

LBUSD Small Learning Communities Grant – Cohort 07

**Year 3 Evaluation Report
2009-2010**

The SRM Evaluation Group
University of California, Los Angeles

Jessica Robles
Noelle V. Banuelos
Minerva Avila

August 2010

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary.....	4
Program/Grant Description	7
School Characteristics	7
Evaluation Details.....	8
Format of Remainder of Report.....	9
District Grant Administration Support	9
Respondent Demographics	11
Lakewood High School.....	13
SLC Membership.....	13
SLC Development.....	14
SLC Culture and Climate.....	14
SLC Governance.....	16
Challenges to SLC Development	18
Overall Grant Awareness	20
Goal #1.....	22
Goal-Related Activities	22
Expectations of Students.....	23
Post-secondary Support, Knowledge, and Preparedness	24
Support and Remediation.....	28
Goal #2	29
Goal-Related Activities	29
Tutoring	30
College Aides.....	32
Goal #3	33
Goal-Related Activities	33
Collaboration Among SLCs.....	34
Course Selection and SLC Requirements.....	36
Goal #4	36
Goal-Related Activities	36
AP Program – Implementation and Outcomes	38
Millikan High School.....	43
SLC Membership	43
SLC Development	44
SLC Culture and Climate.....	44
Challenges to SLC Development	47
Overall Grant Awareness.....	49
Goal #1	51
Goal-Related Activities	51
Expectations of Students.....	53
Post-secondary Support, Knowledge, and Preparedness	53
Support and Remediation.....	57

Goal #2	58
Goal-Related Activities	58
Tutoring	59
College Aides.....	62
Goal #3	62
Goal-Related Activities	63
Teacher Collaboration.....	63
Course Selection and SLC Requirements.....	65
Goal #4	66
Goal-Related Activities	66
AP Program – Implementation and Outcomes	67
Report Summary	71

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY KEY FINDINGS

SLC DEVELOPMENT

- Teachers/staff, students and parents generally agreed that they understood purpose and goals of SLCs although students were more likely to feel a sense of belonging in their SLC. However, a greater proportion of Millikan teachers understood the overall purpose of SLCs in general. (Lakewood HS, see pp. 14-15; Millikan HS, see p. 44)
- The majority of teachers/staff believed that there was a strong SLC culture on campus which supported SLC identification among teachers and students. This was attributed to such factors as teacher buy-in and increased collaboration among teachers. (Lakewood HS, see pp. 15-18; Millikan HS, see pp. 44-46)
- Challenges that hindered SLC development included a perception of hierarchical structure among SLCs, the Master Schedule (viz., limiting the number of electives a student can take), funding, and potential loss of key staff members. (Lakewood HS, see pp. 18-19; Millikan HS, see pp. 47-48)
- Although teachers reported an increase in collaboration time, it was believed that more time and professional development is needed to meet the requirements of the grant. (Lakewood HS, see p. 19-20; Millikan HS, see p. 49)

OVERALL GRANT AWARENESS

- School principals and SLC coordinators demonstrated understanding of the grant and its goals. Teachers/staff were able to recall the grant and its goals, but could not provide specific details. (Lakewood HS, see pp. 20-21; Millikan HS, see pp. 49-51)

GOAL #1: PREPARE ALL STUDENTS FOR SUCCESS IN POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION AND CAREERS WITHOUT THE NEED FOR REMEDIATION

- Both schools were similar in their implementation of College Preparedness Workshops, Bi-Annual Parent Institutes, SLC Parent Booster Clubs, and training and use of School Loop. Lakewood and Millikan reported similar participation in Middle School Outreach, but Millikan reported significantly higher participation in Bi-Annual Saturday Report Card Parent Meetings, Tele-Parent programs, Middle School Outreach, and School-wide Newsletters. (Lakewood HS, see p. 22-23; Millikan HS, see pp. 51-52)
- Teachers/staff, students and parents generally agreed that clear communication of student expectations exists at their schools. (Lakewood HS, see p. 23; Millikan HS, see p. 53)
- Teachers were more likely than students and parents to report that they talked with students about how to get into and pay for college. (Lakewood HS, see pp. 24; Millikan HS, see pp. 53-54)
- Parents were more likely than students to report having read school-wide newsletters highlighting SLCs, college information and career information. (Lakewood HS, see p. 25; Millikan HS, see p. 54)

- Overall, students were aware of A-G requirements necessary for college. (Lakewood HS, see p. 26-27; Millikan HS, see p. 56)
- For Lakewood, students and parents had the greatest confidence that students would be prepared to succeed in postsecondary college/careers by graduation. For Millikan, students, parents, and staff reported similar levels of confidence that students would be prepared to succeed in postsecondary college/careers by graduation. (Lakewood HS, see p. 27-28; Millikan HS, see p. 57)

GOAL #2: PROVIDE INTENSIVE INTERVENTIONS IN READING/LANGUAGE ARTS AND MATH SKILLS.

- In both schools, teachers reported the implementation of literacy and numeracy strategies, where applicable. Tutoring emerged as the major intervention area. (Lakewood HS, see pp. 30-31; Millikan HS, see pp. 59-62)
- Both schools instituted tutoring efforts, with varying degrees of success due primarily to student transportation issues and conflict with other after-school activities. Tutoring was offered in classrooms, libraries, and labs. Attempts at creating a school-wide tutoring system were not successful. (Lakewood HS, see pp. 30-32; Millikan HS, see pp. 59-62)
- College aides were used in study labs, with AVID curriculum, and individual student assistance. Data indicated that college aides had limited classroom responsibilities, and only a small percentage of teachers referenced college aides. An even smaller number of students reported having had one in their classrooms. (Lakewood HS, see p. 32-33; Millikan HS, see pp. 61)

GOAL #3: ENROLL AND SUPPORT STUDENTS IN A COHERENT SEQUENCE OF RIGOROUS ENGLISH/LANGUAGE ARTS, MATH, AND SCIENCE COURSES.

- Both schools reported similar participation rates in District-wide Professional Learning Community workshops and the development/modification of curriculum tied to SLC themes. Millikan reported greater participation in Summer Curriculum Institutes, School-based Professional Learning Community workshops, and Differentiated Instructional Techniques. (Lakewood HS, see pp. 33-34; Millikan HS, see p. 63)
- Staff engaged in teacher collaboration, which occurred school-wide, within departments and across grade levels. The results of collaboration included better communication among teachers, greater connectedness within SLCs, and the ability for teachers to better align SLC curricula across classes. (Lakewood HS, see pp. 34-35; Millikan HS, see pp. 63-64)

GOAL #4: INCREASE OPPORTUNITIES FOR STUDENTS TO EARN POSTSECONDARY CREDIT THROUGH AP COURSES.

- Implementation of AP Teacher Training hinged on adequate funding. Other goal-related activities were reported with varying, albeit limited, participation. Both schools had AP coordinators and were firm in their commitment to increasing AP success. (Lakewood HS, see pp. 36-37; Millikan HS, see pp. 66-67)

- For Lakewood, over half of the teachers believed students had equal access to AP courses, while over two thirds of Millikan’s teachers believed their students had equal access to AP courses. For both schools, students were even more confident than teachers that they had equal access to AP courses. (Lakewood HS, see p. 38-39; Millikan HS, see p. 68)
- Overall, students and staff reported similar levels of encouragement to take AP courses, with students indicating that counselors offer the most encouragement. (Lakewood HS, see p. 39; Millikan HS, see pp. 68-69)
- Students were reportedly less knowledgeable about how to sign up for the AP exams than staff expected. (Lakewood HS, see pp. 40; Millikan HS, see pp. 70)
- For Lakewood, number of exams take increased slightly from 2008-2009. For Millikan, the increase in number of exams taken was slightly more substantial. For both schools, the number of AP students increased approximately 3%. Similar to the 2008-2009 school year, in 2009-2010 the percentage increase of scores 3 or above remained within 5 percentage points for both schools. (Lakewood HS, see pp. 41-42; Millikan HS, see p. 71)

PROGRAM/GRANT DESCRIPTION

This particular grant was funded in fall 2007 to implement academic reform through the use of the Small Learning Communities (SLCs) structure operating within both Lakewood and Millikan High Schools in the Long Beach Unified School District (LBUSD), a large, urban school district located in Southern California. SLCs are geared towards raising student achievement through the personalization of education by developing foundations and processes that encourage deeper and more meaningful relationships among teachers, between teachers and students, as well as among students themselves. SLCs at Lakewood and Millikan High Schools were initially developed under a previous federal grant in from 2003 to 2007. Of the six comprehensive high schools in LBUSD, Lakewood and Millikan were identified as having a high need for SLC enhancements and the ability to continue making gains through this model and was therefore re-funded. This is the third year of implementation for this particular grant.

