

LBUSD Small Learning Communities Grant – Cohort 05

Evaluation Report - Final

Implementation Year 4

2008-2009

The SRM Evaluation Group
University of California, Los Angeles

Janet Lee
Minerva Avila
Nicole Gerardi
Mark Hansen
Anne Vo

December 2009

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Executive Summary.....	ii
I. Introduction.....	1
Grant/Program Description.....	1
Evaluation Details.....	2
Format of the Report.....	4
District Grant Administration.....	5
Respondent Demographics.....	7
II. Cabrillo High School	9
Previous Years' Evaluation Summary	9
SLC Program Description.....	9
Evaluation Results 2008-09.....	12
Attitudes and Beliefs Toward Achievement	12
Culture and Climate	20
Building Leadership Capacity.....	28
Summary/Conclusions.....	33
III. Jordan High School	34
Previous Years' Evaluation Summary	34
SLC Program Description.....	34
Evaluation Results 2008-09.....	37
Attitudes and Beliefs Toward Achievement	37
Culture and Climate	46
Building Leadership Capacity.....	55
Summary/Conclusions	65
IV. Polytechnic High School	67
Previous Years' Evaluation Summary	67
SLC Program Description.....	67
Evaluation Results 2008-09.....	71
Attitudes and Beliefs Toward Achievement	71
Culture and Climate	79
Building Leadership Capacity.....	85
Summary/Conclusions	91
V. Report Summary and Conclusions.....	92
Appendix A – SLC Descriptions.....	94
Appendix B – Respondent Demographic Tables.....	97

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

KEY FINDINGS

SLC Program Description

In 2008-09, all three schools had between 5 to 6 SLCs on their campus, excluding Secondary Specialized Programs (SSPs). The majority of students across schools were assigned to an SLC. Specifically, all students at Cabrillo HS but seniors were assigned to an SLC while all but about 750 to 800 students at Jordan HS belonged to an SLC. At Poly HS, every student and teacher was assigned to an academy (either an SLC or SSP). Next year, the goal is to have every student in an SLC, or at least touched by one, across schools.

The majority of student, parent, and staff survey respondents across schools were able to identify their SLCs. Approximately 97% of Poly HS students and 70% at Cabrillo HS named their SLC while only 52% at Jordan HS were able to do the same. These disaggregated results closely resemble what parents reported at the three schools in terms of their ability to identify their children's SLCs. As for staff, 94% of Cabrillo HS, 81% of Poly, and 63% of Jordan staff were able to select the SLC to which they belonged. It should be noted that both Cabrillo HS and Jordan HS do not yet have wall-to-wall SLCs.

For the most part, the student survey respondents' gender distribution within SLCs was fairly even. There were five notable exceptions in which one gender was represented by two-thirds or more. Two of these SLCs are at Cabrillo HS and three are at Jordan HS. The student survey respondents' ethnic representation within SLCs varied across schools. While three ethnic groups had significant representation at two schools (Cabrillo HS and Jordan HS), five were significantly represented at Poly HS.

Evaluation Results 2008-09:

Attitudes and Beliefs Toward Achievement

Compared to previous years, a higher percentage of students at the three high schools reported engaging in academic conversations, including talking with their counselor about their class schedule and with their teachers and peers about academic work. Most students across schools reported always talking to their peers about their plans after high school.

As in previous years, the high percentage of teachers who reported talking with their students about college was much higher than the percentage of those who disclosed talking about how to finance a post-secondary education. While the percentage of students who reported not having conversations about how to get into college decreased overall, it has remained relatively the same at two schools (Cabrillo HS and Jordan HS). This same scenario applies to conversations about how to finance a college education.

Approximately 85% of student survey respondents agreed that they want to attend college immediately after high school. This percentage has changed minimally when compared to previous years. Parent survey responses mirror those of their children at each school. The percentage of students expecting to pursue a degree beyond high school has steadily increased since the first year of the grant. As in previous years, staff expectations for students'

educational attainment are much lower than those of students and parents. A strong majority of student survey respondents across schools reported knowing how to differentiate between 2-year and 4-year colleges and being aware of the UC A-G requirements. For two schools (Cabrillo HS and Jordan HS), however, the numbers decreased moderately when compared to previous years while they increased slightly at Poly HS. In general, there is also more AP awareness reported at two schools (Cabrillo HS and Poly HS) when compared to previous years. By the time they graduate from high school, a strong majority of student survey respondents indicated that they will have taken the classes required to apply to college. Teachers are not as confident. Students continue to lack confidence in being able to finance a college education and knowing which standardized tests to take.

Culture and Climate

SLC identity and the level of SLC awareness vary across schools but seem to be heavily influenced by the years of an SLC's existence. Those established before the grant have a stronger identity and benefit from high SLC awareness. Despite having had some moderate success with implementing SLCs, Cabrillo HS students continued to lack awareness when it comes to knowing and identifying their own SLC. At Jordan HS, students can identify their SLC but in establishing an SLC culture and climate there has been difficulty given two facts: 1) not all students are enrolled in SLCs, and 2) the school is comprised of two campuses (the main campus and JFA). Poly HS SLCs are more established given their longer history and, thus, have a stronger presence on campus. The challenge at Poly HS, however, continues to be developing SLCs that have equal footing with SSPs.

Students and parents perceive teachers as being supportive of students' academic well-being while in high school. As in previous years, staff members' perceptions of student-teacher relations are more positive than students' perceptions of the same. The consensus at all three schools seems to be that the implementation of SLCs has led to better, more personal relations among peers and between students and teachers as well. Students, however, do not report feeling any closer to SLC peers than to students outside their SLC.

Building Leadership Capacity

In general, the administration and staff from all three schools reported understanding the purpose for implementing SLCs. For the most part, staff felt comfortable with how the schools have developed SLCs, made time available for teacher collaboration, and provided opportunities for them to suggest SLC modifications. At Cabrillo HS, however, the majority of staff indicated that they do not feel comfortable with how individual as well as school-wide SLCs are being developed. They also indicated feeling that the school does not provide time on a regular basis for SLC teams to meet, unlike what staff at Jordan HS and Poly HS reported.

Despite some of the challenges with implementation, a majority of staff survey respondents across schools agreed that there are conversations taking place among teachers regarding students who are struggling academically. Staff also reported that colleagues work collaboratively to assist students at risk of failing. At all three schools, staff reported enjoying the increase in colleague collaboration that has resulted with the implementation of SLCs.

In general across schools, the main challenge to implementation continues to be teacher buy-in. Cabrillo HS staff reported that a common conference period is essential for teacher collaboration and the necessary dialogue for proper implementation of SLCs. At Jordan HS, teacher buy-in continues to be affected by a past attempt at establishing an SLC-type reform that called for academic ‘houses.’ For Poly HS, there is some frustration with administrative procedures (e.g. accessing funds).

Although some progress was made in 2008-09, parent and community involvement continues to be a challenge for all three schools.

I. INTRODUCTION

GRANT/PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Amongst the many education reform efforts being implemented across the United States, one that is occurring in many large comprehensive high schools is the implementation of small learning communities. The premise is that small communities eventually lead to student individualization, improved communication and collaboration among teachers, and innovative teaching techniques. This allows students in those small communities to have more positive social and academic experiences at their schools. This report provides the 2008-2009 evaluation results for the implementation of such small learning communities at three high schools in the Long Beach Unified School District (LBUSD). In 2005, LBUSD received funding from the United States Department of Education (DOE) Smaller Learning Communities (SLC) Initiative to develop SLCs at Cabrillo High School (HS), Jordan High School (HS), and Polytechnic (Poly) High School (HS). This is the fourth year of SLC implementation at these schools.

This particular grant for implementing SLCs is supporting activities occurring at three high schools in LBUSD, a large, urban school district. Each school serves a diverse student population that includes significant populations of students from high-poverty backgrounds. District-wide enrollment in 2008-09 by ethnicity shows that students in the district are comprised of approximately 52% Latinos, 17% African Americans, 8% Asians, 16% Whites, 4% Filipinos, 2% Pacific Islanders, and 0.2% Native Americans. Approximately 21% of the total enrollment is English language learners. Each school is challenged by low achievement, high mobility, and teacher turnover.

In the effort to raise student achievement in all district high schools, LBUSD is also currently in the midst of a major local reform. The first two goals for this high school reform initiative include a commitment to improving student achievement and attempting to close the achievement gap. The third goal is to build the capacity of teachers to lead and a fourth, and final goal, is to improve the culture and climate of high schools. To support this reform initiative, the district and the three schools (Cabrillo HS, Jordan HS, and Poly HS) applied for and received a federal grant to implement and support small learning communities at each school. SLCs are geared towards raising student achievement through the personalization of education by developing structures and processes that encourage deeper and more meaningful relationships among teachers, between teachers and students, as well as among students themselves.

At the conclusion of the 2008-09 school year, Cabrillo HS had six SLCs while both Jordan HS and Poly HS had five supported through this grant, not including Secondary Specialized Programs (SSPs). The SLCs at Cabrillo HS and Jordan HS were newly developed at the onset of this grant. Table 1 below lists all the small communities at each school. The SLCs at Poly HS were previously established and are being further developed through the support of this grant. While all three schools have SSPs, commonly known as magnets, both Jordan HS and Poly HS's essentially function as additional SLCs. Jordan HS 9th graders attend a smaller separate campus known as the Jordan HS Freshman Academy (JFA) which in addition to size incorporates a few SLC principles. Some staff consider JFA an SLC while some do not. For the purpose of this

report, JFA is considered to be an SLC. The SLCs at each individual campus will be discussed in further detail in subsequent sections of this report. For a detailed description of each SLC, please refer to Appendix A.

Table 1.1. Small Learning Communities at Cabrillo HS, Jordan HS, and Poly HS, 2008-09.

Cabrillo HS SLCs	Jordan HS SLCs	Poly HS SLCs
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Cabrillo Academy of Business (CAB) ▪ Cabrillo Academy of Social Justice & Law (CASJL)* ▪ Cabrillo Arts and Technology (CAT)/(SACMAA)** ▪ Cabrillo Engineering and Design (CED) ▪ Cabrillo Health Occupations and Careers (CHOC) ▪ International Studies at Cabrillo HS (ISC) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Business and Entertainment School of Travel, Trade and Tourism (BESTT) ▪ Excellence Through the Arts (ETA) ▪ Jordan Media and Communication Learning Community (JMAC) ▪ Panther International† ▪ Jordan Freshman Academy (JFA) <p><u>Specialized Secondary Programs</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Architecture, Construction, Engineering (ACE) ▪ Aspiration in Medical Services (AIMS) ▪ International Baccalaureate (IB) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Academy of Humanities ▪ Beach Academy of Math and Science ▪ Media, Entertainment, Technology, & Sports (METS)^ ▪ Medical and Paramedical Services (MAPS)^^ ▪ Poly Academy of Achievers and Learners (PAAL) <p><u>Specialized Secondary Programs</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Pacific Rim Academy (Pac Rim) ▪ Center for International Commerce (CIC) ▪ Program of Additional Curricular Experiences (PACE)

*Formerly Cabrillo School for Social Justice (CSSJ)

**CAT merged with Specialized Academy of Computer Media, Arts & Animation (SACMAA), an established SSP.

†Formerly Panther Academy

^Formerly Communications Academy

^^Formerly Business and Technology Academy

EVALUATION DETAILS

To evaluate the SLC initiative in these Long Beach high schools, LBUSD administrators contracted with the Social Research Methodology Evaluation Group (SRM Evaluation Group), directed by Dr. Marv Alkin at the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA). As a former director of the national Center for the Study of Evaluation, a professor and scholar of evaluation theory and practice at UCLA for over 30 years, and a leading expert on evaluation utilization, Dr. Alkin brings a wealth of expertise, experience, and knowledge to the evaluation of small learning communities. Project staff members are all graduate level students in the SRM Division of UCLA’s Department of Education, and are specializing in program evaluation.

There are two general purposes for this SLC evaluation:

A) To understand how SLCs are being implemented so that we can:

1. develop “lessons learned”
2. make mid-course corrections, if needed
3. monitor progress
4. understand what aspects may have contributed to effects

and

B) To understand the effects of SLCs on:

1. achievement and attitudes towards achievement
2. culture and climate at school(s)
3. structure and process of developing leadership capacity

Throughout the course of the 5-year evaluation, data was and will be collected in five general areas: SLC development and implementation; personalization; equity and access; student achievement; and school/community collaboration. Multiple methods, including surveys, interviews, focus groups and observations will be used to gather data from numerous sources, including teachers, administrators, students and parents.

To build on our work with the schools from the previous year, three survey protocols were used to gather data from school staff (administrators and teachers), students, and parents for the evaluation of this fourth year's implementation. Although minor adjustments were made to the staff, student, and parent survey protocols to more closely align the data collected to the interests of the SLC evaluation, the survey protocols remained very similar to those used in the previous year. The staff, student, and parent surveys were administered in Spring 2009. For the most part, the staff, student, and parent surveys were aligned with each other.

The evaluation plan also called for additional data to be collected through student and staff focus groups and interviews. In March 2009, the evaluation team interviewed principals and SLC coordinators at each of the three schools. Two SLC teacher focus groups and one non-SLC teacher focus group were conducted at Cabrillo HS and Poly HS. At Poly HS, the non-SLC teacher focus group was comprised of those assigned to SSPs. At Jordan, four teacher focus groups, two SLC and two non-SLC, were conducted. While some teachers in the non-SLC teacher focus groups at the schools may have had SLC students in their classes, the teachers themselves were not active members of a particular SLC during the 2008-09 academic year. As with teachers, two SLC student focus groups and one non-SLC student focus group were conducted at Cabrillo HS and Poly HS. At Poly, the non-SLC student focus group was also comprised of those assigned to SSPs. At Jordan, four student focus groups, two SLC and two non-SLC, were conducted. A summary of the data collected and their sources used in this analysis can be found in Table 2.

Table 1.2. Table of Data Sources

	Cabrillo	Jordan	Poly	Total	Description
	<i>n</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>n</i>	
Staff Survey	79	73	38	190	To measure teacher attitudes towards involvement in SLC implementation and development, personalization as it relates to both student/teacher (staff) and peer/ peer relations, and teacher perception of student achievement expressed in terms of their students' academic behavior and college preparation/knowledge.
Staff focus groups	20	21	14	55	To gain an understanding of the teacher experience and perception of SLC development and implementation, needed resources, challenges/ dilemmas, and solutions.
Principal Interview	1	2	1	4	To gain an understanding of the principal's experience and perception of SLC development and implementation, needed resources, challenges/ dilemmas, and solutions.
SLC Coordinator Interview	1	1	1	3	To gain an understanding of the SLC coordinator's experience and perception of SLC development and implementation, needed resources, challenges/ dilemmas, and solutions.
Student Survey	1,830	1,275	3,608	6,713	To measure students' attitudes towards involvement in SLC implementation and development, personalization as it relates to both student/ teacher (staff) and peer/ peer relations, and student achievement expressed in terms of academic behavior and college preparation/knowledge.
Student focus groups	15	23	21	59	To gain an understanding of the student experience with SLC implementation and development, personalization as it relates to the state of teacher/student and peer/peer relations, and academic achievement as expressed through academic behavior and college knowledge.
Parent Survey	604	437	1,543	2,584	To measure parents' attitudes towards involvement in SLC implementation and development, personalization as it relates to parent perception of their children's interactions with teachers (staff), and parent perception of student achievement expressed in terms of their child's academic behavior and college preparation/knowledge.

FORMAT OF THE REPORT

The report is divided into the following sections:

- I. Introduction – This includes the grant/program description, evaluation details, an overview of LBUSD's grant administration and support, and the demographic information of all survey respondents, both district-wide and disaggregated by school.
- II. School profile - Cabrillo High School - Each school's profile includes all findings related to data collected during the 2008-09 school year.
 - A. *Previous Years' Evaluation Summary*
 - B. *SLC Program Description*
 - C. *Evaluation Results 2008-09*
 1. *Attitudes and Beliefs Toward Achievement* – This section provides a descriptive review of students' perceptions and attitudes towards their own achievement as well as the achievement of their peers. Also included in this section is parent perception of their child's experience and attitudes towards achievement. When available and relevant, staff

perceptions of student attitudes towards achievement will be presented. The results of this section are taken primarily from the student and parent surveys and student focus groups.

2. *Culture and Climate* – This section provides a descriptive review of students', parents', and staff perceptions of the culture and climate at their school, including student, parental, and staff involvement with SLC development and implementation. Also included in this section is a review of the student, parent, and staff experiences that may highlight the level of personalization taking place at school. This section draws from the results of the student, parent, and staff surveys and student and staff focus groups.
3. *Building Leadership Capacity* – This section of the report details staff perceptions of SLC development and implementation. Findings for this section are drawn primarily from the staff survey, teacher focus groups, and administrator (principal and SLC coordinator) interviews.

D. *Conclusions*

III. School profile - Jordan High School

- A. *Previous Years' Evaluation Summary*
- B. *SLC Program Description*
- C. *Evaluation Results 2008-09*
 1. *Attitudes and Beliefs Toward Achievement*
 2. *Culture and Climate*
 3. *Building Leadership Capacity*
- D. *Conclusions*

IV. School profile - Polytechnic High School

- A. *Previous Years' Evaluation Summary*
- B. *SLC Program Description*
- C. *Evaluation Results 2008-09*
 1. *Attitudes and Beliefs Toward Achievement*
 2. *Culture and Climate*
 3. *Building Leadership Capacity*
- D. *Conclusions*

V. Overall Summary/Conclusions

DISTRICT GRANT ADMINISTRATION SUPPORT

As previously mentioned, LBUSD is currently administering two SLC grants at five high schools: Cabrillo, Jordan, and Polytechnic High Schools comprise cohort (2005) while Lakewood and Millikan High Schools represent cohort 2007. To support the implementation of the activities specified in both grants and monitor their progress, the district's SLC director has established monthly meetings and quarterly workshops during the academic year. At the monthly meetings, SLC coordinators for both cohorts shared their successes and learned about available resources. Similarly, the quarterly workshops allowed SLC coordinators and lead teachers from schools in both cohorts to discuss SLC-related issues, gain awareness of available resources, and learn new skills.

In 2008-09, the SLC coordinator monthly meetings also served as a place to monitor progress in achieving LBUSD's High School Office goals. The SLC grant goals are closely aligned with the High School Office goals. Specifically, the purposes¹ of these SLC coordinator meetings were to:

¹ This list was generated from 2008-09 meeting agendas.

- Build support systems for SLC leaders
- Monitor progress in achieving the High School Office goals
- Create a strategy for seamless communication with middle schools regarding SLC pathways
- Create an SLC protocol for looking at formative and summative data and using the information to affect collaboration and instruction
- Discuss SLC protocol for using formative and summative data from the UCLA evaluations
- Determine the types of professional development opportunities needed to advance the District Initiative for Expanding Pathways
- Discuss SLC courses of study for alignment to High School Office goals
- Discuss possible SLC protocols for using formative and summative data to improve SLC practice
- Discuss implementation of the High School Reform Initiative 2009-2013 & the District Initiative for Expanding Pathways
- Strategize an approach to School Choice 2010

The attention to detail and preparation the SLC director dedicated to these meetings, along with consistent attendance by the SLC coordinators, contributed to a supportive and collaborative environment.

In addition to the above-mentioned monthly meetings, the SLC coordinators and SLC lead teachers participated in quarterly workshops, or Lead Teacher Institutes, where they received support, guidance, and resources to enhance SLCs and encourage progress in meeting the grant goals. The purposes and topics of those Institutes were to:

- Equip SLC leaders with research-based, data-driven strategies that will advance and achieve the High School Office goals for 2008-2009
- Build each SLCs leadership capacity to support a personalized and meaningful, theme-based and/or career-related course of study for all students
- Review the professional development calendar for 2009-2010
- Update the SLC Resource Guide for 2009-2010
- Build high school leadership capacity to design, implement, and sustain reform and improvement efforts in conjunction with the High School Office goals for 2008-2009

At these Institutes, SLC coordinators and lead teachers were divided by school to allow for in-depth discussions and school-based collaboration. These meetings and institutes provided a space where discussions took place regarding accomplishments, challenges, and needs for the successful implementation of the grant's goals. Due to the unique context of each site, it was understood by all that implementation of the grant will vary across schools. Despite these contextual differences, however, schools shared some similarities. Thus, the monthly SLC coordinator meetings and quarterly SLC Lead Teacher Institutes provided a venue where colleagues could share ideas, brainstorm, support each other, commiserate, and receive guidance from the SLC director. This was critical for assisting SLC coordinators and lead teachers in their work towards meeting grant goals and, for the SLC director, in monitoring their progress.

RESPONDENT DEMOGRAPHICS

Staff Survey Participants

While schools' disaggregated staff survey data can be found in their respective school sections, the following is a profile of the district-wide staff survey participants. A total of 190 teachers and administrators from the three high schools completed the Spring 2009 staff survey, which was intended to measure staff member's perceptions of SLC implementation. These 190 teachers and administrators represent a 33% of the total number of staff members at the three schools. Of the staff members who did take the survey, 95% were teachers, 4% counselors, 1% administrators, and 1% identified themselves as "Other." Sixty percent were female and 40% male; 52% identified themselves as White, 17% identified themselves as Hispanic/Latino and 12% as African American – the three most popular categories. The majority of the teachers who took the survey teach 9th grade (24%) or 10th grade (28%), with 19% teaching multiple grade levels. Of the teachers who took the survey, the majority taught the following subjects: 23% teach English, 17% identified themselves as teaching an "Other" subject, 15% teach history/social studies, 13% teach mathematics, and 13% teach science. Although the experience level of these teachers varied, approximately 71% of teachers have been at their schools ten years or less. About 62% of teachers who took the survey have been educators for at least 10 years. For details, please refer to the tables in Appendix B.

Student Survey Participants

While schools' disaggregated student survey data can be found in their respective school sections, the following is a profile of the district-wide student survey participants. A total of 6,713 students from the three high schools took the Spring 2009 student survey, which was intended to measure students' attitudes towards involvement in SLC implementation and development, personalization as it relates to both student/teacher (staff) and peer/peer relations, and student achievement expressed in terms of academic behavior and college preparation/knowledge. These 6,713 students represent 54% of the total combined number of students at the three schools. Of the students who did take the survey, 51% were female and 49% male; 44% identified themselves as Hispanic/Latino, 18% as African American, and 15% as Asian – the three most popular categories. Most students who took the survey were 10th grader (33%), followed by 11th graders (28%) and 9th graders (27%). Seniors comprised the lowest percentage, 13%, of student survey participants. For details, please refer to the tables in Appendix B.

Parent Survey Participants

While schools' disaggregated parent survey data can be found in their respective school sections, the following is a profile of the district-wide parent survey participants. A total of 2,585 parents of students from the three high schools took the Spring 2009 parent survey, which was intended to measure parents' attitudes towards involvement in SLC implementation and development, personalization as it relates to parent perception of their children's interactions with teachers (staff), and parent perception of student achievement expressed in terms of their child's academic behavior and college preparation/knowledge. Of the parents who did take the survey, 58% were female and 42% male; 40% identified themselves as Hispanic/Latino, 19% as Asian, and 15% as African American - the three most popular categories. Most parents who took the survey had children who were 10th graders (34%), followed by 9th graders (33%) and 11th graders (27%).

Parents of seniors comprised the lowest percentage, 7%, of parent survey participants. For details, please refer to the tables in Appendix B.

Interviews and Focus Groups

As noted in the Table of Data Sources on page 4, four principals and three SLC coordinators from the three high schools participated in one-on-one interviews. A total of 55 SLC and non-SLC teachers participated in focus groups that represented all grade levels and the following academic departments: art, English, technology, science, history/social studies, physical education, mathematics, and “Other.”² Late arrivals to the focus groups did not provide demographic data and, therefore, other academic areas may have been also represented. A total of 59 SLC and non-SLC students representing all grade levels took part in the focus groups. Students and teachers represented all but one SLC each across schools.

² Foreign Language was not included in “Other.”

II. CABRILLO HIGH SCHOOL

A. Previous Years' Evaluation Summary

Although Cabrillo HS staff members have faced a variety of challenges in implementing the grant, nonetheless, SLCs have slowly developed. The first year of implementation of this SLC Initiative, 2005-06, was a planning year for Cabrillo HS. During this time, to expand their knowledge about SLCs and hone leadership skills, Cabrillo HS staff participated in professional development workshops provided by the Northwest Regional Lab and the LBUSD High School Office. Staff also participated in a logic model session moderated by SRM Evaluation Group evaluators. A logic model draft was finalized by Summer 2006. Although 2005-06 was primarily a planning year, it was also a year to build momentum and increase teacher buy-in. Staff expressed their enthusiasm for the implementation of SLCs and worked diligently in preparation for the 2006-07 academic year.

By Fall 2006, Cabrillo HS had six SLCs in place. About half of the staff felt comfortable with the implementation of SLCs and/or their own. By the end of 2006-07, staff at Cabrillo indicated that they understood the purpose and vision behind implementing SLCs and reported strongly believing that SLCs would help raise student achievement. However, there was doubt that SLCs would help improve the systems and processes at the school. The most rewarding aspect seemed to be an increase in collaboration and improved relations for both teachers and students. The biggest challenge was providing time to staff to share ideas and instructional strategies, and opportunities for collaboration. By the end of 2006-07, student survey results indicated that although progressing, SLC awareness and identities needed further development. Furthermore, SLC personalization effects were not yet evident. By the third year, 2007-08, teachers had become less comfortable with how SLCs were being implemented and were growing confused about their purpose and vision. This frustration seemed to stem from the fact that when SLC electives, which were designed to define SLCs and serve as cohesion, were cancelled by the administration after the first year, teachers grew disillusioned. In 2007-08, only a third of the staff reported feeling comfortable with implementation of SLCs and/or their own. An increase in collaboration and improved relations with both teachers and students continued to be the most rewarding aspect of SLCs. It was evident that after two years into the grant, SLC awareness needed further development. Students were not experiencing the "community feeling" that SLCs are supposed to generate.

B. SLC Program Description

In the fourth year of implementation (2008-09), Cabrillo HS continues to have six SLCs. These are:

1. Cabrillo Academy of Business (CAB)
2. Cabrillo Academy of Social Justice & Law (CASJL)
3. Cabrillo Arts and Technology (CAT)/(SACMAA)
4. Cabrillo Engineering and Design (CED)
5. Cabrillo Health Occupations and Careers (CHOC)
6. International Studies at Cabrillo (ISC)

For a detailed description of each SLC, please refer to Appendix A. Each SLC leadership team continues to work on action plans, as does the SLC coordinator with a school-wide version. These outcome action plans are reviewed periodically. Some of these charts were modified in 2008-09 to adhere to a district initiative that calls for a stronger alignment between SLC themes and academic and career pathways. As a result, there has been some internal restructuring within SLCs. One SLC modified its theme and renamed itself from Cabrillo School for Social Justice (CSSJ) to CA Academy of Social Justice & Law (CASJL). Also, an existing academic program, Specialized Academy of Computer Media, Arts & Animation (SACMAA), merged into an SLC, Cabrillo Arts & Technology (CAT). As originally planned, all 9th through 11th graders are officially assigned to an SLC. Most staff members are also affiliated with an SLC. Next year, the fifth year of implementation, calls for a wall-to-wall implementation of SLCs that would result in every student belonging to an SLC.

Survey and Focus Group Participants - Cabrillo

As first described in the Introduction, a total of 1,830 Cabrillo students (51% of the total student population) responded to the survey, 79 staff members (47% of total school staff), and 604 parents. In this section, further demographic details are described specifically as related to individual SLCs at Cabrillo.

Of the students who responded to the survey, approximately 70% indicated membership in an SLC. The remaining 30% indicated that they either: a) did not belong to an SLC, or b) did not know to which SLC they were assigned. Each SLC is represented by the students who responded to this survey. The distribution of parents that responded to the survey is very similar to that of the student responses, with respect to SLC representation. Amongst the staff survey respondents, there were very few (6%) that indicated that they did not know their SLC assignment or did not know to which SLC they belonged. The distribution of responses can be seen in Table 2.1 below.

Table 2.1. Percentage Distribution of Cabrillo Survey Respondents by SLC, LBUSD HS SLC Survey, Student, Staff, and Parent Respondents, 2009.

Cabrillo SLCs	Student %	Staff %	Parent %
Cabrillo Academy of Business (CAB)	11	16	11
Cabrillo Academy of Social Justice & Law (CASJL)	7	13	6
Cabrillo Arts & Technology (CAT)/(SACMAA)	19	14	21
Cabrillo Engineering & Design (CED)	13	16	15
Cabrillo Health Occupations & Careers (CHOC)	11	20	13
International Studies at Cabrillo (ISC)	9	13	3
Multiple	n/a	1	n/a
I'm (or my child is) not in a SLC.	15	3	15
I don't know which SLC I am (or my child is) in.	15	3	16
Total	100	100	100
N	1,688	76	560

Overall, 51% of student survey respondents from Cabrillo were male. The gender distribution for each SLC can be seen in Table 2.2. Amongst the survey respondents, the majority of the

SLCs have a fairly even distribution between female and male students, with two notable exceptions: 73% of the CED respondents were male, and 76% of the CHOC respondents were female.

