

# LBUSD Small Learning Communities Evaluation Report

## 2005-2006

### Table of Contents

- I. Introduction
- II. Program Description
- III. First Year Implementation
- IV. Baseline Measure of Outcomes
- V. Summary and Conclusions

## **I. INTRODUCTION**

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 evaluation results for the implementation of Small Learning Communities during the 2005-2006 academic year for three high schools in Long Beach Unified School District (LBUSD). This is the first year of implementation. These schools – Cabrillo High School, Jordan High School, and Polytechnic High School – received funding from US Department of Education (DOE) Smaller Learning Communities (SLC) implementation grants. To evaluate the Small Learning Community Initiative in Long Beach high schools, LBUSD contracted with UCLA’s Social Research Methodology Evaluation Group (SRM Evaluation Group), directed by Dr. Marv Alkin. 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.

### ***Evaluation Details***

The SRM Evaluation Group has evaluated a variety of programs over the years, using a wide variety of qualitative and quantitative research methods, beginning with the evaluation of the UCLA Outreach Programs in 2000. Typically, the team’s approach emphasizes formative evaluation; that is, providing feedback on an ongoing basis that can be used for improving programs. Additionally, the group focuses on evaluation utilization, or designing and implementing evaluations where findings and the process of monitoring progress are made useful and usable to key stakeholders. To this end, the SRM Evaluation group has employed an array of techniques for collecting and analyzing data, including interviews and focus groups, case studies, surveys, and document analysis.

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 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, and observations, will be used to gather data from numerous sources, including teachers, administrators, students and parents.

For the evaluation for this first year of implementation, data collection was limited by several factors. Because school administrators were primarily focused on going through WASC (Western Association of Schools and College) review, priority was given to preparing for school accreditation. Given that the teacher and student survey served multiple purposes (WASC, GEAR UP, etc), only a limited number of SLC questions were included.

## **II. PROGRAM DESCRIPTION**

This particular grant for implementing SLCs is supporting activities occurring at three high schools in a large, urban school district (LBUSD). Each school serves a diverse student population that includes significant populations of students from high-poverty backgrounds and together comprises approximately 43% Latinos, 27% African Americans, 14% Asians, 7% Whites, 5% Filipinos, 4% Pacific Islanders, .3% Native Americans, and 23% English language learners. Each school is also challenged by low achievement, high mobility, and teacher turnover. State and district achievement data show that in 2004, only 25.1% of students in these schools scored at proficient or above in English, 11.6% in mathematics, on the California Content Standards Tests.

In the effort to raise student achievement in all of the high schools in the district, LBUSD is also currently in the midst of a major local reform. The goals for this high school reform initiative include a commitment to improving student achievement while at the same time 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, these three schools (Jordan, Polytechnic, and Cabrillo High Schools) applied for and received a federal grant to implement small learning communities (SLC) 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 between teachers, teachers and students, as well as between students themselves.

At Jordan High School, it is expected that half of their freshman class for the 2006-2007 academic year will be in full theme based academies, while the remaining 9<sup>th</sup> graders will be in ‘houses.’ Eventually the goal is to have ‘wall to wall’ implementation with every student 9-12<sup>th</sup> grade in an SLC. At Cabrillo High School, every 9<sup>th</sup> grade student for the 2006-2007 year is in a theme-based SLC, for a total of six SLCs. Each year, each 9<sup>th</sup> grade cohort will be added to the SLCs until eventually all students will be in a SLC by the end of the 5-year grant. At Polytechnic High School every student is in one of seven SLCs.

### **III. FIRST YEAR IMPLEMENTATION**

The implementation stage of the Small Learning Communities (SLCs) initiative that slowly began in early Fall 2005 at Cabrillo High School, Jordan High School, and Polytechnic High School has led to the successful development of SLCs. Each school took a different path in implementing its SLCs but all have ultimately accomplished the same goal: all currently have SLCs. At the moment, Cabrillo High School has six SLCs, Jordan High also has six SLCs in place, and Polytechnic High has established seven SLCs. During this implementation period, time was also dedicated to collecting data to establish benchmarks for future comparisons. To reach this success, the SLCs required much work from the school district administration and the leadership teams at each site to generate collaboration, cooperation, and support at the administrative, teacher, and student levels.

The school district administration has provided support to each school site by facilitating the availability of research and SLC experts. In Fall 2005, SLC experts from the Northwest Regional Lab provided a one-day SLC professional development workshop to the leadership teams of the three sites. The goal was to further equip teams with tools necessary to combat challenges that might arise in the implementation stage and to get a broader understanding of the many benefits of SLCs. Also, in Fall 2005, the leadership teams began the process of developing logic models for their respective SLC programs. This activity encouraged the leadership teams to think concretely of, and map out, how the SLCs, as they were being implemented, were to meet the main goals specified in the grant. Created to be a ‘road map’ for SLC implementation, the model informs the evaluators what additional data may need to be collected as well as how to subsequently analyze the data. Moreover, the logic model provides the evaluation team the all-important “compared to what” of the evaluation. In Summer 2006, the Fall 2005 logic model drafts were revisited and finalized. (See Appendix A)

At the teacher level, much work at the part of the leadership teams has led to a successful first step in the implementation of the SLCs. With the exception of one site, the leadership team coordinators have provided strong leadership and stability to the SLC initiative. As coordinators, they have streamlined administrative processes and have gained the trust of other teachers in the leadership team. As a result, the leadership teams at each site have participated consistently in the workshops and have researched SLCs at other sites to learn what features may be better suited for their campuses. Much enthusiasm is evident at the leadership team level. Teachers who are part of the leadership teams have taken that enthusiasm to their respective SLC teachers and have begun to form strong bonds with them. With the help of this bond among SLC teachers, each SLC’s identity,

at the administrative level, has begun to slowly develop. The challenge has been to gather similar enthusiastic support from other teachers not actively involved at the moment with SLCs.

Students at each of the campuses are slowly becoming aware of the SLCs and are learning to distinguish among them. The primary method of raising SLC awareness among students has been through the middle schools as 8<sup>th</sup> graders prepare to select their high schools. At least one representative of the leadership team of each high school has presented information at the middle schools. A school choice fair has also allowed SLC leadership team members, as well as SLC teachers and current SLC students, to provide more detailed information about their SLCs and to answer questions from students and parents. As administrators and teachers get better organized and as SLCs reach full implementation, SLC awareness will continue to grow among students and parents.

SLC implementation has required much work and dedication, primarily at the teacher-level, at each of the campuses. With the enthusiasm and commitment currently present, teachers in the leadership teams have pushed the Initiative forward. As challenges surface, teachers and administrators work to provide solutions in order to further develop SLCs at their respective campuses. Without actively interfering in their development, the district administration is always present and willing to provide assistance when requested. Students have slowly begun to learn about the SLCs and are contributing to development of SLC identities.

## ***Interviews***

To get an understanding of the expectations staff at Cabrillo High School, Jordan High School, and Long Beach Polytechnic High School may have regarding Small Learning Communities (SLCs), the SRM Evaluation Group staff conducted interviews in late Winter 2006 and early Spring 2006. Interview participants included one Cabrillo High principal, two principals at Jordan High, two principals at Long Beach Polytechnic (Poly) High, the SLC coordinator at each of the three schools, one teacher at Jordan High, one teacher at Poly High, and two teachers at Cabrillo High School. The interviews focused on issues regarding vision, resources, challenges/dilemmas, and solutions. All interviews lasted approximately an hour each and took place on the campus in which the interviewees work.

## **Vision**

Through their interviews, principals, lead teachers and SLC coordinators revealed that they have common perceptions of small learning communities (SLCs). Teachers and administrators at all three schools alluded to a core of teachers as an important element of SLCs that leads to personalized attention for students. Although individuals at each school mentioned the importance of a theme or focus per small community, Jordan and Cabrillo personnel as a group put a greater emphasis on that factor than did Poly's staff. Poly staff also pointed out the need of having a counselor per SLC as an important factor in the structure of SLCs. When discussing SLC size, variation existed between schools and among schools' personnel. At the time of the interviews, Jordan High School administrators indicated that they had not decided on the appropriate size for their school's SLCs. The teachers, on the other hand, mentioned a range from 210 to 420 pupils per SLCs. Because Poly already has SLCs in place, the staff referred to their current sizes in the 600s

and mentioned restricting SLC size to a maximum of 800 students, although they recognized that smaller would be better. Cabrillo High staff's visualized the size of their SLCs at somewhere between 150 and 720. As a group, teachers at all three schools spoke about SLC size in relation to class size, e.g. 35 students times 4 sections per grade. At times, it was unclear whether teachers referred to SLCs per grade level or if they meant per community. The administrators, on the other hand, spoke strictly in terms of community size.

Discussing the physical layout of schools seemed a sensitive issue for staff at each of the three sites. Perhaps because teachers and administrators do not see the layout of the SLCs currently in place at Poly as presenting a problem, staff at this school consistently pointed out no need for layout change. At Jordan High, the administrators said that the issue was still, at the time, in discussions but indicated that they would defer to the design team. Jordan teachers, on the other hand, mentioned no need for layout change. At Cabrillo High, half of the staff indicated that no changes would take place, at least not immediately, while the other half indicated that layout changes could not be avoided. While staff at each school recognize the advantages of having teachers belonging to an SLC in close proximity of each other, they also acknowledge the logistical problems with attempting to create such layout.

Personnel at each school expressed different views on how to build SLC identity but shared a common outlook when conversing about recruitment. While Jordan High teachers indicated that products such as uniforms, t-shirts, supplies with logos, and SLC focus or a common interest would help develop an SLC's identity, the administrators pointed to teachers as those who would help build it. At the moment, Poly's SLCs, do not have an identity other than in name. There is agreement that the SLCs at Poly are working to build these identities and may look at curriculum or initiation packets to guide students. Cabrillo is looking at team building activities as a way to start building identity, along with activities such as dress day to help support the identity throughout the year. Cabrillo staff also acknowledged that identity evolves over time. For recruitment purposes, staff at all three schools indicated that presentations at the feeder middle schools would help raise awareness of the various options students have at the high schools. Opening up the high school campus for parents to visit, as Jordan and Poly already do, would also attract individuals to visit with and ask questions to each SLC's staff. In addition, the Jordan and Cabrillo coordinators mentioned either doing a queue search to learn about students' interests or having students take a career survey to help them select an appropriate SLC. In terms of recruitment, aside from raising SLC awareness among students and parents, there is interest in having school personnel investigate the career or academic interests of students to facilitate a SLC/student match.

Those interviewed were posed questions regarding their perception of how SLCs would affect curriculum and instruction. Jordan High's staff indicated that SLCs would affect instruction delivery as they would lead to a personalized instruction that would allow staff to focus on problems such as addressing issues of literacy and numeracy, motivation, low test scores, and API. Furthermore, the collaboration among teachers would allow students to see the links between the different classes. Staff at Poly, on the other hand, immediately raised concerns regarding changes to a curriculum already dictated by the state and district. According to Poly staff, any SLC impact in terms of curriculum may be found primarily in the electives. Staff at Cabrillo also pointed to electives as the most viable place for the SLC focus to develop. Cabrillo teachers echoed concern with the lack of room for curriculum changes given the state standards and other requirements. The

principal indicated that staff would need professional development to learn how to collaborate and create cross-curricular and interdisciplinary instruction. Overall, there seems to be a concern with the lack of curriculum flexibility but enthusiasm over the potential for teacher collaboration and personalized instruction.

In discussing structures that can lead to student individualization, Poly High staff indicated the need for more communication about students and with students, along with giving pupils opportunities for them to make decisions. Jordan High teachers pointed to improved teacher/student relations as the main structure leading to individualization, while the administration indicated that having counselor(s) and assistant principal assigned to each SLC would lead to more opportunities for individualization. Cabrillo indicated that a team of people, teachers in particular, creating interventions for students would lead to more student individualization. One person at Cabrillo also indicated that not being entirely content driven, but utilizing data analysis as well, will help with student individualization. Essentially, increased and improved communication between students and school personnel seemed the overarching theme among those interviewed as the structure that leads to more student individualization.