In the effort to raise student achievement in all district high schools, LBUSD was in the midst of a major long-term local reform when it applied for this grant. The first two goals for this high school reform initiative included a commitment to improving student achievement and attempting to close the achievement gap. The third goal was to build the capacity of teachers to lead and the fourth, and final goal, was to improve the culture and climate of high schools. In addition, the district's High School Office had a short-term reform that sought to prepare all students for postsecondary educations and careers, provide intensive interventions to assist them, and, enroll and support students in a coherent sequence of rigorous courses. To support all of the above high school reform initiatives and continue the development of SLCs, the district and the two schools applied for and received this SLC federal grant. To focus their reform efforts, the schools committed to the following goals as written in the grant:

- Goal #1. Prepare all students for success in postsecondary education and careers without the need for remediation.¹
- Goal #2. Provide intensive interventions in reading/language arts and math skills.
- Goal #3. Enroll and support students in a coherent sequence of rigorous English, math, and science courses to succeed in postsecondary education and/or careers.
- Goal #4. Increase opportunities for students to earn postsecondary credit through AP Courses.

The action management plan, included as part of the grant proposal, specified the activities both schools would employ as a guide to achieving the grant goals. It should be noted that not all activities were designed for 100% participation from the staff. Low percentages do not necessarily indicate unsuccessful participation.

SCHOOL CHARACTERISTICS

Both Lakewood High and Millikan High continue to serve diverse student populations that included a significant number of students from high-poverty backgrounds. District-wide enrollment in 2008-09 by ethnicity showed that students in the district were comprised of approximately 52% Latinos,

¹ This is how the goal appears in the grant proposal. In the management action plan, this goal is written as, "Through a comprehensive guidance and academic advising program for students and their parents, prepare all students to succeed in postsecondary education and careers." In this report, we will refer to the goal as written in the grant.

17% African Americans, 8% Asians, 16% Whites, 4% Filipinos, 2% Pacific Islanders, and 0.2% Native Americans. Approximately 21% of the total enrollment was comprised of English language learners. Each large, urban high school was challenged by low achievement, high mobility, and high teacher turnover. Lakewood High had a 9th through 12th grade student populations of over 3,000 while Millikan High had one of over 4,000 (2009-10). A majority of students on each campus were bused to school on a daily basis. At Millikan, approximately 75% of enrolled students lived in neighborhoods outside the school's attendance area, while at Lakewood, about 50% lived outside its boundaries. With both of these schools serving primarily as commuter campuses, the ability to provide before and/or after school academic interventions was limited. Both schools currently have "wall-to-wall" SLCs so every 9th, 10th, 11th, and 12th grade student, teacher, administrator, and staff member was affiliated with a specific SLC. At the conclusion of the 2008-09 academic year, this grant supported seven SLCs at Lakewood High and eight SLCs at Millikan.

EVALUATION DETAILS

There were two general questions that guided the evaluation during Year 3 of the grant:

- 1) What is the nature of SLC development/implementation at the two schools?
- 2) To what extent have the four goals of the grant been implemented?

During the early years of the evaluation, the evaluators worked with designated program and school staff in structuring the evaluation activities and clarifying some of the grant's ambiguous language. The primary data collection effort consisted of: principal and SLC coordinator interviews; teacher and student focus groups; and three survey protocols administered to school staff, students, and parents. The staff survey was closely aligned to the activities specified under the goals of this grant. Also, where applicable, the student and parent surveys included specific questions about goal activities. Questions asked of participants in all focus groups and interviews were also aligned with the goals. All surveys, interviews, and focus groups were conducted in spring 2010.

Focus groups and interviews were conducted for the purpose of gathering insight on the implementation of the grant and the general state of SLC development at the high schools. The items on the teacher/staff, student, and parent surveys also intended to gather perspectives on grant implementation and SLC development. Most questions asked in focus groups, interviews, and surveys were aligned across all participants while a few were specific to each respondent group. The aligned items provided insight into how the different groups perceived similar issues. It is important to note that although every effort was made to generate high response rates, some focus groups and survey respondent groups may have fallen short of desired expectations.

Throughout the course of this three-year evaluation, data has been collected in five general areas. The first area is SLC development and implementation. The remaining four areas correspond to the four goals as written in the grant and management action plan. Although there were data limitations in year one of the grant evaluation, multiple data collection methods, including surveys, interviews, and focus groups were used for years two and three to gather data from numerous sources, including teachers, administrators, students, and parents. An attempt will be made to access data on student achievement and course enrollments through collaboration with the district's research office.

FORMAT OF THE REMAINDER OF THIS REPORT

The first section provides an overview of LBUSD's support of the grant and how it has been administered. The second section presents the demographic information of all survey respondents, both disaggregated by school and in total. The report is then divided by school, Lakewood High School and Millikan High School, respectively. Within each school's section, the evaluation findings are discussed under the following major categories:

- A. *SLC Membership*
- B. *SLC Development*
- C. *Overall Grant Awareness*
- D. *Goal #1: Prepare all students for success in postsecondary education and careers without the need for remediation.*
- E. *Goal #2: Provide intensive interventions in Reading/Language Arts and Math skills.*
- F. *Goal #3: Enroll and support students in a coherent sequence of rigorous English/Language Arts, Math, and Science courses.*
- G. *Goal #4: Increase opportunities for students to earn postsecondary credit through AP courses.*

Each school's section includes all findings related to data collected during the 2009-10 school year. The final portion of this report consists of a brief summary inclusive of both schools.

DISTRICT GRANT ADMINISTRATION SUPPORT

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

In 2009-10, the SLC coordinator monthly meetings also served as a place to monitor progress in achieving LBUSD's High School Office goals. The SLC grant goals are closely aligned with the High School Office goals. Specifically, the purposes² of these SLC coordinator meetings were to:

- Build support systems for SLC leaders
- Monitor progress in achieving the High School Office goals for 2009-2010
- Discuss implementation of the High School Reform Initiative 2009-2014
- Discuss implementation of the District Initiative for Expanding Pathways
- Strategize an approach to Choice 2010
- Strategize an approach for measuring career readiness
- Strategize an approach for rolling out ConnectEd Studios at the site level

² This list was generated from 2009-10 meeting agendas.

- Share effective grant management strategies
- Strategize an efficient and effective way to gather data for UCLA's annual evaluation
- Review timeline for key deliverables in the pathways implementation process
- Review/critique timeline for key deliverables and professional development sequence in the pathways implementation process
- Discuss funding and its implications for work in advancing SLC/Pathways models
- Prepare for April 21 Key Results Consultancy
- Determine professional development opportunities that support pathway programs
- Review budgets for Cohort 5 and Cohort 7 schools as approved by the federal government
- Strategically align SLC work with GEAR UP for the 2010-2011 school year
- Determine professional development opportunities that support pathway programs and review the protocols for planning them

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

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

- Equip SLC leaders with research-based, data-driven strategies that will advance and achieve the High School Office goals for 2009-2010
- Build each SLCs leadership capacity to support a personalized and meaningful, theme-based and/or career-related course of study for all students
- Develop a framework for measuring career readiness for students in various pathways
- Utilize meaningful effective data from 2008-2009 to guide discussions about and/or revisions of Action Plan
- Provide student outcome chart professional development by academic themes/career pathways
- Partner with postsecondary, community, business, and industry partners to define clear student outcomes for students within a pathway program
- To learn from critical feedback about SLC/Pathway Program vision and mission statements
- To identify potential gaps in our student outcome charts and strategize potential solutions given our constraints.

At these Institutes, SLC coordinators and lead teachers were divided by school to allow for in-depth discussions and school-based collaboration. At times, they were also divided by career path or industry sector so that valuable resources would be more relevant to attendees. These meetings and institutes provided a space where discussions took place regarding accomplishments, challenges, and needs for the successful implementation of the grant's goals. The monthly SLC coordinator meetings and quarterly SLC Lead Teacher Institutes provided a venue where colleagues could share ideas, brainstorm, support each other, commiserate, and receive guidance from the SLC director.

This was critical for assisting SLC coordinators and lead teachers in their work towards meeting grant goals and, for the SLC director, in monitoring their progress.

RESPONDENT DEMOGRAPHICS

Teachers and Staff - Survey

For the 2009-2010 school year, there were 303 teacher, administrator, and staff respondents to the survey. Of this total, 179 respondents were from Lakewood High School and 124 were from Millikan High School. The response rates were 99% and 62% for Lakewood and Millikan, respectively. The following tables contain demographic information of the respondents from each school, respectively, as well as aggregated totals. The table below shows that the overall majority of respondents were classroom teachers.

Table 1. Assignment and Position of Staff Survey Respondents (N = 303)

	N	Teacher	Counselor	Administrator	Classified	Custodial
Lakewood HS	179	87%	4%	3%	4%	1%
Millikan HS	124	73%	7%	3%	15%	1%
TOTAL	303	82%	6%	3%	9%	1%

Table 2 presents both gender and grade levels taught by survey respondents. As shown, slightly more than one half of the teachers from both schools taught students in lower grade levels (9th and 10th grades). Table 3 presents the ethnic distribution of the respondents.

Table 2. Gender and Grade Level Taught of Staff Survey Respondents (N = 270 and 257, respectively)

	N	Female	Male	N	9 th	10 th	11 th	12 th
Lakewood HS	158	62%	38%	156	29%	31%	24%	17%
Millikan HS	112	64%	36%	101	34%	33%	22%	12%
TOTAL	270	63%	37%	257	31%	32%	23%	15%

Table 3. Ethnicity of Staff Survey Respondents (N = 271)

	N	White	Hispanic/ Latino	African American	Asian/ Pac. Isl.	Biracial/ Multiracial	Filipino	Other
Lakewood HS	158	70%	11%	3%	2%	4%	0%	9%
Millikan HS	113	70%	9%	4%	4%	6%	1%	4%
TOTAL	271	70%	10%	3%	3%	5%	>1%	7%

Table 4 below presents the various content areas taught among survey respondents. Overall, teachers in the four core subjects of English, Math, Science, and History/SS were relatively well represented. The most common responses in the “other” category included special education, business/career related courses, and general studies.