Table 2.2. Percentage Distribution of Gender by Cabrillo SLC, LBUSD HS SLC Survey, Student Respondents, 2009

	Female %	Male %	Total N
Cabrillo Academy of Business (CAB)	42	58	177
Cabrillo Academy of Social Justice & Law (CASJL)	50	50	121
Cabrillo Arts & Technology (CAT)/(SACMAA)	52	48	308
Cabrillo Engineering & Design (CED)	27	73	216
Cabrillo Health Occupations & Careers (CHOC)	76	24	172
International Studies at Cabrillo (ISC)	48	53	150
I'm not in a SLC.	54	46	239
I don't know which SLC I am in.	50	50	237
Total	49	51	1,620

While Table B9 in Appendix B provides a detailed description of the students' self-identified ethnic distribution for the overall student survey respondents, Table 2.3 shows the percentage distribution of ethnic group by SLC. The ethnic group distribution by SLC is fairly similar for each SLC. There are slightly higher percentages of Filipino students who responded from CAT, CED, and CHOC, with a corresponding decrease in the percentage of Hispanic/Latino respondents. The 'other' respondents were also slightly higher for CASJL and CED. The most common response for African American students who took the survey was "I'm not in an SLC," with approximately 18% selecting that option over the other SLC choices.

Table 2.3. Percentage Distribution of Ethnic Group* by Cabrillo SLC, LBUSD HS SLC Survey, Student Respondents, 2009

	African American %	Filipino %	Hispanic/ Latino %	Other** %	Total %
Cabrillo Academy of Business (CAB)	10	8	71	10	99
Cabrillo Academy of Social Justice & Law (CASJL)	10	8	65	17	100
Cabrillo Arts & Technology (CAT)/(SACMAA)	11	14	63	13	101
Cabrillo Engineering & Design (CED)	13	12	60	15	100
Cabrillo Health Occupations & Careers (CHOC)	11	16	64	10	101
International Studies at Cabrillo (ISC)	12	7	71	11	101
I'm not in a SLC.	18	8	61	13	100
I don't know which SLC I am in.	10	8	71	11	100
Total %	12	10	65	12	99
N	192	164	1,049	198	1,603

* Breakdown by Ethnic Group is only provided when a minimum of 5% of respondents chose a particular Ethnic Group.

** Other in this case includes: American Indian, Asian, Pacific Islander, White, Biracial/Multiracial, and Other - unspecified. In total, Other here represents 12% of the respondents for Cabrillo HS.

A total of three student focus groups, two SLC and one non-SLC, with the participation of 15 students were conducted at Cabrillo. Of the five 9th graders, two 10th graders, and three 11th graders who comprised the SLC student focus groups, one represented CHOC and another one represented CAB, while CED, CAT, ISC, and CSSJ were represented by two students each. The

seniors who participated did not officially belong to an SLC, although two indicated that they were part of CAT/SACMAA.

A principal and SLC coordinator participated in separate interviews. A total of three teacher focus groups, two SLC and one non-SLC, with the participation of 20 teachers were conducted at Cabrillo. There were some limitations to demographic data collection during the focus groups given that some teachers arrived late after the data had already been collected at the beginning. Some teacher participants reported teaching multiple grades and subjects. All grade levels and the following subjects were represented by teachers: art, English, science, history/ social studies, mathematics, and Other (including industrial tech, electives, special education). Five teachers represented CSSJ, four belonged to CAT, two were in CHOC, and one represented ISC. Both CAB and CED were each represented by three teachers.

C. Evaluation Results 2008-09

1. ATTITUDES AND BELIEFS TOWARD ACHIEVEMENT

Academic Behavior and Expectations

In an effort to understand student academic behavior, students were asked about their experiences in gathering resources or seeking assistance with college information, academic planning, and schoolwork. In particular, students were asked about discussing class schedules with counselors, engaging in conversations with their teachers about their academic work, getting into college and paying for college, and engaging in conversations with their peers about their academic work and plans after high school. Students were also asked about their expectations for their academic future, specifically whether they desired to attend college immediately after completing high school and their expected highest level of education. Student survey results for these questions can be found in Table 2.4 on page 14. To more accurately capture student academic behavior, parents were asked the same questions framed as their perception of their children's experiences. Table 2.5 on page 16 presents parent survey results for these questions. Because a few of these questions coincided with the staff survey, results were included in the analysis and made available in Table 2.6 on page 17. Whenever possible, this year's findings were compared to baseline data collected three years ago. A complete comparison is not possible given that the student survey was modified and condensed after the first year of implementation at the request of school district staff. If no baseline data was available, a comparison was made with last year's findings. Comparisons for parents' responses are not possible because this is the first year Cabrillo parents were surveyed.

At Cabrillo HS, student survey responses indicate that the vast majority of students are having conversations with their counselor at least once a year about their academic schedule. About half the students indicated they talked with their counselor between 1-3 times a year. For approximately 40% of the students these conversations were more frequent – at least once a month. There is just a small minority (12%) that indicated that they never talk to their counselor about their schedule. Compared to the responses to this same question from the past couple of years, the percentage of students who said 'never' has decreased. This would seem to indicate that more students are participating in their academic planning. When parents are asked a similar

question, only 8% believe that their child ‘never’ speaks with a counselor about their schedule. The most common response by parents was 2-3 times a year.

When students were asked how often they spoke to their teachers about their academic work, over half (56%) responded that these conversations were occurring at least every other week. Approximately 75% of students said they talked to their teachers about their academic work at least once a month. A small percentage of students (13%) did say that they never talk with their teachers about their academic work. When compared to responses to the same question in the previous two years, it is evident that this percentage of students who never talked has been slowly but consistently decreasing since 2007. Students at Cabrillo show a similar trend when asked how often they talk to their peers about their academic work. In Spring 2009 there is a slightly larger percentage (16%) of students who indicated never having conversations about their academic work with their peers, when compared to those who indicated never having these conversations with their teachers. But, again, this percentage has a declining trend when compared to responses from two years ago, although there was no change from last year. Parents were also asked how often they believed their children spoke to someone at school about their academic work. A very small percentage (6%) believes that their children never talked with someone at school about their academics, while approximately 70% of parents believe this happened at least monthly.

Like the survey results, the analysis of the focus group data seems to support that student/teacher and peer/peer conversations regarding academic work and careers are taking place. This may be due to the fact that both SLC and non-SLC students feel that the influence of SLCs is primarily on engaging students by focusing on their academic interests and raising career awareness of SLC-related fields. School trips seem to provide an ideal place for raising casual conversations about these issues. For example, a staff member reflected on the following conversation that took place on a field trip:

“We took (students) over to one of the maintenance facilities for Union Pacific...we had students in there going, ‘Wow...I didn’t realize that girls, women can do these types of jobs,’ and we had two girls in that class, so kids were like, ‘Wow, there’s really something out there for me that I’m interested in.’”

Thus, some of these conversations seem to be taking place simultaneously between teachers and peers. Therefore, the slight increase in engaging in academic conversations found in the survey results might be attributable to the presence of SLCs.

While students did not directly discuss changes to their academic behavior, SLC and non-SLC students who participated in focus groups expressed an attitude that sees value in belonging to an SLC. One student specifically reflected that, “it hits you, because you wouldn’t pick that SLC if you didn’t know what you were doing...it’s not just a class, where it’s just a class that I’ve got to go to it so I can pass.” Another student commented on how being in an SLC motivates students because “[if you’re not in an SLC], you’d pretty much just be going to school—just to be going. You wouldn’t be focusing on what you wanna actually focus on and what you wanna major on in college.” Thus although it is difficult to indentify changes in academic behavior, students nevertheless seem to allude to a behavior that is strongly influenced by SLCs.

Table 2.4. Cabrillo Student Survey Responses on Academic Attitudes and Behavior, including comparisons to previous years for the response category “Never,” LBUSD HS SLC Survey, 2009.

	Always	Once a week	Every other week	Once a month	2-3 times a year	Once a year	Never	Total	Total Never	Total Never	Total Never	Total Never
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	<i>n</i>	06 %	07 %	08 %	09 %
A. I talk to my counselor about my class schedule.	12	5	7	17	29	19	12	1,721	n/a	17	20	12
B. I talk to my teachers about my academic work.	21	18	17	18	8	5	13	1,774	n/a	17	14	13
C. I talk to my peers about my academic work.	27	17	16	11	7	4	16	1,743	n/a	22	16	16
D. I talk to someone at school about how to get into college.	12	9	12	17	19	12	19	1,800	19	19	19	19
E. I talk to someone at school about how to pay for college.	7	6	9	15	14	13	37	1,790	33	37	33	37
F. I talk to my peers about my plans after high school.	37	13	14	14	9	5	9	1,750	n/a	n/a	n/a	9
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total				Total Agree	Total Agree	Total Agree	
	%	%	%	%	<i>n</i>				07 %	08 %	09 %	
G. Immediately after high school, I want to go to college.	51	32	14	3	1,797				84	86	83	
H. What is the highest level of education you think you will complete?	less than high school	high school graduate	some college	Technical/Trade college	AA degree (2-year)	BA/BS degree (4-year)	Graduate-level degree	Total				
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	<i>n</i>				
2009	2	7	14	5	14	39	19	1,576				
2008	1	5	9	3	13	38	31	1,546				
2007	1	8	15	4	11	33	27	898				
2006	2	12	18	7	7	30	24	1,827				

On the survey, students were also asked to specify how often they spoke to someone at school about how to get into college and how to pay for college. With regard to conversations about how to get into college, about one third of the students indicated they spoke with someone at school between 1-3 times a year. About half of the students at Cabrillo spoke to someone at least once a month, if not more frequently. This means that almost 20% of students indicated that they never talked with someone at school about how to get into college. This trend has held very steady since 2006. According to the parents surveyed from Cabrillo, about half also believed that their child spoke to someone at school about how to get into college at least once a month. A much smaller percentage (7%) thought their child had never spoken to someone at school about getting into college, however almost 20% did not know whether or not their child had. Interestingly, 95% of staff members surveyed agreed or strongly agreed that they spoke with their students about how to get into college.

Similar to years past, the conversations about how to get into college are happening more frequently than are the conversations about how to pay for college. About one-third of students report that they have never spoken to someone at school about how to pay for college. This trend in student responses has also held very steady since 2006, varying slightly between 33-37% over the years. In 2009, a much smaller percentage of parents (16%), when compared to students, indicated that they believed that their child has never spoken to someone at school about how to pay for college. However, 18% also indicated that they did not know whether or not their child spoke to someone at school about financing a college education. This year, 82% of staff members did indicate that they have spoken with their students about how to pay for college.

When it comes to talking with their peers about their plans after high school, the largest percentage of students (37%) indicated that this happens 'always.' About the same number of students (41% of survey respondents) indicated that they talk with their peers about their plans after high school between once a week to once a month. A small percentage (9%) said they never spoke to peers about plans after high school.

Table 2.5. Cabrillo Parent Survey Responses on Academic Attitudes and Behavior, LBUSD HS SLC Survey, 2009.

	Always %	Once a week %	Every other week %	Once a month %	2-3 times a year %	Once a year %	Never %	Don't Know %	Total <i>n</i>	Total Never 09 %
A. My child talks to the counselor about his/her class schedule.	11	6	10	19	22	15	8	10	598	8
B. My child talks to someone at school about his/her academic work.	24	12	17	15	9	6	6	12	596	6
C. My child talks to someone at school about how to get into college.	14	10	10	16	17	9	7	17	598	7
D. My child talks to someone at school about how to pay for college.	9	8	8	17	14	11	16	18	591	16
	Strongly Agree %	Agree %	Disagree %	Strongly Disagree %	Don't Know %	Total <i>n</i>	Total Agree 09%			
D. My child wants to go to college right after graduating from high school.	49	36	7	1	7	600	85			
E. What is the highest level of education you think your child will complete?	less than high school %	high school graduate %	some college %	Technical/ Trade college %	AA degree (2-year) %	BA/BS degree (4-year) %	Graduate -level degree %	Total <i>n</i>		
2009	2	7	12	5	14	36	25	558		

An important precursor to whether a student achieves post-secondary academic success is their expectations for post-secondary plans. Therefore, students were also asked whether they desired to attend college immediately after completing high school and what was their expected highest level of education. At the end of the 2009 school year, 83% of the students who responded to the survey indicated that they agreed or strongly agreed that immediately after high school they wanted to go to college. This percentage dropped slightly from the previous two years (down 3% and 1% from 2008 and 2007, respectively). The parents' response to a comparable question was very similar to that of their children. Eighty five percent of parents agreed or strongly agreed that immediately after high school their child wanted to attend college.

The majority of students at Cabrillo do have fairly high expectations when it comes to their expected highest level of education. In 2009, 39% of students expected they would eventually obtain an undergraduate degree from a 4-year college. This percentage has steadily increased

from 30% in 2006. Similarly, the percentage of students expected to earn a 2-year degree has also increased from 7% in 2006 to 14% in 2009, and the percentage of students expecting to just graduate from high school has steadily decreased from 12% in 2006 to 7% in 2009.

Interestingly, there has been quite some fluctuation in the percentage of students who expect to earn some sort of graduate degree. In 2006, 24% of students expected to earn a graduate degree. This increased to 27% and 31% in 2007 and 2008, respectively. However, in 2009 only 19% of students thought they would complete a graduate degree. This could be an indication that students are more aware (and therefore more realistic) about what is required to complete a graduate degree.

Parents are similarly optimistic as the students when it comes to their child’s expected highest level of education. Of those parents that responded to the survey, 14% believed their child would complete a 2-year degree, 36% a 4-year degree, and 25% some form of graduate school. Staff members were asked a similar, but slightly different question with respect to expected education levels. Staff members were asked what percentage of their students they believed would complete a certain education level. These percentages were then averaged across respondents for each education level. The results can be seen in Table 2.6. At Cabrillo, staff expectations for students’ educational attainment are much lower than those of the students and parents, as expressed in previous years. On average, staff members believe that almost one-third (29%) of students will not graduate from high school and that another third (33%) will have complete high school as their highest level of education completed. Again, on average, staff members believe that 15% of their students will obtain a 2-year degree and 12% a 4-year degree.

Table 2.6. Cabrillo Staff Survey Responses on Academic Attitudes and Behavior, LBUSD HS SLC Survey, 2009.

	Strongly Agree %	Agree %	Disagree %	Strongly Disagree %	Not Applicable %	Total <i>n</i>
A. I talk with my students about how to get into college.	47	48	5	0	0	77
B. I talk with my students about how to pay for college.	31	51	14	1	3	77
C. In your opinion, what percentage of your students will complete the following levels of education:	Mean % *					<i>n</i>
Less than high school	29					78
High school graduate	33					77
Some college	13					78
Attend a trade/technical school	8					78
Attend a community college (AA degree)	15					78
Attend a 4-year college (BA degree)	12					77
Attend graduate school	3					76

* Respondents provided an estimated percentage for each level of education; the “Mean %” is the average of the responses of all respondents. The sum of these averages does not equal 100% because not all staff provided percentages adding to 100%.

College Knowledge

Students were also asked to state to what degree they agreed with six statements that were intended to better understand students' college knowledge. These statements included feeling prepared to succeed in college, affording a 4-year college with financial assistance, and knowing: a) the difference between 2-year and 4-year colleges; b) the required standardized tests needed to apply to college; c) how AP courses help in college; and d) the A-G requirements. The results are summarized in Table 2.7. Parents were also asked these six statements framed as their perception of their children's college knowledge. Additionally, parents were asked whether the school provided them with college information for their children. The parent survey results are available in Table 2.8. In addition, two questions answered by staff regarding these topics are presented in Table 2.9.

Before discussing the survey results, it should be noted that during the focus group interviews, SLC and non-SLC students alike demonstrated awareness of college entrance requirements. Students in both groups reported being informed by their teachers or guest speakers of steps in the application process, including needing to complete the FAFSA, taking required courses, and obtaining passing grades. Students also reported that teachers discussed colleges and recommended certain ones. Moreover, the post-secondary benefits of belonging in an SLC were also mentioned. For example, two students reported that having a focused (theme-oriented) SLC is advantageous for getting a start on a college major while another commented that, "(i)f you're like strong in your small learning community, you might get a scholarship for that for college." Seniors also mentioned programs that cut across all SLCs, AVID and GEAR UP for example, as helping raise awareness about both college admissions and financial aid resources.

Table 2.7. Cabrillo Student Survey Responses on College Knowledge, LBUSD HS SLC Survey, 2009.

	Strongly Agree %	Agree %	Disagree %	Strongly Disagree %	Total <i>n</i>	Total Agree 07 %	Total Agree 08 %	Total Agree 09 %
A. Once I graduate, I will have taken the classes required to apply to college.	36	47	14	3	1,796	n/a	n/a	83
B. I think I can afford to attend a public, 4-year college using financial aid, scholarships, or my family's income.	21	46	26	7	1,790	76	78	67
C. I know the difference between a 2-year and 4-year college.	41	41	14	4	1,810	81	88	82
D. I know which standardized test(s) I need to take to apply for college.	25	39	30	6	1,797	69	74	64
E. I understand how taking AP courses will help me in college.	39	45	13	4	1,794	81	80	84
F. I know about the A-G requirements to get into a UC.	41	39	15	5	1,792	84	83	80

While the analysis from the focus groups gave the impression that students were very well aware of college entrance and preparation requirements, the student survey results provide details of where the strengths and weaknesses regarding student college knowledge lie. For example, a large majority of the students surveyed (82%) agreed that they know the difference between a 2-year and 4-year college. Although high, this is a slight drop from the previous year when 88% of students agreed with that statement. Parents' responses were fairly similar to students in that 80% agreed that their child knew the difference between a 2-year and 4-year college. There was also a slight drop in the percentage of students who said they know about the A-G requirements needed to get into a UC school. In 2009, 80% of students agreed with this statement, while in 2008 and 2007 this percentage was 83% and 84%. Parents and staff were more alike in their responses to a similar question. Amongst the parents, 77% of respondents agreed that their child knew about the A-G requirements and 90% of staff members agreed that their students were aware of the A-G requirements.

On the other hand, a slightly higher percentage of students indicated that they understood how taking AP courses will help them in college when comparing last years' response to this years' (80% in 2008 versus 84% in 2009). In 2009, 78% of parents also agreed with this statement.

Tables 2.8. Cabrillo Parent Survey Responses on College Knowledge, LBUSD HS SLC Survey, 2009.

	Strongly Agree %	Agree %	Disagree %	Strongly Disagree %	Don't Know %	Total <i>n</i>	Total Agree 09%
A. Once my child graduates, he/she will have taken the classes required to apply to college.	34	48	4	1	13	593	82
B. I think I can pay to send my child to a public, 4-year college with my income, financial aid, or scholarships.	16	41	15	10	18	594	57
C. My child knows the difference between a 2-year and a 4-year college.	36	44	7	2	11	599	80
D. My child knows which standardized test(s) they need to take to apply for college.	29	40	12	3	17	594	69
E. My child knows about the A-G requirements to get into a UC.	36	41	7	2	13	599	77
F. My child knows how taking Advanced Placement (AP) classes will help him/her in college.	37	41	8	3	11	601	78
G. The school informs parents about college.	17	47	19	8	9	595	64

Students were asked for the first time this year to what extent they agreed that once they graduate they will have taken the classes required to apply to college. Eighty-three percent of students agreed or strongly agreed with that statement. This closely mirrors the parents' response of 82% agreement to a comparable statement. However, when staff was asked to what extent they

agreed with the statement “By the time students graduate from this school, they will be prepared to succeed at the college or career of their choice,” only 44% agreed or strongly agreed. The majority, 56%, disagreed or strongly disagreed. This, again, illustrates the different expectations that staff members may have for their students when compared to the expectations that students have for themselves or parents have for their children.

When it came to financing post-secondary education and knowing which standardized tests were needed to apply for college, students and parents were not as confident. Approximately two-thirds (67%) of students agreed or strongly agreed with the statement, “I think I can afford to attend a public, 4-year college using financial aid, scholarships, or my family’s income.” Fifty-seven percent of parents agreed or strongly agreed with the corresponding statement. The students’ response, when compared to the previous years’ is clearly trending downward. This could be a reflection of the overall difficult economic times in 2008-2009.

Table 2.9. Cabrillo Staff Survey Responses on College Knowledge, LBUSD HS SLC Survey, 2009.

	Strongly Agree %	Agree %	Disagree %	Strongly Disagree %	Not Applicable %	Total <i>n</i>
A. Students are aware of the A-G requirements needed to get into a UC or CSU.	28	62	9	0	0	74
B. By the time students graduate from this school, they will be prepared to succeed at the college or career of their choice.	3	41	52	4	0	73

In response to a statement about knowing which standardized tests to take, 64% of students agreed to some extent. This is also down from previous years (69% in 2007, 74% in 2008). It is not immediately clear what might account for the 10% drop in agreement by students regarding knowledge about taking standardized tests. When parents are asked for their perspective, 69% agreed or strongly agreed that their child knew which standardized tests needed to be taken. Just under two-thirds (64%) of parents also agreed that the school informed them about college.

2. CULTURE AND CLIMATE

SLC Awareness and Student Involvement

As previously mentioned and illustrated on Table 2.1, 6% of Cabrillo HS staff reported in the survey not knowing their SLC assignment or indicated they were not part of one. The level of awareness of SLC assignment is relatively high among Cabrillo HS staff. In contrast, 15% of Cabrillo HS student survey participants report not knowing their assigned SLC and 15% report not being placed in one. Only 12% of the survey respondents (12th graders) were officially not assigned to SLCs. Thus, having a combined 30% of respondents not knowing their SLCs or claiming to not belong in one reflects a significant low SLC awareness among students. The previous year, when 11th and 12th graders did participate in SLCs, approximately 25% of students reported not knowing their assigned SLC and 36% reported not being placed in one. Parents’

SLC awareness closely resembles students' in that 16% of parents indicated that they did not know which SLC their child belonged and 15% indicated their child was not in an SLC.

There seems to be a lack of awareness on the student part concerning SLCs. Out of 10 SLC students who participated in the focus groups, at least three could not identify their SLCs, one student insisted that s/he was enrolled in two SLCs, two students in the same SLC did not know each other, and at least two students were able to name their SLC after some assistance from their peers. The student who insisted that s/he belonged in two SLCs might have been attributing his/her enrollment in two electives as evidence of his membership in the two SLCs. Non-SLC students, comprised of seniors at Cabrillo, seemed equally confused about SLCs and identified other academic programs on campus, University Scholars and AVID, as SLCs. Some non-SLC students reported belonging to SLCs and having been part of these academic programs "before they turned into SLCs." It appears that participation in other academic programs and special electives gives the impression to students that they belong to an SLC.

Despite this confusion regarding membership and SLCs, a significant majority of students seem to understand the underlying purpose behind SLCs. Most students even reported having read about SLCs at the end of 8th grade and submitting applications. Non-SLC students indicated that they would have appreciated having had access to the variety of SLCs offered at Cabrillo because they "are like really cool." Students who did know their SLC were able to describe their respective focus or theme. They reported that SLCs differ primarily due to their theme and the activities they offer. SLCs were described as a venue where students can explore different career options. One student indicated that s/he might switch SLCs because although s/he has an interest in one SLC's focus, s/he is also interested in pursuing a career in a different field. Another student described how s/he uses "small learning communities to like open doors, and to figure out what I wanna do with my future." For those who are fairly confident about the academic field they plan to pursue, SLCs provide a space where they can focus in that particular area. SLC students perceive SLCs as preparing them for both college and careers.

There were other comments shared regarding expected positive effects related to SLC implementation. For example, a teacher suggested that, "when you talk about a small learning community, the focus is to be for our students...I think it's to help them be successful and help them develop that feeling of being part of a family." However, students suggested that despite these expected outcomes, the extent of their SLC involvement is limited. Moreover, one non-SLC student suggested that while SLC implementation "helps with the SLC spirit, cause I've seen kids in SLC that are like juiced on their SLCs," it does not seem to strongly influence overall school climate.

Through focus groups and interviews, students, faculty, and staff at Cabrillo provided mixed reports regarding SLC development and implementation on their campus. Students and staff at Cabrillo presented varying understandings of the SLC selection and application process. School staff was knowledgeable of the annual School Choice process that took place in the district, which allowed parents and students to select their SLC preferences. However, some teachers indicated concern regarding equity and access to SLCs, classes, and resources that place certain students at an advantage over others. For example, one SLC teacher suggested that SLCs seem to be "almost turning into sort of like some tracking" while another commented that:

“since [students in my SLC] have less access to being in classes with students who are in AP classes and higher level math and science—I have seen a change, and it's negative. The students that they're in all their classes with are lower level, so that's definitely changed the culture of the students that are in my SLC.”

Thus, it seems that interview and focus group data yielded information that suggests that SLC structures need further development to offer students equitable access to courses and resources across SLCs.

On the student survey, five items were used to gauge students' involvement with their SLC. Students were asked to what extent they agreed that they a) help make decision at their school that affect them, b) help make suggestions about how to change their SLC, c) felt comfortable in their SLC community, d) liked to participate in their SLC activities, and e) wanted to work or get a college education in the same area of focus of their SLC. Parents were also asked to give their perspective on how comfortable their child was in his/her SLC community and if s/he liked participating in the SLC activities. There was one corresponding item on the staff survey that also provides some insight into student involvement in SLC development. Staff members were asked to what extent they agreed that students had opportunities to suggest modifications to SLCs. Detailed results for these survey items can be seen in Tables 2.10.

Table 2.10. Cabrillo Survey Responses on Student SLC Involvement, LBUSD HS SLC Survey, 2009.

Students	Strongly Agree %	Agree %	Disagree %	Strongly Disagree %	Total <i>n</i>	Total Agree 07 %	Total Agree 08 %	Total Agree 09 %
A. I help make decisions at this school that affect me.	14	46	30	9	1,802	n/a	n/a	60
B. I help make suggestions about how to change my SLC.	5	23	53	19	1,732	n/a	n/a	28
C. I feel comfortable in my SLC community.	19	50	21	10	1,720	64	74	69
D. I like to participate in my SLC activities.	13	41	34	12	1,714	53	65	54
E. After high school, I want to work or get a college education in the same area of focus as my SLC.	22	38	29	11	1,720	n/a	n/a	60
Parents	Strongly Agree %	Agree %	Disagree %	Strongly Disagree %	Don't Know %	Total <i>n</i>	Total Agree 09%	
A. My child feels comfortable in his/her SLC community.	18	47	7	3	26	581	65	
B. My child likes to participate in his/her SLC activities.	15	39	14	4	29	576	54	
Staff	Strongly Agree %	Agree %	Disagree %	Strongly Disagree %	Not Applicable %	Total <i>n</i>		
A. Students at this school have opportunities to suggest modifications to the SLCs.	4	13	52	21	9	75		

Survey results indicate that the majority of students at Cabrillo feel they have a say in decisions that affect them at their school level, but not so much when it comes to making suggestions for changes to their SLC. A total of 60% of students agreed or strongly agreed that they help make decisions at school that affect them, but only 28% agreed to some extent that they help make suggestions about how to change their SLC. This suggests that students are not yet very involved in the SLC development process. Staff members agreed with students that there may be limited opportunities for students to be involved in SLC development. When presented with the statement “Students at this school have opportunities to suggest modifications to the SLCs” only 17% of staff members agreed to some extent with that statement. In the focus group interviews, students reported not being actively involved in making decisions for their school. If they want to make a suggestion, they indicated that they could approach a counselor. To improve SLCs, SLC students indicated that they would benefit from additional electives, having more students involved in SLCs, and removing disruptive students from campus.

The majority of students agreed that they felt comfortable in their SLC community (69% agreed/strongly agreed) and that they liked to participate in their SLC activities (54% agreed/strongly agreed). While these percentages are down from the survey results in 2008, they increased when compared to the 2007 survey results. The majority of parents also agreed that their children were comfortable in their SLC community (65%) and that their child liked to participate in the SLC activities (54%). Student survey responses also seem to indicate there is strong interest by the students to continue in the field of focus of their SLC. Sixty percent of students were in some form of agreement that after high school they wanted to work or study in the same area of focus as their SLC.

Personalization

SLCs have a moderate amount of presence on the Cabrillo campus as evidenced by the comments and reflections provided by students, staff, and faculty. Cabrillo staff and faculty indicated that, “building school culture...is something that this school has had a hard time building, just because it being a new school.” Despite the challenge, school staff report that “we’re trying to set up things that now become kind of a tradition,” to increase the extent of personalization that students experience. Planned efforts include organizing awards ceremonies, SLC assemblies, and homecoming competitions. Additionally, customized student identification cards have already been created to help students become aware of the SLC to which they belong.

One important premise of implementing SLCs is that the smaller school communities provide opportunities for increased and higher quality interactions between the students and teachers, as well as between the students themselves. This idea, termed personalization, can provide students with academic and non-academic support. To ascertain the degree of student-teacher interactions, students were asked to respond to questions pertaining to the level of communication and quality of support they receive from their teachers. Parents were also asked similar questions in efforts to gather their perceptions of the type of personalization that is taking place at school. In some cases, teachers were asked questions aligned to the other surveys to investigate if their responses were consistent with those of students and parents. Students and parents were then also asked several questions about peer-to-peer interactions.

