



No Child Left Behind Mandates School Choice: Colorado's First Year

*by Pamela Benigno
Director, Education Policy Center
Independence Institute*

Issue Paper
Number 9-2003
June 2003

Executive Summary

The *No Child Left Behind Act* of 2001 (NCLB) created a mandate that poorly-performing schools (placed on a “School Improvement” list and receiving federal dollars for low-income students) are required to notify parents of specific information outlined in federal law, including the parents’ option to transfer their children to a higher-performing school.

This strong accountability program places pressure on educators to increase student performance. Additionally, it creates two measures of accountability for parents: One, it places the responsibility on parents to decide if their children should move to another school. Two, the notification to parents must explain how parents can be involved in addressing the educational problems within the school. The success of the NCLB reform is dependent on the effectiveness of communication between the school and the parents.

This Issue Paper examines letters of notification that were provided to parents with children in Colorado public schools that were placed on School Improvement status. In addition, this paper discusses the results of a survey sent to schools about methods of parental notification. The objective in the first year of this project was to determine whether the format and contents of the parental notification incorporated essential elements required by law and to determine if the required information was imparted in a neutral manner or was improperly biased so as to dissuade parents from opting to transfer their children to another school.

The findings show that in the first year of implementation, many districts and schools did not completely inform parents of their rights, and in some cases misled parents or attempted to deter them from exercising their rights to transfer their children to a higher-performing school. The law is precise about what is required. There is no excuse for confusing, misleading, or intimidating notification.

The following recommendations will aid the success of this educational reform:

1. The Colorado Department of Education should establish a subcommittee dedicated to the NCLB choice provision within its Communication Committee. This Committee already addresses many elements of NCLB.
2. School districts need to not only fulfill the requirements of the law but also live up to the spirit of the law: informing parents of their rights under the law with a neutral tone.
3. Parents must become informed educational consumers. Before parents move their children to a higher-performing public school, they should investigate the school of their choice. And parents whose children remain in their current school need to take seriously their responsibility to become involved in increasing student achievement.
4. The U.S. Department of Education should revise its Draft Non-Regulatory Guidance about NCLB Public School Choice. The parental notification section does not include the requirement that parents must be notified that transportation is to be provided by the school district.

No Child Left Behind Mandates School Choice: Colorado's First Year

By Pamela Benigno, Director, Education Policy Center

Introduction

The *No Child Left Behind Act* of 2001 (NCLB), signed in January 2002 by President Bush, reauthorized the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act* of 1965 (ESEA).¹ One of the many reforms included in NCLB requires Title I schools (those schools receiving extra federal dollars based on the number of low-income children enrolled), that have not met Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) standards for two or more years, to offer students the option to transfer to higher-performing schools with transportation provided. Depending on how many years the school has failed to meet AYP, the school is identified for School Improvement, Corrective Action, or Restructuring.²

Each school identified for any of these programs is required to notify parents of specific information outlined in federal law, including the option to transfer their children. This strong accountability program places pressure on educators to increase student performance and to include parents in the education of their children. The success of this reform is

dependent on the effectiveness of the communication between the school and the parents.

One of the key factors in a child's success in school is how much the parents are involved.³

One of the key factors in a child's success in school is how much the parents are involved.

For too long parents have fully trusted the public education system to educate their children, creating a mentality that the schools will educate their children and parents need do nothing else. The choice provision of the NCLB Act is one small but significant step in helping parents realize the need for their input and involvement. This is why it is crucial that parents understand their rights and responsibilities under this law.

The average parent is unaware of his rights under the NCLB Act. It is the responsibility of the public education system to explain to parents their rights in an understandable manner—in fact the law requires it.

The law certainly gives children the opportunity to leave a failing school, but additionally it creates at least two other measures of accountability for parents. One, the law places the

¹ *No Child Left Behind: A Desktop Reference 2002*, pg. 9, <http://www.ed.gov/offices/OESE/reference.pdf>.

² *No Child Left Behind Act*, Title I, Part A, Subpart 1, Sect. 1116(b)(6)-(8), <http://www.ed.gov/legislation/ESEA02/pg2.html#sec1116>.

³ Philip Vassallo, *More Than Grades: How Choice Boosts Parental Involvement and Benefits Children*, Cato Institute (Policy Analysis No. 383), October 26, 2000, <http://www.cato.org/pubs/pas/pa383.pdf>.

responsibility on the parents to decide if their children should move to another school. Two, the notification to parents must explain how parents can be involved to address the educational problems within the school.

The No Child Left Behind Choice Project

Realizing the importance of school districts properly communicating to parents their rights under NCLB, the Education Policy Center at the Independence Institute requested Colorado public schools identified for School Improvement or Corrective Action, to provide a copy of the letter or other format used to communicate with parents about parental choice options. A survey was included in the request to determine further information (see Appendix A).

