

ED 2/77.2/EF3/1982 c.2

c.2



RECEIVED

JAN 27 1982

COLORADO STATE LIBRARY,  
State Publications Depository

Report to the

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

The Effectiveness of  
The English Language Proficiency Act  
(C.R.S. 1973 22-24-101 et.seq. (Supp. 1981))

Prepared by:

The Colorado Department of Education  
Dr. Calvin M. Frazier, Commissioner  
January 1982

Report to the General Assembly  
The Effectiveness of  
The English Language Proficiency Act  
(C.R.S. 1973 22-24-101 et.seq. (Supp. 1981))

On November 13, 1981, the Colorado State Board of Education allocated \$2.8 million to 107 school districts eligible for funding in accordance with the new English Language Proficiency Act enacted by the 1981 legislature. An initial payment of \$2.5 million (90%) was approved by the State Board, with the remainder to be awarded upon receipt and verification of the districts' annual evaluation reports by the Department of Education.

The purpose of the Act is to require the establishment of and to help school districts defray the costs of an English language proficiency program in the public schools for children whose dominant language is not English.

School districts are charged with the identification of students eligible for the program. A state summary of numbers of students identified as eligible and now being served is attached. Children are eligible under the A/B category if their dominant language is not English. These students either speak or comprehend little or no English. Children are eligible under the C category if their dominant language is difficult to determine. These students speak both English and another language. Their achievement scores are below the district or national mean of a nationally standardized test or below the acceptable proficiency level on an English language proficiency test.

In comparison to the previous Bilingual (1980-81) and Tutorial (1980-81) programs, the English Language Proficiency Act program appears to be reaching a broader base of students, providing more funds (\$2.8 million vs. \$1.8 million for the combined Bilingual and Tutorial programs) to more districts (107 vs. 81) for more students (11,016 vs. 10,079) who are from more language groups (66 vs. 43). Additionally, the funds allocated concentrate more on students who are dominant in a language other than English.

It is hoped that the evaluation results will reflect positive data in relation to programs provided in accordance with the intent of the Act.

# # #

State SummaryI. Number of Eligible School Districts 107

II. Congressional District Summary:

	<u># of School Districts</u>	<u>Eligible Students A/B</u>	<u>Students C</u>	<u>Total Allocation</u>
District 1	<u>1</u>	<u>2429</u>	<u>893</u>	<u>\$ 990,137.</u>
District 2	<u>3</u>	<u>842</u>	<u>590</u>	<u>381,086.</u>
District 3	<u>48</u>	<u>644</u>	<u>1811</u>	<u>475,037.</u>
District 4	<u>36</u>	<u>1035</u>	<u>1185</u>	<u>530,505.</u>
District 5	<u>19</u>	<u>907</u>	<u>680</u>	<u>416,506.</u>
TOTAL	<u>107</u>	<u>5857</u>	<u>5159</u>	<u>\$2,793,271.</u>

III. Number of Schools with Eligible ELPA Children:

A. Elementary	<u>514</u>
B. Junior High	<u>162</u>
C. High School	<u>121</u>
TOTAL	<u>797</u>

IV. Number of Children Eligible:

	<u>Grade Level</u>		<u>Total</u>
	<u>K-6</u>	<u>7-12</u>	
A. A/B Category	<u>3872</u>	<u>1985</u>	<u>5857</u>
B. C Category	<u>3228</u>	<u>1931</u>	<u>5159</u>
TOTAL	<u>7100</u>	<u>3916</u>	<u>11,016</u>

V. Allocation of Funds:

	<u>Available</u>	<u>Allocation/Student</u>
A. A/B Category	\$2.1 million	\$358 /student
B. C Category	<u>.7 million</u>	\$135 /student
TOTAL	<u>\$2.8 million</u>	

VI. Language Spoken by Eligible Children:

A. Languages Spoken 66 (See attached list)

<u>Method of Assessment:</u>	<u>District Usage</u>	<u>% of Districts</u>
A. Standardized Test		<u>48</u>
B. English Language Proficiency Test		<u>11</u>
C. Both		<u>20</u>
D. No Testing Required		<u>28</u>
TOTAL		<u>107</u>

ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY PROGRAM

LANGUAGES SPOKEN

<u>LANGUAGE</u>	<u>STUDENT CATEGORY</u> <u>A/B</u>		<u>STUDENT CATEGORY</u> <u>C</u>		<u>TOTAL</u>
	<u>K-6</u>	<u>7-12</u>	<u>K-6</u>	<u>7-12</u>	
1. SPANISH	2289	645	2703	1519	7156
2. VIETNAMESE	407	463	114	113	1097
3. H'MONG	326	214	57	36	633
4. LAOTIAN	197	165	27	19	408
5. KOREAN	98	97	64	55	314
6. CHINESE	95	104	41	22	262
7. KHMER	142	97	15	2	256
8. ARABIC	78	23	40	17	158
9. GERMAN	17	14	21	22	74
10. JAPANESE	40	21	7	3	71
11. THAI	14	31	3	10	58
12. FARSI	13	22	4	15	54
13. RUSSIAN	12	10	13	8	43
14. FRENCH	16	9	8	9	42
15. ITALIAN	2	6	16	14	38
16. HEBREW	11	8	7	5	31
17. TAGALOG	11	4	2	13	30
18. NAVAJO	10	4	11	2	27
19. GREEK	7	4	7	7	25
20. HINDI	8	-	9	4	21
21. POLISH	8	7	3	-	18
22. CZECHOSLOVAKIAN	6	2	8	1	17
23. PORTUGUESE	6	4	3	3	16
24. TURKISH	5	1	6	2	14
25. URDU	7	2	3	1	13
26. DUTCH	3	-	8	2	13
27. HUNGARIAN	2	2	4	4	12
28. KICKAPOO	11	-	-	1	12
29. INDONESIAN	3	4	2	2	11
30. FINNISH	4	3	1	2	10
31. NORWEGIAN	-	6	-	3	9
32. SWEDISH	3	1	3	1	8
33. UTE	-	-	6	-	6
34. NIGERIAN	4	1	-	-	5
35. CROATIAN	3	1	-	1	5
36. AFGHANI	3	0	-	1	4
37. GUJARATI	2	-	-	2	4
38. AMERICAN INDIAN	-	-	2	1	3
39. DANISH	-	2	-	1	3
40. GA	1	-	2	-	3
41. KWA (Ibo)	2	-	-	-	2
42. MALAYAN	-	1	1	-	2
43. SANGO	2	-	-	-	2
44. SAMOAN	-	1	-	1	2

English Language Proficiency Program  
 Languages Spoken  
 Page Two

<u>LANGUAGE</u>	<u>STUDENT CATEGORY</u> A/B		<u>STUDENT CATEGORY</u> C		<u>TOTAL</u>
	<u>K-6</u>	<u>7-12</u>	<u>K-6</u>	<u>7-12</u>	
47. AMHARIC	-	-	-	1	1
48. ARMENIAN	-	-	1	-	1
49. ASRIAN	1	-	-	-	1
50. DARI	-	1	-	-	1
51. DRI	-	1	-	-	1
52. ETHIOPIAN	1	-	-	-	1
53. EURASIAN	-	-	1	-	1
54. GREENLANDIC	-	1	-	-	1
55. ICELANDIC	-	1	-	-	1
56. JAMAICAN	1	-	-	-	1
57. MALTESE	1	-	-	-	1
58. PASHTO	1	-	-	-	1
59. PUNJABI	-	-	-	1	1
60. ROMANIAN	-	1	-	-	1
61. TIGRINIA	-	-	-	1	1
62. TWI	1	-	-	-	1
63. UKRANIAN	-	-	-	1	1
64. URAL ALTAIC	1	-	-	-	1
65. YUGOSLAVIAN	-	-	-	1	1
66. YIDDISH	-	1	-	-	1
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>3,875</b>	<b>1,985</b>	<b>3,225</b>	<b>1,931</b>	<b>11,016</b>