Although Poly High School staff indicated that structures already exist with projects from GEAR UP and AVID, both teachers and principals indicated that they would benefit from more activities to get parents motivated and involved. One Poly teacher admitted that SLCs should first concentrate on teachers and students. Similarly, Cabrillo High staff indicated that more activities such as celebrations are needed to bring parents onto the campus or even having them participate as speakers. Just having smaller activities would lead to a sense of identity. Furthermore, the students' sense of affiliation would diffuse to the parents. Like Cabrillo, Jordan High staff feels that the students' enthusiasm would branch out to parents. Knowing who to contact, continuous communication through the phone or website, and developing more activities for parents could lead to increased parental involvement. Furthermore, Jordan's Parent Center could assist with each SLC's parent outreach efforts. Staff at all three schools alluded to a need for more opportunities for parents to visit the campus or to interact with school personnel.

In terms of collaborating with community partners, Cabrillo High's staff sees opportunities for internships and/or shadowing as a way of bridging out to the community and bringing real life experiences to students. Also, inviting the community into classrooms as guest speakers would also provide career awareness opportunities for students. At Poly High, structures already exist for collaboration with community partners, although there is some concern with how to familiarize SLC staff with what is currently available. There is also concern regarding who would build those community relationships given that lead teachers do not have a free period. Additional activities (career days/nights, recruitment days, internships, mentoring/shadowing, etc) could also open doors to collaboration with the community. At Jordan High, staff indicated that more talks need to take place and that collaboration with the community would depend on each SLC. Team members, according to the teachers, would work on building those community relationships.

Those interviewed generally gave a positive outlook of SLC implementation/transition at the schools. Jordan High School administrators indicated that they envision a slow development of SLC with a lot of planning to avoid mistakes. One teacher mentioned that the school should not face a difficult transition, while another teacher indicated that it is too early to tell given that they

are still being developed. At Poly High, staff emphasized a smooth evolution, a need to strengthen SLC identities, and a need to have teachers collaborate and work more closely. Cabrillo personnel indicated that the implementation will focus on the 9<sup>th</sup> grade and that a difficult transition will be avoided given the positive culture of change alive on campus. A teacher did express worry and indicated that the team needs to organize and develop the SLCs before September 2006.

### Resources

The SRM Evaluation Group staff asked teachers and administrators questions regarding resources to learn what is available and what is needed. When asked what information or data would help in the design of SLCs, Poly High staff indicated that they already have data because they had previously implemented SLCs. One principal mentioned reviewing post-graduation data, unavailable at this time, as helpful. At Jordan High, staff would like to know students' interests and mentioned information on achievement and graduation rates as potentially very helpful. At Cabrillo, staff mentioned a variety of information that would assist in the implementation of their SLCs. Staff called for data to: identify the struggling students; learn what students want; match students' career interests with SLCs; learn from post-graduation information; learn what teachers want/need; and, investigate the interests of parents, students and the business/community. Furthermore, Cabrillo staff would like to know about other unknown data that may help in the implementation of SLCs, as well as learn how to elicit input and interpret data themselves. Staff at all three schools indicated that they would benefit from a student and teacher needs assessment. Although staff at the three schools also indicated that they would want a resource inventory, staff at Poly expressed a concern over getting the resources to people and having time to review them. Cabrillo staff mentioned not knowing for what to ask in terms of the resource inventory.

Teachers and administrators from each of the three schools were individually asked to reflect on the type of data that they would find helpful in implementing their SLCs. Jordan High staff indicated that data regarding post-graduation, student achievement, parents, and students would help with the implementation of SLCs. The principal highlighted the importance of formative data which would help with en route progress. The principal at Cabrillo also pointed to both formative and summative data as helpful in the implementation of SLCs. Formative data, of course, would need a quick turnaround for the team to implement changes. The principal at Cabrillo also indicated that each SLC might want their own tools or data, although they would all share something in common across the board. Furthermore, teachers at Cabrillo indicated that they would benefit from data that showed the successes of SLCs and the appreciation by students of their SLCs. One teacher mentioned the importance of knowing the academic performance level of each student so that resources can be distributed appropriately to each SLC (i.e. how many ELD teachers needed at one SLC versus another). At Poly, one of the principals indicated that there is no need for data for implementation given that the SLCs are already in place. The rest of the staff indicated that it would be advantageous to know what students and staff think of their SLCs and perhaps to learn more about community/business partners.

Those interviewed answered questions regarding the use of evaluation data. Poly High staff indicated that they do not know how they would use evaluation data, although they acknowledged it would be valuable to have. At Jordan High, a principal indicated that evaluation data should revolve around the school's mission and vision. SLC staff would continuously ask questions and review evaluation data. At Cabrillo, teachers indicated using evaluation data for course correction

and to assess each SLC. The principal indicated that evaluation data would help with planning steps, to see how to better meet kids' needs, and to improve the quality of service delivery. It would be crucial to know what and how to measure. Staff at all three schools concurred that a formal dissemination procedure open to the community would benefit the SLCs. A collaborative effort among the educators would govern the SLC decisions making process.

### **Challenges and dilemmas**

When discussing challenges and dilemmas in implementing SLCs, teacher buy-in was mentioned directly or indirectly by everyone interviewed. Cabrillo staff also indicated that SLCs must create parameters for student, teacher and parent interaction. In addition, Cabrillo staff mentioned a need for district personnel to understand the needs and changes that take place at the school as a result of SLC implementation. Poly High, on the other hand, indicated that the challenges would revolve around the master schedule, having reading teachers become part of the SLC, aligning electives teachers to academies, allowing for a common free teacher period, reconfiguring the tutorial hour, providing technology and lab space for students, allowing true school choice, involving parents in a meaningful manner, changing the SLC culture, and preventing an SLC hierarchy. At Jordan High, the additional challenges and dilemmas mentioned included a restricted funding source, time constraints, CAHSEE (the additional required courses students must take to ensure that they pass the exam) because it takes flexibility away from SLCs, keeping open lines of communication, attendance problems, dealing with below basic students as the number of SLCs grow, building the SLC culture, and getting student buy-in.

In terms of maintaining the SLCs, challenges faced by schools according to principals surround the issue of sustainability. Cabrillo's principal pointed out the challenge of developing a quality program without an increase in personnel, while Poly's principals indicated that staff development will be critical for the purpose of sustainability. Teachers at Jordan High mentioned funding, an accommodating schedule, and finding measurable structures of accountability as challenges in maintaining SLCs. Similarly at Poly, teachers mentioned funding for electives, physical space for technology labs, support for a smaller core class size, and keeping a strong core faculty. At Cabrillo, the challenges will be learning and using teachers' strengths, recognizing that all SLCs will be different but will share common goals, having a collective ownership of SLCs, finding funding for electives, finding support at the district, keeping parent meetings, involving everyone, and ensuring that there is no decline on test scores.

### **Proposed solutions**

When proposing solutions, Poly staff mentioned keeping faculty happy, providing more support to teachers, having counselors and administrators attend SLC meetings, and having meetings at less invasive times. At Jordan High, teachers indicated that principals should seek other grants, have people talk to teachers who have not bought into SLCs, establish realistic goals, look at SLC impact on the school as a whole, build a common conference period, give each SLC its own counselor, while principals stated that they should work closely with human resources, be supportive of teachers, educate each other about what is working, and have SLC teachers visit other sites. At Cabrillo, keeping good communication was mentioned by the majority of individuals as a solution to some of the problems previously mentioned. In addition, holding themselves accountable, thinking short and long term, planning, having manager meetings, implementing top/down and bottom/up feedback model, having regular contact with businesses, and believing in the process of



inquiry, urgency and commitment.

## **IV. BASELINE MEASURE OF OUTCOMES**

To collect baseline measure of outcomes, one survey was administered to teachers and another to students in Spring 2006. The outcomes of interest in the student survey pertain to: 1) Students involvement in SLC development and implementation; 2) Personalization as it relates to both student/teacher (staff) and peer/peer relations; and, 3) Student achievement as expressed in terms of academic behavior and college preparation/knowledge. Similarly, the outcomes of interest in the teacher survey are: 1) SLC development and implementation, including staff buy-in, school site communication, curriculum, and teacher-to-teacher interaction; 2) Personalization in terms of student/teacher communication, student/teacher academic and non-academic support, and teacher-to-teacher student monitoring; 3) Student achievement, which includes perspectives on student academic behavior and college attendance; and, 4) Communication with parents and the community. Student achievement outcomes of interest already reported in the APR will not be discussed here.

### ***Student Survey***

In late Spring 2006, students in the 9<sup>th</sup> through 12<sup>th</sup> grades at the three high schools took the Long Beach Unified School District's High School Survey, a 64-item instrument. Because a number of programs in 2006 required survey data, the district staff opted for a single comprehensive survey to avoid overburdening high school teachers and students with several surveys in the spring. Given that the survey served multiple purposes, only a limited number of SLC questions were incorporated. The items included pertain to student involvement in SLC development and implementation, 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. At the time the survey was administered, Cabrillo and Jordan did not have SLCs in place while Poly did have loosely implemented SLCs. The following is analysis of the data, both aggregated and disaggregated, that will serve as a baseline measure of SLC outcomes.

A total of 9,797 students from four high schools, Cabrillo, Jordan, Poly, and Wilson took the student survey. The 2,503 respondents identifying themselves as Wilson High students were removed from the dataset given that they are not part of this study. Table 4.1 below provides a breakdown of student participation by school and ethnicity. Of the 4,835 students at Poly High, a total of 3,227 took the survey. At Cabrillo High, 2,069 students from a population of 3,743 participated in the survey. The lowest participation was at Jordan High where only 1,237 students out of 4,279 took the survey. Unfortunately, a total of 761 students failed to identify their school. Although those identifying themselves as Wilson High students were removed from the dataset, it was impossible to remove those Wilson High students who did not identified their school. Thus, of the 761 participants not identifying their school some may be Wilson High students.

In terms of ethnic breakdown, in both Cabrillo and Jordan the Hispanic/Latino category had the highest percentage of participation, 57.95% and 58.85% respectively, followed by African Americans. As Table 4.1 illustrates, the Asian group had the highest percentage of participation at

26.5% followed by Hispanic/Latino at Poly. Despite having a category for “other,” approximately more than 5% of those who took the survey at each school did not identify with one ethnic group. Those students who did not have a response for the ethnicity question included respondents who selected multiple ethnic groups and whose answers, as a result, were deemed spoiled and labeled as missing. It may be worthwhile to define “other” or add a category of “mixed” to alleviate any future misunderstandings or confusion.

**Table 4.1. Percent of Ethnic Distribution by Schools, High School Students, Long Beach Unified School District High School Survey, Spring 2006.**

Ethnicity	Aggregated (Three Schools)	Cabrillo	Jordan	Poly	No Answer
African American	18.85%	16.43%	19.48%	22.19%	10.25%
Asian	14.46%	2.75%	5.5%	26.5%	9.86%
Filipino	6.03%	8.89%	1.37%	6.76%	2.76%
Hispanic/Latino	37.83%	57.95%	58.85%	21.04%	20.11%
Pacific Islander	2.69%	2.37%	4.04%	2.7%	1.31%
White	6.17%	1.64%	1.46%	9.79%	10.78%
American Indian	0.34%	0.43%	0.4%	0.25%	0.39%
Other	4.52%	3.91%	3.15%	5.48%	4.34%
No Answer	9.1%	5.61%	5.74%	5.3%	40.21%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
N	7,294	2,069	1,237	3,227	761

The district-wide grade distribution indicates greater participation among 9<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> graders and very little among seniors. Table 4.2 illustrates the grade breakdown. Only 16.72% of the students who completed the survey at Cabrillo were seniors while only 14.15% were seniors at Jordan. Poly fell in the middle with 16.24%. Interestingly, Cabrillo had a higher percentage of 10<sup>th</sup> graders who completed the survey than 9<sup>th</sup> graders, opposite of what took place at the other two schools.