The long-term goal of this project is to hold school districts accountable for the delivery of proper notification to parents of their right to transfer their children to a higher-performing school. The objective in the first year of the project was to examine the format and the contents of the notification. This examination included a close look at two factors. First, if the notification included essential elements required by law. Second, whether the message provided information in a neutral manner or if the message deterred parents from exercising their rights under NCLB.

Background

As stated previously, schools that have been identified for School Improvement, Corrective Action, or Restructuring must provide parents with the option to transfer their children to a higher-performing school with transportation provided. After a school does not meet AYP for the second year, it is identified for School Improvement. In the first year of School Improvement the school must offer the option to transfer to a higher-performing school.

In the first year of School Improvement the school must offer the option to transfer to a higher-performing school.

In the second year of School Improvement, schools under the Corrective Action or Restructuring status require additional services and/or action. For the purpose of this discussion, only the requirements for notification to parents in the first year of School Improvement will be addressed with the primary focus on choice.

If a school is identified for School Improvement, according to the Act, notification must be promptly provided to each parent in an understandable and uniform format and, to the extent practicable, in a language that parents can understand.⁴ Additionally, the Rules and Regulations, published in December 2002, state that the school district must notify the parents of each child directly through regular mail or e-mail and through broader means of dissemination such as the Internet, the media, and public agencies serv-

⁴ NCLB Act, Title I, Part A, Subpart 1, Sect. 1116(b)(6), <http://www.ed.gov/legislation/ESEA02/pg2.html#sec1116>.

ing the student population and their families.⁵ As outlined in the NCLB Act the notice must include an explanation of:

- What the identification means
- How the school compares in terms of academic achievement to other elementary and secondary schools in the school district and the state
- The reasons for the identification
- How parents can become involved in addressing the academic issues that led to the identification
- What the school is doing to address the problem of low achievement
- What the school district or the state is doing to help the school address the problem of low achievement
- The parents' option to transfer their children to another public school, including the provision for transportation⁶

Under the Rules and Regulations parents also must be notified about the following:

- The academic achievement of the school or schools to which the child may transfer

Under the Rules and Regulations the explanation may include other information about the

receiving school or schools such as:

- Special academic programs or facilities
- Availability of before- and after-school programs
- Professional qualifications of the teachers in core academic subjects
- Parental involvement opportunities⁷

The Department of Education published its Draft Non-Regulatory Guidance in December 2002. This was intended to help make the law clear and understandable. However, this Guidance made no mention of the requirement, clearly laid out in the law, that parents must be notified that transportation must be provided by the district. This will be reviewed later in the paper.

Although the content of the notification is valuable to parents, the attitude of the school or school district personnel while imparting this information, as well as the completeness of the notification to parents, can determine if the reform will be a catalyst to improve education. The samples of notification collected for the purpose of this study, as well as the responses to the surveys, were revealing.

Methodology

There were 151 Colorado schools on School Improvement or Corrective Action status in

⁵ *Code of Federal Regulations*, Title 34, Part 200, §200.36, <http://www.ed.gov/legislation/FedRegister/finrule/2002-4/120202a.pdf>

⁶ *NCLB Act*, Title I, Part A, Subpart 1, Sect. 1116(b)(6)(A)-(F), <http://www.ed.gov/legislation/ESEA02/pg2.html#sec1116>.

⁷ *Code of Federal Regulations*, Title 34, Part 200, §200.37(b)(4), <http://www.ed.gov/legislation/FedRegister/finrule/2002-4/120202a.pdf>.

the fall of 2002.⁸ In November 2002 the Education Policy Center mailed to the principals of these schools a survey (see Appendix A) and a request for a copy of the form of the notification that was provided to parents explaining the parents' option to transfer their children to a higher-performing school. Thirty schools responded. A second letter was mailed in January to the principals who did not respond to the first letter and a letter was also sent at that time to the school district's Title I director requesting the information. At least two phone calls were made to the Title I directors in districts where there was still no response. A total of 53 school districts were contacted and 33 responded. As of April 17, 2003 a total of 124 schools, or 82% of the 151 schools, were accounted for.

The Denver Public Schools (DPS) Title I director responded with a comprehensive report that included a sample letter that was provided to parents by all required schools. However, only five of the 45 schools in DPS contacted returned the survey. With two schools responding, Colorado Springs 11 also provided a report for its 10 schools.

Weld County District 8 stated in a fax that they chose not to participate in the survey and asked us not to continue to contact their staff. Under the Colorado Open Records Act school districts must make available a copy of the form of notification. Weld County District 8's

document secrecy is illegal.