Student/Teacher Interaction

When asked if their teachers cared about how they did in school, a large majority of students agreed or strongly agreed with this statement (81%). This percentage has fluctuated slightly but not by much since 2007 (-3%). Similarly, 76% of students also agreed or strongly agreed that they feel supported by their teachers in their academic performance. There was also a slight drop in agreement (-4%) compared to the previous two years. The majority of parents also agreed or strongly agreed (77%) that teachers at Cabrillo care about how their child does in school. Detailed student responses can be found in Table 2.11 and parent responses in Table 2.12.

Table 2.11. Cabrillo Student Survey Responses on Student-Teacher Interaction, LBUSD HS SLC Survey, 2009.

	Strongly Agree %	Agree %	Disagree %	Strongly Disagree %	Total n	Total Agree 06 %	Total Agree 07 %	Total Agree 08 %	Total Agree 09 %
A. My teachers care about how I do in school.	27	54	13	5	1,704	n/a	85	86	81
B. I feel supported by my teachers in my academic performance in class.	19	57	19	5	1,776	n/a	80	80	76
C. My teachers' lessons are designed to encourage me to think critically.	19	60	17	4	1,789	n/a	81	83	79
D. Teachers use a variety of teaching approaches to help students with different learning styles.	27	56	13	4	1,789	79	76	78	83
E. Teachers sometimes change their lesson plans because of student suggestions.	11	45	34	10	1,778	55	54	55	56
F. Teachers do a good job of making sure students know how they can get help if they fall behind.	21	54	18	7	1,794	n/a	78	78	75
G. My teachers tutor me when I need help with my homework.	16	53	22	8	1,716	n/a	n/a	n/a	69
H. Teachers help me make plans for life after high school.	14	41	34	11	1,775	n/a	67	69	55

Personalization can also be reflected in teachers' lessons and instruction. Students were asked to rate their level of agreement in terms of the amount of instructional changes they perceived occurring in their classes. In general, majority of students agree that they are encouraged to think critically and that their teachers use various instructional approaches to meet the needs of different students. Specifically, when asked this year if their teachers' lessons are designed to encourage them to think critically, 79% agreed. This is very similar to previous years' responses (81% - 2007; 83% - 2008). Although there was a slight drop, nevertheless, a strong majority feels that teachers' lessons are designed to encourage them to think critically. This reflects what

teachers believe. Approximately 80% of them reported that lessons are designed to encourage students to think critically. Detailed staff responses can be seen in Table 2.13.

A strong majority of students also agreed that teachers use a variety of teaching approaches to help students with different learning styles (83%). This is up from the 78% of students who agreed with this statement in the 2008 survey. A similar percentage (84%) of teachers also agreed with this statement. Amongst the students there was not as strong agreement on whether or not teachers sometimes change their lesson plans because of student suggestions. Slightly more than half (56%) agreed or strongly agreed with this statement.

Table 2.12. Cabrillo Parent Survey Responses on Student-Teacher Interaction, LBUSD HS SLC Survey, 2009.

	Strongly Agree %	Agree %	Disagree %	Strongly Disagree %	Don't Know %	Total <i>n</i>	Total Agree 09%
A. Teachers do a good job of making sure students know how they can get help if they fall behind.	19	54	11	4	12	600	73
B. Teachers care about how my child does in school.	22	55	8	3	12	597	77
C. Teachers help my child make plans for life after high school.	17	46	16	5	17	598	63

Students were also asked if they felt supported by their teachers when it came to receiving academic assistance. In particular, students were asked if they agreed that teachers do a good job of making sure students know how they can get help if they fall behind, and if teachers offer tutoring when students need help with their homework. Three-fourths (75%) of students did agree or strongly agree that teachers do a good job of making sure students understand how to get help if they fall behind. Approximately three-fourths of parents (73%) also agree that teachers do a good job of making sure that students know how to get help if they fall behind. Teachers have a very similar perspective to the students and parents; 86% of staff members agreed with the same statement. When it comes to tutoring, 69% of students agree that teachers offer tutoring help for homework. A slightly higher percentage of teachers (79%) agreed that they offer tutoring for students who might need some additional academic support.

All groups surveyed – students, parents, and staff – were asked if teachers help students make plans for life after high school. There was some variation in responses. Just over half of the students surveyed (55%) agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. This is down in percentage from years' past. In 2007, 67% agreed while 69% agreed with that statement in 2008. Amongst the parent survey respondents 63% agreed that teachers help their child make plans for after high school. Staff members had the highest percentage of agreement (99%) when asked to what extent they agreed that they talk with their students about their plans after high school.

On several additional statements regarding student and staff interaction, staff members indicated fairly strong agreement with the following, that a) students receive regular guidance on course

selection (73% agreement), b) there is a climate of trust here among students, teachers, and administrators (60%), c) teachers have high expectations for students (78%), and d) students receive prompt feedback and regular progress reports with specific suggestions for improvement (80%).

Table 2.13. Cabrillo Staff Survey Responses on Student-Teacher Interaction, LBUSD HS SLC Survey, 2009.

	Strongly Agree %	Agree %	Disagree %	Strongly Disagree %	Not Applicable %	Total <i>n</i>
A. I talk with students about their plans after high school.	47	52	1	0	0	77
B. I tutor students who might need some additional academic support.	30	49	11	0	11	76
C. Teachers use a variety of teaching approaches to help students with different learning styles.	17	67	14	0	3	78
D. Lessons are designed and conducted to encourage students to think critically.	14	66	16	1	3	76
E. Teachers do a good job of making sure students know how they can get help if they fall behind.	16	70	9	1	4	77
F. Students receive regular guidance on course selection.	7	66	18	4	5	73
G. There is a climate of trust here among students, teachers, and administrators.	7	53	29	9	1	75
H. Teachers have high expectations for students.	14	64	21	1	0	72
I. Students receive prompt feedback and regular progress reports with specific suggestions for improvement.	9	71	18	0	1	76

From teachers’ perspectives, student-teacher relationships within SLCs have improved to the extent that they are more familiar with each other. For example, one teacher commented that, “the ones that I’ve had for three years I know very well...you’re going to have more of a connection with them...You’re going to get to know their quirks and know everything about them.” SLC students independently corroborated this observation as one student suggested that, “I know all my teachers good. If I didn’t know my teacher—I would pretty much hate my class.” Students, however, could not comment on whether they are any closer to their SLC teachers than those outside their SLC. One SLC student commented that “a few of my teachers I know that are actually (in my) SLC” while another commented that “I don’t have a class that’s in my SLC.” Furthermore, SLC students seem to have a similar type of relationship with teachers as non-SLC students.

Student-to-Student Interaction

Information about the quality of relationships amongst students was also obtained to gain a better understanding of the culture and climate in which students are operating. Specifically, questions pertaining to peer relations and level of support for academic-related issues were asked to both students and parents. Findings from the survey on student-to-student interaction can be found in Table 2.14.

With regard to peer relations, students were asked how much they agreed that in their SLC students treat each other with respect, and if they felt closer to their SLC peers than to peers in other SLCs. Almost two-thirds (63%) of students agreed that in their SLC students treated each other with respect. When parents were asked a similar question, just over half (54%) agreed, however approximately one-third (33%) indicated that they did not know whether or not students in their child's SLC treated each other with respect. While students in SLCs may respect one another, in general, at Cabrillo, students do not feel closer to their SLC peers when compared to their non-SLC peers. In 2009, only 28% of students agreed that they felt closer to the SLC peers. This is the same percent who agree in 2007. In 2008 there was considerably higher agreement (41%). It is not clear what may have contributed to this change.

In terms of student relations, they seem to be stronger within the classroom because SLCs encourage peers to "work together as a team." Class student relations are furtherer strengthen given that students follow each other to different classes. This could also be a disadvantage as some students commented that they get tired of seeing the same peers and would actually like to meet new people. Outside of the classroom, SLC students do not seem to be any closer to their SLC peers than students in other communities. This is the same impression that non-SLC students have of SLC peer-to-peer relations. Non-SLC students, however, seemed to be fairly familiar with peers in their own academic programs, like University Scholars. This could be due to the fact that these students are seniors and have had more time to bond with each other.

Table 2.14. Cabrillo Survey Responses on Student-Student Interaction, LBUSD HS SLC Survey, 2009.

Students	Strongly Agree %	Agree %	Disagree %	Strongly Disagree %	Total <i>n</i>	Total Agree 07 %	Total Agree 08 %	Total Agree 09 %
A. My peers care about how I do in school.	19	51	21	8	1,759	69	73	70
B. My peers encourage me to value my education.	23	52	19	6	1,752	72	77	75
C. In my SLC, students treat each other with respect.	12	51	26	12	1,693	n/a	n/a	63
D. I feel closer to my SLC peers than to peers not in my SLC.	6	22	49	23	1,691	28	41	28
Parents	Strongly Agree %	Agree %	Disagree %	Strongly Disagree %	Don't Know %	Total <i>n</i>	Total Agree 09%	
A. Students in my child's SLC treat each other with respect.	13	41	9	4	33	582	54	

With regard to academics, students were asked to what extent they agreed that their peers cared about how they do in school, and also that their peers encourage them to value their education.

About 70% of students agreed that their peers care about how they do in school, and about 75% agreed that their peers encourage them to value their education. For both of these statements, the response is very similar to that of past survey results. For many of the Cabrillo student responses, the percentage of agreement rose slightly from 2007 to 2008, but then decreased minimally when compared to responses from 2009.

3. BUILDING LEADERSHIP CAPACITY

SLC Development and Implementation

To look at the role of leadership in putting into operation SLCs, staff was asked questions in surveys, interviews, and a focus group regarding SLC development and implementation. Sharing of information regarding available resources, clinics on building leadership skills, and discussions on SLC development and implementation take place at monthly SLC coordinators' meetings and quarterly lead teacher workshops.

On the survey, staff members were asked to rate the extent of their agreement or disagreement with a series of statements pertaining to SLC implementation at their school. Detailed results can be seen in Table 2.15. In general, at Cabrillo, staff agreed that they 1) understood the purpose and goals for SLCs at their school (74%), and 2) understood the vision and goals for their particular SLC (70%). Similarly, during the focus groups/interviews, administrators and teachers at Cabrillo seem to demonstrate a clear understanding of the purpose and role that SLCs should play with respect to student achievement and school climate. For example, a teacher reported that, "I think we understand that there could be value in the SLC. The more student contact...the more involvement...the more it makes a difference."

However, when asked to describe the state of SLCs on this campus, another teacher commented, "Still in it's beginning—developmental stage...I think there's a whole spectrum where some of the newer ones are still developing they're program—trying to find a way that works." Survey results also confirm that there is clearly some continued discomfort with how SLCs are being developed at the school, for staff members' individual SLCs as well as SLCs in general. When asked if they are comfortable with how their school has developed SLCs, approximately 69% of staff at Cabrillo disagreed with that statement. Staff indicated that they are more comfortable with how their individual SLCs are developing, however, slightly more than half (52%) still disagreed. Staff members are split almost in half when it comes to understanding their role in their SLC – 54% agree with that statement, while 46% disagree.

Cabrillo administrators and teachers monitor progress with the use of an action plan, which also assists in re-evaluating each year. Existing academic programs that evolved into SLCs or continued as SSPs are running more smoothly than SLCs in general. SLC teachers mentioned that SSPs are at an advantage as they recruit students early and draw students with higher test scores. According to three teachers, as a result, they find students with lower test scores being assigned to their SLCs. Frustrations with SLC development and implementation can also be seen when looking at to what extent staff members agree that SLCs can help raise student achievement. This year only 54% of staff members at Cabrillo agreed with that sentiment, compared to 65% from one year ago.

Results of the staff survey also indicate there is also some disagreement with the statement that the school provides time on a regular basis for SLC teams to meet (57% disagreed or strongly disagreed). This sentiment is also reflected in staff responses to the open-ended survey question regarding the biggest challenge to the implementation of SLCs. One of the most frequent responses was the need for more time. Clearly there is also some frustration with navigating through various administrative procedures. About half of staff who responded to the survey reported that they disagreed with the two statements regarding negotiating administrative procedures at both the district (57% in disagreement) and school (45% in disagreement) level.

Staff members were also asked to gauge to what extent they agreed or disagreed about their peers' understanding regarding the purpose and goals for SLCs at Cabrillo. Overall, a slim majority of staff (57%) agreed that the faculty and staff understood the purpose and goals of SLCs at the school. A greater percentage (69%) agreed that the faculty and staff at the school have opportunities to suggest modifications to the SLCs.

As the survey and focus group/interview results indicate, conceptually, teachers do buy-in to the SLC structure and philosophy. In practice, however, there are many challenges. Many changes took place in 2008-09. First, there was a move at the school and district-wide levels to make SLCs more career pathways related and to make their themes more practical career-wise. Although most teachers initially selected their SLCs, there was "rebalancing" done to "make sure all disciplines were represented" and, as a result, teachers were reassigned to different SLCs. To provide historical context, teacher buy-in was negatively affected after the first year of SLC implementation when electives were cancelled, summer trainings dwindled away, and funding became more restrictive. SLC teachers reported challenges with the implementation of SLCs as "many of our teachers don't have any experience being in a private, smaller community and so it's like, what is this? How do we do it? How do we make it grow?" Teachers do have posted on their windows the SLCs to which they belong. One teacher reported that out of 25 teachers in her/his SLC, "about 10 to 12 are really committed to it, and show up at meetings, and are very proactive about doing things and trying new things." This teacher also reported that her/his SLC has a high turn-over rate. One teacher admitted that s/he is "burnt out by the schedule" and does not have time to think about SLCs. Another SLC teacher also reported that although s/he is in one SLC, s/he attends the meetings of another SLC. It is unclear why this happens. There is a lack of awareness on, but an interest in knowing, how the grant funds can be spent. Administration mentioned being aware of all these challenges affecting teacher buy-in and working on plans to address them. Thus, administrators are aware of the challenges teachers and students face in developing SLCs at Cabrillo.

Table 2.15. Cabrillo Staff Survey Responses on SLC Development and Implementation, LBUSD HS SLC Survey, 2009.

	Strongly Agree %	Agree %	Disagree %	Strongly Disagree %	Not Applicable %	Total <i>n</i>
A. I understand the purpose and goals for small learning communities at this school.	20	54	15	10	0	79
B. I understand the vision and goals for my particular SLC.	14	56	21	9	0	77
C. I am comfortable with how my school has developed small learning communities.	1	29	44	25	1	77
D. I am comfortable with how my SLC is being developed.	8	39	34	18	1	77
E. I understand what my role is in my SLC.	13	41	32	14	0	76
F. The school provides time on a regular basis for SLC teams to meet to share information, discuss students' academic progress, curriculum needs, etc.	8	35	44	13	0	77
G. I am able to navigate through the district's administrative procedures with regards to matters pertaining to SLCs.	0	28	46	11	15	74
H. I am able to navigate through the school's administrative procedures with regards to matters pertaining to SLCs.	0	45	33	12	9	75
I. I believe that small learning communities will help this school raise student achievement.	13	41	31	15	0	75
J. The faculty and staff understand the purpose and goals for SLCs at this school.	6	51	30	13	0	77
K. The faculty and staff at this school have opportunities to suggest modifications to the SLCs.	8	61	21	9	1	77

Another means of encouraging the development of leadership via the implementing SLCs is to also increase the level of teacher collaboration. Teacher-to-teacher interactions were assessed through two items on the staff survey. Results are shown in Table 2.16 below. Staff members were asked if 1) they talked with other teachers about students who are struggling academically, and 2) if the administration, teachers and staff at the school worked together to assist students who may be at risk of failing. An overwhelming majority (95%) of staff members indicated that they do, indeed, talk with other teachers about students who are struggling academically. Although not quite as high, a strong majority (81%) also agreed that staff members worked collaboratively to assist students at risk of failing.

Table 2.16. Cabrillo Staff Survey Responses on Teacher-Teacher Interaction, LBUSD HS SLC Survey, 2009.

	Strongly Agree %	Agree %	Disagree %	Strongly Disagree %	Not Applicable %	Total <i>n</i>
A. I talk with other teachers about students who might be struggling academically.	29	66	4	1	0	77
B. The administration, teachers, and staff at this school work together to assist students who may be at risk of failing.	8	73	14	5	0	74

Parent/Community Collaboration

Also of interest when building leadership capacity at the school is the involvement of parents and community collaborators. In order to gauge these relationships, two questions were asked on the staff survey. One asked staff members to indicate to what extent they agreed or disagreed that they have regular contact with parents, and the second asked them to do the same regarding a statement about the school's support of the involvement of families and community members in planning, reviewing, and improving school programs. Parents were also asked about various parent/teacher – parent/school relationships. These survey results can be seen in Table 2.17.

Table 2.17. Cabrillo Survey Responses on Parent/Community Collaboration, LBUSD HS SLC Survey, 2009.

Staff	Strongly Agree %	Agree %	Disagree %	Strongly Disagree %	Not Applicable %	Total <i>n</i>
A. I have regular contact with parents to inform them of their child's progress.	22	61	18	0	0	74
B. The school supports the involvement of families and community members in planning, reviewing, and improving school programs.	13	69	16	1	0	75

Parents	Strongly Agree %	Agree %	Disagree %	Strongly Disagree %	Don't Know %	Total <i>n</i>	Total Agree 09%
A. Parents can share their thoughts about decisions that affect their children at their school.	21	54	8	4	14	597	75
B. The school uses a variety of ways to communicate with parents.	25	54	11	3	8	595	79
C. My child's SLC teacher(s) inform me about my child's academic progress.	13	39	22	10	16	582	52
D. My child's SLC teacher(s) inform me about SLC activities	10	31	28	11	20	580	41

The majority of staff members (83%) agreed or strongly agreed that they have regular contact with parents to inform them about their child's progress. A very similar percentage (82%) also agreed that the school is supportive of the involvement of families and community members. Along the same train of thought, parents were in agreement that they are able to share their thoughts about decisions that affect their children at Cabrillo (75% agreement). A majority (79%) of parents also agreed that the school used a variety of ways to communicate with the them. When asked specifically about interactions with the teacher(s), half (52%) of parents agreed that their child's SLC teacher(s) does inform them about their child's academic progress, but only 41% agreed that they are informed about SLC activities.

As for parental involvement and community partners, SLC teachers do report some progress. Teachers from various SLCs indicated that they communicate with parents regarding low student grades primarily via the telephone and e-mail. However, one on-campus activity, Back-to-School Night, did result in improvements across SLCs perhaps due to a friendly SLC competition. Also, school staff and faculty reported that they have been able to establish and maintain collaborative relationships with community organizations. The school's relationship with the Long Beach City College's Alternative Fuel Program was cited as an example of how students were being provided with opportunities to apply their classroom knowledge. There is also some communication with the Long Beach Port. An administrator mentioned that there are discussions to implement a guest speaker series but lack of class purity has prohibited the movement from going forward.

Challenges & Proposed Solutions

In spite of the positive experiences that were reported at Cabrillo, some challenges remain regarding SLC implementation. School staff and faculty listed lack of time, teacher buy-in, "pure" classes, funding for SLC activities, and clear procedures along with scheduling difficulties as obstacles they have experienced in the past academic year. For example, some teachers reported that:

the new bell schedule did not allow for us to collaborate within our different disciplines, or—you know—within the SLCs...[but] our biggest issue is that our kids' main focus is fulfilling the basic requirements enough to graduate, before we can really get them excited about having an elective. As much as they would want to take it, we need them to focus on passing English the first time, passing the math.

Another teacher added, "The fact that we don't even have pure classes—it's really hard—we don't even know what to do." Another teacher summarized it concisely by stating that:

Without the common conference period – without the master schedule accommodating the common conference periods for grade-level teams – you're not going to find time in the day, nor after school, nor any time else to be able to really have those dialogues that we need for collaboration without pulling out and affecting students' performance.

Proposed solutions include: 1) converting the Cabrillo master schedule to that of a four by four, block schedule so that teachers have common planning periods, 2) switching to an SLC-centered administrative infrastructure (rather than using the department-centered infrastructure that is

currently in place), and 3) finding ways to help teachers and administrators step out of their comfort zones and be more flexible about how decisions are made.

D. Summary/Conclusions

As the fourth year of implementation wraps up, SLCs at Cabrillo High School continue to show slow, but steady progress. At the end of the 2008-09 there are six established SLCs. The level of awareness of SLC assignment is relatively high among Cabrillo HS staff. However, students continue to struggle with SLC awareness, although awareness has increased amongst the students from previous years. Despite the confusion regarding SLC membership, a significant majority of students reported having read about SLCs and signed up for them towards the end of their 8th grade. Parents' awareness regarding SLCs closely mirrors that of the students. Findings indicate that there is little student involvement in SLC development.

Compared to previous years, a higher percentage of students at Cabrillo do report engaging in academic conversations, including talking with their counselor about their class schedule and talking with their teachers and peers about academic work. Both SLC and non-SLC students feel that the influence of SLCs is primarily on engaging students by focusing on their academic interests and raising career awareness of SLC-related fields. Expectations remain high for both students and parents regarding educational attainment, which is not necessarily reflected in staff members' expectations for student achievement. Knowledge regarding college preparation remains about the same as previous years. One area that students continue to struggle with is awareness regarding standardized tests needed for college admission. SLC students see SLCs as preparing them for both college and careers. Evaluation results do show that students and parents both perceive strong academic support by the staff at Cabrillo.

Cabrillo staff and faculty acknowledged that building school culture has been difficult. From teachers' perspectives, student-teacher relationships within SLCs have improved to the extent that they are more familiar with each other. Students, however, could not comment on whether they are any closer to their SLC teachers than those outside their SLC. While students in SLCs may respect one another, in general, at Cabrillo, students do not feel closer to their SLC peers when compared to their non-SLC peers, particularly outside of the classroom.

Administrators and teachers at Cabrillo seem to demonstrate a clear understanding of the purpose and role that SLCs should play with respect to student achievement and school climate. However, there is some frustration with how SLCs are being developed and implemented. Much of this frustration appears to stem from unanticipated changes at the school and district level. As for parental involvement and community partners, SLC teachers do report some progress. Students, parents and staff report many positive experiences at Cabrillo, however, some challenges remain regarding SLC implementation.

III. JORDAN HIGH SCHOOL

A. Previous Years' Evaluation Summary

Jordan HS started the grant in 2005-06 with the advantage of having some established SLCs and, as a result, with a small percentage of the student body already enrolled in one. Jordan HS staff spent the first year of implementation of this SLC Initiative, 2005-06, planning how to structure other SLCs at their campus. During this time, to expand their knowledge about SLCs and hone leadership skills, Jordan HS staff participated in professional development workshops provided by the Northwest Regional Lab and the LBUSD High School Office. Staff also participated in a logic model session moderated by SRM Evaluation Group evaluators. Jordan High's logic model draft was finalized by Summer 2006. Although 2005-06 was primarily a planning year, it was also a year to build momentum and increase teacher buy-in. Staff looked forward to the implementation of SLCs and worked diligently in preparation for the 2006-07 academic year. At the moment, Jordan HS has five SLCs and three SSPs.

In 2006-07, although improving, student survey results indicated that awareness of SLCs and their identities needed further development. Staff understood the purpose and vision behind implementing SLCs and strongly believed that SLCs would help raise student academic achievement. However, there was not as strong agreement on whether SLCs would help improve the systems and processes at their school. The most rewarding aspect seemed to be an increase in collaboration and improved relations for both teachers and students. The biggest challenge was providing time for staff to share ideas and instructional strategies, and opportunities for collaboration. Teachers reported success in outreaching to parents of struggling students. Students reported that SLC teachers cared deeply about their academic and personal well-being. In the third year, 2007-08, there was no change in terms of what staff found rewarding and challenging in relation to SLCs. When compared to the previous year, there was also very little change in students' college knowledge and academic behavior. Students once again reported feeling comfortable in their SLCs and enjoying SLC activities. In 2007-08, however, a little more than a third of teachers could not identify their SLCs, non-SLC students could not describe the purpose of or the enrollment process for SLCs, and SLC students reported wanting more SLC activities.

B. SLC Program Description

In the fourth year of implementation (2008-09), Jordan HS has five SLCs, and three SSPs. These are:

1. Business and Entertainment School of Travel, Trade and Tourism (BESTT)
2. Excellence Through the Arts (ETA)
3. Jordan Media and Communication Learning Community (JMAC)
4. Panther International
5. Jordan HS Freshman Academy (JFA) (*all 9th grade*)

Specialized Secondary Programs

1. Architecture, Construction, Engineering (ACE)

2. Aspiration in Medical Services (AIMS)
3. International Baccalaureate (IB)

One SSP, ACE, started as an SLC, but due to overwhelming community support converted to an SSP. For the purposes of this analysis, SSPs will be treated like SLCs unless otherwise noted. Some confusion exists regarding the SLC status of Jordan HS Freshman Academy (JFA); some staff consider JFA an SLC while others do not. It is difficult to analyze JFA as an SLC given that SLCs exist within it. Therefore, JFA will not be treated as an SLC unless otherwise noted. For a detailed description of each SLC, please refer to Appendix A. Each SLC leadership team continues to work on action plans, as does the SLC coordinator with a school-wide version. These outcome action plans are reviewed periodically. Some of these charts were modified in 2008-09 to adhere to a district initiative that calls for a stronger alignment between SLC themes and academic and career pathways. As a result, there has been some internal restructuring within SLCs. One SLC modified its theme and renamed itself from Panther Academy to Panther International. All but approximately 750 to 800 students were enrolled in an SLC at Jordan in 2008-09. Special education students and English language learners do not belong to SLCs. Jordan HS administration will seek to have all students touched by an SLC by next year. At the time data was collected for this report, it was unclear as to whether that meant that every student and staff would be assigned to an SLC in the 2009-2010 academic year.

Survey and Focus Group Participants - Jordan

As first described in the Introduction, a total of 1,275 Jordan students (31% of the total student population) responded to the survey, 73 staff members (37% of the total school staff), and 437 parents. In this section, further demographic details are described specifically as related to individual SLCs at Jordan.

Of the students who responded to the survey, approximately 52% indicated membership in an SLC. The remaining 48% indicated that they either a) did not belong to an SLC, or b) did not know which SLC to which they were assigned. Each SLC is represented by the students, parents and staff who responded to this survey. The distribution of responses can be seen in Table 3.1, below.

Table 3.1. Percentage Distribution of Jordan Survey Respondents by SLC, LBUSD HS SLC Survey, Student, Staff, and Parent Respondents, 2009.

	Student %	Staff %	Parent %
Architecture, Construction, & Engineering (ACE)	8	17	3
Aspirations in Medical Services (AIMS)	8	5	11
Business & Entertainment School of Travel, Trade, & Tourism (BESTT)	6	12	4
Excellence Through the Arts (ETA)	6	11	3
International Baccalaureate (IB)	14	11	28
Jordan's Media & Communications Learning Community (JMAC)	6	6	4
Panther International	4	2	5
Multiple	n/a	2	n/a
I'm not in a SLC.	41	35	34
I don't know which SLC I am in.	7	2	8
Total	100	100	100
N	1,147	66	416

Overall, 47% of student survey respondents from Jordan were male. The gender distribution for each SLC can be seen in Table 3.2. Amongst the survey respondents, two of the SLCs closely mirror that of the overall gender distribution (BESTT & ETA), where the distribution is close to even, with a slightly higher percentage of female students representing the SLC. For two of the SLCs (ACE and JMAC), approximately two-thirds of the survey respondents were male and for one (AIMS), the respondents were overwhelmingly female. For the remaining SLC and SPP, the survey respondents were predominately female.

Table 3.2. Percentage Distribution of Gender by Jordan SLC, LBUSD HS SLC Survey, Student Respondents, 2009

	Female %	Male %	Total N
Architecture, Construction, & Engineering (ACE)	31	69	88
Aspirations in Medical Services (AIMS)	81	19	95
Business & Entertainment School of Travel, Trade, & Tourism (BESTT)	55	45	65
Excellence Through the Arts (ETA)	55	45	65
International Baccalaureate (IB)	64	36	156
Jordan's Media & Communications Learning Community (JMAC)	37	63	62
Panther International	66	34	47
I'm not in a SLC.	48	52	448
I don't know which SLC I am in.	56	44	72
Total	53	47	1,098

While Table B9 in Appendix B provided a detailed description of the students' self-identified ethnic distribution for the overall student survey respondents, Table 3.3 shows the percentage distribution of ethnic group by SLC for Jordan. Across SLCs, Hispanics/Latinos do comprise the majority in all of the SLCs and SSPs. For ACE, AIMS, and ETA this percentage is close to 75%. For BESTT, IB, JMAC, and Panther it is closer to 50%. For all of the SLCs, African Americans are the second largest ethnic group represented. This is particularly true for BESTT, where almost 30% of their student survey respondents identified themselves as African American. Of those who did not know their SLC or were not in why, the Hispanic/Latino category comprises the largest group.