**Table 4.2. Percent of Grade Level Distribution by Schools, High School Students, Long Beach Unified School District High School Survey, Spring 2006.**

Grade	Aggregated (Three Schools)	Cabrillo	Jordan	Poly	No Answer
9 <sup>th</sup> Grade	31.29%	26.2%	42.68%	33.96%	15.24%
10 <sup>th</sup> Grade	26%	31.75%	18.51%	27.08%	15.24%
11 <sup>th</sup> Grade	21.58%	23.68%	20.7%	21.85%	16.16%
12 <sup>th</sup> Grade	15.12%	16.72%	14.15%	16.24%	7.62%
No Answer	6.29%	1.64%	3.96%	0.87%	45.73%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
N	7,294	2,069	1,237	3,227	761

As previously mentioned, the survey items relevant to the SLC Initiative include student involvement in SLC development and implementation, 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. The following analysis is organized into these three pertinent sections: 1) student involvement in development and implementation; 2) personalization; and 3) student achievement. For the purpose of this analysis, the 761 students who did not designate a school will be excluded.

1) Student Involvement in SLC Development & Implementation

The survey included two statements pertaining to student involvement in decision-making at school. Table 4.3 below lists the two statements and presents the response breakdown in an aggregated and disaggregated form.

Unfortunately, the first statement yields confounding results. The phrasing combined teachers, students, and parents and, thus, the responses cannot be attributed solely to student involvement in decision-making. The aggregated responses indicate that a student majority tends to agree or strongly agree that teachers, students, and parents are involved in decision-making. Approximately 27% are not sure, with a minority disagreeing or strongly disagreeing. When disaggregating the data, a similar pattern exists at the three schools. Poly has more favorable responses to this statement while Jordan has the least favorable. At Cabrillo, approximately 33% are not sure about involvement in decision-making.

**Table 4.3. Percentage of Involvement and School by Agreement Degree, High School Students, Long Beach Unified School District High School Survey, Spring 2006.**

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Not Sure	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Answer	N
Teachers, students, parents are involved in decision making at school.							
Aggregated (Three Schools)	10.61%	34.55%	27.41%	11.31%	3.95%	12.17%	6,533
Cabrillo	8.84%	33.83%	33.3%	11.31%	4.4%	8.31%	2,069
Jordan	7.19%	24.98%	31.93%	16.09%	7.28%	12.53%	1,237
Poly	13.05%	38.67%	21.91%	9.48%	2.39%	14.5%	3,227
Students have opportunities to provide input into decisions that affect them.							
Aggregated (Three Schools)	12.63%	37.53%	21.83%	9.37%	4.55%	14.10%	6,533
Cabrillo	10.54%	38.28%	26.58%	9.28%	4.3%	11.02%	2,069
Jordan	9.78%	30.32%	25.38%	11.72%	6.95%	15.84%	1,237
Poly	15.06%	39.82%	17.42%	8.52%	3.78%	15.4%	3,227

The responses to the second statement yield a similar aggregated pattern as the one found with the first statement. The student majority is found in the “agree” and “strongly agree” side of the scale, although at a slightly higher percentage than with the first statement. When disaggregating the data, Poly is once again the most favorable with a student majority agreeing or strongly agreeing that students have opportunities to provide input into decisions. As with the first statement, Jordan students agreed less and disagreed more with the second statement.

Although a majority of students at the three schools tend to agree that students are involved in decision-making, approximately between 17% and 33% students are not sure and about 8% to 15% failed to rate the statements. This may indicate that many students are unaware of the decision-making opportunities available to them. There is a small minority that disagrees or strongly disagrees that decision-making opportunities exist at their schools.

## 2. Personalization

### ***Student/Teacher (staff)***

In terms of personalization as it relates to teacher(staff)/student communication and support, students were asked to rate a number of statements. Table 4.4 below presents the percentage of those who indicated getting information on high school graduation and college preparation from counselors, teachers, and another school adult. As one can see, more students identified counselors as the providers of information on both high school graduation and college preparation. At all three schools, counselors, teachers, and the school adult tend to communicate high school graduation information to more students than information pertaining to getting into college. Interestingly, Poly High has the highest percentage, when compared to the other schools, in almost every category, except for getting high school graduation information from another school adult.

**Table 4.4. Percent of Type of Information Communicated and Source by Schools, High School Students, Long Beach Unified School District High School Survey, Spring 2006. (N)**

Information Communicated & Source	Aggregated (Three Schools)	Cabrillo	Jordan	Poly
High school graduation from counselors	79.27% (5,179)	77.38% (1,601)	76.31% (944)	81.62% (2,634)
High school graduation from teachers	55.26% (3,610)	54.81% (1,134)	49.96% (618)	57.58% (1,858)
High school graduation from another adult at school	21.54% (1,407)	21.85% (452)	21.58% (267)	21.32% (688)
Getting into college from counselor	67.12% (4,385)	63.75% (1,319)	61.03% (755)	71.61% (2,311)
Getting into college from teacher	43.06% (2,813)	40.79% (844)	39.29% (486)	45.96% (1,483)
Getting into college from another adult in school	18.34% (1,198)	18.99% (393)	14.31% (177)	19.46% (628)

In looking at college awareness, conversations seem to revolve primarily around college entrance and not financial aid. Table 4.5 illustrates the type of conversations students experienced at each high school. The three high schools collectively rank at above 84.07% in terms of college entrance conversations but only at 58.09% when it came to college financial aid. Poly ranked the highest in each category; Jordan ranked the lowest. There is a discrepancy between who provides information (mostly counselors), priority in the type of information communicated (high school graduation), and how college awareness is raised (primarily admission).

**Table 4.5. Percent of Experiencing College Conversations by Schools, High School Students, Long Beach Unified School District High School Survey, Spring 2006. (N)**

Type	Aggregated (Three Schools)	Cabrillo	Jordan	Poly
College Entrance	84.07% (5,492)	82.5% (1,707)	79.3% (981)	86.89% (2,804)
College Finance	58.09% (3,795)	58.58% (1,212)	54.32% (672)	59.22% (1,911)

The survey included a section that sought to quantify the number of times per year that communication or support took place between school adults and students. The statements rated by students on a scale ranging from weekly to never are found in Table 4.6 in Appendix B. These communication and support statements are centered around academic, college, and life planning.

Overall, the results of the section aiming to quantify the staff/student communication and support levels point out that although communication and support exist, they do so at low levels with the majority students not experiencing them. With the exception of the fourth statement pertaining to talking to someone about how to get into college, the student majority fell in the never taking place column. The majority of students, ranging from as low as 23.43% and as high as 43.69%, indicated that they have never: 1) sat down with a counselor to talk about life after school; 2) received academic tutoring or mentoring; 3) gotten help for big test preparation (CAHSEE, SAT, etc.); 4) talked to someone about how to pay for college; 5) talked to someone about getting into or preparing for advanced-level courses; 6) talked with a school adult about their respective test scores and how to improve them; nor, 7) talked to someone about their respective high school plans. Ironically, the statement pertaining to receiving academic tutoring or mentoring had one of the highest percentages falling in the never column as well as one of the highest percentages falling in the weekly column. Thus, students either get no tutoring/mentoring or they do so at a high frequency.

Only the results of the statement pertaining to talking to someone about getting into college differed substantially from the rest. Approximately 40% of students at Cabrillo and Poly rated this statement in the “monthly” and “2-3 times a year” columns. At Cabrillo, only 17.54% indicated they had never spoken to anyone about this while at Poly only 14.38% had not. Jordan’s student majority, 21.67%, indicated that they had never spoken to anyone about getting into college. Jordan is the only school in which a student majority rated every single statement as never taking place.

Another section in the survey asked students to provide their level of agreement with statements pertaining to teacher communication and support as they related to classroom practice. Table 4.7 in Appendix B presents the statements and their ratings by school. The pattern that surfaced is one in which well over 60% of students at each school agreed or strongly agreed that: 1) adults at their school believe students can learn; 2) expectations for achievement are clearly stated; 3) expectations for behavior are clearly stated; 4) teachers have high expectations for student achievement; 5) teachers help them do their best in their classes; 6) they understand how teachers grade their performance; 7) for most classes, teachers make sure students know how they can help if they fall behind; 8) teachers’ lessons are designed to encourage them to find solutions, research ideas, and think critically; 9) teachers use various teaching approaches and resources to help students with different learning styles and needs; 10) teachers use a wide variety of methods to check how students are doing in class; and 11) students receive prompt feedback on assignments and regular progress reports with specific suggestions for improvement. Poly had a higher percentage of students in agreement with the statements than the other schools. Jordan, on the other hand, had the lowest, although still above 60%.

Approximately 51% of students disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement that teachers would change their lesson plans as a result of student suggestions. Cabrillo and Poly had approximately a similar percentage of agreement while Jordan had a lower one at approximately

44%. By and large, however, over 60% of students are in general agreement with these statements pertaining to in-class academic communication and support.

Overall, a student majority reports experiencing positive communication and support when relating to the classroom. Given that the adult with whom students interact in the classroom is a teacher, this implies that positive communication and support is more often experienced when interacting with teachers. Despite the high percentages in this section, there still is a minority of students reporting lack of communication and support. Most often when weak communication and modest support is reported by a majority of students, it pertains to general academic, college, and life planning -- which does not seem to take place in the classroom nor out.

***Student/Student***

The survey included seven statements pertaining to peer-to-peer relations. Unfortunately, for three of those statements, the scale had a typo and, thus, the “strongly agree” category appeared twice and the “strongly disagree” category did not appear at all. Therefore, the results for these three statements are deemed unreliable. Table 4.8 in Appendix C presents a school breakdown of the results of those three statements.

Communication between peers concerning school revolves around high school graduation and less so about getting into college. This follows the same pattern as with the communication between students and counselors, teachers, and school adults. Table 4.9 below illustrates the aggregated and disaggregated breakdown of the types of information communicated through peers. Approximately 32.5% of students get information on high school graduation from their peers but only about 26% do so on getting into college. As previously noted, Poly once again has the highest percentage response in both types of information communicated; Jordan has the lowest.

**Table 4.9. Percent of Type of Information Communicated through Peers by Schools, High School Students, Long Beach Unified School District High School Survey, Spring 2006. (N)**

Type	Aggregated (Three Schools)	Cabrillo	Jordan	Poly
High School Graduation	32.45% (2,120)	27.69% (573)	24.82% (307)	38.43% (1,240)
College Entrance	25.88% (1,169)	21.75% (450)	18.27% (226)	31.45% (1,015)

Peer perception as measured by the two statements presented in Table 4.10 indicate that approximately over 50% of students generally agree that their peers are committed to learning and that most students aim to get good grades. Students are slightly in stronger agreement with the statement that students try hard to get good grades. Nevertheless, approximately over a quarter of the students are in disagreement with both statements. Poly has a higher percentage of students in agreement while Jordan has a higher percentage of students in disagreement.

**Table 4.10. Percent of Type of Peer Perception by Schools, High School Students, Long Beach Unified School District High School Survey, Spring 2006.**

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Answer	N
Students are committed to learning at this school.						
Aggregated (Three Schools)	8.79%	51.66%	27.69%	4.91%	6.96%	6,533
Cabrillo	9.09%	51.18%	27.55%	4.88%	7.3%	2,069
Jordan	5.42%	43.57%	33.55%	8.57%	8.89%	1,237
Poly	9.89%	55.07%	25.5%	3.53%	6.01%	3,227
Most students at this school try hard to get good grades.						
Aggregated (Three Schools)	13.93%	49.84%	25.29%	4.58%	6.37%	6,533
Cabrillo	13.82%	48.53%	26.44%	4.88%	6.33%	2,069
Jordan	10.99%	45.27%	28.94%	7.68%	7.11%	1,237
Poly	15.12%	52.43%	23.15%	3.19%	6.1%	3,227

Overall, the survey results point to most students having a positive perception of their peers and using each other as a source of information on high school graduation. Students do not seem to gather information regarding getting into college from each other. Had the results from the tainted section (mis-labeled scale) been reliable, a portion of the peer-to-peer outcomes would point to disruptive classroom behavior and disrespect among peers.