In the first year of this project we have analyzed the notification provided to parents, with the hope that this research will improve communication with parents in the future. Because the guidance on how to implement this new program trickled slowly through the bureaucracies involved, we will not, in this Issue Paper, name the individual school administrators who broke the law or who demonstrated undesirable attitudes. However, the information has been provided to the Colorado Department of Education and the U.S. Department of Education. School districts that refused to respond to our requests are identified in Appendix B.

Evaluation of Forms of Notification

Even though the Rules and Regulations were not published until December of 2002, the law is very clear about what the notification must include. The Rules and Regulations added a few requirements that districts would not have been aware of during the spring of 2002. For the purpose of this study points were awarded each letter or form of notification for the following elements:

⁸ *Title I School Improvement Schools*, Revised August 9, 2002, CDE.

(Elements are included in the law except for numbers 10-12 that include information parents should be told.)

1. The letter or notice is understandable
2. The identification is explained
3. The reasons for the identification
4. How the school compares to other schools in the district
5. What the school is doing to address the problem of low achievement
6. What the school district or the state is doing to help the school address the problem of low achievement
7. How parents can be involved to address the problem
8. Explanation of the option to transfer
9. Explanation that transportation is provided by district
10. Provide the names of the schools to which the child may transfer
11. Explanation of the duration of the transfer and transportation services
12. Explanation of the transfer application process and deadline

| 2002 Choice Notification | |
|---------------------------------|---------------------|
| Points Scored | Number of Districts |
| 1 | 0 |
| 2 | 1 |
| 3 | 7 |
| 4 | 3 |
| 5 | 2 |
| 6 | 9 |
| 7 | 4 |
| 8 | 6 |
| 9 | 1 |
| 10 | 0 |
| 11 | 1 |
| 12 | 0 |

Many school districts provided a sample letter to the principals to send to parents. Some principals buried the notification in the weekly newsletter, posted a letter in a physical location, or placed advertisements or articles in the local paper. The results will be discussed in terms of districts for the exception of a few cases.

Sadly, eight of the school districts, including 65 of the schools, did not provide parents with an easy to understand explanation.

The sampling of forms of notification revealed strengths and weaknesses

Each element above is worth one point with a possible total of 12 points. The 34 school districts (representing 124 schools) that responded to our request and provided the form of notification to parents are scored in the table.

of the communication to parents. A majority of the 34 districts that responded to our requests did fully and clearly explain what the identification means and the reason for the identification. Sadly, eight of the school districts, including 65 of the schools, did not provide parents with an easy to understand

explanation. However, DPS sent a 2nd notification to the students enrolled in 5 middle schools in August 2002 that clearly explained what the identification meant and the reason for the identification. Only two of the 124 schools compared their student performance with other schools in the area. Approximately half of the districts explained how the school was addressing the low achievement, but only one district explained how the district or state was assisting their efforts. Five districts mentioned how parents can become involved in their children's school.

The subject of transferring to another school was handled in various ways and was probably the most confusing to parents because the notification was generally the only time parents were informed of this new opportunity. If the letter was unclear, parents might not have understood their rights under the law. Only half the districts explained that transportation must be provided at the expense of the district. Thousands of parents received letters from administrators who were trying to discourage parents from transferring children to higher-performing schools. One district notified parents about transportation with the following statement:

“If transportation is to be provided you must choose from those schools listed below...”

Nowhere in the letter was it explained that the district is required by law to provide transportation to a higher-performing school. Parents come from various frames of reference and their rights under NCLB should be fully explained to prevent confusion or misunderstanding.

Parents come from various frames of reference and their rights under NCLB should be fully explained to prevent confusion or misunderstanding.

Attempts to sway or intimidate parents are evident in many of the notices. The following are examples of districts attempting to deter parents from exercising their legal right to transfer their children:

- “While we don’t want this to happen, it is also our responsibility to remind you about Parent Choice.” “It is our hope that you will choose to support us in our improvement efforts.”
- “I believe that the high marks made during the 2001-2002 school year proves that _____ is a successful school and moving to another school to get a quality education just isn’t necessary. But the federal government did not ask my opinion.” “I hope that you as parents will keep your children in _____ and that...”
- “Please be aware that if you choose this option your child becomes a student at the receiving district as that district will receive the entire State funding amount (PPOR).”

- “The final determination of transfer will be based on a conference with principals of the schools.”