Table 3.3. Percentage Distribution of Ethnic Group* by Jordan SLC, LBUSD HS SLC Survey, Student Respondents, 2009

	African American %	Asian %	Hispanic/Latino %	Other** %	Total %
Architecture, Construction, & Engineering Aspirations in Medical Services (AIMS)	18	2	73	6	99
Business & Entertainment School of Travel, Trade, & Tourism (BESTT)	11	8	79	2	100
Excellence Through the Arts (ETA)	29	5	56	11	101
International Baccalaureate (IB)	13	2	71	15	101
Jordan's Media & Communications Learning Community (JMAC)	15	14	57	14	100
Panther International	21	5	54	21	101
I'm not in a SLC.	23	2	51	23	99
I don't know which SLC I am in.	18	4	63	16	101
	0	7	76	17	100
Total %	16	6	64	14	100
N	178	61	697	151	1,087

* Breakdown by Ethnic Group is only provided when a minimum of 5% of respondents chose a particular Ethnic Group.

** Other in this case includes: American Indian, Filipino, Pacific Islander, White, Biracial/Multiracial, and Other - unspecified. In total, Other here represents 13% of the respondents for Jordan HS.

A total of four student focus groups, two SLC and two non-SLC, with the participation of 21 students were conducted at Jordan. One SLC and one non-SLC focus group took place at the Jordan Freshman Academy (JFA) campus, as did a similar number at the main campus. These focus groups were comprised of ten 9th graders, two 10th graders, four 11th graders, and seven seniors. A number of students did not know to which SLC they belonged. Of the eleven students who did know, three belonged to Panther and two each represented ETA and IB. ACE, JMAC, AIMS, and BESTT were represented by one student each.

The two principals and the SLC coordinator participated in separate interviews. A total of four teacher focus groups, two SLC and two non-SLC, with the participation of 21 teachers were conducted at Jordan. One SLC and one non-SLC focus group took place at the JFA campus, as did a similar number at the main campus. There were some limitations to demographic data collection during the focus groups given that some teachers arrived late after the data had already been collected at the beginning. Some teacher participants reported teaching multiple grades and subjects. All grade levels and the following subjects were represented by teachers: art, English, history/social studies, mathematics, and Other (including business, hospitality, counseling, coordinator, ROTC, special education). Three staff members represented IB and two belonged to JMAC. ACE, ETA, Panther, AIMS and BESTT were each represented by one teacher.

C. Evaluation Results 2008-09

1. ATTITUDES AND BELIEFS TOWARD ACHIEVEMENT

Academic Behavior and Expectations

In an effort to understand student academic behavior, students were asked about their experiences in gathering resources or seeking assistance with college information, academic planning, and schoolwork. In particular, students were asked about discussing class schedules with counselors, engaging in conversations with their teachers, about their academic work,

getting into college and paying for college and engaging in conversations with peers about their academic work and plans after high school. Students were also asked about their expectations for their academic future, specifically whether they desired to attend college immediately after completing high school and their expected highest level of education. Student survey results for these questions can be found in Table 3.4. To more accurately capture student academic behavior, parents were asked the same questions framed as their perception of their children's experiences. Table 3.5 presents parent survey results for these questions. Because a few of these questions coincided with the staff survey, results were included in the analysis and made available in Table 3.6. Whenever possible, this year's findings were compared to baseline data collected three years ago. A complete comparison is not possible given that the student survey was modified and condensed after the first year of implementation at the request of school district staff. If no baseline data was available, a comparison was made with last year's findings.

At Jordan HS, SLC focus group participants in all grades indicated that counselors visit classrooms to advise students on their course selection and missing credits. As an example, an SLC 9th grader indicated that his SLC counselor visited his classroom and shared student transcripts from 6th grade to 9th grade. The counselor distributed a handout with the classes students should take in the 10th grade and also mentioned "a couple things about college." Student survey responses also indicate that the vast majority of students are having conversations with their counselor about their academic schedule, at least once a year. About 35% of the students indicated they talked with their counselor between 1-3 times a year. For approximately 40% of the students these conversations were more frequent – at least once a month. However, about one quarter (25%) of students do indicate that they never talk to their counselor about their schedule. Compared to the response for this same question from last year there has been no change. However, this percentage decreased from about one-third of students who reported 'never' in 2007. When parents were asked a similar question, 21% of parents indicated 'never.' This is more than double the percentage of parents who indicated never in the 2008 survey.

When students were asked how often they spoke to their teachers about their academic work, over half (54%) responded that these conversations were occurring at least every other week. Approximately 71% of students said they talked to their teachers about their academic work at least once a month. A small percentage of students (15%) did say that they never talk with their teachers about their academic work. When compared to responses to the same question in the previous two years, this percentage of students who never talked has decreased only 1% since 2007. Students at Jordan show a similar trend when asked how often they talked to their peers about their academic work. In Spring 2009 there is a slightly larger percentage (19%) of students who indicated never having conversations about their academic work with their peers, when compared to those who indicated never having these conversations with their teachers. Again, this percentage has only decreased by 1% from last year. Parents were also asked how often they believed their children spoke to someone at school about their academic work. A small percentage (10%) believe that their child never talked with someone at school about academics, while approximately 62% of parents believe this happened at least monthly.

Table 3.4. Jordan Student Survey Responses on Academic Attitudes and Behavior, including comparisons to previous years for the response category “Never,” LBUSD HS SLC Survey, 2009.

	Always %	Once a week %	Every other week %	Once a month %	2-3 times a year %	Once a year %	Never %	Total <i>n</i>	Total Never 06%	Total Never 07 %	Total Never 08 %	Total Never 09 %
A. I talk to my counselor about my class schedule.	12	5	7	16	20	15	25	1,203	n/a	36	25	25
B. I talk to my teachers about my academic work.	22	15	17	17	8	5	15	1,231	n/a	16	16	15
C. I talk to my peers about my academic work.	27	16	15	11	6	5	19	1,220	n/a	20	20	19
D. I talk to someone at school about how to get into college.	15	10	12	15	16	10	22	1,253	23	22	23	22
E. I talk to someone at school about how to pay for college.	9	7	9	14	12	11	38	1,243	37	41	38	38
F. I talk to my peers about my plans after high school.	39	13	13	11	8	5	11	1,227	n/a	n/a	n/a	11
	Strongly Agree %	Agree %	Disagree %	Strongly Disagree %				Total <i>n</i>	Total Agree 07 %	Total Agree 08 %	Total Agree 09 %	
G. Immediately after high school, I want to go to college.	48	34	14	5				1,237	83	85	82	
H. What is the highest level of education you think you will complete?	less than high school %	high school graduate %	some college %	Technical/ Trade college %	AA degree (2- year) %	BA/BS degree (4- year) %	Graduate- level degree %	Total <i>n</i>				
2009	2	9	14	4	15	38	17	1,041				
2008	2	5	11	3	14	36	29	1,132				
2007	2	8	15	3	10	37	25	791				
2006	2	12	19	7	8	30	22	1,087				

On the survey, students were also asked to specify how often they spoke to someone at school about how to get into college and how to pay for college. With regard to conversations about how to get into college, close to one fourth of the students indicated they spoke with someone at

school between 1-3 times a year. About half of the students at Jordan spoke to someone at least once a month, if not more frequently. This means that about 22% of students indicated that they never talked with someone at school about how to get into college. This trend has held very steady since 2006. According to the parents surveyed from Jordan, almost half (46%) also believed that their child spoke to someone at school about how to get into college at least once a month. Fourteen percent thought their child had never spoken to someone at school about getting into college, however 17% did not know whether or not their child had. Interestingly, 93% of staff members surveyed agreed or strongly agreed that they spoke with their students about how to get into college. Teachers may be including in their definition of conversations their class lessons. This may be a reason for which student focus group participants reported that SLC teachers do talk about college. As an example, a 9th grader described an exercise in which an English teacher required students to write about “what college you want to go to, what do you want to get into, and like what do you want to learn when you’re over there in college, would you like to do sports, would you contribute to it, and um, we turned them in.”

Similar to years past, the conversations about how to get into college are happening more frequently than are the conversations about how to pay for college. A little over one-third of students (38%) report they have never spoken to someone at school about how to pay for college. This trend in student responses has also held very steady since 2006, varying slightly between 37-41% over the years. In 2009, a smaller percentage of parents (21%), when compared to students, indicated that they believed that their child has never spoken to someone at school about how to pay for college. However, another 20% also indicated that they did not know whether or not their child spoke to someone at school about financing a college education. This year, 80% of staff members indicated that they have spoken with their students about how to pay for college.

When it comes to talking with their peers about their plans after high school, the largest percentage of students (39%) indicated that this happens ‘always.’ About the same number of students (37% of survey respondents) indicated that they talk with their peers about their plans after high school between once a week to once a month. A small percentage (11%) said they never spoke to peers about plans after high school.

An important precursor to whether a student achieves post-secondary academic success is their expectations for post-secondary plans. Therefore, students were also asked whether they desired to attend college immediately after completing high school and what was their expected highest level of education. At the end of the 2009 school year, 82% of the students who responded to the survey indicated that they agreed or strongly agreed that immediately after high school they wanted to go to college. This percentage dropped slightly from the previous two years (down 1% and 3% from 2008 and 2007, respectively). The parents’ response to a comparable question was very similar to that of their children. Eighty six percent of parents agreed or strongly agreed that immediately after high school their child wanted to attend college. This is up 4% from parents’ response to the same question in 2008.

Table 3.5. Jordan Parent Survey Responses on Academic Attitudes and Behavior, LBUSD HS SLC Survey, 2009.

	Always %	Once a week %	Every other week %	Once a month %	2-3 times a year %	Once a year %	Never %	Don't Know %	Total <i>n</i>	Total Never 08 %	Total Never 09 %
A. My child talks to the counselor about his/her class schedule.	9	6	6	14	15	15	21	15	428	10	21
B. My child talks to someone at school about his/her academic work.	23	15	11	13	9	5	10	14	429	n/a	10
C. My child talks to someone at school about how to get into college.	15	11	8	12	14	9	14	17	428	15	14
D. My child talks to someone at school about how to pay for college.	11	8	9	10	11	10	21	20	426	23	21
	Strongly Agree %	Agree %	Disagree %	Strongly Disagree %	Don't Know %	Total <i>n</i>	Total Agree 08 %	Total Agree 09 %			
D. My child wants to go to college right after graduating from high school.	52	34	6	1	7	429	82	86			
E. What is the highest level of education you think your child will complete?	less than high school %	high school graduate %	some college %	Technical/ Trade/ college %	AA degree (2-year) %	BA/BS degree (4-year) %	Graduate -level degree %	Total <i>n</i>			
2009	2	7	7	6	13	41	25	396			
2008	1	9	13	3	12	38	25	350			

Parents are similarly optimistic as the students when it comes to their child's expected highest level of education. Of those parents that responded to the survey, 13% believed their child would complete a 2-year degree, 41% a 4-year degree, and 25% some form of graduate school. Staff members were asked a similar, but slightly different question with respect to expected education levels. Staff members were asked what percentage of their students they believed would complete a certain education level. These percentages were then averaged across respondents for each education level. The results can be seen in Table 3.6. At Jordan, staff expectations for students' educational attainment are much lower than those of the students and parents as expressed in previous years. On average, staff members believe that almost one-fifth (21%) of students will not graduate from high school and that another third (35%) will have

completed high school as their highest level of education. On average, staff members believe that 16% of their students will obtain a 2-year degree and 11% a 4-year degree.

Table 3.6. Jordan Staff Survey Responses on Academic Attitudes and Behavior, LBUSD HS SLC Survey, 2009.

	Strongly Agree %	Agree %	Disagree %	Strongly Disagree %	Not Applicable %	Total <i>n</i>
A. I talk with my students about how to get into college.	45	48	5	0	2	62
B. I talk with my students about how to pay for college.	27	53	16	2	2	62
C. In your opinion, what percentage of your students will complete the following levels of education:	Mean % *					<i>n</i>
Less than high school	21					69
High school graduate	35					69
Some college	10					69
Attend a trade/technical school	10					69
Attend a community college (AA degree)	16					69
Attend a 4-year college (BA degree)	11					69
Attend graduate school	3					69

* Respondents provided an estimated percentage for each level of education; the "Mean %" is the average of the responses of all respondents. The sum of these averages does not equal 100% because not all staff provided percentages adding to 100%.

While the survey results address specific attitudes and academic behavior, the focus group data captures general attitudes and behavior as expressed by a small group. Students who participated in the focus groups indicated that SLCs facilitate access to academic assistance and college information. Most students, whether in an SLC or not, agreed that the individual also has some responsibility to seek resources as well. As an example, an SLC 9th grader indicated that he joined a non-SLC affiliated club that provided access to college tours of many historically Black colleges and universities. Another non-SLC student indicated that he checks SchoolLoop, the online school records database for parent and students, regularly to monitor his grades. As a result, one day this student was alerted to the FAFSA deadline, which he completed online and submitted that same day. Yet another non-SLC student also reported that the counselor at the Career Center provides assistance to all students who take the initiative to go in for assistance. The majority of non-SLC students agreed that the college counselor, Ms. Lawrence, is helpful, caring, and supportive. There does not seem to be any significant differences between SLC and non-SLC students in terms of their academic behavior once enrolled in high school. However, students who did choose to be in an SLC seemed to express a greater concern for their education and plans after high school, at least in 8th grade when registering for high school, than students who did not apply to an SLC. Thus, it seems that those who chose to belong in SLCs may already have a more disciplined academic behavior.

College Knowledge

Students were also asked to state to what degree they agreed with six statements that were intended to better understand students' college knowledge. These statements included feeling prepared to succeed in college, affording a 4-year college with financial assistance, and knowing: a) the difference between 2-year and 4-year colleges; b) the required standardized tests needed to apply to college; c) how AP courses help in college; and d) the A-G requirements. The results are summarized in Table 3.7. Parents were also asked these six statements framed as their perception of their children's college knowledge. Additionally, parents were asked whether they believed that the school informed them about college. The parent survey results are available in Table 3.8. Two questions answered by staff regarding these topics are presented in Table 3.9.

A large majority of the students surveyed (84%) agreed that they know the difference between a 2-year and 4-year college. However, this is a slight drop from the previous year where 86% of students agreed with that statement. Parents' responses were fairly similar to students in that 79% agreed that their child knew the difference between a 2-year and 4-year college. There was also a slight drop in the percentage of students who said they know about the A-G requirements needed to get into a UC school. In 2009, 71% of students agreed with this statement, while in 2008 and 2007 this percentage was 80% and 73%. This is despite students being constantly reminded about the A-G requirements by posters on campus, morning announcements, and school assemblies, as reported by non-SLC student focus group participants. Amongst the parents, 66% of respondents agreed that their child knew about the A-G requirements. Staff members were the most optimistic with 84% agreeing that their students were aware of the A-G requirements.

Table 3.7. Jordan Student Survey Responses on College Knowledge, LBUSD HS SLC Survey, 2009.

	Strongly Agree %	Agree %	Disagree %	Strongly Disagree %	Total <i>n</i>	Total Agree 07 %	Total Agree 08 %	Total Agree 09 %
A. Once I graduate, I will have taken the classes required to apply to college.	33	48	14	4	1,245	n/a	n/a	81
B. I think I can afford to attend a public, 4-year college using financial aid, scholarships, or my family's income.	21	43	26	10	1,243	77	76	64
C. I know the difference between a 2-year and 4-year college.	43	41	12	4	1,250	82	86	84
D. I know which standardized test(s) I need to take to apply for college.	26	38	28	8	1,245	66	70	64
E. I understand how taking AP courses will help me in college.	31	41	28	8	1,238	74	78	72
F. I know about the A-G requirements to get into a UC.	35	36	21	8	1,246	73	80	71

The percentage of students who indicated that they understood how taking AP courses will help them in college when comparing last years' response to this years' also dropped - 78% in 2008 versus 72% in 2009). In 2009, 74% of parents also agreed with this statement.

Students were asked for the first time this year to what extent they agreed that once they graduate they will have taken the classes required to apply to college. Eighty-one percent of students agreed or strongly agreed with that statement. This closely mirrors the parents' response of 79% agreement to a comparable statement. However, when staff was asked to what extent they agreed with the statement "By the time students graduate from this school, they will be prepared to succeed at the college or career of their choice," only 53% agreed or strongly agreed. This, again, illustrates the different expectations that staff members may have for their students when compared to the expectations that students have for themselves or parents have for their children.

Table 3.8. Jordan Parent Survey Responses on College Knowledge, LBUSD HS SLC Survey, 2009.

	Strongly Agree %	Agree %	Disagree %	Strongly Disagree %	Don't Know %	Total <i>n</i>	Total Agree 08 %	Total Agree 09 %
A. Once my child graduates, he/she will have taken the classes required to apply to college.	36	43	6	2	14	428	n/a	79
B. I think I can pay to send my child to a public, 4-year college with my income, financial aid, or scholarships.	19	34	16	12	19	426	64	53
C. My child knows the difference between a 2-year and a 4-year college.	36	43	8	2	11	426	78	79
D. My child knows which standardized test(s) they need to take to apply for college.	27	40	14	4	16	428	67	67
E. My child knows about the A-G requirements to get into a UC.	28	38	9	5	20	430	64	66
F. My child knows how taking Advanced Placement (AP) classes will help him/her in college.	33	41	8	3	16	430	n/a	74
G. The school informs parents about college.	16	40	22	7	16	431	n/a	56

When it came to financing post-secondary education and knowing which standardized tests were needed to apply for college, students and parents were not as confident. Approximately two-thirds (64%) of students agreed or strongly agreed with the statement, "I think I can afford to attend a public, 4-year college using financial aid, scholarships, or my family's income." Fifty-three percent of parents agreed or strongly agreed with the corresponding statement. The

students' response, when compared to the previous years' is clearly trending downward, as does the parents'. This could be a reflection of the overall difficult economic times in 2008-09.

In response to a statement about knowing which standardized tests to take, 64% of students agreed to some extent. This is also down from previous years (66% in 2007, 70% in 2008). It is not immediately clear what might account for the 6% drop in agreement by students regarding knowledge about taking standardized test. In student focus group discussions, it was noted that Ms. Lawrence, the counselor at the Career Center, is constantly reminding students about, and signing them up for, standardized tests. One non-SLC student even attributed the reason for which he is going to college to Ms. Lawrence. When parents are asked for their perspective, 67% agreed or strongly agreed that their child knew which standardized tests needed to be taken. This is the same as the previous year. Just over half (56%) of parents also agreed that the school informed them about college.

Table 3.9. Jordan Staff Survey Responses on College Knowledge, LBUSD HS SLC Survey, 2009.

	Strongly Agree %	Agree %	Disagree %	Strongly Disagree %	Not Applicable %	Total <i>n</i>
A. Students are aware of the A-G requirements needed to get into a UC or CSU.	34	50	16	0	0	62
B. By the time students graduate from this school, they will be prepared to succeed at the college or career of their choice.	15	38	39	8	0	61

In the student focus groups, there were some discussions that revealed what type of college information students received and how. Both SLC and non-SLC students can get college information from school announcements, AVID, and the Career Center. Some SLC 9th graders indicated that they also hear about college from AVID, which sponsors college tours including one to San Diego State University in early Spring 2009. AVID participants are both non-SLC and SLC students. One 9th grader indicated that career discussions that do not necessarily address college also take place. In discussing what students plan to do when they graduate from high school, one 9th grader indicated that “some of us like were thinking of having jobs or helping parents out or trying to get started to go to college.” Another student reported that SLCs provide additional extra-curricular opportunities, such as working as editor of the newspaper, which look good on either a college or employment application.

The main difference in terms of raising college awareness among non-SLC and SLC students seems to be rooted in the amount and location. SLC students reported that counselors meet with them in the classroom to discuss their academic and college choices while non-SLC students indicated that teachers and counselors talk about college because “they all want us to get there.” Non-SLC students spoke in general about where and how they get college information while SLC students were able to provide specific details of their interactions with counselors and the activities in which they participated. Thus, it seems that college awareness activities may be better organized and delivered to SLC students than to non-SLC students. Even 9th grade non-SLC students declared that SLCs prepare students for college. It should be noted that most non-

SLC students in the focus group indicated that they had a parent, sibling, or relative who attended college and who motivates them to do the same.

2. CULTURE AND CLIMATE

SLC Awareness and Student Involvement

As previously mentioned and illustrated on Table 3.1, only 2% of Jordan HS staff reported in the survey not knowing their SLC assignment or indicated they were not part of one. The level of awareness of SLC assignment is relatively high among Jordan HS staff. This is also true of students. Only 7% of student survey participants reported not knowing their assigned SLC. Parents' SLC awareness closely resembles students' in that only 8% of parents indicated that they did not know to which SLC their child belonged.

SLC identities at JFA are not very developed, at least for most SLCs. Students in one SLC at JFA only have one SLC class and with no activities, it is difficult to build their SLC identity. A different teacher reported that "we need work." Students are wearing lanyards so "that brings ownership to the student too" because others will ask about their SLCs. However, teachers are not sure if students really understand what it means to be in their SLC, other than knowing that students share the same teachers and go on fieldtrips. One particular SLC does have a strong SLC identity. On the main campus there are more SLC activities and new ones continue to be developed. In Spring 2009, for example, there were plans to select a school-wide SLC student of the month.

The 9th grade SLC teachers indicated that all students will have to select an SLC when they go to the main campus. A concern they have is that students are submitting applications. One teacher related how she has been informing students about this decision they need to make because she is trying to avoid students being assigned to an SLC that they may not want. She indicated that she also fears having students assigned to her SCL who do not want to be there. She indicated that there "needs to be an environment where the students want to be there because it's something that they're going to focus on and actually bring involvement in their education so they'll want to be there." Non-SLC teachers did not know the requirements for joining an SLC but they expressed that having a GPA requirement on the application is a little daunting for certain students, especially the special education population. It is unclear to non-SLC teachers whether there is a GPA requirement for SLCs. Because sometimes students want to switch SLCs, one SLC teacher thinks that perhaps students in a particular program should have the flexibility to float between SLCs.

In terms of SLCs collaborating with each other, not much of that has taken place. Most collaboration that does take place is service oriented like, for example, when one SLC produces a video for another. Two SLCs are working on a project in which one will make benches and the other will decorate them. A few SLCs are also funded through the CA Partnership Academy grant and, therefore, they attend conferences to, among other things, help each other meet the CTE standards and to bounce ideas for integrated projects. One teacher indicated that s/he learned about the CPA SLCs from attending a workshop and as a result wished that all SLCs would participate in the upcoming workshop because "I don't really know what they do." Once teachers find out what SLCs do, then "you can find connections to almost anything."

SLC teachers at the Jordan Freshman Academy mentioned a number of successes they have experienced with SLCs this year. At the beginning of the year, one SLC had a very successful student meet and greet with approximately 200 students in attendance, which according to one SLC teacher “shows they are really more excited by the program.” The SLC teacher was proud of the fact that during recruitment most students selected that SLC as their first choice. Another teacher described how a parent could not decide which school to send his daughter and decided to send her to Jordan because of the art-based SLC. There is a consensus among teachers that SLCs are making a name for themselves and improving public perception of Jordan. Students are “looking to come to Jordan as opposed to being sent to Jordan and that’s a big change.” Another success is the enthusiasm students have to belong to something and to really feel like they are part of a group. Even non-SLC teachers reported that students are more focused and motivated. Tutoring has also been successful. Many teachers offer tutoring before and after school and make adjustments to accommodate students. SLC teachers at JFA report that on the main campus, there is SLC teacher unity and cohesiveness, as well as a lot of collaboration and cross-curricular projects.

SLC teachers on main campus report that they saw a number of SLC successes this past year. The grant has made it possible to take students on fieldtrips to such places like the Cerritos Performing Arts Center, Long Beach Airport, and the Queen Mary to expose them to possible career opportunities. Non-SLC teachers reported that students do get excited about these fieldtrips. There have also been more guest speakers this year. There have been connections with local organizations such as the group that promotes women in nontraditional trades. This organization was invited to Jordan by an SLC that is having trouble recruiting female students. Teachers believe that the “biggest success” will be in 2010 when the first class of SLC students graduates.

Student Involvement

On the student survey, five items were used to gauge students’ involvement with their SLC. Students were asked to what extent they agreed that they a) help make decision at their school that affect them, b) help make suggestions about how to change their SLC, c) felt comfortable in their SLC community, d) liked to participate in their SLC activities, and e) wanted to work or get a college education in the same area of focus as their SLC. Parents were also asked to give their perspective on how comfortable their child was in his/her SLC community and if s/he liked participating in the SLC activities. There was one corresponding item on the staff survey that also provides some insight into student involvement in SLC development. Staff members were asked to what extent they agreed that students had opportunities to suggest modifications to the SLCs. Detailed results for these survey items can be seen in Tables 3.10.

Table 3.10. Jordan Survey Responses on Student SLC Involvement, LBUSD HS SLC Survey, 2009.

Students	Strongly Agree %	Agree %	Disagree %	Strongly Disagree %	Total <i>n</i>	Total Agree 07 %	Total Agree 08 %	Total Agree 09 %
A. I help make decisions at this school that affect me.	16	50	26	8	1,243	n/a	n/a	66
B. I help make suggestions about how to change my SLC.	7	31	43	19	1,190	n/a	n/a	38
C. I feel comfortable in my SLC community.	22	40	24	15	1,178	76	72	62
D. I like to participate in my SLC activities.	19	40	28	13	1,160	64	66	59
E. After high school, I want to work or get a college education in the same area of focus as my SLC.	22	36	29	13	1,196	n/a	n/a	58

Parents	Strongly Agree %	Agree %	Disagree %	Strongly Disagree %	Don't Know %	Total <i>n</i>	Total Agree 08 %	Total Agree 09 %
A. My child feels comfortable in his/her SLC community.	22	41	8	5	24	408	53	63
B. My child likes to participate in his/her SLC activities.	18	41	9	6	26	407	49	59

Staff	Strongly Agree %	Agree %	Disagree %	Strongly Disagree %	Not Applicable %	Total <i>n</i>
A. Students at this school have opportunities to suggest modifications to the SLCs.	10	39	30	7	14	70

Survey results indicate that the majority of students at Jordan feel they have a say in decisions that affect them at their school level, but not so much when it comes to making suggestions for changes to their SLC. A total of 66% of students agreed or strongly agreed that they help make decisions at school that affect them, but only 38% agreed to some extent that they help make suggestions about how to change their SLC. This suggests that students are not yet very involved in the SLC development process. Staff members are more optimistic about their students' involvement with SLC development. When presented with the statement "Students at this school have opportunities to suggest modifications to the SLCs" 49% of staff members agreed to some extent with that statement.

The majority of students did agree that they felt comfortable in their SLC community (62% agreed or strongly agreed) and that they liked to participate in their SLC activities (59% agreed or strongly agreed). However, these percentages are down from the survey results in 2007 and 2008. The majority of parents also agreed that their child was comfortable in their SLC community (63%) and that their child liked to participate in the SLC activities (59%). These are both 10% higher than the percentages from the previous year. Student survey responses also seem to indicate there is strong interest by the students to continue in the field of focus by their SLC. Fifty-eight percent of students agreed or strongly agreed that after high school they wanted to work or study in the same area of focus as their SLC.

Personalization

One important premise of implementing SLCs is that the smaller school communities provide opportunities for increased and higher quality interactions between the students and teachers, as well as between the students themselves. This idea, termed personalization, can provide students with academic and non-academic support. To ascertain the degree of student-teacher interactions, students were asked to respond to questions pertaining to the level of communication and quality of support they receive from their teachers. Parents were also asked similar questions in efforts to gather their perceptions of the type of personalization that is taking place at the school. In some cases, teachers were asked questions aligned to the other surveys to investigate if their responses were consistent with those of students and parents. Students and parents were then also asked several questions about peer-to-peer interactions.

In terms of effects of SLCs on students, there have been improvements in terms of personalization and students becoming familiar with interdisciplinary class work. According to staff who participated in the focus groups, for those who have taught in the older SLCs, there have been no noticeable changes since the implementation of this new grant. However, a teacher in one of the SLCs reported being grateful that more students are benefiting and that other teachers are experiencing what s/he has experienced as a member of his/her SLC. One non-SLC teacher mentioned that it would be difficult to comment on whether SLCs are making a difference given that s/he does not know which students are in SLCs.

Student/Teacher Interaction

When asked if their teachers cared about how they did in school, a large majority of students agreed or strongly agreed with this statement (80%). This percentage has fluctuated slightly, but not by much since 2007 (-4%). Similarly, 74% of students also agreed or strongly agreed that they feel supported by their teachers in their academic performance. There was also a slight drop in agreement (-4%) compared to the previous two years. The majority of parents also agreed or strongly agreed (71%) that teachers at Jordan care about how their child does in school. This is also down slightly from 74% from the previous year. Detailed student responses can be found in Table 3.11 and parent responses in Table 3.12.

Table 3.11. Jordan Student Survey Responses on Student-Teacher Interaction, LBUSD HS SLC Survey, 2009.

