinators forwarded them on to local school districts. Local school district staff forwarded them on for local use at school sites.**

4. The Healthy Start Program funded a variety of parent centers **at school sites that were used in coordination with SDFSC and TUPE programs.**

5. CDE supported the California Healthy Kids Resource Center (CHKRC) **to provide resource materials and information to interested persons in schools and communities. The resource center has 259 titles that use the key word "parent." Examples are materials on fetal alcohol syndrome. Thousands of individuals obtain information and materials from the resource center each year.**

6. CDE included parent representatives on a external advisory committee **when CDE staff developed the Local Educational Agency Plan (LEAP) instructions and format that are required to be completed by all Local Educational agencies receiving state or federal categorical funds.**

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.

THE CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION EXPECTS 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).

PLEASE REFER TO THE ATTACHMENT, "CSPR II ATTACHMENT INNOVATIVE PROGRAMS."

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[1]	Number of LEAs that used **20**% 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: **Student Achievement in Reading and Math**	**419**	**198**	**1,752,206**
Area 2: **Teacher Quality**	**609**	**295**	**2,748,439**
Area 3: **Safe and Drug Free Schools**	**48**	**22**	**1,752,112**
Area 4: **Increase Access for all Students**	**86**	**42**	**1,742,403**
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. **398**

B.2 Indicate the number of LEAs shown in B.1 that met AYP in school year 2002-2003. **122**

[1] 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.

248

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. **CDE IS IN THE PROCESS OF COLLECTING THIS INFORMATION FOR THE FIRST TIME. WE EXPECT TO RECEIVE THE DATA IN DECEMBER 2004.**

Purpose	Number of LEAs
Teacher recruitment and retention, including the use of signing bonuses and other financial incentives	**Data available December 2004**
Teacher professional development, including programs that train teachers to utilize technology to improve teaching and to train special needs teachers	**Data available December 2004**
Educational technology, including software and hardware as described in Title II, Part D	**Data available December 2004**
Parental involvement activities	**Data available December 2004**
Activities authorized under the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program (Title IV, Part A)	**Data available December 2004**
Activities authorized under Title I, Part A	**Data available December 2004**
Activities authorized under Title III (Language instruction for LEP and immigrant students)	**Data available December 2004**

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.

For the 2002-03 school year, the State Education Agency (SEA) participated in the Rural Low-Income School Grant (RLIS) by awarding subgrants to 81 local educational agencies (LEAs) using a formula allocation. The California Department of Education (CDE) informs the recipient LEAs about the specific state criteria to increase the academic performance and achievement of all students.

The CDE's accountability system monitors schools' and LEAs' progress toward ensuring that all students are achieving the state's academic content standards. The measure of such student achievement is the determination of whether Title I schools and LEAs make Adequately Yearly Progress (AYP), as required under NCLB.

Following are the four components used to make AYP determinations in California:

1. Meeting Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) regarding student proficiency in English language arts and mathematics
2. Achieving a 95 percent student participation rate on assessments in English Language arts and mathematics
3. Making or exceeding the specified growth target on the state's Academic Performance Index (API), the additional factor for determining AYP
4. Increasing the high school graduation rate

Review of the 2002-03 assessment data indicates that 30 LEAs (37 %) of the 81 RLIS recipients made AYP. The 2002-03 data will serve as the baseline in assessing progress of these LEAs in improving student academic achievement.

CDE will continue to review the annual AYP data provided about each RLIS recipient. CDE will compare and contrast AYP data from school years 2003-04 and 2004-05 with the 2003-03 baseline data. After the third year of an LEA's RLIS participation, CDE will be able to determine from the data whether the LEA has consistently met the state's AYP criteria, thereby remaining eligible for the RLIS grant.

Accountability for student achievement is included in CDE's Coordinated Compliance Review (CCR) process. That process is currently being revamped so that the monitoring process, to be initiated in the 2004 –05 school year, will be driven largely by student academic achievement results. Technical assistance to LEAs, as needed, will remain a feature of the CDE's monitoring work.

XIII. Funding Transferability for State and Local Educational Agencies (Title VI, Part A, Subpart 2)

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. **197**

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.

Program	Total Number of LEAs transferring funds TO eligible program	Total amount of funds transferred TO eligible program
Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (section 2121)	**17**	**$7,595,525**
Educational Technology State Grants (section 2412(a)(2)(A))	**12**	**$158,647**
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (section 4112(b)(1))	**8**	**$48,189**
State Grants for Innovative Programs (section 5112(a))	**64**	**$1,755,876**
Title I, Part A, Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs	**96**	**$232,449**

Program	Total Number of LEAs transferring funds FROM eligible program	Total amount of funds transferred FROM eligible program
Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (section 2121)	**115**	**$3,359,484**
Educational Technology State Grants (section 2412(a)(2)(A))	**58**	**$4,446,453**
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (section 4112(b)(1))	**106**	**$1,623,505**
State Grants for Innovative Programs (section 5112(a))	**41**	**$2,217,796**

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