Other school administrators made the announcement that the school was identified for School Improvement with such a tone that parents might not have realized that School Improvement status means that the students are not progressing as is expected and the school needs to improve. The term used in the federal legislation, “School Improvement,” was a poor selection of words to describe a failing school. The term can easily be construed to mean that the school has shown improvement rather than it is a school that needs to improve. Indeed, student performance may have improved, but may not be meeting AYP and therefore the school is identified for School Improvement. The following is an example of possibly a misleading explanation:

“All schools in District _____ are committed to excellence through continuous improvement. _____ Elementary is no exception. Our school has been identified for ‘School Improvement’ by Federal Title I guidelines. We are excited by this opportunity to focus on increasing student achievement on the CSAP assessments.”

Compare this to a commendably honest letter from the school principal and Title I director of Olathe Elementary:

“This letter is to formally notify you that as a result of the ‘No Child Left Behind’ legislation, the Colorado Department of Education has identified Olathe Elementary as a school in need of improvement. Schools identified for school improvement are ones that have failed to make adequate yearly progress as measured by the state assessment (CSAP) over a period of two consecutive years.”

Many schools placed the notification in cluttered newsletters, weekly bulletins, or at the end of a lengthy letters about other matters.

The letter from Olathe Elementary alerted the parents that what they were reading was a formal notification and therefore gave the impression that the content of the letter was important. The notice was also specific to NCLB.

Many schools placed the notification in cluttered newsletters, weekly bulletins, or at the end of a lengthy letters about other matters. However, the Olathe Elementary letter clearly explained that the school needs to improve as well as explained the option to transfer to higher-performing schools. In the letter, the choice schools were listed and the letter included information about the district providing transportation. The school mailed the letter to the parents and was one of the better letters that were collected during this study. Eight students transferred under the NCLB Act from this school.

Accounting for 82% of the schools that were required to notify parents about their right to transfer their children to higher-performing

schools only 170 children in the state were tracked as transfers under the NCLB Act. These students came from nine school districts and included a total of 24 schools. Three districts with the greatest numbers of schools identified for School Improvement are highlighted in the following paragraphs. In 2002 Colorado Springs District 11 is the single district in the state, according to the information that we received, that closely followed the notification requirements in the NCLB Act and made an impressive effort to be supportive of the law.

Colorado Springs District 11 had 10 schools that were required to notify parents and from those schools 65 students chose to transfer. The district's letter included all but one element required by law and was by far the best form of notification that was collected during this study for 2002-2003 school year.⁹ The district has received national recognition for its support of choice in the NCLB Act.

Denver Public Schools, the second largest school district in the state, had 45 schools identified for School Improvement or Corrective Action and did not track students in its first round of notification to 22,000 stu-

dents, which was in January 2002. The timing of the first letter was in conjunction with the District's regular open enrollment program and was sent home to parents just days after the legislation was signed into law. The students attending schools identified for School Improvement were only offered the same opportunities as all students in DPS. In August a second round of letters were sent to 3,000 middle school students and 65 students chose to transfer to a higher-performing school. The letter in August was mailed to parents and transportation was offered.¹⁰

(For 2003 DPS has completed its notification and enrollment process for NCLB. The District mailed approximately 16,700 letters, color-coded applications, as well as a District publication in newspaper format for the cost of \$50,000. Approximately 365 students chose to transfer to another higher-performing school. The District letter was very comprehensive and included all the required information.)¹¹

Jefferson County Public Schools, the largest district in the state, with seven schools identified for School Improvement or Corrective Action, claims that no students in the district transferred under NCLB.¹²

⁹ *School District #11 School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services Procedures and Implementation*, Colorado Springs School District #11 Title I Department, received in an e-mail attachment March 20, 2003.

¹⁰ Report prepared for the Independence Institute by Nancy Connor, DPS Title I Director, received March 3, 2003.

¹¹ Telephone communication with Nancy Connor, May 15, 2003. The number of transferring students will most likely increase. The application deadline has passed, but DPS is still working with those who wish to transfer and will continue to do so until the beginning of the school year.

¹² Telephone communication with Pat Sudduth, Jefferson County Public Schools Title I Coordinator, April 18, 2003.

Survey Results

Out of 151 schools, 66 surveys were completed. The survey revealed that half the schools translated the notification into a language other than English. Less than half of the schools mailed a letter to the parents; however, mailing the notice, via regular mail or e-mail, was not required until the Rules and Regulations established the requirement.¹³

Districts allowed parents anywhere from one week to one year to respond to the offer to transfer.

Some districts informed parents with a letter included in the fall registration packet. Such a late notice is not conducive to students changing schools.

Another question asked about the number of schools offered for a transfer under NCLB.

The table below totals the results from the 66 surveys returned completed.

How Many Choice Schools Were Offered?