	Strongly Agree %	Agree %	Disagree %	Strongly Disagree %	Total <i>n</i>	Total Agree 06 %	Total Agree 07 %	Total Agree 08 %	Total Agree 09 %
A. My teachers care about how I do in school.	31	49	13	7	1,192	n/a	84	85	80
B. I feel supported by my teachers in my academic performance in class.	22	52	19	7	1,248	n/a	78	78	74
C. My teachers' lessons are designed to encourage me to think critically.	23	55	17	5	1,240	n/a	82	81	78
D. Teachers use a variety of teaching approaches to help students with different learning styles.	29	52	14	5	1,250	71	79	78	81
E. Teachers sometimes change their lesson plans because of student suggestions.	14	41	33	13	1,236	50	52	53	55
F. Teachers do a good job of making sure students know how they can get help if they fall behind.	23	50	18	9	1,237	n/a	75	77	73
G. My teachers tutor me when I need help with my homework.	21	48	22	9	1,202	n/a	n/a	n/a	69
H. Teachers help me make plans for life after high school.	16	43	30	12	1,236	n/a	65	66	59

Personalization can also be reflected in teachers' lessons and instruction. Students were asked to rate their level of agreement in terms of the amount of instructional changes they perceived occurring in their classes. In general, majority of students agree that they are encouraged to think critically and that their teachers use various instructional approaches to meet the needs of different students. Specifically, when asked this year if their teachers' lessons are designed to encourage them to think critically, 78% agreed. This is very similar but slightly less than in previous years (82% - 2007; 81% - 2008). Although there was a slight drop, nevertheless, a strong majority feels that teacher lessons are designed to encourage them to think critically. Staff members would agree. Approximately 86% of them agreed that lessons are designed to encourage students to think critically.

A strong majority of students also agreed that teachers use a variety of teaching approaches to help students with different learning styles (81%). This is up from the 78% of students who agreed with this statement in the 2008 survey. A large percentage (86%) of teachers also agree with this statement. Amongst the students there was not as strong agreement on whether or not teachers sometimes change their lesson plans because of student suggestions. Slightly more than half (55%) agreed or strongly agreed with this statement.

Students were also asked if they felt supported by their teachers when it came to receiving academic assistance. In particular, students were asked if they agreed that teachers do a good job of making sure students know how they can get help if they fall behind, and if teachers offer tutoring when students need help with their homework. Almost three-fourths (73%) of students did agree or strongly agree that teachers do a good job of making sure students understand how to get help if they fall behind. Just over two-thirds of parents (68%) also agree that teachers do a good job of making sure that students know how to get help if they fall behind. Teachers have a very similar perspective to the students and parents; 87% of staff members agreed with the same statement. When it comes to tutoring, 69% of students agree that teachers offer tutoring help for homework. A slightly higher percentage of teachers (86%) agreed that they offer tutoring for students who might need some additional academic support.

Table 3.12. Jordan Parent Survey Responses on Student-Teacher Interaction, LBUSD HS SLC Survey, 2009.

	Strongly Agree %	Agree %	Disagree %	Strongly Disagree %	Don't Know %	Total <i>n</i>	Total Agree 08 %	Total Agree 09%
A. Teachers do a good job of making sure students know how they can get help if they fall behind.	21	47	9	5	18	428	78	68
B. Teachers care about how my child does in school.	20	51	11	3	14	430	74	71
C. Teachers help my child make plans for life after high school.	17	41	15	5	22	425	77	58

All groups surveyed – students, parents, and staff – were asked if teachers help students make plans for life after high school. There was some variation in responses. Just over half of the students surveyed (59%) agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. This is slightly less than in years' past. In 2007, 65% agreed, and in 2008, 66% agreed with that statement. Amongst the parent survey respondents 58% agreed that teachers help their child make plans for after high school. This is also less than in the previous year when 77% of parents agreed with that statement. Staff members had the highest percentage of agreement (95%) when asked to what extent they agreed that they talk with their students about their plans after high school.

On several additional statements regarding student and staff interaction, staff members indicated fairly strong agreement with the following: a) students receive regular guidance on course selection (65% agreement), b) teachers have high expectations for students (79%), and c) students receive prompt feedback and regular progress reports with specific suggestions for improvement (82%). However, only 53% of staff surveyed agreed that there is a climate of trust here among students, teachers, and administrators. These results can be seen in Table 3.13.

Table 3.13. Jordan Staff Survey Responses on Student-Teacher Interaction, LBUSD HS SLC Survey, 2009.

	Strongly Agree %	Agree %	Disagree %	Strongly Disagree %	Not Applicable %	Total <i>n</i>
A. I talk with students about their plans after high school.	42	53	2	2	2	64
B. I tutor students who might need some additional academic support.	36	50	5	0	9	64
C. Teachers use a variety of teaching approaches to help students with different learning styles.	28	58	9	3	3	69
D. Lessons are designed and conducted to encourage students to think critically.	27	59	5	6	3	66
E. Teachers do a good job of making sure students know how they can get help if they fall behind.	36	51	10	1	1	70
F. Students receive regular guidance on course selection.	21	44	21	9	5	66
G. There is a climate of trust here among students, teachers, and administrators.	12	41	31	12	4	68
H. Teachers have high expectations for students.	24	55	13	5	3	62
I. Students receive prompt feedback and regular progress reports with specific suggestions for improvement.	24	58	12	1	4	67

During the focus groups, for student-to-teacher interaction, SLC 9th graders indicated that they know their teachers “well.” One student stated the following: “We have bonds with our teachers. They’re really friendly, like, they help you when you need it.” This is despite the fact that they see teachers every other day except for Monday, due to block scheduling. On the main campus, one student also reported that students build friendships with their SLC teachers. One SLC moves teachers with students for a second year to strengthen the teacher/student bond even further. A student described the interaction in the following manner:

And it’s like they’re not just our teachers, they’re our mentors. We’re like always at their classrooms asking questions. Like even school wise or our future or just what we want to do in life.

This relationship is further enhanced, according to one student, by the nature of having smaller classes, which also facilitate the learning process. This in turn gets the students more excited to learn. One student reported that she spends so much time with one of her SLC teachers that students and staff tease her about it by calling her “Ms. Arnie’s daughter.” Another student described how when students start in their SLC, teachers introduce themselves by talking to students and being more like a friend than a teacher. Students described the level of involvement of teachers in the following manner:

[Mr. Morris] didn't want any of his students falling behind so he'll stay after school when he didn't have to and help us. To me he is also a mentor too. So if I ever run into any problems he is the first person I will go to.

There's two teachers... (they) are always in their classroom, they're like our mentors, we can go to them for any problems. And I don't think we see them as teachers, we see them more as friends. We don't dread going into their classroom and, "Oh it's that teacher again." We enjoy having them as a teacher.

I think all of my JMAC teachers are cool, they really are...they're like those kind of kick back teachers, but when it's time to be serious, they'll be [mutter] it's time to be serious. I love all of them to death... the person that started our program... [Mr. Bruno's] like a mentor, he mentored us through all of it... I'm so happy that we have these kind of teachers in our SLC.

One student described how this kind of personalization makes a difference. He related his experience in 9th grade when he did not care about school and was getting bad grades. However, once he enrolled in an SLC and teachers helped him focus on his studies by inviting him to attend after school, lunch or morning tutoring sessions, he made Honor Roll. This student attributed his academic success to this type of personalization. Another student echoed that SLC teachers are committed to helping students maintain a good GPA and will, therefore, stay in their classroom afterschool, during lunch, or during their own time to help tutor students. One student summarized why SLC teachers are so committed in the following manner:

[T]eachers know that we want to get somewhere in life, that we want to make a difference even though we're in a high school that doesn't have a good reputation as opposed to others. But they know that we want to get somewhere in life and they're gearing us towards what we want to do.

Although non-SLC students indicated that they know their teachers well, they recognize that SLC students interact more with their teachers. Non-SLC students believe this is the case because SLC teachers go on fieldtrips with their students and due to the smaller SLC classes which allow teachers to interact with kids. Teachers of "regular" classes are not afforded the same opportunities. One non-SLC student described how his teacher keeps asking a student his/her name even though the student has been in the class for over one semester.

SLC teachers at JFA have a slightly different experience with SLCs than teachers at the main campus. While teachers on both campuses report that SLC students identify with their SLCs and do have a sense of belonging, teachers on the main campus complained that some students are developing a stronger affiliation with their SLCs than their school. Main campus teachers also reported that although the personalization factor has at times led to unruly classrooms, the benefits outweigh the drawbacks. Although surprised at times, students know and appreciate that teachers talk amongst each other about them and are aware of what is happening in their lives. According to main campus teachers, improved communication with parents has also led to teachers having a stronger connection with students in the classroom. Parents communicate more with teachers about what is happening with the student at home. Teachers on both

campuses report that students describe their SLC teachers as caring about them. Unfortunately, main campus teachers do not have a connection with the 9th graders in their SLCs given the lack of interaction due to being on different campuses. The 9th grade teachers, on the other hand, who have seen former students at the main campus indicate that they are blossoming as a result of SLCs. Students continue to identify with their SLCs, talk about caring teachers, and discuss the feeling of belonging to a family. Students who have participated in SLCs for three years are very committed and dedicated to their SLCs.

Student-to-Student Interaction

Information about the quality of relationships amongst students was also obtained to gain a better understanding of the culture and climate in which students are operating. Specifically, questions pertaining to peer relations and level of support for academic-related issues were asked to both students and parents. Findings from the survey on student-to-student interaction can be found in Table 3.14.

In terms of student-to-student interaction, SLC 9th graders indicated that “it’s like a family” and that students get along “really well.” In the classroom, SLC students report being reassured to have SLC peers relate to them. Students on the main campus also reported that they build a community with their peers because everyone is working towards the same goal. Due to the SLC structure, students interact more with each other. One student described how the bond strengthens as a result of interacting with the same peers from 9th grade until senior year. One student from the main campus, however, did acknowledge that there are one or two individuals in his/her SLC who do not talk to each other. Any differences those students may have, however, are left outside of the academy/SLC. In the classroom, SLC peers are like family. In one SLC, students refer to each other as “sisters” or “buddy” and they respect their teacher as they do their parents. One student summarized that she’s “pretty sure [that in] all SLCs, the peers, they’re like a family.”

With regard to peer relationships, on the survey students were asked how much they agreed that in their SLC students treat each other with respect, and if they felt close to their SLC peers than to peers in other SLCs. A little more than half (57%) of students agreed that students in their SLC treated each other with respect. When parents were asked a similar question, 55% agreed, however, approximately one-third (32%) indicated that they did not know whether or not students in their child’s SLC treated each other with respect. Results for both students and parents can be seen in Table 3.14. While students in SLCs may respect one another, the majority of students at Jordan do not feel closer to their SLC peers when compared to their non-SLC peers. In 2009, only 44% of students agreed that they felt closer to the SLC peers. This increased slightly from 40% in both 2007 and 2008.

The non-SLC student perception of peer-to-peer interaction differs from what SLC students describe. Non-SLC 9th graders reported that there are numerous cliques on campus, most of which are racially-based. They perceive things even more divided on the main campus. Within SLCs, students “get along real good” and “it’s not a racial thing” because students are all “working hard to get there.” Similarly, non-SLC students on the main campus indicated that students get along well in general. They do admit that SLC students, by the nature of spending more time together, get along and help each other. As for SLC and non-SLC student

interactions, SLC students indicated that their peers bridge connections to other students in or outside the SLC. Outside the classroom, students meet students from other SLCs and those not in one. Contradicting what non-SLC students described, SLC 9th graders reported that cliques are not evident. As one student put it, “I’m pretty sure that every group probably has a kid from IB or Panther something like that.” The perception by SLC 9th graders is that it is similar at the main campus.

In the focus group, 9th grade teachers explained how student interaction with the same peers has resulted in students being very supportive of each other. Teachers described how conversations take place between peers regarding class material. Although students do participate on SLC fieldtrips, a challenge that hinders further interaction between SLC peers is the fact that most SLC students and activities are on the main campus. The 9th graders do not have access to transportation to attend events or meet with older SLC peers on the main campus.

Table 3.14. Jordan Survey Responses on Student-Student Interaction, LBUSD HS SLC Survey, 2009.

Students	Strongly Agree %	Agree %	Disagree %	Strongly Disagree %	Total <i>n</i>	Total Agree 07 %	Total Agree 08 %	Total Agree 09 %
A. My peers care about how I do in school.	24	49	17	9	1,228	66	69	73
B. My peers encourage me to value my education.	24	52	17	7	1,213	72	74	76
C. In my SLC, students treat each other with respect.	17	40	27	16	1,169	n/a	n/a	57
D. I feel closer to my SLC peers than to peers not in my SLC.	16	28	36	20	1,160	40	40	44
Parents	Strongly Agree %	Agree %	Disagree %	Strongly Disagree %	Don't Know %	Total <i>n</i>	Total Agree 09%	
A. Students in my child's SLC treat each other with respect.	15	40	7	6	32	417	55	

3. BUILDING LEADERSHIP CAPACITY

SLC Development and Implementation

To look at the role of leadership in putting into operation SLCs, staff was asked questions in surveys, interviews, and a focus group regarding SLC development and implementation. Sharing of information regarding available resources, clinics on building leadership skills, and discussions on SLC development and implementation take place at monthly SLC coordinators’ meetings and quarterly lead teacher workshops.

The SLC coordinator sees her role as trying to meet all the requirements of the grant and providing resources to lead teachers to help with SLC personalization, teacher looping, outcome charts, curriculum, and support them in every possible way. She sees her goal as assisting them in becoming leaders and self-sustaining for the future. Work towards these goals is monitored through action plans at SLC lead teacher meetings. However, the SLC coordinator also manages

other programs, AVID and ELL, which take up a large portion of her time. The SLC lead teachers also struggle with the amount of time they can dedicate to the SLCs given that they did not realize they would require so much.

On the survey, staff members were asked to rate the extent of their agreement or disagreement with a series of statements pertaining to SLC implementation at their school. Detailed survey results can be seen in Table 3.15.

Table 3.15. Jordan Staff Survey Responses on SLC Development and Implementation, LBUSD HS SLC Survey, 2009.

	Strongly Agree %	Agree %	Disagree %	Strongly Disagree %	Not Applicable %	Total <i>n</i>
A. I understand the purpose and goals for small learning communities at this school.	39	49	7	4	1	72
B. I understand the vision and goals for my particular SLC.	36	24	4	3	33	70
C. I am comfortable with how my school has developed small learning communities.	10	56	23	7	4	71
D. I am comfortable with how my SLC is being developed.	19	31	13	1	34	67
E. I understand what my role is in my SLC.	36	25	4	1	33	69
F. The school provides time on a regular basis for SLC teams to meet to share information, discuss students' academic progress, curriculum needs, etc.	20	41	17	12	10	69
G. I am able to navigate through the district's administrative procedures with regards to matters pertaining to SLCs.	5	36	23	15	21	66
H. I am able to navigate through the school's administrative procedures with regards to matters pertaining to SLCs.	12	40	22	9	17	65
I. I believe that small learning communities will help this school raise student achievement.	24	57	9	6	4	70
J. The faculty and staff understand the purpose and goals for SLCs at this school.	17	63	14	4	3	72
K. The faculty and staff at this school have opportunities to suggest modifications to the SLCs.	19	44	21	6	10	72

In general, at Jordan, staff agreed that they understood the purpose and goals for SLCs at their school (88%). All teacher focus group participants, whether in an SLC or not, reported that the

purpose of SLCs at Jordan is to provide student with a smaller learning environment to support their academic needs and career interests. Another 60% of staff understood the vision and goals for their particular SLC, but it is important to note that for 33% of respondents, this question was not applicable. When asked if they are comfortable with how their school has developed SLCs, approximately 66% of staff at Jordan agreed with that statement. Staff indicated that they are also fairly comfortable with how their individual SLCs are developing. There is very little disagreement (only 5%), about understanding one's role in the SLC as well, with again, approximately one-third of teachers indicating not applicable on these last two items. Staff members were also asked to gauge to what extent they agreed or disagreed about their peers' understanding regarding the purpose and goals for SLCs at Jordan. Overall, the majority of staff (80%) agreed that the faculty and staff understood the purpose and goals of SLCs at the school. About two-thirds (63%) agreed that the faculty and staff at the school have opportunities to suggest modifications to the SLCs. There is also very strong agreement (81%) with the belief that SLCs will help raise student achievement for Jordan HS.

Despite positive staff survey findings, there is some confusion regarding certain SLC guidelines, such as the SLC membership policy for 2009-2010. According to SLC teachers on the main campus, only 9th through 11th graders were in SLCs in 2008-09 and approximately 750 students in 10th through 12th were not enrolled in an SLC. In 2009-2010, however, students in 9th through 12th grades will be assigned to SLCs. According to SLC teachers at JFA, it is unclear whether every student or just 10th graders will have to be in an SLC at the beginning of the 2009-10 academic year. When trying to clarify this issue, some teachers described the new policy as calling for students to be "touched" by an SLC or to have some form of an SLC experience, such as capstone class, by the time they graduate from Jordan High. It is unclear whether JFA itself would count as an SLC and, therefore, having "touched" all the 9th graders. According to teachers on the main campus, every 9th grader is in an SLC because they are either enrolled in one or "touched" by being at JFA. One teacher argued that this would mean that JFA SLC students were in two SLCs, while another teacher argued it would just be one. Non-SLC teachers at JFA questioned whether JFA is an SLC given that they do not have the same level of interaction and collaboration as most SLC teachers. The principals do identify JFA as an SLC given that it has a mentor-type of program in a smaller setting separate from the main campus. Some teachers understood that by the third year, every student should be in an SLC. After the lengthy discussion, there was no consensus as to whether all students will be required to be in an SLC next academic year. It is also unclear how teachers will become part of an SLC once the school goes wall-to-wall, if that happens. If a teacher is required to be part of multiple SLCs, it is unclear which SLC meetings they will attend.

As of March 2009, the decision regarding going wall-to-wall had not been made according to the principals and SLC coordinator. The issue was still under consideration. However, the consensus by SLC teachers on the main campus was that next year SLCs will be wall-to-wall for all students and teachers. There were some contradictions in terms of how this will take place. According to a number in the focus group, some teachers will not have pure classes but they will be designated to an SLC. Other teachers say that while the SLCs will grow by two, the number of teachers in SLCs will not necessarily increase. If teachers want to join SLCs, one teacher argued that they would be welcomed but they will not be forced. The new policy was to be officially presented the following week but a heated discussion had already surfaced at a recent

meeting as some teachers voiced their disapproval of being assigned to an SLC. Another teacher reported that teachers were shocked to hear the announcement but did not react at the time. Teachers in the focus group reported that they believe those teachers will be voicing their concerns at future faculty meetings. Originally, when the school first got the grant, there was agreement among teachers that going wall-to-wall would not work at Jordan. Thus, introducing this new policy was a little surprising to them. One teacher predicts that teachers will need time to process the new policy but that some will be hostile regardless given that some teachers are just never happy. Meanwhile, one teacher reported that she has received a few e-mails asking if there are any openings in her SLC.

There is also some confusion as to what is taking place at the campuses with regard to SLCs. For example, main campus SLC teachers indicated that all SLCs are represented in JFA, which contradicts what JFA teachers and students reported. The general perception by some on the main campus is that SLCs have been part of Jordan for some time given that some have functioned as magnets/SSPs and/or CA Partnership Academy prior to the SLC grant. The SLC coordinator and principals make clear distinctions between SLCs and Specialized Student Programs (SSPs)/magnets while teachers generally do not. Teachers described the challenges they faced when the school implemented an SLC-like academic reform called “houses” years ago that did not work. Some teachers continue to be skeptical about the new SLC initiative given that history. When asked about the current state of SLCs, one teacher noted that:

As always, growing, changing, they have been for 19 years. Developing. A lot of times because of grant stipulations, SLCs come and go based on funding which is not a good thing. SLCs should be self-sustaining. The reality is they don't have a strong core of teachers who want them to be sustained. So the current status is as they've always been: which is that some of them are working great and some of them are hardly working.

The more successful SLCs are not necessarily the more established, according to SLC teachers. As one teacher noted, a newly established SLC faced some obstacles at the beginning but it is now working very successfully.

SLCs at JFA run a little different than on the main campus given that JFA “is so much smaller and fewer teachers so it's a lot easier to coordinate here.” According to SLC teachers, JFA itself functions like an SLC because “the ninth grade academy over here works well for the kids, it gets them prepared and gets them a little more unity amongst themselves too.” Most JFA SLC teachers believe that there is more friction on the main campus where “there's always these constant battles between the counselors and the other teachers and scheduling” in attempts to create more pure classes. This contradicts what SLC teachers on the main campus report. Main campus SLC teachers expressed gratitude to the head counselor for allowing them to share the same free conference period. Another teacher reported that “the counselors have been really good with the SLCs. We all have our own counselors and everyone else is on board and doing a really, really good job.”

One SLC 9th grade teacher disagreed that things run more smoothly for SLCs at JFA. This teacher, the only member of her SLC at JFA, reported that her 9th grade students have limited access to SLC activities because most take place on the main campus. To do an SLC activity at

JFA, students from the main campus would have to take time off from class which is something teachers try to avoid. Although colleagues are helpful with the occasional lunchtime activity and fieldtrips, there are usually “some technical difficulties.” This lone SLC teacher is working to recruit the computer lab teacher, who would make a “huge difference because (they) could coordinate and she could teach (students) some of the media scope they need to learn.” An art teacher offered to assist if the SLC is interested in creating a pure art class. In terms of having SLC meetings, they alternate between the two campuses, although if really important issues are to be discussed, then meetings will take place at main campus to ensure more participation. Non-SLC teachers at JFA seemed to be aware of the SLC benefits and would like to join them but are unable to given the teacher recruitment process. One non-SLC teacher reported that s/he is frustrated because s/he has expressed interest twice but cannot seem to join an SLC. Apparently, if an SLC has someone teaching a particular subject already, then that SLC does not need someone else teaching the same subject matter. According to non-SLC teachers, those who do teach in SLCs seem enthusiastic about their assignments and do not want to give up their posts. Thus, there are a limited number of SLC slots available to teachers. The principals admit that SLC lead teachers do struggle to recruit people who will best fit in their SLCs. Non-SLC teachers at JFA want to join SLCs because they perceive the students as being “better.” Also, the thought of working with the same students and teachers appeals to non-SLC teachers at JFA. A JFA special education non-SLC teacher did indicate that SLCs might not work for him/her given the student population s/he teaches.

Reasons for which non-SLC teachers on the main campus did not participating in SLCs varied but are rooted in lack of awareness. A common theme among those on the main campus is that teachers will not participate if the students they serve are not enrolled in SLCs. For example, special education students and English language learners do not participate in SLCs and, therefore, their teachers do not see a role they can play in SLCs. These teachers perceive their students as being in their own type of SLC given the smaller group of people with whom they interact (Special Ed, ELL, and ROTC). This sentiment is recognized by the SLC coordinator who agrees that in many ways these programs are “pretty similar” to SLCs because they also have the pure core classes, looping and some personalization. Main campus non-SLC teachers also indicated that they have not been approached to join an SLC. They mentioned that they do not know enough about SLCs in general to get a sense of the type of commitment they would need to join an SLC. One teacher also reported that there is uncertainty as to whether SLCs are working and that “there’s still a lot of questions.” Teachers indicated that there has not been a general meeting to provide an overview of the eight SLCs perhaps because “there was never really a push in the school” for them. They hear that some people have a positive experience while others have a negative one. There was concern by these non-SLC teachers that the purpose of the focus group was to gather information to place them in SLCs. Teachers indicated that they are simply uninformed about SLCs -- how they work and who participates. The little information they do have they do not trust because, for the most part, it seems to be based on rumors. Teachers reported that a couple of days before their participation in the focus group, there was a formal distribution of information regarding SLCs. One non-SLC teacher from the main campus reported that:

We need, as a staff, a clearer understanding from the counselors, what are the goals, what are the teachers connected to the individual SLC, who are the students connected with an

individual SLC, what are the objectives? We know nothing and perhaps if the faculty was more aware so that we are not being asked to commit to something blindly, perhaps it would help. Perhaps it would help if we knew if the child had an interest in the arts or was just lazy.”

According to teachers on the main campus, last year the school created a protocol for having teachers transfer SLCs. In March, student and teachers could apply to SLCs. Announcements about open enrollment were posted on websites and distributed via e-mail. Once teachers apply and interview with the principal and SLC lead teacher, then openings are filled. There is an attempt to make the process very transparent so no one gets the impression that people are going behind each other’s backs “stealing” teachers. Teachers are hoping that this becomes part of the culture of how things happen on campus. The procedure worked well in 2008 year and is working even better in 2009. SLCs, however, do not necessarily have to recruit new teachers. As SLCs grow each year with the addition of a new grade level, one SLC is having teachers who taught in the lower grades teach in the higher grades. Looping teachers who taught 10th grade English to teach 12th grade English helps keep the teacher connected to both the SLC and students. Another SLC is having a challenge because the oldest cohort is small, which creates and off balance

There does seem to be some frustration with regard to negotiating administrative procedures at the district level, approximately 41% agree, and 38% disagree (the other 21% - not applicable) that they are able to navigate district procedures. At the school level about 52% of the staff surveyed agree and 31% disagree that they can navigate the school’s administrative procedures regarding SLCs.

Another means of encouraging the development of leadership via the implementing SLCs is to also increase the level of teacher collaboration. Both survey and interview/focus group data suggest that collaboration between SLC teachers is taking place. According to staff members, the majority do agree (61%) with the statement that the school provides time on a regular basis for SLC teams to meet. In the staff responses to the open-ended survey question regarding the biggest challenge to the implementation of SLCs, however, one of the most frequent responses was the need for more time.

Table 3.16. Jordan Staff Survey Responses on Teacher-Teacher Interaction, LBUSD HS SLC Survey, 2009.

	Strongly Agree %	Agree %	Disagree %	Strongly Disagree %	Not Applicable %	Total <i>n</i>
A. I talk with other teachers about students who might be struggling academically.	46	43	6	1	4	70
B. The administration, teachers, and staff at this school work together to assist students who may be at risk of failing.	23	50	23	5	0	62

Teacher to teacher interactions were assessed through two items on the staff survey. Staff members at Jordan HS were asked if 1) they talked with other teachers about students who are

struggling academically, and 2) if the administration, teachers and staff at the school worked together to assist students who may be at risk of failing. Survey results can be seen in Table 3.16. An overwhelming majority (89%) of staff members indicated that they do, indeed, talk with other teachers about students who are struggling academically. Although not quite as high, a strong majority (73%) also agreed that staff members worked collaboratively to assist students at risk of failing.

During one of the focus groups, a main campus teacher from a newer SLC indicated that her SLC meets once a week during conference periods. She and her colleagues work collaboratively on projects and support each other. Not all teachers from other SLCs share the same free conference period but most do. One teacher attributed SLC success to collaboration during this time. This SLC teacher stated that they:

have that opportunity to meet on a regular basis and.. talk... if we didn't have the time, everyone would be lost and doing their own thing, and we wouldn't have that cohesiveness... and I think that's an integral part of the success of the SLCs."

One SLC teacher on the main campus reported that s/he has not personally changed as a result of this initiative but s/he thinks it is nice to have a core group of teachers dealing with the same things. The collaboration is appreciated as it has made teaching a lot more fun. According to a teacher on the main campus, one can get stuck doing the same things over and over. Teaching in an SLC makes it more fun and interactive because "it's a whole new avenue for different ideas, projects, and lessons, and all that kind of stuff." Principals noted that SLC teachers generally do look are "happier, more content individuals." SLC teachers do report some curricular changes. Thus, teaching in an SLC is "about growth and evolving inside your career." Some teachers do feel pressured when collaborating to put together integrated projects. However, according to a teacher, only one person needs to modify his/her curriculum to match that of the other teacher to produce the integrated project. Having only one teacher make adjustments alleviates any stress the second party may have. Some teachers with extensive SLC-type experience have served as mentors to their colleagues. For example, a lead teacher and former SLC coordinator volunteered to meet with the staff of an SLC in the summer to help train them on how to do integrated projects. According to a participant, the training was very valuable and the teacher has been a great resource.

SLC teachers at JFA want to change but many are apprehensive about getting too involved in SLCs given previous experiences with a magnet program at Jordan that got dismantled. It is also difficult to have stability when there is a new JFA administrator on campus approximately every three years. The time commitment of SLCs can be demanding and, as a result, some teachers are more dedicated than others. Principals seem to believe that all SLC teachers have 100% buy-in. One lead teacher indicated that out of 17 teachers, she has five that are truly committed to the SLC. . She reported that most teachers do care but it becomes extremely difficult to participate in meetings if the teacher is also coaching sports or leading other extracurricular activities. However, the lead teachers are gaining experience on how to facilitate participation. One SLC lead developed committees and now more teachers participate because they know in advance when they will have to do certain tasks. From comments, it seems that SLC lead teacher turnover at JFA is high. For one SLC, the teacher who launched it selected teachers to be in it

but some of those teachers have not been very committed to the SLC. For some SLCs, however, the number of teachers does not matter. One SLC has only about six or seven teachers but they work very well together and they all participate.

SLC teachers at JFA do report that “there has been more of a [teacher] unity this year than I think any other.” According to a lead teacher, “the lead teacher group seemed to really have gelled this year and we work together really nicely.” Even some of the people with whom a lead teacher did not work well are now collaborating successfully. The improvement, according to teachers, may be due to a better understanding of the grant and people feeling more comfortable with what they were doing. One teacher explained that “there was a competition and now the competition is gone and we work together.”