### 3. Student Achievement

#### ***Academic Behavior***

Although the survey included a number of items pertaining to the availability of academic opportunities, only one of them actually inquired about student academic behavior. Table 4.11 tabulates the results of students' rating of their involvement in developing and monitoring their high school plans. The aggregated responses indicate that a greater percentage is involved in developing/monitoring their high school plan with the second highest percentage falling in the "don't know" category, as is the pattern at each of the three schools. Approximately over 50% of students at Poly indicated that they are involved. About 20% of the students at Cabrillo and Jordan do not know whether they are involved in their high school planning.

**Table 4.11. Percent of Student Involvement in Developing/Monitoring their High School Plan by Schools, High School Students, Long Beach Unified School District High School Survey, Spring 2006.**

	Aggregated (Three Schools)	Cabrillo	Jordan	Poly
Yes	45.86%	39.83%	37.91%	52.77%
No	18.97%	20.73%	22.47%	16.49%
Don't Know	30.35%	33.49%	34.52%	26.74%
No Answer	4.82%	5.94%	5.09%	4%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%
N	6,533	2,069	1,237	3,227

### ***College Knowledge***

The survey included various items pertaining to college preparation communication but only two aiming to measure college knowledge. The results of the first statement, which asked students to rate whether they thought they could afford college, are found in Table 4.12. The results of the second statement, which asked students to rate whether they were on track with completing the UC/CSU requirements, are found in Table 4.13.

As one can see, only a very small percentage believes they cannot afford college. The majority of students fall within the “definitely” and “probably” can afford college categories. About 25% of the student respondents at Cabrillo and Jordan are not sure whether they can or cannot afford college. At Poly, only 20% fall in the “not sure” category.

**Table 4.12. Percent of Students Believing they can Afford College by Schools, High School Students, Long Beach Unified School District High School Survey, Spring 2006.**

	Aggregated	Cabrillo	Jordan	Poly
Definitely	24.98%	18.75%	21.34%	30.37%
Probably	38.73%	40.07%	38.16%	38.08%
Not sure	22.96%	25.71%	25.79%	20.11%
Probably not	5.85%	7.39%	6.22%	4.71%
Definitely not	2.43%	2.71%	2.51%	2.23%
No Answer	5.05%	5.36%	5.98%	4.49%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%
N	6,533	2,069	1,237	3,227

The majority of students also report being on track to completing the UC and CSU requirements, as Table 4.13 illustrates. There is a high disparity between schools regarding student responses to this statement. At Poly, only approximately 15% report not knowing but at Jordan twice as many indicated that they do not know. Approximately 45% of the students at Poly reported that they are on track to completing the requirements. At Cabrillo, about 25% report being on track to fulfilling the requirements.

**Table 4.13. Percent of Students on Track to Completing UC/CSU Requirements by Schools, High School Students, Long Beach Unified School District High School Survey, Spring 2006.**

	Aggregated	Cabrillo	Jordan	Poly
Yes, on track	33.12%	25.76%	20.29%	44.78%
Sort of, missing a few	22.61%	26%	24.58%	19.68%
No, not at all on track	7.13%	8.55%	8.73%	5.61%
Don't Know	20.25%	23.05%	29.83%	14.78%
Doesn't apply, not going to UC/CSU	7.47%	8.12%	7.6%	7%
No Answer	8.42%	8.51%	8.97%	8.15%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%
N	6,533	2,069	1,237	3,227

It should be noted that the college knowledge data is self-reported and reflect students' perception of how they think they are doing. The survey does not test college knowledge. Overall, the results indicate that a majority of students seem to be aware of college admission requirements but are not



as aware of how to finance a postsecondary education. The majority of students also demonstrate behavior that alludes to interest and involvement in their academic planning. In both the academic behavior and college knowledge cases, however, the positive responses are just slim majorities.

### ***Teacher Survey***

A 53-item teacher survey was also administered to the three high schools in late Spring 2006. Again, because of other needs in the district, the survey that was administered to the teachers served multiple purposes and the items pertaining specifically to small learning communities were very limited. However, there was enough overlap in survey items that the results from selected items can also serve as a baseline measure of SLC outcomes. The items included in this analysis pertain to teachers' perspectives on: 1) SLC development and implementation, which includes staff buy-in, school site communication, curriculum, and teacher-to-teacher interaction; 2) Personalization, which includes student/teacher communication, student/teacher academic and non-academic support, and teacher-to-teacher student monitoring; 3) Student achievement, which includes perspectives on student academic behavior and college attendance; and 4) Communication with parents and the community.

At the time the survey was administered, Cabrillo and Jordan did not have SLCs in place while Poly did have loosely implemented SLCs. The following is analysis of the data, both aggregated and disaggregated, that will serve as a baseline measure of SLC outcomes.

A total of 371 teachers from four high schools Cabrillo, Jordan, Poly, and Wilson took the student survey. The 93 teachers identifying themselves as Wilson High School teachers were removed from the dataset given that they are not a part of this study. Therefore, we have a total survey sample of 278 teachers. Of the three high schools that are a part of this evaluation, Poly High had the highest return of surveys with a total of 150 out of 176 teachers (85%) completing the survey. At Cabrillo and Jordan, participation was considerably lower, with 47% (63 of 134) and 41% (65 of 160) surveys being returned, respectively.

Amongst the teachers who did complete the survey, there is a range of teaching experience (see Table 4.14). On average, teachers have approximately 10 years of total teaching experience, with the average total years at their given school being between 7-10 years. The exception is for the teachers at Cabrillo High School, who have on average been at their school between 2-3 years. This is likely because Cabrillo is one of the newer high schools in the district.

**Table 4.14. Percent Distribution of Experience by School, High School Teachers, Long Beach Unified School District High School Survey, Spring 2006.**

School	Total Number of Years Teaching							Total
	1 <sup>st</sup> yr	2-3	4-6	7-10	10-15	16-20	20+	
Cabrillo	9.52% (6)	22.22% (14)	23.81% (15)	11.11% (7)	19.05% (12)	9.52% (6)	4.76% (3)	100% (63)
Jordan	4.76% (3)	9.52% (6)	6.35% (4)	15.87% (10)	15.87% (10)	15.87% (10)	31.75% (20)	100% (63)
Polytechnic	5.44% (8)	4.08% (6)	16.33% (24)	14.97% (22)	19.05% (28)	14.97% (22)	25.17% (37)	100% (147)
Aggregated (N)	6.23% (17)	9.52% (26)	15.75% (43)	14.29% (39)	18.32% (50)	13.92% (38)	21.98% (60)	100% (273)

  

School	Total Years at School							Total
	1 <sup>st</sup> yr	2-3	4-6	7-10	10-15	16-20	20+	
Cabrillo	21.67% (13)	38.33% (23)	20% (12)	13.33% (8)	6.67% (4)	0% (0)	0% (0)	100% (60)
Jordan	6.45% (4)	20.97% (13)	16.13% (10)	16.13% (10)	14.52% (9)	17.74% (11)	8.06% (5)	100% (62)
Polytechnic	10.87% (15)	13.04% (18)	18.12% (25)	15.94% (22)	22.46% (31)	14.49% (20)	5.07% (7)	100% (138)
Aggregated (N)	12.31% (32)	20.77% (54)	18.08% (47)	15.38% (40)	16.92% (44)	11.92% (31)	4.62% (12)	100% (260)

In Table 4.15 one can see that there is also a wide range of departments in which the respondents teach. Teachers from the English, History/Social Studies, and Math departments do make up slightly more than half of the total teachers. This is no surprise, given that these subjects often make up the core academic curriculum.

**Table 4.15. Percent Distribution of Department by School, High School Teachers, Long Beach Unified School District High School Survey, Spring 2006.**

School	Department									Total
	Art (F&P)	Eng	His/SS	For Lang	Sci	Math	PE	Tech	Other	
Cabrillo	8.2% (5)	19.7% (12)	21.3% (13)	3.3% (2)	8.2% (5)	18% (11)	1.6% (1)	4.9% (3)	14.8% (9)	100% (61)
Jordan	8.1% (5)	22.6% (14)	21% (13)	3.2% (3)	11.3% (7)	14.5% (9)	4.8% (3)	0% (0)	14.5% (9)	100% (62)
Polytechnic	7% (10)	17.6% (25)	14.8% (21)	9.9% (14)	9.2% (13)	16.9% (24)	4.9% (7)	3.5% (5)	16.2% (23)	100% (142)
Aggregated (N)	7.6% (20)	19.3% (51)	17.7% (47)	6.8% (18)	9.4% (25)	16.6% (44)	4.2% (11)	3% (8)	15.5% (41)	100% (265)

### *1. SLC Development and Implementation Staff Buy-in*

Although the items regarding SLCs on the survey were limited, teachers were asked to rate to what extent they agreed or disagreed with three statements regarding small learning communities. The statements and teachers' responses are detailed below in Table 4.16. Overall, approximately 85% of the teachers agreed or strongly agreed that they did understand the vision and goals for implementing SLCs and almost 75% of the teachers did agree or strongly agree with the belief that forming SLCs would help raise student achievement. However, only about 65% of the teachers agreed or strongly agreed with the statement that they were comfortable with how their school was preparing for implementation. The teachers at Poly High, which at the time was the only school

with some established SLCs, did consistently have a higher percentage of teachers who agreed or strongly agreed with each statement.

**Table 4.16. Percent Agreement on Statements Regarding Small Learning Communities by School, High School Teachers, Long Beach Unified School District High School Survey, Spring 2006.**

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	DK/NA	N
I understand the vision and goals for implementing small learning communities next year.						
Aggregate (Three Schools)	28.78%	49.82%	11.44%	4.06%	5.9%	271
Cabrillo	25.81%	50%	14.52%	6.45%	3.23%	62
Jordan	15.87%	57.14%	11.11%	7.94%	7.94%	63
Poly	35.62%	46.58%	10.27%	1.37%	6.16%	146
I am comfortable with how my school is preparing to implement small learning communities next year.						
Aggregate (Three Schools)	21.89%	43.4%	16.6%	7.17%	10.94%	265
Cabrillo	12.9%	43.55%	24.19%	12.9%	6.45%	62
Jordan	8.2%	54.1%	9.84%	13.11%	14.75%	61
Poly	31.69%	38.73%	16.2%	2.11%	11.27%	142
I believe that forming small learning communities will help this school raise student achievement.						
Aggregate (Three Schools)	31.94%	41.83%	10.27%	4.18%	11.79%	263
Cabrillo	19.35%	37.1%	22.58%	6.45%	14.52%	62
Jordan	23.33%	50%	10%	8.33%	8.33%	60
Poly	41.13%	40.43%	4.96%	1.42%	12.06%	141

While we were not able to distinguish whether or not teachers were currently, at the time, in an SLC, teachers were asked if they had *ever* been a teacher within an SLC. Approximately half of the overall teachers have been a part of an SLC at some point (See Table 4.17).

**Table 4.17. Percent with SLC Experience by School, High School Teachers, Long Beach Unified School District High School Survey, Spring 2006.**

	Aggregated (Total Schools)	Jordan	Poly	Cabrillo
Yes	49.74%	46%	55.1%	41.86%
No	35.6%	44%	22.45%	55.81%
Not sure	14.66%	10%	22.45%	2.33%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%
N	191	50	98	43

Table 4.18 below illustrates the overall percentage of agreement and disagreement with the same SLC statements above, partitioned by whether or not a teacher reported having been a part of an SLC. For each statement, those teachers with SLC experience tended to agree more with the statement than their peers who had not previously been a member of an SLC. For the sake of simplicity, in this table the percentage of teachers who responded with a 'Not sure' to whether they have ever been a part of an SLC has been taken out. For a detailed description of the extent to

which teachers agreed/disagreed with the SLC statements by SLC experience, see Table 4.19 in Appendix D.