Table 4. Content Areas Taught by Staff Survey Respondents (N = 276)

	N	English	Math	For. Lang.	Science	Hist/SS	Technology	Art	P.E.	Other
Lakewood HS	167	19%	14%	7%	14%	11%	4%	5%	6%	20%
Millikan HS	109	19%	14%	8%	13%	11%	7%	4%	2%	22%
TOTAL	276	19%	14%	7%	13%	11%	5%	5%	4%	21%

Students - Survey

For the 2009-2010 school year, there were 4,160 respondents to the student survey. Of this total, 2,972 respondents were from Lakewood High School and 1,233 were from Millikan High School. Tables 5 and 6 present the gender, grade level, and ethnic distribution of the student respondents.

Table 5. Gender and Grade Levels of Student Survey Respondents (N = 4,160)

	n	Female	Male	n	9 th	10 th	11 th	12 th
Lakewood HS	2,927	49%	51%	2,927	35%	32%	11%	22%
Millikan HS	1,233	56%	44%	1,233	31%	28%	27%	14%
TOTAL	4,160	51%	49%	4,160	34%	31%	16%	20%

Table 6. Ethnicity of Student Survey Respondents (N = 4,162)

	n	White	Hispanic Latino	African American	Asian/Pac. Isl.	Filipino	Bi/Multi-racial	Amer. Indian	Other
Lakewood HS	2,928	24%	39%	12%	10%	5%	5%	>1%	5%
Millikan HS	1,234	24%	50%	6%	6%	5%	5%	>1%	4%
TOTAL	4,162	24%	42%	11%	9%	5%	5%	>1%	4%

Parents - Survey

For the 2009-2010 school year, there were 1,026 respondents to the parent survey, almost half of the number of the previous year's respondents. Of this total, 599 respondents were from Lakewood High School and 427 were from Millikan High School. Tables 7 and 8 present the students' gender, grade level, and ethnic distribution corresponding to the parent respondents.

Table 7. Gender (n=1,008) and Grade Levels (n=1,011) of Students Related to Parent Survey Respondents

	N	Female	Male	N	9 th	10 th	11 th	12 th
Lakewood HS	582	46%	54%	588	31%	29%	22%	18%
Millikan HS	426	51%	49%	423	41%	26%	20%	13%
TOTAL	1,008	48%	52%	1,011	36%	28%	21%	16%

Table 8. Ethnicity of Students Related to Parent Survey Respondents (N=1,012)

	N	White	Hispanic Latino	African American	Asian/Pac. Isl.	Filipino	Biracial / Multi	Amer. Indian	Other
Lakewood HS	588	44	22%	12%	6%	3%	9%	1%	2%
Millikan HS	424	44	27%	8%	5%	4%	9%	1%	3%
TOTAL	1,012	44	24%	10%	6%	3%	9%	1%	3%

Focus Groups and Interviews

The principal and SLC Coordinator from both Lakewood and Millikan each participated in one-on-one interviews. Two teacher focus groups conducted at each school (four in total). At Lakewood, five teachers in all participated from various grade levels, departments, and SLCs. At Millikan, 14 teachers participated in all and represented both mixed and pure classes. There were also two student focus groups conducted at each school. At Lakewood, only four students participated while 13 students participated at Millikan. It is important to note that given the small number of students in the Lakewood focus groups, responses are not representative of the population and should be interpreted with caution.

LAKWOOD HIGH SCHOOL

A. SLC Membership

During the 2009-2010 school year at Lakewood High School, seven Small Learning Communities were in operation. Table 9 below presents the SLC membership for all survey respondents. As shown, one percent of the students had trouble recalling their SLC while 2% of the parents were unaware of their child's SLC. This was a positive change from 2007-08 where 10% of the parents did not know their children's SLC membership, and reflects no change from 2008-2009. While ATM had the most student representation, PALMS was underrepresented among teachers and students, and TCM was underrepresented among students. As for parents, there was low representation for The Arts, TCM, and HERO and a high ATM and Merit representation.

Table 9. SLC Membership of all Lakewood HS Survey Respondents

	Teachers/Staff	Students	Parents
The Arts	20%	8%	8%
ATM	18%	29%	25%
TCM (formerly GLOBE)	11%	8%	5%
HERO	12%	12%	8%
Merit	13%	16%	22%
Odyssey	13%	17%	18%
PALMS	6%	8%	10%
Don't Know	1%	1%	2%
Not part of an SLC	6%	0%	1%
TOTAL N	180	2,950	595

Of the four students who participated in the focus groups, all indicated that they chose their SLC toward the end of eighth grade. All reported that the choice was somewhat dependent on what sounded “coolest” (three students) or which program the student’s friends selected (one student).

B. SLC Development

Although not explicitly mentioned in the grant, SLC structures are intended to facilitate the implementation of the activities proposed as part of the grant goals. Given the nature of continuous reforms at LBUSD schools, the state of SLCs at Lakewood High is also likely to change. It is critical, therefore, to examine the state of SLC development, as SLCs are the vehicles through which the grant goals will be met, as we assess the implementation of each of the four grant goals.

Before addressing the specifics of SLC development, it is helpful to know how many students were informed about SLCs before coming to Lakewood High School. In table 10, 77% of students and parents agreed that their high school informed them about SLCs when they or their children were in middle school.

Table 10.

		N	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	N/A
My high school informed me about SLCs when I was in middle school.	Students	2906	9%	14%	40%	37%	---
My child’s high school informed me about SLCs when he/she was in middle school.	Parents	574	5%	12%	36%	41%	7% (DK)

As part of the focus group and interview process, participants were asked questions regarding the general state of SLC development at Lakewood High. During these discussions, two central themes emerged: SLC culture and climate, and SLC governance. Although the conversations focused primarily on successes in those areas, there were also in-depth discussions on the challenges faced by administrators and teachers in the continuous development of SLCs. The following are the data findings broken down into three sections: SLC culture and climate, SLC governance, and challenges to SLC development.

SLC Culture and Climate

There was consensus among the staff that there was a well-built SLC culture on campus that has both students and teachers strongly identifying with their SLCs. This belief was supported by survey responses to items pertaining to understanding SLC purpose, goals, and roles. As may be seen in Table 11, all three respondent groups generally agreed that they understood the purpose and goals of their specific SLCs. Furthermore, 89% of the teachers reported that they understood the overall purpose and goals for having SLCs.

Table 11.

		N	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	N/A
I understand the purpose and goals of my SLC.	Staff	174	3%	6%	44%	45%	3%
	Students	2918	3%	10%	54%	34%	---
I understand the purpose and goals of my child's SLC.	Parents	578	3%	7%	48%	38%	5% (DK)
The faculty and staff at this school understand the purpose and goals for SLCs.	Staff	172	8%	16%	58%	18%	0%

Teachers provided a number of reasons that could explain the presence of a strong SLC culture and the above survey results. One teacher noted that unlike previous years, everyone, not just those in SLCs was “on board,” and that this was contributing to a strong feeling of SLC unity. A different teacher was happy that the SLCs allowed them to meet together more often, which in turn allowed for more open lines of communication and better preparation for students by teachers. Specifically, she explained:

[Everyone] knows what each other's doing in our classrooms. I know what my neighbors are doing. I know what the teacher who has my kids next year expects my kids to be able to do when they get to her. And that goes all the way through twelfth grade.

Overall, the teachers reported that the students were enthusiastic, and one teacher praised the fact that it felt like they were a family and emphasized that this was the message they tried to give to their students.

Both teachers and students reported that students were identifying with and enjoying being part of their SLCs. Students described getting to know new people, especially everyone in their classes, as a benefit of their SLCs. Because SLC peers worked together for four years, students indicated that they became a family of sorts. Similarly, students reported that they also got to know their teachers better, especially the core class teachers. Students attributed this to the fact that teachers were able to focus on a smaller group of students. Additional structural changes that have led to more personalization pertained to students with special needs. In 2008-09, students with special needs and their teachers were incorporated into the SLC communities for the first time. This act was perceived by staff and administrators as a huge accomplishment. In the focus groups for 2009-2010, a special education teacher was interviewed, but did not feel that the integration of the special education group into the SLC culture was necessarily positive. This teacher was worried that the special education students were not receiving the full benefits of being in small learning community, noting that they were often left out of award ceremonies and general SLC activities because not many teachers knew who they were. These students also took a special set of classes apart from the general community.

On the teacher survey, respondents were asked to describe changes to the culture and climate of their school that could be attributed to SLCs. The specific question stated, “*Since the implementation of this grant (F2007), in what ways are SLCs changing the culture/climate of this school?*” Eighty-seven teachers responded to this question. The main categories that emerged through the analyses of responses

were “Teacher/Staff-focused,” “Student-focused,” “SLC Placement/Organization,” and “School-focused.” The described changes varied by focus and level of positivity. Below is a list of the most common responses by focus.