- 13 schools offered no option
- 21 schools offered 1 choice
- 12 schools offered the choice of 2 schools
- 6 schools offered the choice of 3 schools
- 4 schools offered the choice of 4 schools
- 2 schools offered the choice of 5 schools
- 2 schools offered the choice of 10 schools
- 1 school offered the choice of 12 schools
- 5 schools offered the choice of 22 schools

In the first year there was obvious confusion about which schools should be available to receive the transferring students. The receiving school must not be identified for School Improvement, Corrective Action, or

Restructuring. The receiving school need not be a Title I school. One

Some districts informed parents with a letter included in the fall registration packet. Such a late notice is not conducive to students changing schools.

Colorado school district incorrectly assumed that the choice school had to be a Title I school. The district explained to parents that there were no other schools for them to choose from because all the

Title I schools were on School Improvement. Some school districts said the neighboring districts refused to take their students.

Recommendations

At the time NCLB was signed into law, Colorado had in place most of the major required elements such as standards, assessments, and accountability. The state of Colorado has been praised by President George W. Bush as well as by Secretary of Education Rod Paige for its commitment to the implementation of NCLB. However, the study reveals that improvements can be made:

1. The Colorado Department of Education (CDE) has organized an HR 1 (NCLB) Committee with subcommittees, or work groups, that address the many elements of NCLB. Unfortunately, there is no subcommittee that specifically addresses the

¹³ Code of Federal Regulations, Title 34, Part 200, §200.36, <http://www.ed.gov/legislation/FedRegister/finrule/2002-4/120202a.pdf>.

NCLB choice provision.¹⁴ This study illustrates that there is a need for a sub-committee dedicated to this issue.

2. School districts need not only to fulfill the requirements of the law but also live up to the spirit of the law. As professionals, school district personnel should not try to deter parents from becoming actively involved in their children's education. Parents should be informed of the law and their rights under the law with a neutral attitude from the school district.

3. Parents must become informed consumers of educational choices. Before parents move their children to another higher-performing public school, they should investigate the school of choice. "Choice" itself is not a panacea. Just because the school is a higher-performing school does not mean that the school is academically sound.

As discussed earlier, parents under NCLB are required to be notified about how they can become involved in addressing the academic issues that led to the school being placed on School Improvement status. Parents whose children remain in the school need to take seriously their respon-

sibility to become involved in increasing student achievement.

4. The U.S. Department of Education Draft Non-Regulatory Guidance about Public School Choice under NCLB was published in December 2002. This document answers many questions that school districts may have about the implementation of the choice provision in the Act, but is surprisingly deficient in the section regarding notification to parents concern-

As professionals, school district personnel should not try to deter parents from becoming actively involved in their children's education.

ing school choice. Item D-2 lists the minimum information that the notification must include. The minimum requirements do not incorporate an explanation to parents that transportation must be provided by the school district. The publication is also specific to school choice and does not mention other elements, required by law but not necessarily pertaining to school choice, which must be included in a notification to parents.¹⁵

This Guidance may cause more confusion for school districts, resulting in a reduced amount of information disseminated to parents. To avoid confusion, the U.S. Department of Education should revise its guidance document regarding parental notification.

¹⁴ *Chiefline*, Colorado Department of Education, January 28, 2003, <http://www.cde.state.co.us/cdecomm/download/pdf/cmchf012803.pdf>.

¹⁵ *Public School Choice*, (U.S. Department of Education, Washington D.C., December 4, 2002), (Draft Non-Regulatory Guidance), D-2, <http://www.ed.gov/offices/OESE/SASA/schoolchoiceguid.pdf>.

Conclusion

This project revealed that schools need to do a better job informing parents about the choice provision in the *No Child Left Behind Act*.

Schools need to not only fully explain the provision, but also do so in way that does not intimidate parents or deter them from exercising their rights under the law.

In this new world of choices in education, parents and the public school system are experiencing growing pains. In Colorado, before the 1990s, parents traditionally sent their children to the neighborhood public school. Parents were told that teachers were the professionals and when it came to educational methods and materials, it was the educators who knew best.

However, in the 1980s the homeschool movement began to grow at an exponential rate. In the 1990s new laws established interdistrict and intradistrict open enrollment and allowed educators and non-educators alike to develop charter schools. In this new century, school districts are experiencing mandated choice. In 2002 the *No Child Left Behind Act* established a choice program for Title I schools not meeting Adequate Yearly Progress and in 2003 a limited-school-voucher program has become law in Colorado. School districts as a whole have cringed at this newfound educational freedom for families and in many cases they have set up roadblocks to slow down the flow

of dollars leaving the traditional neighborhood schools.

Many parents on the other hand are also experiencing growing pains. Making choices means that the parents must share in responsibility for the outcome of their children's education. School choice is good for children, if for no other reason than it places more responsibility on the parents. The welfare mentality that so many parents have held has contributed to the lack of success of the public school system.