Parent/Community Collaboration

Also of interest when building leadership capacity at the school is the involvement of parents and community collaborators. In order to gauge these relationships, two questions were asked on the staff survey. One asked staff members to indicate to what extent they agreed or disagreed that they have regular contact with parents and the second asked them to do the same regarding a statement about the school’s support of the involvement of families and community members in planning, reviewing, and improving school programs. Parents were also asked about various parent/teacher – parent/school relationships. Findings on parent/community collaboration from both the staff and parent surveys can be found in Table 3.17.

Table 3.17. Jordan Survey Responses on Parent/Community Collaboration, LBUSD HS SLC Survey, 2009.

Staff	Strongly Agree %	Agree %	Disagree %	Strongly Disagree %	Not Applicable %	Total <i>n</i>		
A. I have regular contact with parents to inform them of their child's progress.	25	62	8	2	3	63		
B. The school supports the involvement of families and community members in planning, reviewing, and improving school programs.	18	66	8	7	2	61		
Parents	Strongly Agree %	Agree %	Disagree %	Strongly Disagree %	Don't Know %	Total <i>n</i>	Total Agree 08 %	Total Agree 09 %
A. Parents can share their thoughts about decisions that affect their children at their school.	22	52	9	3	14	426	77	74
B. The school uses a variety of ways to communicate with parents.	20	53	11	5	12	426	71	73
C. My child's SLC teacher(s) inform me about my child's academic progress.	14	40	16	8	22	409	n/a	54
D. My child's SLC teacher(s) inform me about SLC activities	13	34	21	9	24	410	n/a	47

The majority of staff members (87%) agreed or strongly agreed that they have regular contact with parents to inform them about their child's progress. A very similar percentage (84%) also agreed that the school is supportive of the involvement of families and community members. Along the same train of thought, parents were in agreement that they are able to share their thoughts about decisions that affect their children at Jordan (74% agreement). A majority (73%) of parents also agreed that the school used a variety of ways to communicate with the them. When asked specifically about interactions with the teacher(s), slightly more than half (54%) of parents agreed that their child's SLC teacher(s) does inform them about their child's academic progress, but a little less than half, 47%, agreed that they are informed about SLC activities.

Although there have been some improvements at both campuses in recent years with regard to parent participation, it continues to be a challenge according to the SLC coordinator. A 9th grade SLC teacher reported that "a lot of parents" volunteered on a recent trip, an improvement from the past. Also this academic year, "a good number of parents" participated in the Keys to Success Night, an event in which parents are told student expectations at school. Another example is the turnout of approximately 40 parents at a recent SLC Saturday morning meeting to discuss programmatic changes. Furthermore, SLC teachers on the main campus also reported that there is increased communication with parents, primarily over the telephone, as teachers call home more often to inquire about students. SchoolLoop has been helpful. Parents are more responsive to those phone calls or e-mails and feel that teachers care. However, it is still a challenge to get parents to visit the campus. An SLC teacher from the main campus reported that her SLC has a lot of parental involvement primarily due to having a parent advisory council. This teacher also reported that some parents become very committed to a particular SLC and enroll all their children in it. The SLC coordinator also mentioned a Parent Day meeting scheduled in May, as well a proposed SchoolLoop training for parents.

In regards to community partners, one SLC does have a connection with Dramatic Results, a local arts-based organization. SLC students volunteered to put together a mailer for the organization. There is also a connection with the Long Beach airport and a company that pairs students up with local businesses.

Challenges & Proposed Solutions

SLC students also indentified SLC weaknesses or challenges that need to be addressed. The majority of students agree that improvements are needed in the areas of SLC recruitment and SLC enrollment. They recommend raising SLC awareness in middle schools and on the Jordan High campus. One student suggested improving an SLC's website to better inform students and parents about what the SLC offers. Another student complained that SLC students do not get the same recognition as students from the magnet programs (AIMS and IB). The student suggested that SLC participants should also get medallions at graduation or a sash or something that recognizes them for their achievements and/or SLC commitment. Another student wished that SLCs could provide more theme-related classes (electives). Lastly, one SLC student indicated that teacher buy-in and involvement should improve. She explained her experience in the following manner:

I would like to have more teachers interested in the SLCs because I gave my slip to my fifth period teacher and was like, “Oh I hate SLCs.” And I was like “Why?” Well we—I like more teachers to be involved in it because we can have a lot more fun and have a huge Jordan family with the SLCs.”

SLC students are content with their SLCs but they do not hesitate to provide suggestions on how to improve them.

Non-SLC students also discussed what they considered weaknesses or challenges to SLCs at Jordan. Like the SLC students, non-SLC students suggested that there needs to be more SLC awareness on campus and more aggressive recruitment. One student suggested having information about SLCs in the summer during registration. Another student was very specific about the kind of awareness that is lacking: that SLCs are also for students who do not plan to go directly to college upon high school graduation. This student suggested that SLCs need to make students aware that they also serve those who plan to find employment upon graduating from Jordan High. Similarly, another student pointed out that SLCs seem geared for students who get A’s and B’s. However, students who get C’s and D’s also need help. Non-SLC students seem to perceive SLCs as requiring good grades in order for students to enroll in them. Other than the themes, non-SLC students indicated that they do not know other SLC difference. They reported that they would benefit from knowing how to differentiate between SLCs.

As for the at-large school changes, non-SLC students reported a variety. One student suggested that students should vote like Californians do for propositions to make changes at Jordan instead of relying on a few student council members to do make decisions. Another student indicated that poor performing teachers/staff need to be held accountable and either not rehired or “should be talked to” so they can improve. There was consensus among non-SLC students that the school should get rid of the tardy bell sweep, the method in which the school administration addresses students being late to class. In a tardy bell sweep, students are sent to a room for being late to class. Therefore, instead of walking in a few minutes late to class, they do not attend at all. Students suggested implementing a different consequence for being late. Students also called for teachers and counselors to do a better job of informing them about the different activities or resources on campus. Lastly, one student wished for school to start an hour later.

The challenges mentioned by the 9th grade SLC teachers have been mentioned in the past. There continues to be a struggle with teacher buy-in, getting teacher assistants, and improving teacher participation in meetings. The day before the focus group, an SLC had the most successful meeting as six teachers attended. The SLC lead teacher shared that she is trying different ways to get her colleagues to attend meetings and she admitted that providing food seemed to have helped. Although things are improving, there is still the negative public perception of Jordan to struggle with. For one teacher representing an SLC at JFA, the challenge is being the only one in her SLC at JFA and not having the necessary equipment to fully engage students. Another issue pertains to scheduling. A teacher described her struggle in the following manner:

I’m constantly having to regive (counselors) the list of the students that at least should be tagged as JMAC and they’re not or you know my lead teacher are giving the names of students that should be in my classes and they’re not. Also at the beginning of the year,

there's always a lot of corrections to be made which is frustrating.

Another SLC teacher also indicated that "I find the system we have in place for tagging the students and identifying them as difficult." Teachers do not have access to the scheduling information they need and, as one teacher described it, "that there are too many hands in the cookie jar" in regards to scheduling. There has been an attempt to assign one counselor per SLC regardless of grade level because too many counselors are involved in scheduling but the issue has not been resolved. For next year when every student will be in an SLC, having one counselor per SLC would be very beneficial. Another teacher pointed out that "a lot of students were not tagged properly and kind of got lost in the fray." Main campus teachers explained that due to a change of computer systems, many students were not placed properly.

Another challenge faced by JFA is that SLCs make it difficult for non-SLC students because they see their friends going on fieldtrips which are not available to them. According to non-SLC teachers at JFA, SLCs ostracizes non-SLC students because they must think that "Oh, I don't deserve it" or "I'm not good enough" or "Oh, I'm not the smart kid." Similarly, non-SLC teachers at JFA feel that SLCs make their job more difficult as they get the more challenging students given that the "better" students are being placed in SLCs. In addition, SLC and non-SLC teachers are separated in terms of meetings they attend so there is less interaction between them. When 9th graders are promoted to the main campus, the connections between them and their 9th grade teachers are lost.

The challenges mentioned by SLC teachers on the main campus differ somewhat from what 9th grade teachers reported. A challenge mentioned by an SLC teacher pertains to looping teachers so they can teach two grade levels. An SLC teacher can teach 10th and 12th grades but because 9th grade teachers and students are on a different campus, a teacher cannot teach both 9th and 11th grades. According to this SLC teacher, it would be best to have all SLC students on one campus. Another teacher from a different SLC indicated that s/he a block bell schedule would benefit his/her SLC. The SLC coordinator also mentioned parental involvement as a continuous challenge. Another concern for the SLC coordinator is the continuous focus and speculation on what will happen to SLCs once the grant ends. The principals also added that budget constraints at the state and local levels will also have an impact on what can and cannot be done in conjunction with the SLC grant.

D. Summary/Conclusions

At the end of the fourth year of implementation, SLCs at Jordan HS have a small, but growing presence. There are five established SLCs and three SSPs. There are some discrepancies as to how SLC implementation occurs at the main campus versus JFA. On the main campus, for those who are in an SLC, awareness seems to be high. However, at JFA SLCs are not as well-defined. Reasons for which non-SLC teachers on the main campus did not participating in SLCs varied but are rooted in lack of awareness. Parents' awareness regarding SLCs closely mirrors that of the students. Findings indicate that there is yet little student involvement in SLC development.

All teachers, whether in an SLC or not, report that the purpose of SLCs at Jordan is to provide student with a smaller learning environment to support their academic needs and career interests.

Compared to previous years, a higher percentage of students at Jordan do report engaging in academic conversations, including talking with their counselor about their class schedule and talking with their teachers and peers about academic work. While students indicated that SLCs facilitate access to academic assistance and college information, most students, whether in an SLC or not, agreed that the student has some responsibility to seek resources as well. There does not seem to be any significant differences between SLC and non-SLC students in terms of their academic behavior once enrolled in high school. However, students who did choose to be in an SLC seemed to express a greater concern for their education and plans after high school.

Expectations remain high for both students and parents regarding educational attainment, which is not necessarily reflected in staff members' expectations for student achievement. Knowledge regarding college preparation remains about the same as previous years. One area that students continue to struggle with is awareness regarding standardized tests needed for college admission. SLC students see SLCs as preparing them for both college and careers. It seems that college awareness activities may be better organized and delivered to SLC students than to non-SLC students. Evaluation results do show that students and parents both perceive strong academic support by the staff at Jordan.

There have been improvements in terms of personalization and students becoming familiar with interdisciplinary class work. According to staff who participated in the focus groups, for those who have taught in the older SLCs, there have been no noticeable changes since the implementation of this new grant. Both SLC and non-SLC students indicated that they know their teachers well, although there does seem to be the recognition that SLC students interact more with their teachers. SLCs students also appear to interact more with their SLC peers than peers outside their SLC, particularly in the classroom/academic settings.

Administrators and teachers at Jordan seem to demonstrate a clear understanding of the purpose and role that SLCs should play with respect to student achievement and school climate. Specifically, when it comes to SLC implementation, those staff members involved with an SLC seem to enjoy peer collaboration, despite the additional inconvenience caused by having two different school sites. There have been some improvements at both campuses in recent years with regard to parent participation, according to the SLC coordinator, however it continues to be a challenge. Overall SLC recruitment and enrollment continues to be a challenge at Jordan, as well.

IV. POLYTECHNIC HIGH SCHOOL

A. Previous Years' Evaluation Summary

Poly HS started the grant with the advantage of already having loosely established SLCs, including three SSPs. Thus in 2005-06, every Poly HS student was already enrolled in an SLC. The first year of implementation of this SLC Initiative, 2005-06, allowed Poly staff to re-think SLCs and introduce a structure that would support a uniform SLC vision rather than have the programs co-exist independently. During this time, to expand their knowledge about SLCs and hone leadership skills, Poly HS staff also took part in professional development workshops provided by the Northwest Regional Lab and the LBUSD High School Office. Furthermore, staff participated in a logic model session moderated by SRM Evaluation Group evaluators. A Poly HS logic model draft was finalized by Summer 2006. The first year of the grant, therefore, was a time for Poly staff to identify their programs' strengths and weaknesses, plan on how to enhance SLCs, and establish a common vision of how SLCs would lead to overall school improvement. At the moment, Poly has five SLCs of which three are SSPs.

In 2006-07, Poly students were reporting feeling close to their SLC peers. College awareness among students continued to be high, especially when compared to students of other LBUSD high schools. Academic behavior, however, was similar to other high school students. Staff reported understanding the purpose and vision behind implementing SLCs and indicated that they believed that SLCs would help raise student achievement. They were not as confident that SLCs would help improve the systems and processes at the school. The most rewarding aspect seemed to be an increase in collaboration and improved relations for both teachers and students. The biggest challenge was providing time for staff to share ideas and instructional strategies, and opportunities for collaboration. In the third year, 2007-08, there was no change in terms of what staff found rewarding and challenging regarding SLCs. When compared to the previous year, there was also very little change in students' college knowledge and academic behavior. Students continued to feel closer to their SLC peers than to students in other SLCs. In 2007-08, however, some SLC students expressed frustration at being restricted from participating in the college preparation structures available at Poly High. According to students, these are in place and guarded primarily for those enrolled in SSPs. Yet despite that challenge, SLC students appeared just as motivated as SSP students in attending college.

B. SLC Program Description

In the fourth year of implementation (2008-09), Poly HS continues to have five SLCs, and three SSPs. These are:

1. Academy of Humanities
2. Beach Academy of Math and Science
3. Media, Entertainment, Technology, & Sports (METS)
4. Medical and Paramedical Services (MAPS)
5. Poly Academy of Achievers and Learners (PAAL)

Specialized Secondary Programs

1. The Pacific Rim Academy (Pac Rim)
2. Center for International Commerce (CIC)
3. Program of Additional Curricular Experiences (PACE)

For the purposes of this analysis SSPs will be treated like SLCs, unless otherwise noted. A detailed description of each SLC can be found in Appendix A. Each SLC leadership team continues to work on action plans, as does the SLC coordinator with a school-wide version. These outcome action plans are reviewed periodically. Some of these charts were modified in 2008-09 to adhere to a district initiative for that calls for a stronger alignment between SLC themes and academic and career pathways. As a result, there has been some internal restructuring within SLCs. Two SLCs modified their themes and renamed themselves: Communications Academy changed to Media, Entertainment, Technology, & Sports (METS) and Business and Technology Academy renamed itself to Medical and Paramedical Services (MAPS). Poly HS has had wall-to-wall SLCs since the initiation of the grant in 2005. Thus, all students 9th through 12th grade are officially assigned to an academy, whether an SLC or an SSP. All staff members are either assigned to an SSP or an SLC. Some SLC teachers, however, do not have pure classes and cannot partake in the SLC teaching experience despite being affiliated with an SLC.

Survey and Focus Group Participants - Poly

As first described in the Introduction, a total of 3,608 Poly students (76% of the total student population) responded to the survey, 38 staff members (18% of the school staff), and 1543 parents. In this section, further demographic details are described specifically as related to individual SLCs at Poly.

Of the students who responded to the survey, approximately 97% indicated membership in an SLC. Only 3% indicated that they either a) did not belong to an SLC, or b) did not know which SLC to which they were assigned. Similarly, only 4% of parents indicated that they did not know or did not think their child was in an SLC. Each SLC is represented by the students and parents who responded to this survey. For the staff, 19% of respondents indicated that they did not belong to an SLC. Also, there were no responses from Pac Rim staff. The distribution of responses can be seen in Table 4.1 below.

Table 4.1. Percentage Distribution of Polytechnic Survey Respondents by SLC, LBUSD HS SLC Survey, Student, Staff, and Parent Respondents, 2009.

	Student %	Staff %	Parent %
Academy of the Humanities	13	11	11
Beach Academy of Math & Science	16	3	16
Center for International Commerce (CIC)	15	14	21
Media, Entertainment, Technology, & Sports (METS)	13	3	11
Medical and Paramedical Services (MAPS)	12	11	10
Pacific Rim Academy (Pac Rim)	5	0	5
Poly Academy of Achievers & Learners (PAAL)	7	17	3
Program of Additional Curricular Experiences (PACE)	15	11	20
Multiple	n/a	11	n/a
I'm (or my child is) not in a SLC.	2	19	1
I don't know which SLC I (or my child is) am in.	1	0	3
Total	100	100	100
N	3,534	36	1,462

Overall, 49% of student survey respondents from Poly were male. The gender distribution for each SLC can be seen in Table 4.2. Amongst the survey respondents, most of the SLCs and SSPs have approximately a 50-50 gender distribution. For two programs, the Academy of the Humanities and PACE there is a slightly higher percentage of females. The reverse is true for MAPS and PAAL, which have a slightly higher percentage of males.

Table 4.2. Percentage Distribution of Gender by Polytechnic SLC, LBUSD HS SLC Survey, Student Respondents, 2009.

	Female %	Male %	Total N
Academy of the Humanities	60	40	459
Beach Academy of Math & Science	45	55	551
Center for International Commerce (CIC)	52	48	520
Media, Entertainment, Technology, & Sports (METS)	50	50	434
Medical and Paramedical Services (MAPS)	43	57	410
Pacific Rim Academy (Pac Rim)	49	51	173
Poly Academy of Achievers & Learners (PAAL)	41	59	251
Program of Additional Curricular Experiences (PACE)	64	36	520
I'm not in an SLC.	31	69	67
I don't know which SLC I am in.	32	68	50
Total	51	49	3,435

While Table B9 in Appendix B provides a detailed description of the students' self-identified ethnic distribution for the overall student survey respondents, Table 4.3 shows the percentage distribution of ethnic group by SLC for Poly student survey respondents. At Poly, Humanities, METS, and MAPS show a fairly even ethnic distribution amongst predominate ethnic groups (African American, Asian/Filipino, and Hispanic/Latino). Three SLCs/SSPs - Beach, CIC, and PACE – have fairly large percentages of Asian and Filipino students, ranging from 38-43%. The two SSPs also have the largest percentage of White students. PAAL and the Humanities SLC have the largest percentage of African American students who responded to the student survey.

Table 4.3. Percentage Distribution of Ethnic Group* by Polytechnic SLC, LBUSD HS SLC Survey, Student Respondents, 2009

	African American %	Asian %	Filipino %	Hispanic/ Latino %	White %	Biracial/ Multiracial %	Other** %	Total %
Academy of the Humanities	30	19	4	32	2	8	6	101
Beach Academy of Math & Science	18	33	10	25	3	5	6	100
Center for International Commerce (CIC)	12	26	12	17	19	10	3	99
Media, Entertainment, Technology, & Sports (METS)	35	25	3	24	3	6	5	101
Medical and Paramedical Services (MAPS)	26	26	5	29	2	6	6	100
Pacific Rim Academy (Pac Rim)	31	11	7	28	7	7	9	100
Poly Academy of Achievers & Learners (PAAL)	43	16	1	29	1	5	5	100
Program of Additional Curricular Experiences (PACE)	6	27	12	12	31	9	3	100
I'm not in an SLC.	12	7	4	65	3	1	7	99
I don't know which SLC I am in.	15	23	2	50	2	0	8	100
Total %	22	24	7	25	10	7	5	100
N	737	805	241	819	322	231	168	3,323

* Breakdown by Ethnic Group is only provided when a minimum of 5% of respondents chose a particular Ethnic Group.

** Other in this case includes: American Indian, Pacific Islander, and Other - unspecified. In total, Other here represents 5% of the respondents for Poly HS.

A total of three student focus groups, two SLC and one non-SLC, with the participation of 21 students were conducted at Poly. There were some limitations to demographic data collection during the focus groups given that some students arrived late after the data had already been collected at the beginning. It is unknown but highly unlikely that any 9th graders participated in the focus groups. It is known that two 10th graders, six 11th graders, and seven seniors participated in the focus group. Six students represented PAAL, four belonged to PACE, and two were in METS. Both CIC and MAPS were represented by three students each while PacRim and the Academy of the Humanities were each represented by one student.

A principal and SLC coordinator participated in separate interviews. A total of three teacher focus groups, two SLC and one non-SLC, with the participation of 14 teachers were conducted at Poly. There were some limitations to demographic data collection during the focus groups given that some teachers arrived late after the data had already been collected at the beginning. Some teacher participants reported teaching multiple grades and subjects. All grade levels and the following subjects were represented by teachers: English, science, computer/technology, history/ social studies, and mathematics. Four teachers represented MAPS, three were in Beach Academy of Math & Science, and one belonged to METS. Both the Academy of the Humanities and PACE were each represented by two teachers. It appears that CIC, PacRim, and PAAL had no teacher representation in the focus groups.

C. Evaluation Results 2008-09

1. ATTITUDES AND BELIEFS TOWARD ACHIEVEMENT

Academic Behavior and Expectations

In an effort to understand student academic behavior, students were asked about their experiences in gathering resources or seeking assistance with college information, academic planning, and schoolwork. In particular, students were asked about discussing class schedules with counselors, engaging in conversations with their teachers about their academic work, getting into college and paying for college, and engaging in conversations with peers about their academic work and plans after high school. Students were also asked about their expectations for their academic future, specifically whether they desired to attend college immediately after completing high school and their expected highest level of education. Student survey results for these questions can be found in Table 4.4. To more accurately capture student academic behavior, parents were asked the same questions framed as their perception of their children's experiences. Table 4.5 presents parent survey results for these questions. Because a few of these questions coincided with the staff survey, results were included in the analysis and made available in Table 4.6. Whenever possible, this year's findings were compared to baseline data collected three years ago. A complete comparison is not possible given that the student survey was modified and condensed after the first year of implementation at the request of school district staff. If no baseline data was available, a comparison was made with last year's findings.

At Poly HS, student survey responses indicate that the vast majority of students are having conversations about their academic schedule with their counselor at least once a year. About 51% of the students indicated they talked with their counselor between 1-3 times a year. For approximately 37% of the students these conversations were more frequent – at least once a month. A small percentage of students (11%) do indicate that they never talk to their counselor about their schedule. Compared to the response for this same question from last year this percentage of students dropped 7% from 18% in 2008. When parents were asked a similar question, only 7% of parents reported 'never.' This is 1% less than the parents who responded 'never' in the 2008 survey.

When students were asked how often they spoke to their teachers about their academic work, over half (69%) responded that these conversations were occurring at least every other week. An overwhelming majority of 84% of students said they talked to their teachers about their academic work at least once a month. A very small percentage of students (5%) did say that they never spoke with their teachers about their academic work. When compared to responses to the same question in the previous two years, this percentage of students has decreased by 13% from 2008. Students at Poly show a similar trend when asked how often they talked to their peers about their academic work. In Spring 2009 there is a slightly larger percentage (7%) of students who indicated never having conversations about their academic work with their peers, when compared to those who indicated never having these conversations with their teachers. Again, this percentage has only decreased by 10% from last year. Parents were also asked how often they believed their children talked to someone at school about their academic work. A very

small percentage, 3%, believe that their child never talked with someone at school about their academics, while approximately 77% of parents believe this happened at least monthly.

Table 4.4. Polytechnic Student Survey Responses on Academic Attitudes and Behavior, including comparisons to previous years for the response category “Never,” LBUSD HS SLC Survey, 2009.

	Always %	Once a week %	Every other week %	Once a month %	2-3 times a year %	Once a year %	Never %	Total <i>n</i>	Total Never 06%	Total Never 07 %	Total Never 08 %	Total Never 09 %
A. I talk to my counselor about my class schedule.	8	5	7	17	35	16	11	3,436	n/a	15	18	11
B. I talk to my teachers about my academic work.	32	19	18	15	7	3	5	3,541	n/a	10	18	5
C. I talk to my peers about my academic work.	43	21	14	9	4	3	7	3,549	n/a	11	17	7
D. I talk to someone at school about how to get into college.	16	11	14	20	21	8	9	3,559	15	13	24	9
E. I talk to someone at school about how to pay for college.	9	7	9	17	18	14	25	3,536	31	36	42	25
F. I talk to my peers about my plans after high school.	41	17	14	14	7	3	4	3,521	n/a	n/a	n/a	4
	Strongly Agree %	Agree %	Disagree %	Strongly Disagree %	Total <i>n</i>	Total Agree 07 %	Total Agree 08 %	Total Agree 09 %				
G. Immediately after high school, I want to go to college.	67	24	8	1	3,581	90	85	91				
H. What is the highest level of education you think you will complete?	less than high school %	high school graduate %	some college %	Technical/ Trade college %	AA degree (2- year) %	BA/BS degree (4- year) %	Graduate- level degree %	Total <i>n</i>				
2009	1	3	8	3	8	43	35	3,342				
2008	2	7	11	3	10	32	35	2,023				
2007	1	6	8	2	8	34	41	1,450				
2006	1	7	11	4	5	36	35	2,878				

On the survey, students were also asked to specify how often they spoke to someone at school about how to get into college and how to pay for college. With regard to conversations about how to get into college, close to one third (29%) of the students indicated they spoke with someone at school between 1-3 times a year. About 61% of the students at Poly spoke to someone at least once a month, if not more frequently. This means that about 9% of students indicated that they never talked with someone at school about how to get into college. This percentage has dropped significantly from 24% in 2008. According to the parents surveyed from Poly, half (51%) also believed that their child spoke to someone at school at least once a month about how to get into college. Only 6% thought their children had never spoken to someone at school about getting into college, however 12% did not know whether or not their child had done so. Interestingly, 91% of staff members surveyed agreed or strongly agreed that they spoke with their students about how to get into college. At Poly, student, parent, and staff perceptions regarding college awareness conversations appear to be aligned.

Similar to years past, the conversations about how to get into college are happening more frequently than are the conversations about how to pay for college. One fourth of students (25%) report they have never spoken to someone at school about how to pay for college. This is a much smaller percentage of students at Poly than in previous years. In 2009, a smaller percentage of parents (16%), when compared to students, indicated that they believe that their children have never spoken to someone at school about how to pay for college. However, another 16% also indicated that they did not know whether or not their children spoke to someone at school about financing a college education. This year, 73% of staff members did indicated that they have spoken with their students about how to pay for college.

When it comes to talking with their peers about their plans after high school, the largest percentage of students (41%) indicated that this happens ‘always.’ About the same number of students (45% of survey respondents) indicated that they spoke with their peers about their plans after high school between once a week to once a month. A very small percentage (4%) said they never spoke to peers about plans after high school.

An important precursor to whether a student achieves post-secondary academic success is their expectations for post-secondary plans. Therefore, students were also asked whether they desired to attend college immediately after completing high school and what was their expected highest level of education. At the end of the 2009 school year, 91% of the students who responded to the survey indicated that they agreed or strongly agreed that immediately after high school they wanted to go to college. This percentage increased slightly from the previous two years (up 6% and 1% from 2008 and 2007, respectively). The parents’ response to a comparable question was very similar to that of their children. Ninety three percent of parents agreed or strongly agreed that immediately after high school their children wanted to attend college. This increased 2% from parents’ responses to the same question in 2008.

The majority of students at Poly do have fairly high expectations when it comes to their expected highest level of education. In 2009, 43% of students expected they would eventually obtain an undergraduate degree from a 4-year college. This percentage had been steadily decreasing, but then increased by 11% from 2008 to 2009. Similarly, the percentage of students expected to earn a graduate degree has also been fairly high for Poly students, ranging from 35-41% in the years

2006 to 2009. There is only a small percentage (15%) of overall Poly students who do not expect to earn at minimum a 2-year degree.

Table 4.5. Polytechnic Parent Survey Responses on Academic Attitudes and Behavior, LBUSD HS SLC Survey, 2009.

	Always %	Once a week %	Every other week %	Once a month %	2-3 times a year %	Once a year %	Never %	Don't Know %	Total <i>n</i>	Total Never 08 %	Total Never 09 %
A. My child talks to the counselor about his/her class schedule.	8	6	5	13	33	17	7	11	1,527	8	7
B. My child talks to someone at school about his/her academic work.	33	18	13	13	9	4	3	8	1,523	n/a	3
C. My child talks to someone at school about how to get into college.	15	11	9	16	20	10	6	12	1,528	14	6
D. My child talks to someone at school about how to pay for college.	9	8	8	14	15	16	16	16	1,524	27	16
	Strongly Agree %	Agree %	Disagree %	Strongly Disagree %	Don't Know %	Total <i>n</i>	Total Agree 08 %	Total Agree 09 %			
D. My child wants to go to college right after graduating from high school.	64	29	4	1	3	1,536	91	93			
E. What is the highest level of education you think your child will complete?	less than high school %	high school graduate %	some college %	Technical/ Trade college %	AA degree (2-year) %	BA/BS degree (4-year) %	Graduate -level degree %	Total <i>n</i>			
2009	1	4	5	3	6	39	42	1,458			
2008	2	3	6	1	5	39	44	1,249			

Parents are similarly optimistic as the students when it comes to their child's expected highest level of education. Of those parents that responded to the survey, 39% believed their children would complete a 4-year degree while 42% expect graduate level degrees. Staff members were asked a similar, but slightly different question with respect to expected education levels. Staff members were asked what percentage of their students they believed would complete a certain education level. These percentages were then averaged across respondents for each education

level. The results can be seen in Table 4.6. At Poly, staff expectations for students' educational attainment are much lower than those of the students and parents, as expressed in previous years. On average, staff members believe that about one third of their students (29%) will have completed high school as their highest level of education. On average, staff members believe that 26% of their students will obtain a 4-year degree.