Teacher / Staff –focused changes

- Teacher collaboration

Student-focused changes

- Sense of belonging/connectedness among students
- Student-teacher relationships improved

SLC Organization

- SLC stratification
- Poor integration of special education students

School-focused changes

- Negligible/No change

The above responses reflect varying teacher perspectives of the overall culture and climate of their school since the implementation of this SLC grant. As previously mentioned, there was general agreement that SLC identity has improved as teachers worked more closely together and students felt a sense of belonging. However, 10 out of 87 teachers reported that they had noticed no improvement at all, and those who stated the change was “negligible” indicated some improvement, but that the change, in their opinion, was not significant. There were two distinct negative observations reported regarding the school culture by focus group participants: a stratified SLC system and an inefficient integration of the special education group as an SLC (discussed in the previous section, page 15). In the challenges to SLC development section, the perceived stratified SLC system is discussed in greater detail.

In addition to one SLC redefining its themes and changing its name, other SLCs have also implemented changes. These changes focused primarily on providing additional support to students and included introducing more college/career-centered curriculum, adding a mentoring program for incoming 9th graders, developing and expanding tutoring services, and hiring college aides for science classes.

SLC Governance

During focus groups for 2009-2010, teachers spoke less about the governance, and more about challenges to SLC development. This is likely due to the fact that many of the governance issues were more prominent during the first year of implementation. However, both teachers and administrators agreed that the biggest issue with SLC governance was finding a person to take the lead of each SLC. One teacher reported that it would be difficult to move forward as planned without consistent leadership. Of the four teachers interviewed, only one reported that she did not know much about the grant or the grant goals. Another said that she did know of the grant goals, but could not remember them without looking at a chart. Yet, teachers and administrators indicated that working on outcome charts helped personalize SLC goals, brought staff together to discuss goals, and strengthened SLC culture and identity. Outcome charts, “half-way curricular tasks for

SLCs,” mapped out the activities that SLCs will employ to reach particular goals. Whenever outcome charts were mentioned, they were done so in a positive light.

Survey results supported the comments made in focus groups and interviews regarding staff engagement in (re)defining SLCs. Certain survey items were aimed at investigating how all three respondent groups perceived the availability of opportunities to suggest changes to SLCs that would be heard and considered. These opportunities represent a form of support in that they provide members of each group with a voice, membership, and a potential role in SLC development. As shown in the response distribution in Table 12, 75% of the teacher respondents and 75% of the students were in general agreement that these opportunities were provided for them at their school. However, only 49% of the teachers were in general agreement that students have such opportunities.

Table 12.

		N	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	N/A
The faculty and staff at this school have opportunities to suggest changes to the SLCs that are heard and taken into consideration.	Staff	174	9%	15%	53%	22%	1%
Students at this school have opportunities to suggest changes to the SLCs that are heard and taken into consideration.	Students	2892	5%	20%	58%	17%	---
Parents can share their thoughts about decisions that affect their children.	Parents	527	4%	7%	51%	30%	9% (DK)
Students at this school can suggest changes to the SLCs that are heard and taken into consideration.	Staff	170	14%	29%	39%	10%	9%

Parents were asked to respond to a slightly different statement, one that addressed the opportunity to share thoughts/opinions on decisions specifically affecting their children. Although this item differs in scope from the other item, it still provides some indication of the support given to parents and by parents in the development of SLCs. In general, 81% of the parents agreed that they can express themselves with regard to decisions affecting their children.

The following items in Table 13 address the involvement of parents and community members in connection with SLC development. These items address the support Lakewood High provided to involve families and community members. Teachers (65%) and students (79%) generally agreed that the school supported this involvement. Almost half of the parents, on the other hand, reported a “don’t know” response (44%), while 43% did agree with the statement. It is possible that the inclusion of both families and community members in the same statement limited the parents’ responses.

Table 13.

		N	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	N/A
The school supports the involvement of families and community members in planning, reviewing, and improving SLC programs.	Teachers/ Staff	172	9%	22%	47%	18%	4%
	Students	2897	4%	17%	57%	22%	---
Families and people from the community help plan, review, or improve SLC programs.	Parents	571	4%	9%	28%	15%	44% (DK)

Challenges of SLC Development

Administrators and teachers were asked to describe the challenges of SLC development. The most common responses, by far, pertained to issues surrounding the master schedule and teacher buy-in. In addition, there was a lengthy discussion between two teachers about the unfair stratification of SLCs, especially in the context of special education. Also briefly mentioned was the need for more help for the lead teachers and the continuation of the SLC Coordinator position.

Administrators had the greatest concern about the master schedule. Specifically, they alluded to a tension between departments and SLCs, reporting that there was major disagreement in terms of which classes students should take. This tension seems to stem from teachers' resistance against the administration's move to create a master schedule that is more SLC-friendly. Further, two administrators spoke about the problem of strictly-defined pathways and whether students should be mostly restricted to classes in their pathways, or whether they should be able to take classes that were not listed in their pathways. One administrator stated that if a block schedule were to be utilized, students could take more classes and the problem of limiting classes would no longer be an issue.

While administrators discussed issues with the master schedule, teachers were more concerned with leadership and teacher buy-in. This could be attributed to having a relatively new administrator with extensive SLC experience who has pushed to move from a department-driven to an SLC-driven master schedule. One teacher reported that one of the biggest obstacles for SLC development was getting teachers to commit to and invest in the idea of SLCs. Specifically, it was noted by two teachers that it was very difficult to “[get the SLCs] off the ground, [get] the teachers on board, [and get] the teachers to agree that this was something that we wanted to try and perhaps it would be beneficial for the [students].” According to another teacher, teacher buy-in was most difficult when teachers were assigned to SLCs and not able to select their community of choice.

Another challenge addressed by teachers pertained to a perceived inequity among SLCs, an issue that seems rooted in student recruitment and SLC placement. Teachers in the focus groups reported the manner in which students were assigned to SLCs as problematic. According to one teacher, two SLCs selected students with high GPA's and good test scores, leaving the “left-overs” for the other SLCs. This concern was echoed by a different teacher who added that this ability of the magnet programs created an unnecessary but clear hierarchy of SLCs. Both teachers in one focus group agreed that while everyone tried very hard not to compare SLCs, these comparisons

were still made. Of the four students who participated in the focus groups, two did not mention anything about SLC stratification while the other two spoke of it openly. One student commented that one SLC (Odyssey) was better than GLOBE, and defined the other SLCs in the following way:

Merit's for smart people. Odyssey is for college-bound people, but also it's more of an easier course...And then ATM's more computers. Globe and Hero are [for] people who don't know what they want to do.

The other student commented that there was a friendly competition among the SLCs and believed that each SLC had its advantages over the others. In sum, teachers seemed to have more negative feelings toward the perceived inequity of the SLCs, while some students seemed to enjoy the "healthy competition."

As mentioned above, most teachers participating in the focus groups expressed frustration with having the higher achieving students assigned to a couple of select SLCs. Of the two focus groups conducted with teachers, one group had generally positive things to say about the nature of SLCs, while the other group had a greater number of concerns. Specifically, the biggest concern of one of the teachers was that the students in special education were not receiving the same benefits of being in an SLC, even though they were by nature a small learning community. The main concern was that these students were being left out of awards ceremonies. One teacher commented,

The special education group...[is] minimally involved with the SLC...it's been a struggle, because we've talked about having our own SLC, but then we can't because of the limitations of the grant, because these guys are on an IEP."

This teacher concluded that it was frustrating to be around the SLCs, but not being able to be a part of it. In general, the two teachers felt that students in special education were "left out."

To explore ideas on how to address some of these challenges, teachers were asked on the survey, *"What additional resources do you feel you will need to meet the goals of the SLC grant?"* Eighty-one teachers responded to this question. The most common responses by theme are summarized below.

Teacher/Staff –focused resources

- Planning/collaboration time
- Professional development

School-focused resources

- College/career events, pathways, guidance
- College aides in classroom/tutoring

Scheduling resources

- More pure classes
- More time to prepare students for college
- Cohorts of students to one core teacher

Other resources

- Money (for supplies and activities such as fieldtrips)

Although teachers reported in focus groups that they have more collaboration time than in previous years, they nevertheless felt they needed more time to meet the requirements of the grant. They also recognized the need for more professional development. Furthermore, teachers reportedly lacked the necessary resources to raise college and career awareness in addition to the preparation time needed to prepare a college/career-centered curriculum. These were all necessities that teachers believed were essential in order to, presumably, further develop SLCs, and meet the goals proposed in the grant.

To summarize, teachers and students reported that there was a strong SLC culture on campus that has improved personalization at both the student/student and teacher/student levels. Teachers indicated that there was an improved understanding of SLCs and that more colleague collaboration was taking place. Challenges to SLC development, however, remained. There was consensus among administrators that the master schedule continued to pose a challenge in generating appropriate pathways for student, which in turn affected SLCs, and teacher collaboration. Administrators struggled with the idea of restricting which courses students could take given the limitations of the master schedule. There was a lengthy discussion regarding SLC inequity issues given that some teachers and students detected a hierarchical SLC structure at their school. It is important to recognize and understand these successes and challenges as they illustrate the state of development of SLCs at Lakewood High. Because this state of development provides the context under which the grant goals are being implemented, it is critical to review it continuously when investigating if and how the grant goals are being met.