**Table 4.18. Percent Agreement on SLC Statements by SLC Experience, High School Teachers, Long Beach Unified School District High School Survey, Spring 2006.**

SLC experience	Understanding vision and goals of SLC		Comfortable with plans for implementation		SLCs will raise student achievement	
	Agree	Disagree	Agree	Disagree	Agree	Disagree
Yes	84%	11%	66%	25%	79%	13%
No	78%	15%	58%	27%	69%	14%

***School Site Communication***

Also of interest as an SLC outcome is the ease of school site communication. Table 4.20 summarizes teachers’ responses to four items that asked to what extent they agreed with several statements regarding school site communication. The overwhelming majority, approximately 90%, agreed or strongly agreed that the educational mission of their school is based on student needs and is easily identified. Between 85 and 95% of the teachers also agreed or strongly agreed with the statement that the leadership at their school clearly communicates goals, standards, and expectations for achievement and behavior. Teachers at Poly High were also in strong agreement that they felt well informed about the decisions that were made at their school. However, not as many teachers at Cabrillo and Jordan agreed with that statement. Almost 40% of the teachers at those two schools disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement about being well informed. With regard to school site policies and procedures, 40% of the teachers at Jordan and 30% of the teachers at Cabrillo did not agree that those were clearly communicated. 17% of the teachers at Poly also were in disagreement that that statement.

**Table 4.20. Percent Agreement on School Site Communication by School, High School Teachers, Long Beach Unified School District High School Survey, Spring 2006.**

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	DK/NA	N
The educational Mission of this school is based on student needs and is easily identified.						
Aggregate (Three Schools)	39.93%	52.38%	5.86%	1.83%	0%	273
Cabrillo	37.7%	52.46%	8.2%	1.64%	0%	61
Jordan	18.75%	68.75%	7.81%	4.69%	0%	64
Poly	50%	45.27%	4.05%	0.68%	0%	148
The leadership of this school clearly communicates goals, standards, and expectations for achievement and behavior.						
Aggregate (Three Schools)	43.87%	45.72%	7.81%	2.6%	0%	269
Cabrillo	36.07%	49.18%	9.84%	4.92%	0%	61
Jordan	20.97%	59.68%	16.13%	3.23%	0%	62
Poly	56.85%	38.36%	3.42%	1.37%	0%	146
I feel well-informed about the decisions that are made at this school.						
Aggregate (Three Schools)	23.88%	49.63%	18.66%	5.6%	2.24%	268
Cabrillo	12.9%	46.77%	27.42%	9.68%	3.23%	62
Jordan	10.94%	46.88%	26.56%	10.94%	4.69%	64
Poly	34.51%	52.11%	11.27%	1.41%	0.7%	142
School site policies and procedures are clearly communicated.						
Aggregate (Three Schools)	22.27%	50.39%	17.58%	8.59%	1.17%	256
Cabrillo	8.93%	55.36%	23.21%	8.93%	3.57%	56
Jordan	12.9%	43.55%	30.65%	11.29%	1.61%	62
Poly	31.88%	51.45%	9.42%	7.25%	0%	138

### ***Curriculum***

The survey included seven items pertaining to curriculum. Teachers were again asked the extent to which they agreed with statements regarding curriculum. Table 4.21 lists each statement and the responses are presented by school as well as in aggregate. Overall, teachers seem to be fairly confident that the curriculum at their school is rigorous and challenging (86% agreement) and opportunities are available for students to receive lessons that engage them in problem-solving, critical thinking, and inquiry (89% agreement). Teachers also overwhelmingly agree (93%) that opportunities are available for students to be involved in accelerated and challenging course. Across schools teachers also agree that there is differentiated instruction based upon different backgrounds, learning styles and needs (88% agreement) and that instructional plans are modified and adjusted according to levels of achievement (89% agreement). At Poly, between 86 and 93% of the teachers agreed with each of the statements. Approximately 86% of the teachers agreed with both the statements that curriculum and sequence of instruction were coordinated throughout the grade levels and that teachers regularly engaged in innovative instructional practices. However, at Cabrillo and Jordan, almost one third and one quarter, respectively, of the teachers who completed the survey were in disagreement regarding the coordinating of curriculum and sequence of instruction throughout the grade levels. Approximately 75% of the teachers at Cabrillo and Jordan were in agreement that teachers regularly engage in innovative instructional practices.

**Table 4.21. Percent Agreement on Curriculum by School, High School Teachers, Long Beach Unified School District High School Survey, Spring 2006.**

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	DK/NA	N
Curriculum is rigorous and challenges each student.						
Aggregated (Three Schools)	25.8%	60.3%	12%	1.5%	0.4%	267
Cabrillo	11.7%	66.7%	15%	5%	1.7%	60
Jordan	10%	66.7%	21.7%	1.7%	0%	60
Poly	38.1%	55.1%	6.8%	0%	0%	147
The curriculum and sequence of instruction are coordinated throughout grade levels.						
Aggregated (Three Schools)	23.4%	55.1%	11.3%	2.3%	5.6%	256
Cabrillo	20.3%	49.2%	22%	1.7%	6.8%	59
Jordan	10.3%	67.2%	10.3%	3.5%	8.6%	58
Poly	33.8%	52.5%	7.2%	2.2%	4.3%	139
Lessons are designed and conducted so students engage in problem-solving, critical thinking, and inquiry.						
Aggregated (Three Schools)	26.9%	61.6%	9.3%	0.4%	1.9%	268
Cabrillo	17%	72.9%	10.2%	0%	0%	59
Jordan	10%	76.7%	10%	0%	3.3%	60
Poly	37.6%	51%	8.7%	0.7%	2%	149
Opportunities are available for students to be involved in accelerated and challenging courses.						
Aggregated (Three Schools)	42.8%	50%	5.7%	0.8%	0.8%	264
Cabrillo	45.8%	54.2%	0%	0%	0%	59
Jordan	31.7%	61.7%	5%	1.7%	0%	60
Poly	46.2%	43.5%	8.3%	0.7%	1.4%	145
Teachers differentiate instruction by using instructional strategies and resources to support the different backgrounds, learning styles, and needs of all students.						
Aggregated (Three Schools)	31.6%	56.4%	8.3%	1.9%	1.9%	266
Cabrillo	24.1%	58.6%	13.8%	1.7%	1.7%	58
Jordan	12.5%	75%	9.4%	1.6%	1.6%	64
Poly	43.1%	47.22%	5.6%	2.1%	2.1%	144
Teachers adjust and modify instructional plans based upon student achievement and other sources of information.						
Aggregated (Three Schools)	28.4%	60.6%	8%	0.4%	2.7%	264
Cabrillo	15.3%	66.1%	15.3%	0%	3.4%	59
Jordan	12.7%	77.8%	7.9%	0%	1.6%	63
Poly	40.9%	50.7%	4.9%	0.7%	2.8%	142
Teachers regularly engage in innovative instructional practices/strategies at this school.						
Aggregated (Three Schools)	26.8%	53.3%	14.7%	0.7%	4.4%	272
Cabrillo	14.8%	60.7%	14.8%	3.3%	6.6%	61
Jordan	10.9%	60.9%	23.4%	0%	4.7%	64
Poly	38.8%	46.9%	10.9%	0%	3.4%	147

### ***Teacher-to-teacher Interaction***

In the survey, teachers were also asked about various interactions with their peers. Table 4.22 below shows what percentage of teachers agreed or disagreed with two statements regarding teacher to teacher interaction. Overall approximately 85% of the teachers agreed or strongly agreed that teachers have opportunities to collaborate on decisions about student achievement, systems and processes, and professional development and 80% agreed or strongly agreed that the school provides time on a regular basis for the sharing of information, ideas, and instructional strategies. Again, the percentage of agreement is slightly higher at Poly than at Cabrillo and Jordan. At the later two schools, about 30% of the teachers were in disagreement with the statement about the school providing time on a regular basis for sharing with one another.

**Table 4.22. Percent Agreement on Teacher-to-teacher Interaction by School, High School Teachers, Long Beach Unified School District High School Survey, Spring 2006.**

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	DK/NA	N
Teachers have opportunities to collaborate on decisions about student achievement, systems and processes, and professional development.						
Aggregated (Three Schools)	35.29%	50.74%	8.09%	4.78%	1.1%	272
Cabrillo	29.03%	48.39%	12.9%	6.45%	3.23%	62
Jordan	22.22%	60.32%	11.11%	6.35%	0%	63
Poly	43.54%	47.62%	4.76%	3.4%	0.68%	147
The school provides time on a regular basis for the sharing of information, ideas, and instructional strategies.						
Aggregated (Three Schools)	30.83%	48.12%	16.54%	4.14%	0.38%	266
Cabrillo	19.67%	49.18%	22.95%	6.56%	1.64%	61
Jordan	24.59%	47.54%	26.23%	1.64%	0%	61
Poly	38.19%	47.92%	9.72%	4.17%	0%	144

## ***2. Personalization***

### ***Student/Teacher Communication***

In terms of personalization, one dimension of interest is student/teacher communication. When asked to what extent they agreed with the statement that “students receive prompt feedback and regular progress reports with specific suggestions for improvement,” overall, 87% of teachers agreed with that statement (see Table 4.23).

**Table 4.23. Percent Agreement on Prompt Feedback to Students by School, High School Teachers, Long Beach Unified School District High School Survey, Spring 2006.**

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	DK/NA	N
Aggregated (Three Schools)	27.01%	59.85%	8.03%	0.73%	4.38%	274
Cabrillo	13.11%	67.21%	11.48%	3.28%	4.92%	61
Jordan	12.31%	73.85%	12.31%	0%	1.54%	65
Poly	39.19%	50.68%	4.73%	0%	5.41%	148

Teachers were also asked how often they spoke with their students about getting into and preparing for advanced level courses as well as getting into and preparing for college. Table 4.24 below illustrates the breakdown in responses by school as well as in aggregate. At Cabrillo and Poly, over 50% of teachers indicated that they speak with their students about advanced level courses ‘a lot’ and less than 10% of teachers at those two schools responded ‘not at all.’ At Jordan, a little bit less than half of the teachers (43%) indicated the spoke with their students ‘a lot’ with regard to advanced level courses, but 18% of the teachers did indicate that they do not speak with their students about advanced level course. Approximately two-thirds of the teachers from all three schools did say that they spoke with students ‘a lot’ regarding how to get into or prepare for college and fewer than 5% at any school said ‘not at all.’

**Table 4.24. Percent of Type of Communication by Frequency by School, High School Teachers, Long Beach Unified School District High School Survey, Spring 2006.**

	A lot	A little	Not at all	N
Speak with students about how to get into or prepare for advanced level courses.				
Aggregated (Three Schools)	51.52%	39.02%	9.47%	264
Cabrillo	51.67%	40%	8.33%	60
Jordan	42.86%	39.68%	17.46%	63
Poly	55.32%	38.3%	6.38%	141
Speak with students about how to get into or prepare for college.				
Aggregated (Three Schools)	67.42%	30.34%	2.25%	267
Cabrillo	67.8%	28.81%	3.39%	59
Jordan	66.67%	28.57%	4.76%	63
Poly	67.59%	31.72%	0.69%	145

***Student/Teacher Academic and Non-academic Support***

Also of interest is the level of student/teacher support, both academic and non-academic. Table 4.25 presents several statements and teachers’ responses regarding the type of support that students may be receiving. Results indicate that academically, students receive the most support when they are having difficulty with their schoolwork. Approximately 95% of teachers at all three schools agreed that help is available to students who struggle with their school work. Approximately 82% of teachers have also been involved with developing and monitoring students’ learning plans. Just over two-thirds of the teachers would also agree that students receive regular guidance on course selection and college and career planning. At Poly, 90% of the teachers agree or strongly agree with that statement.

In terms of general high expectations and respect, 77% of teachers, overall, agree or strongly agree that teachers have high expectations for all students, but only 67% of teachers agree that teachers and students treat each other respectfully at their school. Interestingly, there is also a fairly big difference when looking at respect by school. At Jordan High over half (57%) of teachers were in disagreement that teachers and students treat each other respectfully. At Poly, the percentage in disagreement was substantially less at 20%.