Table 4.6. Polytechnic Staff Survey Responses on Academic Attitudes and Behavior, LBUSD HS SLC Survey, 2009.

	Strongly Agree %	Agree %	Disagree %	Strongly Disagree %	Not Applicable %	Total <i>n</i>
A. I talk with my students about how to get into college.	59	32	8	0	0	37
B. I talk with my students about how to pay for college.	43	30	22	0	5	37
C. In your opinion, what percentage of your students will complete the following levels of education:	Mean % *					<i>n</i>
Less than high school	10					37
High school graduate	29					37
Some college	14					37
Attend a trade/technical school	10					37
Attend a community college (AA degree)	17					37
Attend a 4-year college (BA degree)	26					37
Attend graduate school	8					37

* Respondents provided an estimated percentage for each level of education; the "Mean %" is the average of the responses of all respondents. The sum of these averages does not equal 100% because not all staff provided percentages adding to 100%.

While the survey results provided details of specific academic behavior and expectations, the focus group data analysis yielded more general information regarding these issues. Students of one SLC are in a unique situation because their academy is designed to support them in earning missing course credits necessary for graduation. Thus, students enrolled in that SLC must exhibit an academic behavior that is committed to doing the extra work necessary to meet the credit requirements for graduation. Students from this SLC reported being exposed to both a "better learning environment" and a longer day of instruction than students in other academies. Students indicated that they recognize and appreciate these differences, as they do the flexibility of being able to focus on individual learning. Displaying a concern for resources available to them at the conclusion of the focus group, students asked for better books in the library.

SLC students report that there is evidence that when students take the initiative and ask for assistance, they will receive it. One student in the focus group implied that peers need to take the initiative to get all the college information they may need from their counselors. The student summarized it by indicating that counselors "might give you information, they support you but you gotta meet them halfway too and that's like with anything in life." Similarly, students from other SLCs reported that when peers ask teachers for help, they can and do receive one-on-one assistance with homework. SLC students from the main campus described an environment in

which students socialize and help each other with homework. These students also reported that their good academic behavior and achievements are recognized by counselors, who assist them in their pursuit of awards.

There are two main challenges SLC students face in pursuing rigorous courses: 1) SLC courses include disruptive students who make it difficult to learn, and 2) they have limited access to those courses. First, SLC students reported having a better learning experience enrolling in courses outside their SLCs because they avoid disruptive peers. Students indicated that their SLCs move at a slower pace when compared to SSPs because some of their SLC peers take longer to understand the material. SSP peers confirm that SLC “students themselves also seemed less competitive” while “competitive (SSP) kids usually pay attention more and do their homework more often” and are “a lot more motivated.” Therefore, SLC students must take the initiative to enroll in SSP courses to pursue a better learning environment. Secondly, there is some resentment from SLC students because, despite attempts to enroll in challenging courses or fun electives, SSP students “get first choice and then if they’re already full, we (SLC students) get the leftovers.” There is the perception that SLC students “don’t get a lot of classes like they (SSP students) do.” Although SLC students are perceived as being less academically prepared than SSP students, an SLC student indicated that negative comments are “not gonna stop us from doing” what they need to. One student described her experience in attempting to enroll in Honors English which she failed to do so because the two courses were meant for SSP students. SSP students confirmed that AP courses are limited primarily to them but that SLC students could enroll if they get a teacher recommendation. Despite displaying positive academic behavior, the system in place seems to limit students from pursuing academic challenges. One student described how s/he just “wanted to see how it would feel to be in Honors English, just never had the chance.” As a result, s/he feels underprepared for the AP English class in which s/he enrolled.

College Knowledge

Students were also asked to state to what degree they agreed with six statements that were intended to better understand students’ college knowledge. These statements included feeling prepared to succeed in college, affording a 4-year college with financial assistance, and knowing: a) the difference between 2-year and 4-year colleges; b) the required standardized tests needed to apply to college; c) how AP courses help in college; and d) the A-G requirements. The results are summarized in Table 4.7. Parents were also asked these six statements framed as their perception of their children’s college knowledge. Additionally, parents were asked whether they believed that the school informed them about college. The parent survey results are available in Table 4.8. Two questions answered by staff regarding these topics are presented in Table 4.9.

A very large majority of the students surveyed (91%) agreed that they know the difference between a 2-year and 4-year college. This is a slight increase from the previous year where 85% of students agreed with that statement. Parents’ responses were fairly similar to students in that 89% agreed that their child knew the difference between a 2-year and 4-year college. There was also an increase in the percentage of students who said they know about the A-G requirements needed to get into a UC school. In 2009, 90% of students agreed with this statement, while in 2008 and 2007 this percentage was 89% and 82%, respectively. Amongst the parents, 84% of

respondents agreed that their child knew about the A-G requirements. This is a slight decrease from the previous year when 90% of parents thought their students knew about the A-G requirements. Staff members were similar in their response with 92% agreeing that their students were aware of the A-G requirements.

Table 4.7. Polytechnic Student Survey Responses on College Knowledge, LBUSD HS SLC Survey, 2009.

	Strongly Agree %	Agree %	Disagree %	Strongly Disagree %	Total <i>n</i>	Total Agree 07 %	Total Agree 08 %	Total Agree 09 %
A. Once I graduate, I will have taken the classes required to apply to college.	55	37	7	1	3,590	n/a	n/a	92
B. I think I can afford to attend a public, 4-year college using financial aid, scholarships, or my family's income.	31	50	15	4	3,592	84	77	81
C. I know the difference between a 2-year and 4-year college.	55	36	8	1	3,594	89	85	91
D. I know which standardized test(s) I need to take to apply for college.	38	39	20	3	3,585	80	70	77
E. I understand how taking AP courses will help me in college.	53	37	9	1	3,580	88	81	90
F. I know about the A-G requirements to get into a UC.	56	34	8	2	3,586	89	82	90

The percentage of students who indicated that they understood how taking AP courses will help them in college when comparing last years' response to this years' also increased (81% in 2008 versus 90% in 2009). In 2009, 87% of parents also agreed with this statement.

Students were asked for the first time this year to what extent they agreed that once they graduate they will have taken the classes required to apply to college. Ninety two percent of students agreed or strongly agreed with that statement. This closely mirrors the parents' response of 91% agreement to a comparable statement. However, when staff was asked to what extent they agreed with the statement "By the time students graduate from this school, they will be prepared to succeed at the college or career of their choice," only 78% agreed or strongly agreed. This, again, illustrates the different expectations that staff members may have for their students when compared to the expectations that students have for themselves or parents have for their children.

When it came to financing post-secondary education and knowing which standardized tests were needed to apply for college, students and parents were not as confident. Eighty-one percent of students agreed or strongly agreed with the statement, "I think I can afford to attend a public, 4-year college using financial aid, scholarships, or my family's income." Sixty-six percent of parents agreed or strongly agreed with the corresponding statement. Interestingly students'

responses, when compared to the previous years' did increase slightly. However, the parents' level of agreement did trend downward. This could be a reflection of the overall difficult economic times in 2008-09.

Table 4.8. Polytechnic Parent Survey Responses on College Knowledge, LBUSD HS SLC Survey, 2009.

	Strongly Agree %	Agree %	Disagree %	Strongly Disagree %	Don't Know %	Total <i>n</i>	Total Agree 08 %	Total Agree 09 %
A. Once my child graduates, he/she will have taken the classes required to apply to college.	50	41	3	1	5	1,528	n/a	91
B. I think I can pay to send my child to a public, 4-year college with my income, financial aid, or scholarships.	23	43	15	8	12	1,520	77	66
C. My child knows the difference between a 2-year and a 4-year college.	49	40	5	1	7	1,531	87	89
D. My child knows which standardized test(s) they need to take to apply for college.	35	44	10	1	10	1,539	81	79
E. My child knows about the A-G requirements to get into a UC.	43	41	6	1	9	1,521	90	84
F. My child knows how taking Advanced Placement (AP) classes will help him/her in college.	46	41	5	1	7	1526	n/a	87
G. The school informs parents about college.	19	52	16	4	9	1,534	n/a	71

In response to a statement about knowing which standardized tests to take, 77% of students agreed to some extent. Although this is up 7% from the previous year, it is down 3% from 2007. When parents are asked for their perspective, 79% agreed or strongly agreed that their child knew which standardized tests needed to be taken. This is down 2% from the previous year. Seventy one percent of parents also agreed that the school informed parents about college.

Table 4.9. Polytechnic Staff Survey Responses on College Knowledge, LBUSD HS SLC Survey, 2009.

	Strongly Agree %	Agree %	Disagree %	Strongly Disagree %	Not Applicable %	Total <i>n</i>
A. Students are aware of the A-G requirements needed to get into a UC or CSU.	38	54	5	3	0	37
B. By the time students graduate from this school, they will be prepared to succeed at the college or career of their choice.	28	50	22	0	0	36

While the analysis from the student survey results provided details of where the strengths and weaknesses regarding student college knowledge lie, the focus group analysis yielded general information about college entrance and preparation requirements. Both SLC and SSP students at Poly reported being aware of college application requirements and financial aid resources. Whether enrolled in an SLC or SSP, students credit their knowledge to counselors making classroom visits, teachers showing them how to sign up for e-mail updates from different universities and scholarship resources, their participation in various college preparatory programs, and information that is available at the Career Center. A student described his/her experience of how college awareness is raised in the different grade levels. Visitors first came to classes in the 9th grade to discuss colleges and then 10th graders visited UCLA. One student described the early college awareness exposure in the following manner: “thank God they were here for information because if I didn’t sign up then I probably would have a lower (SAT/ACT) score.” In 11th grade, visitors went to classrooms and discussed different scholarships. As seniors, the guidance intensifies and “people” talk to students to make sure that they are completing the FAFSA. One student noted that, “Our counselors...they work with our teachers to make sure we’re prepared.” Students also noted that, “everybody (students and their peers) does discuss [college admission issues].” More importantly to a student is that the history teacher is teaching students how to write their thesis, which is something they will have to do once enrolled in college.

2. CULTURE AND CLIMATE

SLC Awareness and Student Involvement

As previously mentioned and illustrated on Table 4.1, only 1% of Poly HS students reported in the survey not knowing their SLC assignment or indicated they were not part of one. Parents’ SLC awareness closely resembles students’ in that 3% of parents indicated that they did not know to which SLC their child belonged. The option ‘I’m not in an SLC’ was not selected by any staff members. The level of awareness of SLC assignment is very high among Poly HS staff, students, and parents.

On the student survey, five items were used to gauge students’ involvement with their SLC. Students were asked to what extent they agreed that they a) help make decision at their school that affect them, b) help make suggestions about how to change their SLC, c) felt comfortable in their SLC community, d) liked to participate in their SLC activities, and e) wanted to work or get a college education in the same area of focus as their SLC. Parents were also asked to give their perspective on how comfortable their child was in his/her SLC community and if s/he liked participating in the SLC activities. There was one corresponding item on the staff survey that also provides some insight into student involvement in SLC development. Staff members were asked to what extent they agreed that students had opportunities to suggest modifications to SLCs. Detailed results for these survey items can be seen in Tables 4.10.

Survey results indicate that the majority of students at Poly feel they have a say in decisions that affect them at their school level, but not so much when it comes to making suggestions for changes to their SLC. A total of 72% of students agreed or strongly agreed that they help make decisions at school that affect them, but only 37% agreed to some extent that they help make suggestions about how to change their SLC. This suggests that students are not yet very

involved in the SLC development process. Staff members were a little more optimistic about their students' involvement with SLC development. When presented with the statement "Students at this school have opportunities to suggest modifications to the SLCs" 62% of staff members agreed to some extent with that statement.

The majority of students did agree that they felt comfortable in their SLC community (88% agreed/strongly agreed) and that they liked to participate in their SLC activities (66% agreed/strongly agreed). The majority of parents also agreed that their child was comfortable in their SLC community (87%) and that their child liked to participate in the SLC activities (69%). These are both higher than the percentages from the previous year. Student survey responses also seem to indicate there is strong interest by the students to continue in the field of focus of their SLC. Sixty one percent of students agreed or strongly agreed that after high school they wanted to work or study in the same area of focus as their SLC.

Table 4.10. Polytechnic Survey Responses on Student SLC Involvement, LBUSD HS SLC Survey, 2009.

Students	Strongly Agree %	Agree %	Disagree %	Strongly Disagree %	Total <i>n</i>	Total Agree 07 %	Total Agree 08 %	Total Agree 09 %
A. I help make decisions at this school that affect me.	20	52	23	5	3,594	n/a	n/a	72
B. I help make suggestions about how to change my SLC.	5	32	52	11	3,563	n/a	n/a	37
C. I feel comfortable in my SLC community.	35	53	9	3	3,578	89	76	88
D. I like to participate in my SLC activities.	14	52	29	6	3,551	78	59	66
E. After high school, I want to work or get a college education in the same area of focus as my SLC.	21	40	31	8	3,572	n/a	n/a	61
Parents	Strongly Agree %	Agree %	Disagree %	Strongly Disagree %	Don't Know %	Total <i>n</i>	Total Agree 08 %	Total Agree 09 %
A. My child feels comfortable in his/her SLC community.	33	54	5	2	7	1,531	73	87
B. My child likes to participate in his/her SLC activities.	18	51	13	3	14	1,533	60	69
Staff	Strongly Agree %	Agree %	Disagree %	Strongly Disagree %	Not Applicable %	Total <i>n</i>		
A. Students at this school have opportunities to suggest modifications to the SLCs.	16	46	24	8	5	37		

Administrators and faculty demonstrated their understanding and awareness of the purpose of SLC implementation on the Poly campus through comments provided during interviews and focus groups. A non-SLC teacher noted the strong presence of SLCs at Poly by noting that, "I see the academies really promoting themselves and advertising." Students seemed to agree that because "there are so many kids, like, if you divide it up, the classes, there are more similar

people in them, it's easier for us all to learn at the same time." In terms of building SLC identity, they continue to develop. According to some teachers, other than knowing to which SLC they belong and which peers belong to their SLC, students do not seem to see the big picture. Teachers believe that perhaps with more electives, students will truly understand what it means to be in their SLCs.

Interestingly, Poly students were initially confused by the term "SLC" because they do not refer to SLCs as such; rather, they use the term "academies." According to these students, the term "academies" is used more broadly across campus to include both SSPs and SLCs. In terms of structure, students agreed that SSPs and SLCs are similar and only differ in terms of the courses in which students are required to enroll. Some teachers in the focus groups did not realize that SSPs work slightly different than SLCs. Students directly, and at times indirectly, discussed a hierarchy that puts SSPs above SLCs. One SLC student commented that an SLC is "for me personally it's like more of a college-prep program" rather than a SSP/magnet.

Several concerns were raised among students, faculty, and staff regarding issues of equity and access. First, faculty took issue with the fact that not all SLCs offered advanced classes. Their second concern was regarding how different SLCs were on different bell schedules. Teachers noted that this has been problematic because it prevented many students from enrolling in advanced classes that were not offered by their own SLC. Students also noted that the implementation of SLCs have also seemed to create stereotypes among their peers. For example, several SLC students commented that SSP students were "stereotyped to be like the smarter kids at the school" and that they "feel like [they] don't get a lot of classes like [students in the magnet programs] do... [that they] get the leftovers." Non-SLC students also independently supported this comment when they noted feeling that students are placed in SLCs according to the grades that they have earned and that students are judged by the academy to which they belong. All students reported that the SSP students are perceived as being more motivated to perform well academically than students in SLCs. SLC students resent this stereotype and find themselves continuously tackling the school's structures that ensure that SSP students have access to more rigorous courses.

Personalization

One important premise of implementing SLCs is that the smaller school communities provide opportunities for increased and higher quality interactions between the students and teachers, as well as between the students themselves. This idea, termed personalization, can provide students with academic and non-academic support. To ascertain the degree of student-teacher interactions, students were asked to respond to questions pertaining to the level of communication and quality of support they receive from their teachers. Parents were also asked similar questions in efforts to gather their perceptions of the type of personalization that is taking place at the school. In some cases, teachers were asked questions aligned to the other surveys to investigate if their responses were consistent with those of students and parents. Students and parents were then also asked several questions about peer-to-peer interactions.

Student/Teacher Interaction

When asked if their teachers cared about how they did in school, a large majority of students agreed or strongly agreed with this statement (91%). This percentage has fluctuated slightly but not by much since 2007 (+2%). Similarly, 86% of students also agreed or strongly agreed that they feel supported by their teachers in their academic performance. The majority of parents also agreed or strongly agreed (82%) that teachers at Poly care about how their child does in school. This is also down slightly from 86% from the previous year. Student survey results on student-teacher interaction can be found in Table 4.11, parent survey results in Table 4.12, and staff survey results in Table 4.13.

Table 4.11. Polytechnic Student Survey Responses on Student-Teacher Interaction, LBUSD HS SLC Survey, 2009.

	Strongly Agree %	Agree %	Disagree %	Strongly Disagree %	Total <i>n</i>	Total Agree 06 %	Total Agree 07 %	Total Agree 08 %	Total Agree 09 %
A. My teachers care about how I do in school.	38	53	8	2	3,496	n/a	89	83	91
B. I feel supported by my teachers in my academic performance in class.	28	58	11	2	3,576	n/a	86	76	86
C. My teachers' lessons are designed to encourage me to think critically.	30	58	11	1	3,578	n/a	87	78	88
D. Teachers use a variety of teaching approaches to help students with different learning styles.	33	53	12	2	3,573	80	80	75	86
E. Teachers sometimes change their lesson plans because of student suggestions.	14	46	33	7	3,570	55	59	53	60
F. Teachers do a good job of making sure students know how they can get help if they fall behind.	30	53	14	2	3,570	n/a	84	75	83
G. My teachers tutor me when I need help with my homework.	25	56	17	3	3,500	n/a	n/a	n/a	81
H. Teachers help me make plans for life after high school.	15	49	31	5	3,579	n/a	75	64	63

Personalization can also be reflected in teachers' lessons and instruction. Students were asked to rate their level of agreement in terms of the amount of instructional changes they perceived occurring in their classes. In general, majority of students agree that they are encouraged to think critically and that their teachers use various instructional approaches to meet the needs of different students. Specifically, when asked this year if their teachers' lessons are designed to encourage them to think critically, 88% agreed. This is very similar to the response in 2007, and an increase from results in 2008 (87% - 2007; 78% - 2008). Approximately 95% of staff members agreed that lessons are designed to encourage students to think critically.

A strong majority of students also agreed that teachers use a variety of teaching approaches to help students with different learning styles (86%). This is up from the 75% of students who agreed with this statement in the 2008 survey. A large percentage (89%) of teachers also agree with this statement. Amongst the students there was not as strong agreement on whether or not teachers sometimes change their lesson plans because of student suggestions. Slightly more than half (60%) agreed or strongly agreed with this statement.

Students were also asked if they felt supported by their teachers when it came to receiving academic assistance. In particular, students were asked if they agreed that teachers do a good job of making sure students know how they can get help if they fall behind, and if teachers offer tutoring when students need help with their homework. Eighty three percent of students did agree or strongly agree that teachers do a good job of making sure students understand how to get help if they fall behind. Just over three-fourths of parents (79%) also agree that teachers do a good job of making sure that students know how to get help if they fall behind. Teachers feel even more strongly than students and parents; 92% of staff members agreed with the same statement. When it comes to tutoring, 81% of students agree that teachers offer tutoring help for homework. A higher percentage of teachers (98%) agreed that they offer tutoring for students who might need some additional academic support.

Table 4.12. Polytechnic Parent Survey Responses on Student-Teacher Interaction, LBUSD HS SLC Survey, 2009.

	Strongly Agree %	Agree %	Disagree %	Strongly Disagree %	Don't Know %	Total <i>n</i>	Total Agree 08 %	Total Agree 09%
A. Teachers do a good job of making sure students know how they can get help if they fall behind.	25	54	10	2	9	1,523	86	79
B. Teachers care about how my child does in school.	24	58	7	2	9	1,527	86	82
C. Teachers help my child make plans for life after high school.	16	49	15	3	16	1,522	80	65

All groups surveyed – students, parents, and staff – were asked if teachers help students make plans for life after high school. There was some variation in responses. Just less than two thirds of the students surveyed (63%) agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. This is down in percentage from two years ago, but the same as the previous year. In 2007, 75% agreed while 64% agreed with that statement in 2008. Amongst the parent survey respondents, 65% agreed that teachers help their child make plans for after high school. This is also down from the previous year, when 80% of parents agreed with that statement. Staff members had the highest percentage of agreement (100%) when asked to what extent they agreed that they talk with their students about their plans after high school.

On several additional statements regarding student and staff interaction, staff members indicated fairly strong agreement with the following: a) students receive regular guidance on course selection (89% agreement), b) there is a climate of trust here among students, teachers, and administrators (87%), c) teachers have high expectations for students (89%), and d) students

receive prompt feedback and regular progress reports with specific suggestions for improvement (86%).

Table 4.13. Polytechnic Staff Survey Responses on Student-Teacher Interaction, LBUSD HS SLC Survey, 2009.

	Strongly Agree %	Agree %	Disagree %	Strongly Disagree %	Not Applicable %	Total <i>n</i>
A. I talk with students about their plans after high school.	59	41	0	0	0	37
B. I tutor students who might need some additional academic support.	49	49	3	0	0	37
C. Teachers use a variety of teaching approaches to help students with different learning styles.	51	38	5	3	3	37
D. Lessons are designed and conducted to encourage students to think critically.	42	53	6	0	0	36
E. Teachers do a good job of making sure students know how they can get help if they fall behind.	51	41	5	0	3	37
F. Students receive regular guidance on course selection.	34	55	8	0	3	38
G. There is a climate of trust here among students, teachers, and administrators.	29	58	8	5	0	38
H. Teachers have high expectations for students.	36	53	8	3	0	36
I. Students receive prompt feedback and regular progress reports with specific suggestions for improvement.	43	43	14	0	0	37

Comments from students, faculty, and staff suggest that personalization is experienced across the board at Poly. For example, staff indicated that, “I think our teachers know our kids better now, and when we create that relationship I think there are less disciplinary actions in the classroom.” When teachers were asked about efforts to create a personalized school environment for students, several commented that, “all the kids, definitely identify themselves by SLC” and that “students have come up and said, ‘why haven’t you called...I got calls from this teacher and that teacher.’” Both SLC and SSP student comments corroborated those of teachers’ and staff’s. Specifically, several SLC students shared that, “if you’re lost or something, you can actually ask the teacher for help and they’ll like help you one-on-one.” Similarly, SSP students indicated that, “I’m way super close with all my teachers...I can go to them for anything. I can talk about anything with them, because they always want to help you, even at a personal level.” Students also credited the extent of personalization and positive student relationships to Poly North, which they described as a weekend-long camp that students could attend to obtain the tools to address and counter “different stereotypes, social issues, your own personal values.” Some SLC students, however,

did describe peers showing lack of respect in the classroom, which is not the case with SSP students, who indicated that their peers are very supporting and respectful in class.

Student-to-Student Interaction

Information about the quality of relationships amongst students was also obtained to gain a better sense of the culture and climate in which students are operating. Specifically, questions pertaining to peer relations and level of support for academic-related issues were asked.

With regard to peer relations, on the survey students were asked how much they agreed that in their SLC students treat each other with respect, and if they felt closer to their SLC peers than to peers in other SLCs. Almost three fourths (78%) of students agreed that in their SLC students treated each other with respect. When parents were asked a similar question, a similar percentage (70%) agreed, however approximately one-fifth (18%) indicated that they did not know whether or not students in their child’s SLC treated each other with respect. While students in SLCs may respect one another, the majority of students at Poly do not feel closer to their SLC peers when compared to their non-SLC peers. In 2009, only 47% of students agreed that they felt closer to the SLC peers. This decreased by 6% from 2007, but increased by 11% from 2008. These results are illustrated in Table 4.14.

Table 4.14. Polytechnic Survey Responses on Student-Student Interaction, LBUSD HS SLC Survey, 2009.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total	Total Agree 07 %	Total Agree 08 %	Total Agree 09 %
Students	%	%	%	%	<i>n</i>			
A. My peers care about how I do in school.	23	55	17	5	3,532	76	70	78
B. My peers encourage me to value my education.	25	55	17	3	3,531	79	74	80
C. In my SLC, students treat each other with respect.	15	57	21	7	3,556	n/a	n/a	72
D. I feel closer to my SLC peers than to peers not in my SLC.	16	31	40	13	3,544	52	35	47
Parents	Strongly Agree %	Agree %	Disagree %	Strongly Disagree %	Don't Know %	Total <i>N</i>	Total Agree 09%	
A. Students in my child's SLC treat each other with respect.	18	52	9	3	18	1,526	70	

3. BUILDING LEADERSHIP CAPACITY

SLC Development and Implementation

To look at the role of leadership in putting into operation SLCs, staff was asked questions in surveys, interviews, and a focus group regarding SLC development and implementation. Sharing of information regarding available resources, clinics on building leadership skills, and discussions on SLC development and implementation take place at monthly SLC coordinators’ meetings and quarterly lead teacher workshops.

On the survey, staff members were asked to rate the extent of their agreement or disagreement with a series of statements pertaining to SLC implementation at their school. Findings from these items on the staff survey can be seen in Table 4.15. In general, at Poly, staff had very strong agreement that they understood the purpose and goals for SLCs at their school (95%). Another 74% understood the vision and goals for their particular SLC, but it is important to note that for 16% of respondents, this question was not applicable. When asked if they are comfortable with how their school has developed SLCs, approximately 65% of staff at Poly agreed with that statement. However, 32% of staff disagreed with that statement, indicating there is some disagreement with how the school has developed SLCs.

Table 4.15. Polytechnic Staff Survey Responses on SLC Development and Implementation, LBUSD HS SLC Survey, 2009

	Strongly Agree %	Agree %	Disagree %	Strongly Disagree %	Not Applicable %	Total <i>n</i>
A. I understand the purpose and goals for small learning communities at this school.	50	45	5	0	0	38
B. I understand the vision and goals for my particular SLC.	42	32	8	3	16	38
C. I am comfortable with how my school has developed small learning communities.	30	35	27	5	3	37
D. I am comfortable with how my SLC is being developed.	22	35	22	5	16	37
E. I understand what my role is in my SLC.	43	30	5	3	19	37
F. The school provides time on a regular basis for SLC teams to meet to share information, discuss students' academic progress, curriculum needs, etc.	37	29	21	5	8	35
G. I am able to navigate through the district's administrative procedures with regards to matters pertaining to SLCs.	17	34	26	9	14	34
H. I am able to navigate through the school's administrative procedures with regards to matters pertaining to SLCs.	38	35	18	0	9	38
I. I believe that small learning communities will help this school raise student achievement.	46	43	11	0	0	37
J. The faculty and staff understand the purpose and goals for SLCs at this school.	29	53	18	0	0	38
K. The faculty and staff at this school have opportunities to suggest modifications to the SLCs.	39	39	13	3	5	38

Staff indicated that there is also some discrepancy with how their individual SLCs are developing. Approximately 57% agreed or strongly agreed that they were comfortable with how their individual SLC were developing, and 27% disagreed or strongly disagreed. Despite this, there is very little disagreement (only 8%) about understanding one's role in the SLC; however, approximately 19% of staff indicating that this did not apply to them.

According to staff members, the majority do agree (66%) with the statement that the school provides time on a regular basis for SLC teams to meet. There does seem to be some frustration with regard to negotiating administrative procedures at the district level, approximately 51% agree and 35% disagree (the other 14% - not applicable) that they are able to navigate district procedures. At the school level, about 73% of the staff surveyed agree and 18% disagree that they can navigate the school's administrative procedures regarding SLCs.

Staff members were also asked to gauge to what extent they agreed or disagreed about their peers' understanding regarding the purpose and goals for SLCs at Poly. Overall, the majority of staff (82%) agreed that the faculty and staff understood the purpose and goals of SLCs at the school. About three-fourths (78%) agreed that the faculty and staff at the school have opportunities to suggest modifications to the SLCs. There is also very strong agreement (89%) with the belief that SLCs will help raise student achievement for Poly HS.

Comments from teachers and administrators suggest that there are mixed perceptions regarding leadership and capacity building at Poly. To monitor implementation, SLC meetings have taken place regularly at both the school and district levels, as SLC teachers meet within their academy, SLC lead teachers meet with the SLC coordinator, and the SLC coordinator meets with district administrators and other school SLC coordinators. Poly administrators pointed out that the district's High School Office has been incredibly supportive in assisting with SLC development at their school.

There is a general agreement among staff and administrators that the grant has allowed SLCs to (re)develop and (re)focus, which has led to successes in other areas. Some teachers, SSP teachers in particular, are actively involved in vertical and horizontal teaming while others report adopting lesson plans based on their SLC's focus. Although there is more teacher cohesiveness in the academies, SLC teachers report a lot more of it evident between SSP teachers. One SLC teacher indicated that his/her colleagues are really trying to strengthen the SLC focus and to push for electives. Electives seem to be the defining core for some SLCs and, thus, there is a constant push to develop more of them. There is a bit of apprehension on the part of some teachers regarding how the career tech education standards will affect SLCs.