C. Overall Grant Awareness

The individuals most familiar with details of the grant were the two primary administrators (principal and SLC coordinator). Both administrators were very familiar with the grant goals and indicated that they adhered exclusively to the management action plan. The administrators did not specifically address the successes and challenges of each goal, as a result, supplementary commentary will only be provided where available. The status of the goals, which one administrator condensed to College and Career, Interventions, Rigor, and AP, are the following:

- Goal 1 (College and Career) - *Through a comprehensive guidance and academic advising program for students and their parents, prepare all students to succeed in postsecondary education and careers.* According to the administrators, Lakewood has done well in terms of meeting the activities stated under this goal. One administrator noted that Lakewood had put a lot of effort into interventions within the last couple of years. The administrator also mentioned that the pathways had become clearer to students, which led to a greater sense of focus among them.
- Goal 2 (Interventions) - *Provide intensive interventions in reading/ language arts and math skills.* As previously stated, one administrator lauded the increased number of interventions that the school had begun implementing. The administrator commented that Lakewood had a hugely successful math tutoring program and peer tutoring program, and that student participation in these programs had increased 300 percent.

- Goal 3 (Rigor) - *Enroll and support students in a coherent sequence of rigorous English, math and science courses to succeed in postsecondary education and/or careers.* According to two administrators, one of the biggest accomplishments has been increasing the number of students enrolled in their AP sequence, Honors program, and A through G requirements.
- Goal 4 (AP) - *Increase opportunities for students to earn postsecondary credit through AP courses.* Administrators spoke of a strengthened AP program. Two administrators mentioned the increased number of student enrolled in AP classes, and one noted that while AP enrollment had increased substantially, AP test scores remained the same.

According to the administrators, leadership teachers have copies of the grant and should be very familiar with the grant's action plan. During teacher focus group discussions, participants indicated that they understood the grant to be the school's second SLC grant but did not provide details. Grant awareness, however, seemed rooted in matters of achievement. Of the four teachers in the focus groups, two indicated that they were very familiar with the grant goals, and that most SLC development activities were "explicitly tied" to the four goals. In contrast, one teacher reported a vague familiarity with the grant goals while one was not familiar at all.

Although not explicitly stated, some teachers and administrators credited the second year of the grant as leading SLCs to refocus/restructure and to build SLC identity, goals they seemed to perceive as part of the grant. The principal described the purpose of the grant as related to SLCs in the following way:

We've put a lot of funding and effort into AP and Honors and building more capacity within each of the SLCs to offer those opportunities to students. And so actually our AP program has grown dramatically. It's tripled in the last five years. Some of the funding and the efforts have been put into departments and how they're...working with students in the intervention programs and what interventions they are able to offer. One of the aspects I'd like to put more emphasis on...is putting in more career awareness and more focus on after they leave high school.

The SLC coordinator had the following to say about the purpose of the grant:

The purpose of the grant is to really enrich these SLCs and get [them] sufficient and going so that beyond the grant they still have that impetus. So that's the purpose of the grant. We've used the funds to do just that and the identification of the SLCs, the personalization between the teachers and each other have grown that...In my view the four goals aren't the end product. They're the process...so using the goals you fulfill the ultimate goal in the grant.

The principal's and coordinator's understanding of the grant was more aligned with the district's understanding while other staff saw the emphasis as continuing to be SLC development. It was evident that this administrator demonstrated greater awareness of the grant's purpose and goals while others continued to work through their understanding.

D. Goal #1: Prepare all students for success in postsecondary education and careers without the need for remediation.

The goal of preparing students for success in postsecondary education and careers is very broad and encompasses school-wide as well as SLC-specific efforts. The majority of the activities under this goal are geared toward postsecondary success and do not directly emphasize the objective of preparing students “without the need for remediation.” Nevertheless, two major areas emerged through the data that supported achievement of this goal: student expectations and post-secondary knowledge, support, and preparedness. Under these major themes, survey results associated with academic support and remediation are also addressed. It is important to note that while remediation is not specifically addressed here, efforts such as tutoring are discussed under subsequent goals.

Goal-Related Activities

Several activities are listed under Goal #1 in the grant’s action plan. These activities are as follows:

- Saturday Report Card Meeting
- College Preparedness Workshops
- SLC Parent Booster Club
- Parent Institutes
- Middle School Outreach regarding SLC Pathways
- Training and Use of School Loop Program
- Training and Use of Tele-Parent Program
- LROIX
- Increased Connections to Faith and Community-Based Organizations and Businesses

Data pertaining to a portion of the above activities was generated through interviews, focus groups, and survey items. Not all of the above activities could be addressed through the data collection efforts. Reasons primarily included time limitations for interviews/focus groups, small sample sizes, and generalized descriptions by respondents. Furthermore, absence of specific activities does not necessarily indicate that they did not occur; rather, it may be that since they were not specifically part of the interview, respondents may not have discussed them. It should also be noted that not all activities were designed for 100% participation by staff. A low percentage of participation does not necessarily mean the activity was not implemented successfully.

- 4% (of 180) of the teacher survey respondents reported participation in Bi-Annual Saturday Report Card Parent Meetings. The Saturday Report Card Parent Meetings were held on Wednesday instead of Saturday, which resulted in lower parent participation. One administrator reported that given the change of day, the Saturday Report Card Meetings had “worked out extremely well.”
- 7% (of 180) of the teachers reported that they participated in College Preparedness Workshops. However, such workshops or similar activities may have been geared toward the students. Various college preparedness activities did take place (e.g. field trips, AVID activities) and are discussed more fully in the subsequent section “Post-secondary Support, Knowledge, and Preparedness.”

- 16% (of 180) of the teachers reported that they engaged in developing/sustaining SLC Parent Booster Clubs.
- 8% (of 180) of the teachers reported that they participated in Bi-Annual Parent Institutes.
- 8% (of 180) of the teachers reported that they participated in Middle School Outreach Regarding SLC Pathways.
- 42% (of 180) of the teachers reported that they participated in training and 95% (of 180) reported that they have used the School Loop Program.
- 9% (of 180) of the teachers reported that they have used the Tele-Parent Program and 5% (of 180) of the teachers reported that they participated in training for the Tele-Parent Program.
- 49% (of 180) of the teachers reported that they have used LROIX, while 17% (of 180) of teachers reported that they had received training for LROIX.
- 9% (of 180) of the teachers reported that they participated in Increased Connections to Faith and Community-Based Organizations and Businesses.

Expectations of Students

Research has shown that establishing high expectations for students leads to high academic achievement (NCREL, 2004).³ As presented in Table 14, 90% of the teacher respondents generally agreed with the statement, “Teachers have high expectations for all students.” Similarly, 82% of the students and 85% of the parents also believed that teachers held high expectations for all students.

Table 14.

		N	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	N/A
Teachers have high expectations for all students.	Staff	171	1%	9%	60%	30%	1%
	Students	2883	4%	14%	50%	32%	---
	Parents	578	1%	8%	48%	37%	5% (DK)

Teacher survey respondents were asked to indicate what percentage of their students they believed would achieve each potential educational level. It was intended that each educational option would

³ North Central Regional Educational Laboratory (2004). High Expectations. Available online: <http://www.ncrel.org/sdrs/areas/issues/students/atrisk/at6lk11.htm>. Retrieved July 2009.

stand alone; however, analyses of the data revealed response overlap and therefore could not be appropriately or reliably interpreted.

Post-secondary Support, Knowledge, and Preparedness

The results in this section specifically address the support, knowledge, and preparation necessary for post-secondary success. The first series of survey items refer to the teacher-student communication that would support students in their understanding of the application and financial requirements of post-secondary education (see Table 15 below). As shown in the table, the vast majority of teachers (94%) responded that they spoke with their students about how to get into college, a slight decrease from 98% in 2008-2009. On the other hand, students were generally divided in their levels of agreement about whether they spoke to their teachers about getting into college, 55% generally agreed while 45% generally disagreed. In considering the disparity in responses between staff and students, it may be important to note that these items were written with the respondent in the active role. In other words, had the student item been written as “Teachers talk to me about how to get into college,” there may have been less of a disparity. It is highly possible that the students were considering their own active role in engaging teachers in these conversations and less about whether or not these conversations took place at all. With regard to paying for college, 70% of the teachers generally agreed that students spoke to teachers and/or counselors, while only 45% of the students were likely to agree. As expected, students at higher grade levels were more likely to agree than their younger counterparts. Although 20% of the parents responded that they did not know whether these communications occurred, they were more likely to agree than disagree that their children communicated with teachers about getting into college (51% vs. 29%). However, parents were more likely to disagree than agree that their children communicated with a teacher or counselor about how to pay for college (41% vs. 35%). This is a shift in response from 2008-2009, when more parents agreed that their children communicated with a teacher or counselor about how to pay for college.

Table 15.