**Table 4.25. Percent Agreement on Type of Support by School, High School Teachers, Long Beach Unified School District High School Survey, Spring 2006.**

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	DK/NA	N
I have been involved in developing and monitoring students' learning plans.						
Aggregated (Three Schools)	28.73%	52.99%	11.57%	1.87%	4.85%	268
Cabrillo	26.67%	48.33%	16.67%	1.67%	6.67%	60
Jordan	15.87%	60.32%	11.11%	6.35%	6.35%	63
Poly	35.17%	51.72%	9.66%	0%	3.45%	145
Students receive regular guidance on course selection and college and career planning.						
Aggregated (Three Schools)	24.16%	45.72%	17.1%	1.49%	11.52%	269
Cabrillo	13.11%	47.54%	22.95%	1.64%	14.75%	61
Jordan	4.84%	45.16%	27.42%	4.84%	17.74%	62
Poly	36.99%	45.21%	10.27%	0%	7.53%	146
Teachers have high expectations for all students.						
Aggregated (Three Schools)	26.77%	50.19%	18.22%	2.6%	2.23%	269
Cabrillo	14.52%	58.06%	20.97%	4.84%	1.61%	62
Jordan	14.29%	42.86%	33.33%	4.76%	4.76%	63
Poly	37.5%	50%	10.42%	0.69%	1.39%	144
Help is available to students who are having difficulty with their schoolwork.						
Aggregated (Three Schools)	54.72%	40.38%	4.53%	0%	0.38%	265
Cabrillo	56.67%	38.33%	5%	0%	0%	60
Jordan	49.18%	47.54%	3.28%	0%	0%	61
Poly	56.25%	38.19%	4.86%	0%	0.69%	144
Teachers and students treat each other respectfully at this school.						
Aggregated (Three Schools)	19.47%	47.71%	27.48%	5.34%	0%	262
Cabrillo	8.2%	54.1%	31.15%	6.56%	0%	61
Jordan	3.39%	40.68%	47.46%	8.47%	0%	59
Poly	30.99%	47.89%	17.61%	3.52%	0%	142

Teachers were also asked to indicate how often they engaged with students in a mentoring role and how often they met with students about homework. Again, a great majority of teachers (over 90%) indicated that they engage in a mentoring role at least 'a little' with over half indicating 'a lot.' The same was true for teachers meeting with students about homework. Over 95% of the teachers at Cabrillo and Poly, and about 90% at Jordan indicated that they do meet with students regarding homework.

**Table 4.26. Percent of Type of Support by Frequency by School, High School Teachers, Long Beach Unified School District High School Survey, Spring 2006.**

	A lot	A little	Not at all	N
Engage Students in mentoring students after school.				
Aggregated (Three Schools)	51.49%	40.67%	7.84%	268
Cabrillo	57.63%	33.9%	8.47%	59
Jordan	44.44%	44.44%	11.11%	63
Poly	52.05%	41.78%	6.16%	146
Meet with students about homework.				
Aggregated (Three Schools)	54.72%	41.13%	4.15%	265
Cabrillo	54.24%	42.37%	3.39%	59
Jordan	42.19%	46.88%	10.94%	64
Poly	60.56%	38.03%	1.41%	142

### ***Teacher-to-Teacher Monitoring***

The survey contained one item that asked about teacher-to-teacher monitoring of students. Teachers were asked to what extent they agreed or disagreed that the administration, teachers, and staff at their school worked together to assist students who may be at risk of failing (see Table 4.27). At Poly, approximately 85% of the teachers agreed with the statement, indicating there is substantial teacher to teacher monitoring. At Cabrillo about 72% agreed and at Jordan about 65% agreed with the statement.

**Table 4.27. Percent Agreement on Teacher-to-teacher Monitoring by School, High School Teachers, Long Beach Unified School District High School Survey, Spring 2006.**

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	DK/NA	N
Aggregated (Three Schools)	29.55%	48.11%	16.29%	2.65%	3.41%	264
Cabrillo	18.03%	54.1%	19.67%	3.28%	4.92%	61
Jordan	15.63%	50%	26.56%	7.81%	0%	64
Poly	41.01%	44.6%	10.07%	0%	4.32%	139

### ***3. Student Achievement***

In order to gain some perspective on teachers' expectations for the students at their schools immediately following high school, respondents were asked to indicate what percentage of the current 12<sup>th</sup> graders would choose various post-secondary options such as seeking a full time job, joining the military, attending post-secondary school, etc. The results can be seen in Table 4.28.

First, teachers were asked what percent of 12<sup>th</sup> graders would graduate from high school. At Poly, 96% of teacher believed that more than half of the seniors would graduate, with 2/3 of the teachers believing that at 71-100% of seniors would graduate. At Cabrillo teachers were a little bit less optimistic with almost 20% of the teachers indicating that they believed that only 31-50% of the seniors would graduate and the majority indicating that they thought between 51-70% would graduate. At Jordan 90% of teachers believed that 51-100% of the 12<sup>th</sup> graders would graduate. With respect to seeking a full-time job, there was a wide range in terms of teachers' beliefs with regard to seniors seeking a full time job after high school. As for the military, overall teachers did seem to feel that less than 30% of seniors would opt to join the military.

When asked about 12<sup>th</sup> graders and their post-secondary options, the majority of teachers at Poly, Jordan and Cabrillo felt that less than 30% of seniors would choose a trade or technical school. However, there was quite a range when it came to teachers' perspectives on the seniors attending a community college. The same cannot be said about teachers' beliefs regarding 12<sup>th</sup> graders attending a four-year college immediately after high school. At Cabrillo and Jordan, just over 50% of teachers feel that 10% or fewer of the seniors will be attending a four-year college. An overwhelming majority of the teachers at Cabrillo and Jordan (85% and 90%, respectively) think that 30% or fewer of the seniors will be attending a four-year college. At Poly the teachers are a little more optimistic with about 25% of the teachers thinking that half of the 12<sup>th</sup> graders will go to a four-year school and only 10% thinking that 0-10% of seniors will go to a four-year college.

**Table 4.28. Percent of Teachers on 12<sup>th</sup> Grade Student Options by School, High School Teachers, Long Beach Unified School District High School Survey, Spring 2006.**

Immediately following high school, what percentage of current 12 <sup>th</sup> graders at your school do you think will:	0-10%	11-30%	31-50%	51-70%	71-100%	N
<b>Graduate from high school</b>						
Aggregated (Three Schools)	0.4%	0.4%	8%	39%	52%	267
Cabrillo	0%	0%	18%	59%	23%	61
Jordan	2%	0%	8%	45%	45%	62
Polytechnic	0%	1%	3%	28%	68%	144
<b>Seek a full time job</b>						
Aggregated (Three Schools)	3%	20%	31%	27%	19%	258
Cabrillo	0%	18%	37%	25%	21%	57
Jordan	2%	19%	31%	34%	15%	62
Polytechnic	5%	22%	29%	25%	19%	139
<b>Join the military</b>						
Aggregated (Three Schools)	50%	41%	8%	2%	0%	261
Cabrillo	31%	49%	20%	0%	0%	59
Jordan	48%	48%	5%	0%	0%	61
Polytechnic	59%	34%	5%	2%	0%	141
<b>Attend a trade/technical school</b>						
Aggregated (Three Schools)	30%	51%	15%	4%	0%	251
Cabrillo	29%	43%	27%	2%	0%	56
Jordan	33%	55%	12%	0%	0%	60
Polytechnic	29%	53%	11%	7%	0%	135
<b>Attend a Community College</b>						
Aggregated (Three Schools)	2%	30%	44%	21%	3%	263
Cabrillo	3%	39%	29%	27%	2%	59
Jordan	5%	41%	43%	11%	0%	63
Polytechnic	0%	21%	52%	22%	5%	141
<b>Attend a 4 year college</b>						
Aggregated (Three Schools)	30%	36%	19%	14%	2%	259
Cabrillo	51%	34%	10%	5%	0%	59
Jordan	52%	38%	8%	2%	0%	63
Polytechnic	10%	36%	28%	23%	4%	137

#### 4. Communication with Parents and the Community

The survey contained two items that asked teachers about their school's relationship with the parents and community. Table 4.29 below presents the statements and teachers' responses on the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with the statement. Overall, a great majority (92%) of teachers agreed or strongly agreed that their school had a system to inform parents regularly of their child's progress. Teachers also appear to think fairly positively about their schools' involvement of the family and community members in planning, reviewing, and improving school programs, with 76% of teachers agreeing that the school supports such involvement.

**Table 4.29. Percent Agreement on Communication with Parents and the Community by School, High School Teachers, Long Beach Unified School District High School Survey, Spring 2006.**

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	DK/NA	N
The school has a system to inform parents regularly of their child's progress.						
Aggregated (Three Schools)	42.26%	49.81%	5.28%	1.13%	1.51%	265
Cabrillo	24.19%	59.68%	8.06%	3.23%	4.84%	62
Jordan	33.9%	61.02%	1.69%	1.69%	1.69%	59
Polytechnic	53.47%	40.97%	5.56%	0%	0%	144
The school supports the involvement of families and community members in planning, reviewing, and improving school programs.						
Aggregated (Three Schools)	27.69%	48.08%	10.77%	2.31%	11.15%	260
Cabrillo	11.67%	53.33%	11.67%	8.33%	15%	60
Jordan	19.67%	52.46%	14.75%	1.64%	11.48%	61
Polytechnic	38.13%	43.88%	8.63%	0%	9.35%	139

## V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

In summary:

- The interviews reflect the collective knowledge administrators and teachers have gained from participating in SLC workshops and collaborating with each other in developing their SLCs. An alignment exists across schools among teachers' SLC perceptions. Principals also seem to share a similar outlook on SLC implementation and expected outcomes.
- The logic model sessions helped staff focus their SLCs. These logic models will help leadership team members monitor activities and provide the evaluators a way to measure progress. Furthermore, the logic models set the stage for the second year of implementation.
- Student survey results indicate that students tend to agree that they are involved in decision-making at school. In terms of personalization, students report experiencing communication and support from teachers in their class but less so with other adults when pertaining to general academic, college, and life planning. Students have a positive perception of their peers. Students are aware of college admission requirements but are not as well versed in how to finance a postsecondary education.
- Results from the teacher survey indicate that teachers seem optimistic regarding small learning communities. Only a minority percentage at each school were in disagreement about understanding the vision and goals for implementing SLCs, feeling comfortable about how their school was preparing for SLCs, and believing that SLCs can help the school raise student achievement. Teachers with previous SLC experience were also more likely to agree with the previous points. With regard to school site communication, teachers at all three schools agreed that the mission and goals/standards for achievement are clearly communicated, although at Cabrillo and Jordan teachers were not as strongly in agreement about feeling well-informed about decisions made at the school and the clarity of school site policies and procedures as the teachers from Poly. Teachers agree that there is a rigorous and challenging curriculum and that instruction is differentiated and adjusted according to need. In terms of personalization, teachers report high levels of communication and support with students. Teachers from Poly are a more optimistic regarding 12<sup>th</sup> graders graduating from high school and attending a four-year college than are teachers from Jordan and Cabrillo.
- Teachers tend to report higher levels of support than students. For example, approximately 90% of teachers report have engaged students in mentoring after school at least 'a little,' compared to a high percentage of students who report having never received academic tutoring or mentoring.