School districts as a whole have cringed at this newfound educational freedom for families and in many cases they have set up roadblocks to slow down the flow of dollars leaving the traditional neighborhood schools.

The NCLB Act mandates that parents, generally of the lowest-performing schools, be fully notified about why their schools have been identified for this special status and their opportunities to

enroll their children in higher-performing schools. The chance to leave a failing school should start to change the thinking of parents as they become more aware of the new potential to transfer their children to a better school, or if not that, to learn of ways to become involved at the school their children currently attend. Is this not what educators really want? The children who attend these schools are primarily from low-income families. It is not uncommon for educators to complain about the lack of involvement and support from parents of these children.

The education establishment should strive to meet these obligations laid out in the law.

And it is their responsibility. But it is unethical for a superintendent or principal to use misleading language to make parents forsake their opportunity to transfer their children to higher-performing schools. It is unprofessional for administrators to not clearly spell out the entire provision, and deceitful to disguise

or hide the information within other documents. The intent of the law is obvious: Parents must be clearly notified of the who, what, when, where, why, and how of the choice options under NCLB. Only then will parents be able to make the best choices for their children.

Appendix A

The following is the survey sent to the principals of every school on the School Improvement list as of August 9, 2002:

No Child Left Behind Choice Provisions Research Project
Education Policy Center at the Independence Institute
November 2002

Survey of Colorado Title I Improvement and Corrective Action Schools
Please return by December 16, 2002

School: _____
School district: _____
Principal: _____
Name of person completing this survey: _____
Title: _____

The following questions regard notification to parents about their opportunity to transfer their children to another public school that has not been identified for improvement.

1. How parents were notified of their transfer opportunities.
Please circle Yes or No for each question below.
 - A. Did you notify parents of their opportunity to transfer to another public school? Yes or No?
 - B. Did you notify parents that transportation is provided by the district?
Yes or No?
 - C. Was a letter mailed to parents? Yes or No?
 - D. Was a letter sent home with students? Yes or No?
 - E. Was a letter provided only to parents who attended a parent meeting?
Yes or No?
 - F. If a letter was provided to parents, into how many languages other than English was the letter translated?
 - G. Was an advertisement placed in a newspaper? Yes or No?
 - H. Were the parents notified in another way?
Please explain: _____

1. Did a school-wide parent meeting take place to explain to parents their opportunities? Yes or No?
2. On what date were parents notified of the opportunity to transfer their children to another public school that has not been identified for improvement?

3. How much time did parents have to respond to the offer to transfer?

4. How many schools did the parents have to choose from?

5. What criteria were used to designate these schools (such as location and space availability)?

6. How many students from the school chose to transfer to another school that has not been identified for improvement in the fall of 2002 under the provision in the No Child Left Behind Act? _____
7. How many students were able to enroll in a school that was their first choice?

8. What was the school's total enrollment in the spring of 2002?

9. In the spring of 2002, how many students were enrolled at the school in each grade level?
K _____ 1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____ 4 _____ 5 _____ 6 _____ 7 _____
8 _____ 9 _____ 10 _____ 11 _____ 12 _____

Please enclose a copy of the letter, bulletin, or advertisement provided to parents.

Appendix B

The following is a list of districts where no information was provided for any school in the district. Title I directors in the following districts received one letter and at least two phone calls requesting a copy of the parental notification and survey information.

1. Adams-Arapahoe 28J
2. Bennett 29J*
3. Burlington RE-6J*
4. Byers†
5. Custer County*
6. Dolores RE-4A*
7. Gilpin RE-1*
8. Greeley 6
9. Holly RE-3
10. Limon RE-4J*
11. Park County RE-2*
12. Pueblo City 60
13. Roaring Fork RE-1
14. Salida R-32*
15. Weld County RE-8‡

* indicates that all schools in that district were taken off School Improvement status in December of 2002 because of increased student performance. However, the schools in these districts were on School Improvement as of August 9, 2002 and were therefore required to provide notification of their School Improvement status before the beginning of the 2002-2003 school year.

†Byers Elementary sent the survey back early in the study with a note saying “We petitioned and are no longer on School Improvement!” The district did not respond to further requests for information.

‡Weld County RE-8 faxed the surveys back to us with the comment, “We are choosing not to participate in this survey. Please do not continue to contact our staff members. Thank you for your honoring our valuable time.”