		N	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	N/A
I talk with my students about how to get into college.	Staff	170	1%	4%	39%	55%	2%
I talk to my teacher about how to get into college.	Students	2862	10%	35%	39%	16%	---
My child talks to his/her teacher about how to get into college.	Parents	570	5%	24%	34%	17%	20% (DK)
Students talk to teachers and/or counselors about how to pay for college.	Staff	169	2%	17%	53%	17%	11%
I talk to my teacher or counselor about how to pay for college.	Students	2851	12%	42%	32%	13%	---
My child talks to his/her teacher or counselor about how to pay for college.	Parents	566	9%	32%	24%	11%	29% (DK)

Providing students with knowledge about post-secondary opportunities was evident through the various activities that the Lakewood teachers implemented to engage students. Teacher and staff members, including administrators, also spoke of the objectives that drove these activities and what they hoped students would gain through their engagement. For example, one teacher and one administrator spoke about a particular SLC's goal as helping the students understand that the objective was not simply to get to college but to have a successful career after college. One SLC teacher shared that the emphasis was not on individual careers but getting them qualified for college. At least two teachers referenced the college counselors that came to the school to speak with the students about individual colleges. Also, one teacher spoke of the addition of more college-centered units beginning in ninth grade. Many teachers spoke of having students investigate and research careers in order get students involved in preparing for the future. The role of SLCs was more about providing a strong academic foundation, a "foundational stepping stone," and helping students research what career they were interested in and figure out "how to get there."

With regard to the connections between SLCs and specific post-secondary options, one teacher shared,

Our students are scheduled to take the ASVAB [Armed Services Vocational Aptitude Battery], and I'm going to do a follow up with my students to look at the results of that exam, which measures their academic qualifications...or where they are academically, where they are as far as technical or trade skills...And it helps to reassure them that yes, they are on the right path, because they've already chosen some type of a major, or it could be that they can be assured that maybe they aren't academically prepared for that career. But they can work a little harder, and then have an understanding of what they're going to do, the challenges they're going to face by choosing that career, or a college major, as they're going forward.

As presented in table 16 below, 39% of students reported having read a school-wide newsletter that highlighted SLCs, while a higher percentage of parents (64%) reported having read the school-wide newsletter. It is likely that a higher percentage of parents read the newsletter due to the fact that these newsletters are often sent to the home of the student with the primary purpose of informing the parents. A slightly higher percentage of students (45%) reported having read a school-wide newsletter that highlighted college and career information. 62% of parents reported having read a newsletter highlighting college information, while 51% reported having read a newsletter highlighting career information. It is possible that parents are more inclined to read information regarding college than they are about careers.

Table 16.

		N	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	N/A
I have read a school-wide newsletter that highlights SLCs.	Students	2898	17%	43%	29%	10%	---
	Parents	568	5%	23%	41%	23%	8% (DK)
I have read a school-wide newsletter that highlights college information.	Students	2855	20%	35%	33%	12%	---
	Parents	576	4%	27%	39%	23%	7% (DK)
I have read a school-wide newsletter that highlights career information.	Students	2848	20%	35%	33%	12%	---
	Parents	568	5%	31%	32%	19%	12% (DK)

It was evident that post-secondary success was a primary goal and several activities took place, school-wide and SLC-specific. Two teachers spoke of having students actively researching options through computer labs, working on career units in class, creating portfolios, and completing mock applications and interviews. Three SLC teachers spoke of having representatives from universities, trade schools, and independent businesses come in and speak to the students. Field trips were also discussed, however it was shared that these have been impacted by budget cuts.

Staff and student survey respondents were asked about field trips and guest speakers. As may be expected, all of the following student responses increased in percentage with increasing grade levels.

- 39% (of 180) of the teachers indicated, “at least one speaker visited my classroom to talk to students about careers.” 83% (of 2827) of the students agreed with this statement.
- 36% (of 180) of the teachers indicated “at least one speaker visited my classroom to talk to students about college/university.” 83% (of 2829) of the students agreed with this statement.
- 11% (of 180) of the teachers reported, “I have taken my students on at least one trip to visit a college/university.” 40% (of 2848) of the students agreed that they had taken at least one trip to a college/university.
- 13% (of 180) of the teachers reported, “I have taken my students on at least one trip somewhere to explore careers.” 35% (of 2841) of the students agreed that they had taken at least one trip to explore careers.

Student focus group respondents were asked how their teachers helped prepare students for college. Responses included teaching organizational skills and emphasis on the A-G requirements. All four students responded that their SLCs were more geared toward career options while one also reported that his/her SLC was specifically college oriented. Two students also reported that they had “heard” about SAT preparation programs but none stated that they actually participated, while one student reported that he had taken an SAT preparation course, but believed that he was underprepared for the test and stopped attending. All four students reported that they heard the most about college through their counselors and teachers.

State universities in California, whether in the UC or the CSU systems, have specific course requirements (A-G requirements) that students must complete prior to admission. In addition, successful completion of one or more standardized tests is required. These test requirements are not limited to state universities and may also be used for placement into particular majors and programs. Table 17 contains the results of the two items that address students' knowledge of these two critical requirements for application and admission into universities. As the table shows, 82% and greater of all three respondent groups agreed that students were aware of the A-G requirements. Both teachers and students spoke of posters around school reminding students of these requirements as well as an increase in certain core subject sections and enrollment. Besides the specific A-G item addressed in Table 15, students also responded to an item stating, "When I graduate, I will have taken the courses necessary to be accepted to college." In general, 89% of the students agreed that they will have taken all necessary courses.

Table 17 also shows that similar proportions of students (75%) and parents (74%) agreed that students were aware of what standardized tests were required. These proportions were lower in comparison to the first item. Disaggregating student responses by grade level, student awareness of standardized tests did increase. However, the disparities across the grades were slightly smaller for this current year than for 2008-09, suggesting that more students were made aware of this particular testing during their first years at Lakewood.

Table 17.

		N	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	N/A
Students are aware of the A-G requirements needed to get into a UC or CSU.	Staff	169	1%	11%	52%	30%	7%
I am aware of the A-G requirements needed to get into a UC or CSU.	Students	2848	3%	9%	46%	42%	---
My child knows about the A-G requirements needed to get into a UC or CSU.	Parents	569	2%	6%	43%	39%	10% (DK)
My child knows which standardized test(s) he/she needs to take to apply for college.	Parents	567	3%	12%	43%	31%	11%
I know which standardized test(s) I need to take to apply for college.	Students	2841	5%	19%	48%	27%	---

Survey respondents were asked about students' preparation for post-secondary success in two ways: subsequent to high school graduation and overall. It is implied, in this first item in Table 18 below, that time and engagement in high school has provided the necessary preparation for either a post-secondary education or a career. Of all three respondent groups, students and parents were the most confident in this preparation (87% and 79%, respectively). Teachers were also generally confident albeit to a slightly lesser degree (70%). Teachers' confidence in student preparation for college decreased slightly from the 77% in 2008-2009.

Table 18.

		N	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	N/A
By the time students graduate from this school, they will be prepared to succeed at the college or career of their choice.	Staff	170	4%	24%	50%	20%	3%
By the time I graduate from this school, I will be prepared to succeed at the college or career of my choice	Students	2849	3%	10%	51%	36%	---
By the time my child graduates from this school, s/he will be prepared to succeed at the college or career of his/her choice.	Parents	570	3%	9%	44%	35%	10% (DK)

The items in Table 19 address the students' and parents' perceptions of their ability to pay for a post-secondary education from various sources. In general, students were slightly more confident (78%) that they could afford attendance at a 4-year institution. A smaller proportion of parents (62%) were as confident. A small portion of the parents reported that they did not know at the time of survey completion (10%), which is a slightly smaller percentage of parents who reported not knowing in 2008-2009 (12%). It is possible that although parents have a great awareness of the family resources, they may not be as aware of scholarship and financial aid opportunities. Conversely, students may not be aware of the actual status of the family resources and therefore may be more confident in that particular source of income than the parents.

Table 19.

		N	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	N/A
I think I can afford to attend a public, 4-year college using financial aid, scholarships, or my family's resources.	Students	2856	7%	16%	53%	25%	---
I think I can pay to send my child to a public, 4-year college with my income, financial aid, or scholarships.	Parents	565	13%	14%	41%	21%	10% (DK)

Support and Remediation

The following survey items address academic support. As described earlier, the portion of the goal that specifies support without the need for remediation was not evaluable since both the activities listed under this goal and the data collected were not sufficient to draw valid conclusions. The items presented in Table 20 below give some indication as to the academic support given to and perceived by the students and may serve as an indirect indicator of fulfilling this portion of the goal.

Table 20.

		N	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	N/A
The administration, teachers, and staff at this school work together to assist students who may be at risk of failing.	Staff	170	4%	15%	58%	22%	0%
	Students	2872	6%	20%	54%	20%	---
	Parents	571	5%	15%	38%	22%	19% (DK)
I talk with other teachers about students who might be struggling academically.	Staff	170	1%	5%	48%	44%	3%
I feel supported by my teachers in my academic performance in class.	Students	2870	5%	16%	55%	25%	---
My child feels supported by his/her teachers in his/her academic performance in class.	Parents	570	5%	16%	46%	25%	9% (DK)

The first item addresses a school-wide effort at supporting students deemed at risk of failing. As shown, 80% of the teachers and 74% of the students agreed that all worked together to provide this support. Parents also agreed, although to a lesser extent (60%). Nineteen percent of parents reported they did not know whether there was a school-wide effort at supporting students deemed at risk of failing. Furthermore, 92% of the teachers agreed that they personally talked with other teachers regarding struggling students. Finally, 80% of the students agreed that they received academic support from their classroom teachers. This disparity between teachers and students may exist because students are questioned about their teachers as a group and not individually. Parents also agreed (71%), to a lesser extent, that their children received this support.