**Appendix A – 1 (Cabrillo High School)**



<b>Activities</b>	<b>Immediate Outputs</b>	<b>Short-term Intermediate Outcomes</b>	<b>Long-term Intermediate Outcomes</b>	<b>Ultimate Goal</b>
<p><b>Administrative</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Scheduling of SLC activities (Orientation, etc.)</li> <li>- Scheduling of students in classes</li> </ul> <p><b>Personalization Activities</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Advisement (monitor; encouragement; direction; reflection)</li> <li>2. Birthdays</li> <li>3. Personalization               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- dress for success</li> </ul> </li> <li>4. Picnics</li> <li>5. School Choice Fair</li> <li>6. Back to School Oct. 4<sup>th</sup></li> <li>7. Orientation (for 8<sup>th</sup> grade)</li> </ol> <p><b>Parent Involvement</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>7. Parent Booster club (mtgs, officers)</li> <li>8. Parent Institute</li> <li>9. Bring Parent to School Day</li> </ol>	<p><b><u>Administrative</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Events are scheduled</li> <li>- Students are grouped together by SLC</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Personalization</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- shirts</li> <li>- banners/posters</li> <li>- brochure</li> <li>- logos</li> <li>- powerpoint/website</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Parent Involvement</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Jag Points?</li> <li>- communication – check points – progress in classes, etc.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Students are aware they are in an SLC</li> <li>- 8<sup>th</sup> grade students are aware of potential SLCs they can join</li> <li>- General awareness of SLCs by counselors, general public, etc.</li> <li>- Students plan the '07-'08 Orientation</li> <li>- Recognition of student achievement</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Structures are in place for the SLCs to run smoothly</li> <li>- Students are empowered to take some responsibility (plan orientation, etc.)</li> <li>- Students feel pride in belonging to their SLC</li> <li>- Increased academic achievement</li> <li>- Increased collaboration between teachers</li> <li>- Increased teacher buy-in</li> </ul>	<p>Through active participation in comprehensive, thematic SLCs, students will increase engagement, academic achievement and develop social responsibility leading to intrinsic motivation as life-long learners.</p>

<p><b>Celebrations for Success</b>  10. Awards  11. Celebrations of success  12. Performances  13. Show cases  14. Welcome back to Picnic  15. Portfolios – presentation; students will use portfolio</p> <p><b>Professional Development</b>  16. Targeted professional development  - how to do student motivation  - advisement curriculum training  - walkthrough – TESA  - Roger Taylor Com (Interdisciplinary Approach)  - Team building – adult learning theory (*Joellen Killian – NSDC; Janet Kierstead – CDE)</p> <p>17. Common Planning  18. Researching and Implementing character education (teacher; students; parent – institutes)</p> <p><b>Signature Pieces</b>  19. Portfolios (projects, presentations)  20. Signature piece/program (motivation)</p>	<p><b><u>Celebrations for Success</u></b>  - increase student pride  - help recruit students</p> <p><b><u>Professional Development</u></b>  - Keep/sustain the progress, expectations, etc. of SLCs</p> <p><b><u>Signature Pieces</u></b>  - write curriculum  - make contacts  - understanding of theme of SLC  - student direction for future</p>			
---	---	--	--	--

<p><b>Team Building</b></p> <p>21. Across SLC meetings</p> <p>22. Team Building</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- teachers/students/parents</li> <li>- ropes course</li> <li>- collaboration</li> <li>- professional development</li> </ul> <p><b>Academic &amp; Career Development</b></p> <p>23. Tutorials (subject, peer, grade)</p> <p>24. Extended school day</p> <p>25. Guest speakers</p> <p>26. Service Learning</p> <p>27. Fieldtrips</p> <p>28. Business/Community Advisory</p> <p>29. Interdisciplinary Projects</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- lessons</li> <li>- college fair</li> <li>- p.s. speakers</li> <li>- university fieldtrips</li> <li>- internships</li> </ul> <p>30. Job shadowing/internship</p>	<p><b><u>Team Building</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- implementation of strategies</li> <li>- trust &amp; collaboration &amp; respect between SLC teachers</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Academic &amp; Career Development</u></b></p>			
--	---	--	--	--



**Appendix A – 2 (Jordan High School)**

<u>Activities</u>	Immediate Outputs	Long-term Intermediate Outcomes	Ultimate Goal
<p>1. Provide Information - Parent orientation night - Send letters home, postcards, brochures, phone calls</p> <p>2. <b><u>Mentoring</u></b> <b><u>a. After school</u></b> <b><u>b. Every other week</u></b></p> <p>3. Tutoring a. Referred to tutoring through grade checks (approx. 2x/mth)</p> <p>4. Staff <b><u>a. Task management</u></b> <b><u>b. Building community</u></b> c. Teacher collaboration -Planning time? -Try to get all students in the same classes - Look into computer program</p> <p>d. Professional Development -Teaching strategies to target all learners -Ways to collaborate: w/in departments, interdisciplinary, cross grade level</p> <p>5. Co-curricular activities a. Fieldtrips b. Community mentors c. Guest speakers</p> <p>6. Internships (JR/SR) Career orientation a. Career Bridges (on-line)</p>	<p>1a. 1b. Parents are aware of the expectations for their students in the SLC</p> <p>1a. 1b. Teacher has contact with parent(s)/guardian</p> <p>2a. 2b.</p> <p>3a.</p> <p>4a. 4b. 4c. Teachers within each SLC are aware of their responsibilities</p> <p>4a. 4b. 4c. Teachers will collaborate with other teachers across disciplines, across grades</p> <p>4d.</p> <p>5a. 5b. 5c. 5d.</p> <p>6a.</p> <p>7a. 7b. Counselors at the feeder middle schools and the counselors at Jordan are aware and informed of the SLCs at Jordan</p> <p>8.</p> <p>9a. 9b. 9c. Student accomplishments are acknowledged</p> <p>10a. 10b. 10c. Students wear t-shirts, use</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased parent support</li> <li>- Development of parent-teacher relationship</li> <li>- Personalization of the school experience</li> <li>- Students are able to connect to some aspect at school; find a niche</li> <li>- Students are able to identify with an aspect of school; find somewhere to belong</li> <li>- Create an environment of trust</li> <li>- SLCs are known and have a presence on campus</li> <li>- Increase student buy-in and engagement into the SLC</li> <li>- SLCs and teachers collaborate/learn from each other and their experiences</li> </ul> <p><b><u>- Regular communication about SLCs</u></b></p>	<p>Through the (SLCs) students become a community in which they experience a connectivity and personalization that reinforces them as lifelong learners, critical thinkers and problem solvers, and proficient communicators so they can become responsible members of society.</p>

<p>7. Recruiting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Publicize</li> <li>b. Meet with counselors at the middle school level and counselors at Jordan</li> </ul> <p>8. Build Relationships with local post-secondary schools</p> <p>9. Celebrations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Awards</li> <li>b. Attendance</li> <li>c. Senior capstone project</li> </ul> <p><b>10. <u>Personalization/SLC identity activities</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. <u>T-shirts</u></li> <li>b. <u>Logo items</u></li> <li>c. <u>Contest to develop logo</u></li> </ul> <p><b>11. <u>SLC recognition/awareness</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. <u>Link on school website</u></li> <li>b. <u>SLC kick-off</u></li> <li>c. <u>SLC newsletter</u></li> <li>d. <u>Video Bulletin</u></li> <li>e. <u>SLC student of the month</u></li> <li>f. <u>SLC night/social</u></li> <li>g. <u>SLC lunch gathering/rally?</u></li> </ul> <p>12. Fundraising</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Booster Club?</li> </ul>	<p>logo items</p> <p>10a. 10b. 10c. Students design logos, submit for review, and choose a logo</p> <p>10a. 10b. 10c. Students in the SLC begin to identify with that SLC</p> <p>11a-11g. Students, Staff, etc. at Jordan are more aware of SLCs on campus</p>		
---	--	--	--

### Appendix A-3 (Poly High School)

<u>Activities</u>	→ Immediate Outputs	→ Short-term Intermediate Outcomes	→ Long-term Intermediate <u>Outcomes</u>	→ Ultimate Goal
<p><b>1. Personalization Activities</b>            a. Back to School Night            b. Tailgate parties            c. Academy picnic            d. Teambuilding activities            e. Fieldtrips            f. Community service (10<sup>th</sup> grade project linked)            g. Student academy club?            h. Academy assembly/            Awards Night            i. Academy fair</p> <p><b>2. College/Career Activities</b>            a. College night            b. College and career talks            c. College visits            d. College fair            e. Career Center modules</p> <p><b>3. Monitoring</b></p> <p>Academic &amp; Social            Progress Activities</p> <p>a. Mandatory tutorials            b. SLC student portfolio activities            c. Sessions in which students assess their academic record            d. Sessions in which teachers assess student grades by SLC</p> <p><b>4. Professional</b></p>	<p>1a. Capture audience. Parents get introduced to teachers of all academies and receive an SLC contact sheet. Students and parents learn SLC and classroom expectations. Parent involvement opportunities. Teachers know their kids are part of this academy.</p> <p>1f. Teambuilding; Networking; Community Awareness</p> <p>2a. Inform parents how college going goals connect to SLCs and more strongly reinforced by giving parents information, reinforcement, students get extra credit. Raise awareness of future activities and events.</p> <p>2b. Have college reps inform students how SLC theme/specialty leads to degree, particular job, income.</p> <p>2c. Communications SLC visits communication dept at local college. All the 10<sup>th</sup> graders visit the UCs. During school day or after school and can involve parents, all related to colleges or careers, academies can choose what to emphasize college v. career,</p> <p>2d. Senior teachers take responsibility for college admissions paperwork, i.e. teachers do applications in class. Students talk to vendors and guest</p>	<p>1. Building Community Activities            -Form connections with parents, students and teachers            -Students and parents id with SLC            -Raise parental knowledge and awareness            - Satisfy requirements            -Reflection</p> <p>2. College &amp; Career Activities            -Know requirements (A-G requirements)            -Networking            -Increase school/community connectedness            -Increase parental involvement in child's education</p> <p>4. Professional Development for Teachers            - Teachers learn not to rate SLCs, because it undermines SLC/school culture.</p> <p>-10<sup>th</sup> grade project specific to SLCs, Academy specific project that is req'd should also be linked to community service and they present that as senior year project and also finish their hours for graduation.</p>	<p>1. Building Community Activities            -Personalization            -Identification with SLC            -Increase graduation rate            -Increase teacher involvement            -Increase parent involvement            -Increase community and college involvement            -Looking at students as a whole and academies trying to support that, e.g. student grades            -Decrease truancy            -Decrease Ds and Fs (letter grades)            -Increase teacher communication about student            -Increase study skills            -Developing plan for after high school, post-graduation plan            -Increase collaboration            -Respect and appreciation of academies            - Teacher effective habits            -Support a college going culture</p>	<p>Through each SLC, students will be in an inclusive group to increase personal connections between peers and adults to identify and support the abilities of each student to develop a post- graduation plan which increases future life success.</p>

<p>Development for Teachers</p> <p>a. How to help students to use planners.</p> <p>b. Poverty training</p> <p>c. Understanding SLCs</p> <p>d. Have teachers assign selves to SLC</p>	<p>speakers. Raise awareness of future activities and events</p> <p>2e. Teachers to modules to give that expectation.</p> <p>3a. Help students get a minimum C grade.</p> <p>3c. Students review their own transcript.</p> <p>3d. Monitoring student grades to see which relationships between students/teachers are working or not.</p> <p>4c. Teachers learn what academies hope to accomplish. Show results from research; show what teachers have done differently, why they need to do differently.</p>			
--	--	--	--	--

## Appendix B

**Table 4.6. Percent of Type of Communication/Support at Schools by Quantity, High School Students, Long Beach Unified School District High School Survey, Spring 2006. (N)**