Teachers report a lack of information regarding SLCs. Teachers were frustrated at not knowing how to access grant funds until a district representative attended an SLC meeting to inform them. Although they now know the process, some teachers continue to be frustrated because restrictive funding prohibits them from using the monies to fund many of their SLC activities. A couple of teachers are skeptical of how funding is being spent and ask to be informed. An SLC teacher also pointed out that grant funds can be used for professional development but colleagues do not seem to know. The teacher reported that "more people would use the opportunity to go to

professional development if they knew that that was something that can be covered by the grant, to go to a conference to learn something and bring it back.”

While teacher cohesiveness has grown, teachers and administrators commented that teacher buy-in is an issue that they are constantly trying to address. There is a consensus that those with a longer teaching career are less likely to buy-in than newer teachers. Also, some admit that certain teachers will just never buy the SLC concept. One teacher noted that, “I have no buy-in to go to these (SLC) meetings because I may have one class but it has four students that are in that academy” while another pointed out that “it’s hard to get buy-in from the teachers who have a smattering of kids from all the academies.” Thus, lack of pure classes seems to have made it difficult to get buy-in from certain teachers. Administrators have in the past unsuccessfully attempted to address this issue but continue to explore different avenues to find a viable solution. Teachers switching SLCs might also be contributing to the lack of buy-in. While it is unclear to teachers why some colleagues switch SLCs, some do so and do often. Administrators, interestingly, reported that “there’s not much (teacher) turnover.” A teacher commented that “the person teaching next to [her] is in her third academy” and yet some have been teaching in their SSPs or programs for many years. At least a few SLC teachers admitted to not participating in SLC meetings due to being unaware of them and not knowing the lead teacher to inquire.

Another means of encouraging the development of leadership via the implementing SLCs is to also increase the level of teacher collaboration. Teacher to teacher interactions were assessed through two items on the staff survey, the results of which can be seen in Table 4.16. Staff members at Poly HS were asked if 1) they talked with other teachers about students who are struggling academically, and 2) if the administration, teachers and staff at the school worked together to assist students who may be at risk of failing. An overwhelming majority (92%) of staff members indicated that they do, indeed, talk with other teachers about students who are struggling academically. Although not quite as high, a strong majority (89%) also agreed that staff members worked collaboratively to assist students at risk of failing.

Table 4.16. Polytechnic Staff Survey Responses on Teacher-Teacher Interaction, LBUSD HS SLC Survey, 2009.

	Strongly Agree %	Agree %	Disagree %	Strongly Disagree %	Not Applicable %	Total <i>n</i>
A. I talk with other teachers about students who might be struggling academically.	45	47	5	0	3	38
B. The administration, teachers, and staff at this school work together to assist students who may be at risk of failing.	38	51	11	0	0	37

There are mixed reports in terms of the level of teacher collaboration within SLCs. Some teachers described an environment in which a lot of vertical teaming and collaboration takes place, while others indicated that very little to no collaboration exists within their SLCs. According to some teachers, personalization at the teacher-to-teacher level varies by grade level. SLCs “become less apparent” in the 11th and 12th grades with less pure classes and, therefore,

less collaboration among teachers. In addition, teachers from certain academic departments, math in particular, find it challenging to participate in their SLCs and collaborate with their colleagues given that their classes are rarely pure. When asked if s/he would be more active in his/her SLC if s/he had pure classes, a teacher reported: “Absolutely. I’d be there in a heartbeat.” These teachers who rarely have pure classes tend to be somewhat disengaged from their SLCs and feel that the SLC teams do not invite or encourage their participation. According to SLC teachers, there are talks of implementing a schedule that would allow them to share the same conference period with their colleagues so more collaboration can take place. Teachers indicated that there is no inter-SLC collaboration.

Parent/Community Collaboration

Also of interest when building leadership capacity at the school is the involvement of parents and community collaborators. In order to gauge these relationships, two questions were asked on the staff survey. One asked staff members to indicate to what extent they agreed or disagreed that they have regular contact with parents, and the second asked them to do the same regarding a statement about the school’s support of the involvement of families and community members in planning, reviewing, and improving school programs. Parents were also asked about various parent/teacher and parent/school relationships. Detailed responses can be found in Table 4.17.

Table 4.17. Polytechnic Survey Responses on Parent/Community Collaboration, LBUSD HS SLC Survey, 2009.

Staff	Strongly Agree %	Agree %	Disagree %	Strongly Disagree %	Not Applicable %	Total n		
A. I have regular contact with parents to inform them of their child's progress.	39	53	8	0	0	36		
B. The school supports the involvement of families and community members in planning, reviewing, and improving school programs.	32	41	24	3	0	37		
Parents	Strongly Agree %	Agree %	Disagree %	Strongly Disagree %	Don't Know %	Total n	Total Agree 08 %	Total Agree 09 %
A. Parents can share their thoughts about decisions that affect their children at their school.	24	58	7	2	10	1,531	82	82
B. The school uses a variety of ways to communicate with parents.	32	55	6	1	5	1,528	81	87
C. My child's SLC teacher(s) inform me about my child's academic progress.	23	52	16	4	6	1,528	n/a	75
D. My child's SLC teacher(s) inform me about SLC activities	12	45	27	7	9	1,528	n/a	57

The majority of staff members (92%) agreed or strongly agreed that they have regular contact with parents to inform them about their child's progress. A smaller percentage (73%) also agreed that the school is supportive of the involvement of families and community members. Along the same train of thought, parents were in agreement that they are able to share their thoughts about decisions that affect their children at Poly (82% agreement). A majority (87%) of parents also agreed that the school used a variety of ways to communicate with them. When asked specifically about interactions with the teacher(s), 75% of parents agreed that their child's SLC teacher(s) does inform them about their children's academic progress. A little more than half, 57%, of parents agreed that they are informed about SLC activities.

With respect to parental involvement, teachers and administrators reported that they continue to work on it, although it is a challenge. According to the administration, Poly does have great parental support at the school-wide level primarily due to its athletic program. SLC teachers also indicated that SSPs have more parental involvement than other academies. SLC communication with parents, however, seems to have improved and facilitated by School Loop and Tel-a-Parent. A teacher reported that "(i)t's easier...we've always had communication but [School Loop and networking] makes it all far more convenient than calling on the phone and leaving a message." It is a challenge for SLCs and the school to do large events aimed at parents given the limited space available on campus. As a result, the administration indicated that communicating with parents electronically or via the telephone seems to work for Poly for now.

As for establishing and maintaining community partnerships, some SLCs have had more success than others. Some SLCs have been (re)defying their focus and, therefore, have not had time to explore the types of partnerships that would benefit their students. In 2008-09, the SLC coordinator dedicated a large portion of his time to accessing potential partners in the community. He invited various guest speakers to Poly to facilitate outreach and provide access for SLCs to some of those potential partners. However, establishing partnerships takes a tremendous amount of time which he cannot afford to provide on a regular basis. Some teachers have been successful on their own in inviting guest speakers to visit classrooms. As in previous years, teachers continue to report that they do not have the time to seek and establish partnerships. From comments, it appeared that Poly faculty and staff have achieved a bit of progress in terms of reaching out to parents and community organizations, but it remains something to continue working on.

Challenges & Proposed Solutions

Through focus groups and interviews, students, faculty, and staff expressed several concerns regarding challenges that they have encountered while SLCs are being implemented on their campus. Staff described lack of teacher buy-in and difficulty infusing school culture into teachers' daily practice as obstacles to successful SLC implementation. Faculty mentioned lack of pure SLC classes; lengthy implementation process; obstacles in establishing unique and interesting elective courses; the need for a person solely dedicated to establishing community partners; and lack of clarity regarding the funding process as challenges. There is also a general belief that SLCs tend to break down in the 11th and 12th grades when the number of pure classes decrease significantly. Lastly, students noted that SLC implementation seemed to contribute to a

divide among students because some students view each other differently depending on the SLC to which they belong.

Proposed solutions mentioned by Poly staff, faculty, and students included offering more professional development; continuing principal and district support; and organizing activities that will encourage integrated student participation across SLCs and SSPs.

D. Summary/Conclusions

At the end of the fourth year of implementation, SLCs at Poly HS are well-established and functioning. There are five SLCs and three SSPs. There is very high awareness among the students, staff and parents with regard to SLC affiliation. Evaluation data from both students and staff indicate that the majority of participants are comfortable in their SLCs. However, the identity of each SLC continues to develop. Interestingly, Poly students were initially confused by the term “SLC” because they do not refer to SLCs as such; rather, they use the term “academies.” According to these students, the term “academies” is used more broadly across campus to include both SSPs and SLCs. In terms of structure, students agreed that SSPs and SLCs are similar and only differ in terms of the courses in which students are required to enroll. Several concerns were raised among students, faculty, and staff regarding issues of equity and access, particularly in regard to the availability of rigorous courses.

Compared to previous years, a higher percentage of students at Poly do report engaging in academic conversations, including talking with their counselor about their class schedule and talking with their teachers and peers about academic work. Expectations remain high for both students and parents regarding educational attainment, which is not necessarily reflected in staff members’ expectations for student achievement. Both SLC and SSP students at Poly reported being aware of college application requirements and financial aid resources. Whether enrolled in an SLC or SSP, students credit their knowledge to counselors making classroom visits; teachers showing them how to sign up for e-mail updates from different universities and scholarship resources; their participation in various college preparatory programs; and information that is available at the Career Center. There are two main challenges SLC students face in pursuing rigorous courses: 1) SLC courses include disruptive students who make it difficult to learn, and 2) they have limited access to those courses. Student survey data does indicate, however, that there is strong perceived support by their teachers. Students, faculty, and staff suggest that personalization is experienced across the board at Poly.

Administrators and faculty demonstrated their understanding and awareness of the purpose of SLC implementation on the Poly campus through comments provided during interviews and focus groups. There is a general agreement among staff and administrators that the grant has allowed SLCs to (re)develop and (re)focus, which has led to successes in other areas. While teacher cohesiveness has grown, teachers and administrators commented that teacher buy-in is an issue that they are constantly trying to address. With respect to parental involvement, teachers and administrators reported that they continue to work on that as well.

V. REPORT SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

At the conclusion of the fourth year of SLC implementation at Cabrillo HS, Jordan HS, and Poly HS, all three schools have established SLCs. Two schools (Jordan HS and Poly HS) also have SSPs that are considered by the schools to function essentially as SLCs. In 2008-09, SLC restructuring took place at all schools to better align SLC themes to academic and career pathways.

With regard to academic behavior and attitudes, a higher percentage of students at all three schools do reported engaging in academic conversations, including talking with their counselor about their class schedule and talking with their teachers and peers about academic work. Not surprisingly, students at all schools reported talking with their peers most frequently regarding plans after high school. Expectations remain high for both students and parents regarding educational attainment, however staff members' expectations for students' eventual academic achievement are not as positive. Students and parents both report that students are aware of college entrance requirements, particularly with regard to A-G requirements and AP courses. However, students from Jordan HS and Cabrillo HS lack awareness regarding standardized tests needed for college admission. At Jordan HS and Cabrillo HS, both SLC and non-SLC students feel that the influence of SLCs is primarily on engaging students by focusing on their academic interests and raising career awareness of SLC-related fields. At Poly HS, there is some competition between SLCs and SSPs with regard to the availability of academic courses, which in turn influences the perception by students on the academic focus of SLCs.

While all three schools have instituted SLCs, there is some variation among students regarding SLC awareness and identify. At Cabrillo HS, although there has been some moderate success with implementing SLCs, there seems to be a continued lack of awareness on the part of students when it comes to knowing to which SLC they belong. At Jordan HS, students are able to identify their SLC but establishing a culture and climate around SLCs has been difficult due to the fact that not all students are in an SLC and the school is split in two (the main campus and JFA). Although SLCs at Poly HS are more established and have a stronger presence on campus, there is a continuous challenge to develop SLCs so that they have an equal footing with the SSPs.

Staff sentiments reflect those of students' with regard to SLC development. In general, the administration and staff from all three schools report understanding the purpose for implementing SLCs. However, at Cabrillo HS, staff expressed some frustration with how individual as well as school-wide SLCs are being developed. There continues to be numerous challenges to implementation. Staff members at Jordan HS and Poly HS indicated that teacher buy-in and participation also continue to be a challenge to SLC implementation. At Jordan HS, many staff members are still wary of the concept of SLCs due to a past attempt at establishing a similar reform with academic 'houses.' For Poly HS, there is some frustration with potential administrative procedures (e.g. accessing funds).

There is the general perception by students and parents that teachers are supportive of students' academic well-being while in high school. While teachers also report talking and assisting students with making plans after high school, students and parents do not see this role being played by teachers. Overall, staff perceptions of student/teacher relations are a little more

positive than student perceptions of the same. However, the consensus at all three schools does seem to be that the implementation of SLCs has led to better, more personal relations among students and between students and teachers. Parent and community involvement continues to be a challenge for all three schools.

Appendix A – SLC Descriptions

Cabrillo HS SLCs

- **Cabrillo Academy of Business (CAB)** – Will open the doors to the world of business and finance, information technology, and hospitality and tourism. The industry-based curriculum offers students the opportunity to: 1) select an area to study in preparation for college and careers; 2) earn paid internships in their chosen field during the summer of their junior year; and, 3) the opportunity to participate in a dual enrollment program with Long Beach City College, earning up to six unites of college credit their senior year.
- **International Studies at Cabrillo (ISC)** – Gives students the opportunity to study a variety of subjects with an emphasis on global issues that prepares student for success in our diverse world. The curriculum offers students the opportunity to select a focus for international study in business, the environment, cultural differences, or politics and international law. The curriculum also offers students foreign language acquisition with an emphasis on foreign service. Students have opportunities to participate in travel, internships, and international conferences.
- **Cabrillo Health Occupations and Careers (CHOC)** – Addresses the impending shortage of personnel in all facets of health sciences and medicine. CHOC is a springboard to career pathways for those students interested in health sciences and medicine. The curriculum offers students: 1) the opportunity to participate in the Guest Speaker series, meeting working professionals up close and personal; 2) a field trip series to investigate a variety of local medical facilities and programs; 3) the opportunity to participate in job shadowing and internships at local health and medical sites; and 4) a senior portfolio to assist them in their transition to college and careers.
- **Cabrillo Engineering and Design (CED)** – Provides students with the opportunity to explore the world of computer drafting and engineering. Combing traditional mathematics and sciences, the program introduces students to the scope, rigor, and discipline of engineering and related fields which include: 1) the foundations and principles of engineering, including robotics; 2) participation in the MESA (Mathematics, Engineering and Science Achievement) program at California State University, Long Beach; and, 3) the capstone of pre- and advanced placement in computer science.
- **Cabrillo Academy of Social Justice & Law (CASJL)** – Provides students with the opportunity to explore social issues, law and government, human relations, leadership and culture as they relate to the functioning of a viable democracy. The curriculum offers students: 1) the opportunity to actively participate in the democratic process through the Building Bridges Camp; 2) the opportunity for student autonomy by selecting a content cluster in which they concentrate their studies (law, cultural studies, media and communication, and participation in Mock Trial, Model Congress, or Academic Decathlon); and, 3) a senior portfolio project consisting of experiences and reflections in social justice.
- **Cabrillo Arts and Technology (CAT)** – Provides a program that develops specialized skills in the visual arts, computer media and animation, and the performing arts, all utilizing technology. The curriculum offers students the opportunity to specialize in the visual arts, the performing arts that include music, drama and dance, or computer media and animation. As students progress through their course of study, they develop a digital portfolio of their selected arts media that is often required for their transition into college and related careers.

Jordan HS SLCs

- **Business and Entertainment School of Travel, Trade and Tourism (BESTT)** – BESTT’s mission is to empower students to prepare for life beyond high school by offering rigorous courses that focus on global travel, trade and tourism in the areas of computer literacy, finance, accounting, sales/marketing and hospitality management. Its goal is to provide students with core content and elective courses to improve their academic and technical skills. BESTT students will understand how a business operates, the functions of the entrepreneur, the role of international trade, the impact of personal and social financial decisions, and the interrelationships of business and economic functions. Students will be prepared for both college and the world of work.

- **Excellence Through the Arts (ETA)** – Offers 9th through 12th graders a community of teachers, students and staff who support artistic endeavors and core class success. Students benefit from guest speakers, field trips, core classes with fellow artistic students, internships and a senior capstone project that will prepare them for post-secondary pursuits. ETA is available to students interested in art, dance, drama or music.
- **Jordan HS's Media and Communication Learning Community (JMAC)** – Prepares students for success in the 21st Century by training them in technical as well as academic skills. In addition to college preparatory classes, students learn how to use the latest technology in graphic design, publishing and video production. JMAC students learn to create and to produce the *Sylus* (Jordan's acclaimed literary and art magazine), JNET (Jordan's news and video production program), and Graphic Design (state-of-the-art computer digital art lab).
- **Panther International** – The four-year program gives students the flexibility to explore their interests through elective courses while addressing core requirements for high school graduation and college. Students are provided with a identified classes, AP/Honors courses, dedicated teachers, AVID strategies, fieldtrips, professional speakers, student recognition, peer support, individual counseling, on-line grades, and after-school tutoring. As members of a small community, students and their teachers create an environment of trust and support that promotes academic success and life-long learning.
- **Jordan HS Freshman Academy (JFA)** – Currently houses the majority of 9th grade students to streamline the transition into high school. Students are placed in a house structure, which allows students to share common teachers and coursework. Students focus on literacy and mathematics, while enjoying their first high school year.

Specialized Secondary Programs

- **Architecture, Construction, Engineering (ACE)** – A program supported by the Mayor of Long Beach, City of Long Beach, and Industry and community partners. ACE offers a myriad of opportunities for students interested in exploring the exciting world of architecture, construction and engineering. ACE provides guest speakers, field experiences, and partnerships with industry professionals and businesses. Students participate in field experiences, and visit job sites frequently such as architectural firms, construction sites and engineering labs. These experiences reinforce and provide the students an opportunity to apply academic knowledge and skills learned.
- **Aspiration in Medical Services (AIMS)** – Provides a challenging four-year academic program for students with a 2.0 or higher grade point average. It is for any student who is interested in investigating the medical field through academic and vocation education. Through internships, guest speakers and hands-on career investigations, AIMS students are able to experience first-hand the opportunities that exist in the medical field. AIMS Academy provides a close, family-like atmosphere where students are provided the skills necessary to set and achieve the goals that will assist them in their future.
- **International Baccalaureate (IB)** – Students who are ready to begin Algebra 1-2, have a cumulative middle school GPA of 3.0 or higher, have a Content Standards Test score of “proficient” or above and have good citizenship and attendance are eligible to enter the IB program. IB offers talented university bound students the opportunity to participate in an internationally renowned honors program. IB prepares students for the rigors of university level coursework by challenging them in advanced level classes in all of the UC-approved subjects. IB students are afforded the opportunity to earn college credit by successfully passing both IB and AP examinations. Colleges and universities throughout the US recognize IB as one of the best college preparation curriculums in which a high school student can participate.

Polytechnic HS SLCs

- **Academy of Humanities** – Students meet college and university requirements while being reinforced with and encouraged in a love of the arts and humanities through a variety of coursework. The Academy provides opportunities for students to show creative expression and to become marketable in various careers. The goal is to create adults who are well-rounded, capable, and competent member of our society.
- **Beach Academy of Math and Science** – Students complete four years of intensive study in the fields of math and science. This program connects coursework to community service projects, fieldwork, and college experiences. The program also prepares students for the rigors of college work or life beyond high school through an

academically challenging course work.

- **Medical and Paramedical Services Academy (MAPS)** – Students are prepared for college and for professional careers in cutting-edge medical and paramedical fields. An extensive offering of required and elective courses provides students with the tools to advance into a college and/or the medical field of their choice. Examples of elective courses include Introduction to Sports Medicine, Fitness and Nutrition, Anatomy and Physiology and AP Biology. Students are encouraged to take at least 2 ROP courses between 11th and 12th grade.
- **Media, Entertainment, Technology and Sports (METS)** – Students in the METS Academy through a four-year course of study, shall develop skills that focus upon media, the entertainment industry, technology, or the industry of sports. Whether the student is college or career bound, the METS Academy Students will have the opportunity to acquire industry standard skills, as well as, complete A-G requirements. METS students will be prepared to enter the workplace, continue on the path of skill enhancement in their area of interest, or enter college on graduation day.
- **Poly HS Academy of Achievers and Learners (PAAL)** – Students in this upper division academy (grades 11 and 12 only) accelerated their learning by earning an extra twenty credits per year by attending a slightly longer school day which allows them to make up missed credits, or to earn a medallion to wear at graduation, or to graduate early. PAAL is subtitled “A Human Relations Academy” because students attend an advisory period designed to teach positive group relations and promote mutual respect.

Specialized Secondary Programs

- **Center for International Commerce (CIC)** – CIC is an international studies, honors program that addresses the needs of gifted, high achieving students who are university bound. With a proven 21-year track record, CIC offers students a challenging, seven-class curriculum of accelerated, honors, and AP classes in history/social studies, English, science and math. CIC takes great pride in its language programs, offering Japanese and Chinese – languages more commonly taught at the university level. CIC’s Japanese language program is the largest program in the continental United States. (Requirements: 3.3 minimum GPA and minimum “Proficient” in Language Arts and Math on the CA Standards Tests).
- **Program of Additional Curricular Experiences (PACE)** – A nationally recognized SSP in existence since 1975, provides a rigorous academic curriculum for 700 students in grades 9-12. PACE students are required to take seven classes each semester. The PACE reputation for excellence is proven each year as Poly students take more than 1000 Advanced Placements Tests with a pass rate between 70 to 80 percent. (Requirements: 3.5 minimum GPA or a minimum of one “Proficient” and one “Advanced” in Language Arts and Math on the California Standards Tests).
- **The Pacific Rim Academy (Pac Rim)** – Students in grades 10-12 combine academics with work experiences that prepare them to work successfully in the field of international trade and transportation. This California Partnership Academy, established in 1990, integrates private sector involvement through mentoring, internship opportunities, curriculum input, classroom speakers, and field trips with a close family-like atmosphere that emphasizes student achievement and positive secondary outcomes.

*Information taken from schools’ program description pamphlets.

Appendix B – Respondent Demographic Tables

Staff Survey Participants

Table B1. Percentage Distribution of Staff Survey Respondents by School, LBUSD HS SLC Survey, 2009

School	<i>n</i>	%
Cabrillo HS	79	42
Jordan HS	73	38
Poly HS	38	20
Total	190	100

Table B2. Percentage Distribution of Staff Survey Respondents by Position, LBUSD HS SLC Survey, 2009

	Cabrillo HS	Jordan HS	Poly HS	Aggregated
	%	%	%	%
Teacher	94	93	100	95
Counselor	4	6	0	4
Administrator	1	1	0	1
Other	1	0	0	1
Total	100	100	100	100
<i>n</i>	78	71	38	187

Table B3. Percentage Distribution of Staff Survey Respondents by Department, LBUSD HS SLC Survey, 2009

	Cabrillo HS	Jordan HS	Poly HS	Aggregated
	%	%	%	%
Art (Fine & Performing)	6	3	3	4
English	24	24	19	23
Technology	4	6	0	4
Foreign Language	6	2	8	5
Science	11	12	19	13
History-Social Science	14	12	22	15
Physical Education	6	0	3	3
Mathematics	10	18	11	13
Other*	15	21	14	17
Multiple	4	2	0	2
Total	100	100	100	100
<i>n</i>	71	66	36	173

*Other departments reported: special education, business, health, general studies, and AVID

Table B4. Percentage Distribution of Staff Survey Respondents by Gender, LBUSD HS SLC Survey, 2009

	Cabrillo HS	Jordan HS	Poly HS	Aggregated
	%	%	%	%
Female	63	61	53	60
Male	37	39	47	40
Total	100	100	100	100
<i>n</i>	75	64	36	175

Table B5. Percentage Distribution of Staff Survey Respondents by Grade Level, LBUSD HS SLC Survey, 2009

	Cabrillo HS	Jordan HS	Poly HS	Aggregated
	%	%	%	%
9th Grade	21	31	14	24
10th Grade	32	23	33	28
11th Grade	16	14	29	17
12th Grade	12	5	5	8
Multiple	16	23	19	19
Not Applicable	4	5	0	4
Total	100	100	100	100
<i>n</i>	76	65	21	162

Table B6. Percentage Distribution of Staff Survey Respondents by Ethnicity, LBUSD HS SLC Survey, 2009

	Cabrillo HS	Jordan HS	Poly HS	Aggregated
	%	%	%	%
African American	12	13	12	12
American Indian	1	2	0	1
Asian	1	5	6	4
Filipino	1	3	3	2
Hispanic/Latino	22	16	9	17
White	49	52	59	52
Biracial/Multiracial	3	7	6	5
Other	9	2	6	6
Total	100	100	100	100
<i>n</i>	67	61	34	162

Table B7. Percentage Distribution of Staff Survey Respondents by Experience, LBUSD HS SLC Survey, 2009

	Cabrillo HS	Jordan HS	Poly HS	Aggregated
	%	%	%	%
Number of Years at School				
First Year	9	9	5	8
2-3 Years	17	16	8	15
4-6 Years	38	22	19	28
7-10 Years	17	20	27	20
10-15 Years	14	11	22	15
16-20 Years	0	3	11	3
10+ Years	1	17	8	8
Not Applicable	4	2	0	2
Total	100	100	100	100
<i>n</i>	77	64	37	178
Number of Years Overall				
First Year	3	6	3	4
2-3 Years	3	6	0	3
4-6 Years	16	9	8	12
7-10 Years	27	9	16	19
10-15 Years	21	23	35	25
16-20 Years	14	13	11	13
10+ Years	14	33	27	24
Not Applicable	3	0	0	1
Total	100	100	100	100
<i>n</i>	77	64	37	178

Student Survey Participants

Table B8. Percentage Distribution of Student Survey Respondents by School, LBUSD HS SLC Survey, 2009

School	%	N
Cabrillo HS	27	1,830
Jordan HS	19	1,275
Poly HS	54	3,608
Total	100	6,713

Table B9. Percentage Distribution of Student Survey Respondents by Ethnicity, LBUSD HS SLC Survey, 2009

	Cabrillo HS %	Jordan HS %	Poly HS %	Aggregated %
African American	12	16	22	18
American Indian	0	0	0	0
Asian	3	6	24	15
Filipino	10	3	7	7
Hispanic/Latino	66	64	25	44
Pacific Islander	3	3	3	3
White	1	1	10	6
Biracial/Multiracial	3	4	7	5
Other	1	2	2	2
Total	100	100	100	100
N	1,727	1,197	3,390	6,314

Table B10. Percentage Distribution of Student Survey Respondents by Gender, LBUSD HS SLC Survey, 2009

	Cabrillo HS %	Jordan HS %	Poly HS %	Aggregated %
Female	49	53	51	51
Male	51	47	49	49
Total	100	100	100	100
N	1,747	1,210	3,501	6,454

Table B11. Percentage Distribution of Student Survey Respondents by Grade Level, LBUSD HS SLC Survey, 2009

	Cabrillo HS %	Jordan HS %	Poly HS %	Aggregated %
9th Grade	21	24	31	27
10th Grade	36	35	30	33
11th Grade	27	27	28	28
12th Grade	15	14	11	13
Total	100	100	100	100
N	1,762	1,228	3,492	6,482

Parent Survey Participants

Table B12. Percentage Distribution of Parent Survey Respondents by School, LBUSD HS SLC Survey, 2009

	%	N
Cabrillo HS	23	604
Jordan HS	17	435
Poly HS	60	1546
Total	100	2,585

Table B13. Percentage Distribution of Parent Survey Respondents by Gender, LBUSD HS SLC Survey, 2009

	Cabrillo HS %	Jordan HS %	Poly HS %	Aggregated %
Female	55	66	57	58
Male	44	34	43	42
Total	100	100	100	100
N	469	323	1,098	1,890

Table B14. Percentage Distribution of Parent Survey Respondents by Grade Level, LBUSD HS SLC Survey, 2009

	Cabrillo HS %	Jordan HS %	Poly HS %	Aggregated %
9th Grade	11	43	38	33
10th Grade	46	21	33	34
11th Grade	27	24	27	27
12th Grade	16	13	2	7
Total	100	100	100	100
N	578	412	1,476	2,466

Table B15. Percentage Distribution of Parent Survey Respondents by Ethnicity, LBUSD HS SLC Survey, 2009

	Cabrillo HS %	Jordan HS %	Poly HS %	Aggregated %
African American	12	15	16	15
American Indian	0	0	0	0
Asian	3	7	28	19
Filipino	14	4	9	10
Hispanic/Latino	16	65	24	40
Pacific Islander	3	3	2	2
White	2	1	12	8
Biracial/Multiracial	2	3	7	5
Other	1	2	2	2
Total	100	100	100	100
N	558	414	1,425	2,397