E. Goal #2: Provide intensive interventions in reading/language arts and math skills.

Lakewood administrators discussed various activities and efforts made at providing interventions for the students. They spoke of the peer mentoring program, interventions for students with D’s and F’s, and the in-school/after-school tutoring available. While the administrators were confident of the success of the tutoring programs, one administrator was unclear as to whether these interventions were actually tied to the SLCs.

Goal-Related Activities

Several activities are listed under goal #2 in the grant’s action plan.

- Implement School-wide Literacy Strategies
- Implement School-wide Numeracy Strategies
- Support Language!, Literacy Workshop, and Stretch Algebra AB/CD Classes with College Aides
- Provide After School Tutoring

- Carnegie Lab Training and Computer Support
- Math Department Lesson Study

Data pertaining to a portion of the above activities was generated through interviews, focus groups, and survey items. Not all of the above activities could be addressed through the data collection efforts. Reasons primarily included time limitations for interviews/focus groups and generalized descriptions by respondents.

- 64% (of 180) of the teachers reported that they implemented literacy strategies.
- 22% (of 180) of the teachers reported that they implemented numeracy strategies.
- 17% (of 180) of staff reported that they had a college aide assigned to the classroom. A more comprehensive discussion of college aides is presented in the sections below.
- 48% (of 180) of the teachers reported that they participated in after school tutoring.
- 2% (of 180) of the teachers reported that they had participated in training on Carnegie Lab/Computer Support. 4% (of 2,950) of students reported having participated in the Carnegie Lab/Computer use for math.
- 7% (of 180) of staff reported having participated in a Math Department Lesson Study.

Tutoring, in its various forms and content emphases, emerged as the primary intervention effort in which the school has engaged during the 2009-2010 year. Tutoring is not listed under this goal as an intervention activity; rather, it was written in the grant under Goal #3. However, the majority of the data that were collected on tutoring emerged as part of the school's intervention efforts and therefore is discussed under this goal.

Tutoring

Tutoring and related efforts took place school-wide, by SLC, and by teacher. The administrators explained that while the school-wide tutoring efforts had been a good idea in theory, in practice this approach had not been successful. The administrator acknowledged that the primary cause was little to no student participation. There were other tutoring programs, however, that were described as more successful. A peer math tutoring program was praised for having been successful, and student described the "special classes" for people with low reading or math skills that one would take as an elective.

Other tutoring efforts described by teachers and students included the lunchtime intervention for students with D's and F's. One student described this intervention:

I'm taking Algebra 2, and I'm on the bridge of...a D and a C, and we had what's called Odyssey refs, and it's like one day at lunch last semester, they bought us pizza and Coke and we went into the two biggest classrooms for Odyssey. And basically it was just an

encouragement group, and they wanted us to get our grades up, so they did it for us to encourage us to get our grades up that we can still fix it. It helped.

It appeared through these discussions that some of these activities were SLC-specific while others were more related to the departments or grade levels. Focus group students also spoke of tutoring in its many forms: before school, after school, and in the library. They expressed awareness that their own teachers as well as others were available to them when they needed help. Nevertheless, tutoring is an ongoing intervention at Lakewood.

Teachers, students, and parents responded to several survey items which addressed tutoring and other academic help. The first series of items pertained to the tutoring efforts provided by the school in both reading/language arts and mathematics. As shown in Table 21 below, teachers and students were similar in their general agreement that Lakewood provided additional tutoring in reading/language arts (74% and 72%, respectively.) However, parents were less likely to agree about math tutoring (50% vs. 94% of the teachers in terms of agreement). This is a curious finding given that administrators, teachers, and students all spoke of the availability of school-wide math tutoring. It is possible that parents had different perceptions of the survey item that included the phrase “outside the school day.” It is possible that parents may have considered the math tutoring as occurring within the school day and therefore responded differently. Responses to the parent survey showed that 72% of the parents generally agreed that the school offered reading or math to students who need it. A smaller proportion of parents (50%) agreed that it occurred outside of the classroom.

Table 21.

		N	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	N/A
For students who need it, the school provides additional tutoring in reading/language arts.	Staff	170	4%	12%	46%	28%	11%
For those who need it, the school gives them more tutoring in reading/language arts outside the school day.	Students	2872	6%	22%	52%	20%	---
For students who need it, the school provides additional tutoring in math.	Staff	170	1%	3%	45%	49%	2%
For those who need it, the school gives them more tutoring in math outside the school day.	Students	2875	4%	13%	54%	30%	---
The school provides more academic tutoring in reading or math for those who need it.	Parents	575	3%	8%	45%	27%	17% (DK)
My child got more academic help (like tutoring) in reading or math outside his/her class.	Parents	568	6%	26%	32%	18%	18% (DK)

Over half of the students disagreed that they received more help in reading (63%) and math (52%) through tutoring or by having more than one class in that subject per semester (see Table 22 below).

Given that students positively reported on the availability of tutoring, it is unclear whether students were responding to the tutoring portion of the item or the additional class.

Table 22.

		N	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	N/A
I got more help in reading/language arts through tutoring or by having more than one English class per semester.	Students	2866	19%	44%	28%	10%	---
I got more academic help in math through tutoring or by having more than one math class per semester.	Students	2877	16%	36%	33%	14%	---

Finally, all three groups responded to the tutoring support provided by the students' individual teachers. Table 23 shows all groups similarly reported that teachers were personally involved in tutoring students. Interestingly, over one-third of the students disagreed that their teachers provided them with tutoring given the previously described occurrence of tutoring by classroom teachers. One possible explanation would be that although students were aware of all of the tutoring opportunities, they were not engaging in them. This non- or limited engagement may be reflected in these responses. Nonetheless, these interpretations are speculative and would require further investigation.

Table 23.

		N	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	N/A
I am involved in tutoring students who need additional academic support.	Staff	169	3%	21%	37%	28%	11%
My teachers tutor me when I need more academic support.	Students	2847	7%	27%	49%	18%	---
My child's teachers tutor him/her when s/he needs some additional academic support.	Parents	570	7%	19%	41%	18%	15% (DK)

College Aides

As listed in the above section on Goal #2 activities, Lakewood has employed college aides to provide support in various English/language arts, mathematics, and other core subject classes.⁴ During focus groups, two students spoke of college aides. Two students reported having had a college aide in their classrooms for the 2008-2009 school year, but not during the 2009-2010 school year. Two different students were not sure whether they knew what a college aide was or if there had been any such person in their classrooms. However, one student was able to recount the experience from the previous year:

⁴ The use of college aides in Science courses is listed as a Goal #3 activity and is discussed in that section.

I had one...last year for Biology. The teacher would let them take over sometimes. I don't know how they worked it out, but they would take over the class sometimes and they'd give us lessons and stuff like that. And if not, like if we wouldn't believe the teacher, you could...ask him. I liked it, 'cause you get to see different teaching strategies and stuff. I liked it. They went around, and if we have questions, we can ask them. They would come over and show us.

Slightly more than half of the teacher survey respondents (58%) believed that Lakewood employed the assistance of college aides to improve literacy and/or numeracy achievement while only 17% of the teachers indicated that a college aide was placed into their specific classroom. Although it is clear some teachers had college aides in the classroom, no further information emerged during the focus group sessions. Furthermore, given the small number of students in the focus groups and their recounts of the last school year, reliable interpretation of the presence, responsibilities, and effective use of college aides for this school year is not possible.

F. Goal #3: Enroll and support students in a coherent sequence of rigorous English, Math, and Science courses to succeed in postsecondary education and/or careers.

In attempting to gather information regarding the underlying meaning of this goal, we found that there was limited clarity and consistency in how it was interpreted by administrators and teachers. Furthermore, when teachers were asked about their understanding of what a coherent sequence meant to them, initial responses illustrated some confusion. Regardless, once the discussion ensued, it was clear that all agreed that coherence was related to the collaborative efforts made by teachers toward interdisciplinary curriculum. Vertical teaming across grade levels, horizontal teaming and cross-curricular projects were discussed as the primary endeavors engaged in by school staff toward achieving this goal.

Goal-Related Activities

Several activities are listed under goal #3 in the grant's action plan. These activities are as follows:

- Master Schedule Building
- Develop and Modify Curriculum to Provide More Connections to SLC Themes/Careers
- Summer Curriculum Institutes to Further Refine Curriculum
- District and Site-Based Professional Learning Community Workshops
- Training on Differentiated Instructional Techniques
- Strategize on how to work with SLCs
- Training for Link Crew

Data pertaining to a portion of the above activities was generated through interviews, focus groups, and survey items. Not all of the above activities could be addressed through the data collection efforts. Reasons primarily included time limitations for interviews/focus groups and generalized descriptions by respondents. It should be noted that not all activities were designed for 100% participation by staff.