Appendix C

One hundred fifty-one schools were on the Colorado Department of Education School Improvement list as of August 9, 2002. Eighty-seven remained on the list revised March 13, 2003. The asterisk (*) denotes those schools that have been taken off the list because of increased school improvement.

| School District | School Name |
|---------------------|---------------------------------|
| Adams 14 | Alsup Elementary School |
| Adams 14 | Dupont Elementary School |
| Adams 14 | Monaco Elementary School |
| Adams 14 | Rose Hill Elementary School |
| Adams-Arapahoe 28J | Crawford Elementary School* |
| Adams-Arapahoe 28J | Elkhart Elementary School* |
| Adams-Arapahoe 28J | Vaughn Elementary School |
| Ault-Highland RE-9 | Highland Elementary School |
| Ault-Highland RE-9 | Highland Middle School |
| Bennett 29J | Bennett Elementary School* |
| Boulder Valley RE 2 | Casey Middle School |
| Buena Vista R-31 | Avery Parsons Elem. School* |
| Burlington RE-6J | Burlington Elementary School* |
| Byers 32J | Byers Elementary School* |
| Canon City RE-1 | Harrison Elementary School* |
| Canon City RE-1 | Lincoln Elementary School* |
| Canon City RE-1 | McKinley Elementary School* |
| Canon City RE-1 | Skyline Elementary School* |
| Canon City RE-1 | Washington Elementary School* |
| Centennial R-1 | Centennial Elementary School |
| Centennial R-1 | Centennial High School |
| Centennial R-1 | Centennial Junior High School |
| Clear Creek RE-1 | Georgetown Elementary School* |
| Colorado Springs 11 | Adams Elementary School* |
| Colorado Springs 11 | Columbia Elementary School |
| Colorado Springs 11 | Hunt Elementary School* |
| Colorado Springs 11 | Ivywild Elementary School |
| Colorado Springs 11 | Midland Elementary School* |
| Colorado Springs 11 | Monroe Elementary School |
| Colorado Springs 11 | Pike Elementary School* |
| Colorado Springs 11 | Queen Palmer Elem. School* |
| Colorado Springs 11 | Roosevelt-Edison Charter School |
| Colorado Springs 11 | Whittier Elementary School* |
| Colorado Springs 11 | Wilson Elementary School* |
| Custer County | Custer County Elem. School* |
| Denver | Amesse Elementary School |
| Denver | Ashley Elementary School* |
| Denver | Baker Middle School |

| School District | School Name |
|-----------------|--------------------------------|
| Denver | Barnum Elementary School |
| Denver | Barrett Elementary School |
| Denver | Brown Elementary School* |
| Denver | Bryant Webster Elem. School* |
| Denver | Castro Elementary School |
| Denver | Cheltenham Elementary School |
| Denver | Cole Middle School |
| Denver | College View Elementary School |
| Denver | Columbine Elementary School* |
| Denver | Cowell Elementary School |
| Denver | Del Pueblo Elementary School |
| Denver | Fairmont Elementary School |
| Denver | Fairview Elementary School |
| Denver | Ford Elementary School |
| Denver | Garden Place Elementary School |
| Denver | Gilpin Elementary School |
| Denver | Goldrick Elementary School |
| Denver | Gove Middle School* |
| Denver | Greenlee Elementary School* |
| Denver | Hallett Elementary School |
| Denver | Horace Mann Middle School |
| Denver | Kepner Middle School |
| Denver | Knapp Elementary School |
| Denver | Lake Middle School |
| Denver | Mitchell Elementary School |
| Denver | Morey Middle School |
| Denver | Munroe Elementary School |
| Denver | Newlon Elementary School* |
| Denver | Pioneer Charter School* |
| Denver | Remington Elementary School |
| Denver | Rishel Middle School |
| Denver | Schenck Elementary School |
| Denver | Schmitt Elementary School* |
| Denver | Skinner Middle School |
| Denver | Smedley Elementary School |
| Denver | Smith Elementary School |
| Denver | Stedman Elementary School |
| Denver | Swansea Elementary School |