	Weekly	Bimonthly	Monthly	2-3 Times a Year	Annually	Never	No Answer
Sit down with a counselor to talk about life after high school (college, work, training).							
Aggregated (Three Schools)	2.98% (195)	4.73% (309)	12.29% (803)	23.31% (1,523)	16.15% (1,055)	35.05% (2,290)	5.48% (358)
Cabrillo	3.67% (76)	5.07% (105)	13.73% (284)	23.3% (482)	16.92% (350)	31.56% (653)	5.75% (119)
Jordan	3.15% (39)	4.69% (58)	12.61% (156)	21.34% (264)	15.2% (188)	35.81% (443)	7.19% (89)
Poly	2.48% (80)	4.52% (146)	11.25% (363)	24.08% (777)	16.02% (517)	37% (1,194)	4.65% (150)
Receive academic tutoring or mentoring.							
Aggregated (Three Schools)	12.78% (835)	11.60% (758)	11.11% (726)	10.76% (703)	8.27% (540)	39.58% (2,586)	5.89% (385)
Cabrillo	14.02% (290)	14.84% (307)	12.13% (251)	11.21% (232)	8.17% (169)	33.16% (686)	6.48% (134)
Jordan	12.13% (150)	8.25% (102)	11.72% (145)	11.32% (140)	10.11% (125)	39.61% (490)	6.87% (85)
Poly	12.24% (395)	10.81% (349)	10.23% (330)	10.26% (331)	7.62% (246)	43.69% (1,410)	5.14% (166)
Get help with how to prepare for big tests (CAHSEE, STAR, PSAT, SAT, AP).							
Aggregated (Three Schools)	12.72% (831)	10.71% (700)	14.39% (940)	17.77% (1,161)	12.60% (823)	25.46% (1,663)	6.35% (415)
Cabrillo	12.76% (264)	11.31% (234)	13.53% (280)	15.76% (326)	12.42% (257)	27.07% (560)	7.15% (148)
Jordan	13.74% (170)	10.27% (127)	14.71% (182)	16.17% (200)	11.08% (137)	26.76% (331)	7.28% (90)
Poly	12.3% (397)	10.51% (339)	14.81% (478)	19.68% (635)	13.29% (429)	23.92% (772)	5.48% (177)
Talk to someone about how to get into college.							
Aggregated (Three Schools)	12.32% (805)	12.52% (818)	19.99% (1,306)	19.61% (1,281)	13.15% (859)	16.76% (1,095)	5.65% (369)
Cabrillo	12.81% (265)	11.5% (238)	19.57% (405)	18.66% (386)	14.11% (292)	17.54% (363)	5.8% (120)
Jordan	10.43% (129)	11.88% (147)	17.95% (222)	17.95% (222)	13.9% (172)	21.67% (268)	6.22% (77)
Poly	12.74% (411)	13.42% (433)	21.04% (679)	20.86% (673)	12.24% (395)	14.38% (464)	5.33% (172)
Talk to someone about how to pay for college.							
Aggregated (Three Schools)	7.65% (500)	8.82% (576)	15.75% (1,029)	16.56% (1,082)	14.51% (948)	30.90% (2,019)	5.80% (379)
Cabrillo	8.41% (174)	8.94% (185)	15.37% (318)	16.19% (335)	14.31% (296)	30.69% (635)	6.09% (126)
Jordan	8.41% (104)	8.41% (104)	13.9% (172)	14.15% (175)	13.58% (168)	34.36% (425)	7.19% (89)
Poly	6.88% (222)	8.89% (287)	16.7% (539)	17.73% (572)	15% (484)	29.72% (959)	5.08% (164)

**Table 4.6 continued. Percent of Type of Communication/Support at Schools by Quantity, High School Students, Long Beach Unified School District High School Survey, Spring 2006. (N)**

	Weekly	Bimonthly	Monthly	2-3 Times a Year	Annually	Never	No Answer
Talk to someone about how to get into or prepare for advanced-level courses.							
Aggregated (Three Schools)	6.02% (393)	7.50% (490)	13.50% (882)	14.79% (966)	13.56% (886)	37.59% (2,456)	7.04% (460)
Cabrillo	5.9% (122)	7.73% (160)	13.39% (277)	13.82% (286)	12.42% (257)	39.63% (820)	7.1% (147)
Jordan	6.22% (77)	6.63% (82)	11.32% (140)	10.43% (129)	12.85% (159)	43.33% (536)	9.22% (114)
Poly	6.01% (194)	7.69% (248)	14.41% (465)	17.07% (551)	14.56% (470)	34.09% (1,100)	6.17% (199)
Talk with an adult at school about my test scores and how to improve them.							
Aggregated (Three Schools)	12.52% (818)	13.29% (868)	17.01% (1,111)	13.32% (870)	10.38% (678)	26.68% (1,743)	6.81% (445)
Cabrillo	13.24% (274)	14.84% (307)	17.74% (367)	13.05% (270)	9.76% (202)	23.92% (495)	7.44% (154)
Jordan	13.74% (170)	13.42% (166)	17.38% (215)	11.64% (144)	11.08% (137)	24.09% (298)	8.65% (107)
Poly	11.59% (374)	12.24% (395)	16.39% (529)	14.13% (456)	10.51% (339)	29.44% (950)	5.7% (184)
Talk to someone about my high school plan (e.g. ILP, 4-year plan, learning plan)							
Aggregated (Three Schools)	11.08% (724)	10.58% (691)	15.31% (1,000)	16.53% (1,080)	14.45% (944)	25.23% (1,648)	6.83% (446)
Cabrillo	10.2% (211)	11.21% (232)	15.37% (318)	15.13% (313)	13.1% (271)	27.31% (565)	7.68% (159)
Jordan	11.08% (137)	9.7% (120)	13.74% (170)	15.52% (192)	15.93% (197)	26.43% (327)	7.6% (94)
Poly	11.65% (376)	10.51% (339)	15.87% (512)	17.82% (575)	14.75% (476)	23.43% (756)	5.98% (193)

**Table 4.7. Percent of Type of Communication/Support at Schools by Agreement Level, High School Students, Long Beach Unified School District High School Survey, Spring 2006.**

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Answer	N
Adults at my school believe that all students can learn.	Aggregated	33.75%	48.57%	10.32%	2.91%	4.45%	6,533
	Cabrillo	30.98%	50.56%	10.83%	3.33%	4.30%	2,069
	Jordan	25.87%	51.33%	13.58%	4.61%	4.61%	1,237
	Poly	38.55%	46.23%	8.74%	1.98%	4.49%	3,227
Expectations for Achievement are clearly stated by principal and staff.	Aggregated	24.90%	54.84%	12.55%	2.48%	5.22%	6,533
	Cabrillo	22.47%	57.03%	12.23%	2.42%	5.85%	2,069
	Jordan	15.52%	56.67%	18.35%	4.61%	4.85%	1,237
	Poly	30.06%	52.74%	10.54%	1.7%	4.96%	3,227
Expectations for Behavior are clearly stated by principal and staff.	Aggregated	30.81%	50.88%	10.41%	2.60%	5.30%	6,533
	Cabrillo	26.87%	53.46%	11.31%	2.8%	5.56%	2,069
	Jordan	23.36%	53.44%	13.34%	4.37%	5.50%	1,237
	Poly	36.19%	48.25%	8.71%	1.8%	5.05%	3,227
Teachers have high expectations for student achievement.	Aggregated	25.90%	51.88%	12.69%	3.18%	6.35%	6,533
	Cabrillo	21.22%	55.1%	13.19%	3.19%	7.30%	2,069
	Jordan	18.92%	49.8%	18.27%	6.55%	6.47%	1,237
	Poly	31.58%	50.6%	10.23%	1.89%	5.70%	3,227
My teachers help me to do my best in their classes.	Aggregated	19.93%	54.19%	15.35%	3.29%	7.24%	6,533
	Cabrillo	17.83%	55.34%	15.76%	3.72%	7.35%	2,069
	Jordan	14.15%	51.98%	21.42%	4.69%	7.76%	1,237
	Poly	23.49%	54.29%	12.77%	2.48%	6.97%	3,227
I understand how my teachers grade my performance.	Aggregated	17.16%	54.13%	17.24%	3.93%	7.55%	6,533
	Cabrillo	16.38%	52.83%	18.8%	4.78%	7.20%	2,069
	Jordan	12.05%	52.55%	20.13%	6.22%	9.05%	1,237
	Poly	19.62%	55.56%	15.12%	2.51%	7.19%	3,227

**Table 4.7 continued. Percent of Type of Communication/Support at Schools by Agreement Level, High School Students, Long Beach Unified School District High School Survey, Spring 2006.**

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Answer	N
For most classes, teachers do a good job of making sure students know how they can get help if they fall behind.	Aggregated	18.81%	54.63%	15.12%	4.12%	7.32%	6,533
	Cabrillo	16.82%	55.68%	14.93%	4.49%	8.07%	2,069
	Jordan	12.77%	53.03%	21.26%	6.14%	6.79%	1,237
	Poly	22.4%	54.57%	12.89%	3.1%	7.03%	3,227
My teachers' lessons are designed to encourage me to find solutions, research ideas, and think critically.	Aggregated	14.85%	58.49%	16.53%	3.14%	7.18%	6,533
	Cabrillo	13.24%	60.61%	16.05%	3.29%	6.81%	2,069
	Jordan	10.27%	55.3%	20.78%	5.5%	8.16%	1,237
	Poly	17.63%	58.35%	14.84%	2.14%	7.03%	3,227
Teachers use various teaching approaches and resources to help students with different learning styles and needs.	Aggregated	14.86%	57.28%	16.78%	3.21%	7.87%	6,533
	Cabrillo	13.19%	59.21%	15.8%	3.58%	8.22%	2,069
	Jordan	9.78%	55.46%	21.1%	5.82%	7.84%	1,237
	Poly	17.88%	56.74%	15.74%	1.98%	7.65%	3,227
Teachers use a wide variety of methods to check how students are doing in class (pop quiz, peer reviews, exam, writing assignments).	Aggregated	21%	56.38%	12.96%	2.63%	7.03%	6,533
	Cabrillo	18.08%	57.76%	14.16%	2.8%	7.20%	2,069
	Jordan	16.09%	56.67%	14.96%	4.61%	7.68%	1,237
	Poly	24.76%	55.38%	11.43%	1.77%	6.66%	3,227
Teachers sometimes change their lesson plans because of student suggestions.	Aggregated	8.50%	40.84%	32.74%	9.44%	8.48%	6,533
	Cabrillo	7.06%	43.02%	32.38%	8.55%	8.99%	2,069
	Jordan	6.79%	37.59%	34.52%	11.64%	9.46%	1,237
	Poly	10.07%	40.69%	32.29%	9.17%	7.78%	3,227
Students receive prompt feedback on assignments and regular progress reports with specific suggestions for improvement.	Aggregated	13.70%	54.40%	20.07%	3.84%	7.99%	6,533
	Cabrillo	12.66	55.68%	18.7%	4.35%	8.60%	2,069
	Jordan	10.83%	51.58%	23.36%	5.25%	8.97%	1,237
	Poly	15.46%	54.66%	19.68%	2.97%	7.22%	3,227



## Appendix C

**Table 4.8. Percent of Type of Peer Perception by Schools, High School Students, Long Beach Unified School District High School Survey, Spring 2006.**

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Answer	N
I feel this school is safe.							
	Aggregated (Three Schools)	9.49%	48.34%	25.52%	5.86%	10.79%	6,533
	Cabrillo	9.09%	50.65%	26.82%	5.51%	7.93%	2,069
	Jordan	4.45%	37.67%	35.41%	10.59%	11.88%	1,237
	Poly	11.68%	50.95%	20.89%	4.28%	12.21%	3,227
Students treat each other with respect.							
	Aggregated (Three Schools)	3.34%	27.34%	47.64%	11.60%	10.09%	6,533
	Cabrillo	3%	27.02%	49.78%	11.65%	8.55%	2,069
	Jordan	1.54%	15.28%	53.44%	17.22%	12.53%	1,237
	Poly	4.25%	32.17%	44.03%	9.42%	10.13%	3,227
Classroom misbehavior constantly interrupts my learning.							
	Aggregated (Three Schools)	15.41%	35.8%	33.23%	6.34%	9.21%	6,533
	Cabrillo	16.63%	39.87%	29.24%	5.22%	9.04%	2,069
	Jordan	15.04%	38.08%	27.57%	6.39%	12.93%	1,237
	Poly	14.78%	32.32%	37.96%	7.03%	7.9%	3,227

## Appendix D

**Table 4.19. Percent Agreement on SLC Statements by SLC Experience, High School Teachers, Long Beach Unified School District High School Survey, Spring 2006.**

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	DK/NA	N
I understand the vision and goals for implementing small learning communities next year.						
no	17.65%	60.29%	10.29%	4.41%	7.35%	68
yes	38.71%	45.16%	10.75%	0%	5.38%	93
not sure	32.14%	39.29%	14.29%	10.71%	3.57%	28
I am comfortable with how my school is preparing to implement small learning communities next year.						
No	13.64%	43.94%	22.73%	4.55%	15.15%	66
Yes	24.18%	41.76%	19.78%	5.49%	8.79%	91
not sure	28.57%	42.86%	7.14%	14.29%	7.14%	28
I believe that forming small learning communities will help this school raise student achievement.						
no	26.56%	42.19%	10.94%	3.13%	17.19%	64
yes	34.78%	44.57%	9.78%	3.26%	7.61%	92
not sure	39.29%	32.14%	7.14%	10.71%	10.71%	28