| School District | School Name |
|-----------------------|---------------------------------|
| Denver | Valdez Elementary School* |
| Denver | Valverde Elementary School |
| Denver | Whiteman Elementary School |
| Denver | Whittier Elementary School |
| Dolores Cty. RE No.2 | Seventh Street Elem. School |
| Dolores RE-4A | Dolores Elementary School* |
| Englewood 1 | Maddox Elementary School* |
| Florence RE-2 | Fremont Elementary School* |
| Fort Morgan RE-3 | Columbine Elementary School* |
| Fort Morgan RE-3 | Green Acres Elementary School |
| Fort Morgan RE-3 | Pioneer Elementary School |
| Garfield 16 | Bea Underwood Elem. School |
| Garfield RE-2 | Esma Lewis Elementary School* |
| Gilpin RE-1 | Gilpin Elementary School* |
| Greeley 6 | Billie Martinez Elem. School |
| Gunnison Watershed | Gunnison Elementary School* |
| Harrison 2 | Bricker Elementary School |
| Harrison 2 | Wildflower Elementary School |
| Holly RE-3 | Shanner Elementary School |
| Ignacio 11 JT | Ignacio Intermediate School |
| Jefferson County | Eiber Elementary School |
| Jefferson County | Fitzmorris Elementary School* |
| Jefferson County | Foster Elementary School* |
| Jefferson County | Lumberg Elementary School |
| Jefferson County | Molholm Elementary School |
| Jefferson County | Pennington Elementary School* |
| Jefferson County | Russell Elementary School |
| Lamar RE-2 | Lincoln Elementary School |
| Lamar RE-2 | Washington Elementary School* |
| Limon RE-4J | Limon Elementary School* |
| Mancos RE-6 | Mancos Elementary School* |
| McClave RE-2 | McClave Elementary School* |
| Mesa County Valley 51 | Chatfield Elementary School* |
| Mesa County Valley 51 | Clifton Elementary School |
| Mesa County Valley 51 | Columbine Elementary School* |
| Mesa County Valley 51 | Dos Rios Elementary School* |
| Mesa County Valley 51 | Lincoln Park Elementary School* |
| Mesa County Valley 51 | Nisley Elementary School* |

| School District | School Name |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Miami/Yoder 60 JT | Miami/Yoder Elementary School |
| Monte Vista C-8 | Bill Metz Elementary School* |
| Montezuma-Cortez | Downey Elementary School* |
| Montezuma-Cortez | Kemper Elementary School |
| Montezuma-Cortez | Manaugh Elementary School |
| Montezuma-Cortez | Mesa Elementary School |
| Montrose County RE-1J | Olathe Elementary School* |
| Northglenn-Thornton 12 | Coronado Hills Elem. School |
| Northglenn-Thornton 12 | Federal Heights Elem. School |
| Northglenn-Thornton 12 | McElwain Elementary School |
| Northglenn-Thornton 12 | North Star Elementary School |
| Northglenn-Thornton 12 | Thornton Elementary School |
| Norwood R-2J | Norwood Elementary School* |
| Park County RE-2 | Edith Teter Elementary School* |
| Pueblo City 60 | Irving Elementary School* |
| Pueblo City 60 | Risley Middle School |
| Roaring Fork RE-1 | Basalt Elementary School* |
| Roaring Fork RE-1 | Carbondale Elementary School |
| Roaring Fork RE-1 | Glenwood Springs Elem. School* |
| Roaring Fork RE-1 | Sopris Elementary School* |
| Rocky Ford R-2 | Jefferson Middle School |
| Rocky Ford R-2 | Liberty Elementary School |
| Salida R-32 | Longfellow Elementary School* |
| Sheridan 2 | Ft. Logan Elementary School |
| South Conejos RE-10 | Antonito High School |
| St. Vrain Valley RE 1J | Spangler Elementary School |
| Stratton R-4 | Stratton Elementary School* |
| Thompson R-2J | Winona Elementary School* |
| Trinidad 1 | Trinidad Jr. High School* |
| Weld County RE-8 | Ft. Lupton High School |
| Weld County RE-8 | Ft. Lupton Intermediate School |
| Weld County RE-8 | Leo Butler Elementary School |
| Weld County RE-8 | Twombly Primary School |
| Widefield 3 | Pinello Elementary School* |
| Widefield 3 | Talbott Elementary School |
| Yuma 1 | K. P. Morris Primary School* |
| Yuma 1 | Yuma Middle School |

INDEPENDENCE INSTITUTE is a non-profit, non-partisan Colorado think tank. It is governed by a statewide board of trustees and holds a 501(c)(3) tax exemption from the IRS. Its public policy research focuses on economic growth, education reform, health care policy, housing and mobility solutions, local government effectiveness, and constitutional rights.

JON CALDARA is the President of the Independence Institute.

DAVID KOPEL is the Research Director at the Independence Institute.

PAMELA BENIGNO is the Director of the Education Policy Center at the Independence Institute. Benigno, a former public school teacher, directs research, writes, and speaks about school accountability and school choice issues. Her publications include: *Public K-12 Online Education: Stop the Discrimination*;

Colorado Public School Open Enrollment Policies: Not Very Open; A New Education Tax Plan for Colorado; and Report Cards: Doing It Right.

MARYA DEGROW is the Education Policy Center Research Assistant and assisted with the research for this Issue Paper.

ADDITIONAL RESOURCES on this subject can be found at: <http://IndependenceInstitute.org>

NOTHING WRITTEN here is to be construed as necessarily representing the views of the Independence Institute or as an attempt to influence any election or legislative action.

PERMISSION TO REPRINT this paper in whole or in part is hereby granted provided full credit is given to the Independence Institute.

Copyright © 2003, Independence Institute