- 18% (of 180) of staff reported that they had helped with Master Schedule Building.

- 40% (of 180) of teachers reported that they worked to develop and modify curriculum to provide more connections to SLC themes/careers (also discussed in subsequent section on Vertical/Horizontal Teaming).
- 12% (of 180) of teachers indicated that they participated in Summer Curriculum Institutes.
- 27% (of 180) of teachers participated in District Professional Learning Community Workshops; 42% participated in Site-based workshops.
- 28% (of 180) of teachers reported receiving training on Differentiated Instructional Techniques.
- 22% (of 180) of the teachers reported that they had participated in strategizing to work with SLCs.
- 2% (of 180) of the teachers reported that they had training on Link Crew.

In addition to the list above, administrators spoke positively of the use of “outcome charts” as making a difference in creating rigor and stimulating dialogue among teachers regarding cross-curricular projects.

Collaboration Among SLCs

The occurrence and extent of collaboration within and between the SLCs may be considered indicators of the overall goal of coherence as well as the activity related to the development and modification of curriculum with greater SLC connections. This year, only one teacher referred specifically to teacher collaboration. One teacher reported that as a result of the SLCs, teachers met together more often and that teachers were more aware of what other teachers were currently doing in their classrooms, and more aware of what next year’s teachers expected their students to know. Further, all four of the students reported that their teachers met with one another and guessed that this meant teachers were collaborating on classroom projects. In particular, one student recalled the “Decades Project” when asked to talk about a lesson that had been planned by multiple teachers.

Two items on the staff survey specifically addressed collaboration in both grade-level and department-level teams within the SLC context. As may be seen in Table 24 below, teacher respondents were almost equally likely to agree that they collaborated in SLC department-level teams (66%) as in SLC grade-level teams (62%). This is a change from 2008-2009, as teachers were more likely to report collaborating with department-level teams (67%) than grade-level teams (58%). Nevertheless, based on focus groups and survey responses, it was evident that the majority of teachers engage in teaming toward the goal of creating coherence.

Table 24.

		N	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	N/A
I collaborate with other members of my SLC grade-level teams.	Staff	173	9%	20%	35%	27%	13%
I collaborate with other members of my SLC department-level teams.	Staff	174	9%	18%	40%	26%	8%

Two students were able to articulate beyond the actual projects and provide insight into the purpose of collaboration. For example, one student commented that the SLC courses were related to one another “in every way possible.” A different student echoed, “[Teachers] always go to meetings together, and when we do projects, it’s not just in one class...It’s been like that for every year.” Further, one student reported that teachers planned lessons together “all the time.” Only one student was not completely sure if teachers collaborated. Nonetheless, these students’ comments provided additional evidence for teaming and coherence of courses.

One item on the student survey addressed cross-curricular projects and the ability for students to earn multiple credits. Almost two-thirds of the students (64%) generally agreed, “because of the way teachers in my SLC work together, I have done assignments for which I received credit in more than one class.” Alternatively, 37% of the students generally disagreed, which does not indicate that teachers did not work across curriculum but only suggests that students may not have received credit in more than one class.

Both teachers and students responded to a survey item about lesson design and the connection to SLC themes. As Table 25 below shows, teachers were less likely to agree (56%) that lessons were designed with the SLC theme in mind than their student counterparts (80%). On the other hand, teachers were in agreement (88%) that teachers’ lessons were designed to encourage critical thinking – a slightly lower percentage than the 95% agreement among teachers in 2008-09. The majority of students (86%) were also in agreement. Finally, almost three-quarters of the students agreed (73%) that their SLC courses were challenging.

Table 25.

		N	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	N/A
Lessons are designed with the SLC theme in mind.	Staff	173	8%	28%	39%	17%	8%
	Students	2880	4%	17%	53%	27%	---
Teachers’ lessons are designed to encourage students to think critically.	Staff	172	2%	6%	53%	35%	3%
My teachers’ lesson are designed to encourage me to think critically	Students	2873	3%	12%	58%	28%	---
My SLC courses are challenging.	Students	2880	6%	21%	48%	25%	---

Course Selection and SLC Requirements

This section addresses course selection and SLC course requirements. These two areas pertain to goal #3 in that they support students' in their enrollment of appropriate and rigorous courses. Table 26 shows both teacher and student responses to corresponding survey items.

Table 26.

		N	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	N/A
I talk to, or refer students to talk to a counselor, about their course selection.	Staff	171	1%	11%	49%	36%	3%
I talk to my teachers or counselor about my course selection.	Students	2877	5%	21%	50%	23%	---
I inform my students about SLC course requirements.	Staff	170	5%	27%	34%	25%	9%
I know which courses are required by my SLC.	Students	2877	4%	16%	49%	30%	---

The majority of teachers (85%) indicated that they talked to, or referred students to a counselor, about course selection. A smaller percentage of students (73%) also agreed that they talked to their teachers or their counselor about course selection, which is a slight decrease from the 76% who agreed with this statement in 2008-2009. A greater disparity in responses may be seen regarding information and knowledge about SLC course requirements. Only 59% of the teachers agreed that they informed students about SLC required courses whereas 79% of the students agreed that they knew which courses were required by their SLC. It is possible that students received this information through other sources such as a counselor or other students.

G. Goal #4: Increase opportunities for students to earn postsecondary credit through AP courses.

Advanced placement (AP) exams offer students the opportunity to earn college credits while still attending high school. The state offers AP courses in over 20 subject areas. Successful completion of the classes and the culminating exam provide students with credits as well as advantages in competitive admissions processes of many universities. Participation in AP courses also provides students an accelerated academic environment which may foster postsecondary academic success. It is important to note that students may take the AP course and not take the exam as well as take an AP exam without necessarily participating in the course. Nevertheless, college credit is only granted with successful completion of an AP exam.

Goal-Related Activities

Several activities are listed under this goal in the grant's action plan. These activities are as follows:

- Participate in College Board Conferences

- Develop and Implement an AP Faire for Students and Parents
- Annual PSAT Parent Workshop to Explain 10th Grade Students Scores
- Refine and Implement an AP Bridge Program
- AP Teacher Training
- Offer SAT Preparation Programs
- AVID Path Training
- Increase AP Enrollment

Data pertaining to a portion of the above activities was generated through interviews, focus groups, and survey items. Not all of the above activities could be addressed through the data collection efforts. Reasons primarily included time limitations for interviews/focus groups and generalized descriptions by respondents.

- 7% of the teachers (n=180) reported having participated in College Board Conferences.
- 8% of the teachers (n=147) reported that they helped with the development of an AP Faire. 33% of the teachers reported that they did not have any knowledge of an AP Faire.
- 4% of the teachers (n=146) reported that they helped with the annual PSAT parent workshop in 2009-10. 29% of the teachers (n=146) reported that they didn't know anything about the annual PSAT parent workshop.
- 12% of the teachers (n=146) reported that they helped with the development of an AP Bridge Program. 26% of the teachers reported that they did not have any knowledge of an AP Bridge Program.
- 4% of the teachers (n=180) reported having participated in AP Teacher Training professional development.
- Offer SAT Preparation Programs – 8% of students (n=233) reported that they had participated in an SAT preparation program. However, there was little to no data to support the implementation of such programs at the school.
- 11% of the teachers (n=180) reported having participated in AVID Path Training professional development.
- 27% of students (n=2806) reported being enrolled in at least one AP course.

Additional activities related to this goal were described by respondents. The administrators spoke of an “AP support group” and two “AP informational nights” for parents that were held in both the fall and spring. An AP café was an effort at providing AP tutoring. However, this was not viewed as a successful endeavor.

AP Program – Implementation and Outcomes

All respondents were asked several questions regarding the AP program ranging from access and encouragement to awareness and knowledge. This section provides a synthesis of the results that illuminates various aspects of the implementation as well as some outcomes of this AP goal.

School administrators at Lakewood HS were extremely positive with regard to how the AP programs were working in the 2009-2010 school year. They both acknowledged a rise in AP enrollment, increased class offerings, and an increased number of students who took the AP exams. The major concern of one administrator was that AP teachers were dealing with an increased number of students who weren't necessarily ready to complete AP-level work, and as a result, were required to do more interventions than they had in previous years. One teacher also acknowledged that AP enrollment had increased substantially and was impressed that the pass rate had remained the same despite the higher numbers of students taking the courses.

In terms of students' understanding the benefits and advantages of taking AP courses, both students (88%) and parents (81%) were in agreement (see Table 27 below). The proportion of teachers also in general agreement (71%) was smaller than the other two groups. It is unclear why students and parents reported more confidence in students' understanding how AP courses will help in college. It is possible, that the content of this "understanding" is not the same for the teachers as the other groups – teachers are likely to have more specific knowledge about how AP courses would help students while the understanding of parents and students may be more general.

Table 27.

		N	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	N/A
Students understand how taking AP courses will help them in college.	Teachers	168	3%	18%	50%	21%	7%
I understand how taking AP courses will help me in college.	Students	2345	3%	9%	40%	48%	---
My child understands how taking AP courses will help him/her in college.	Parents	568	2%	6%	46%	35%	10% (DK)

Access to AP courses may also play a role in student enrollment and the encouragement students receive to enroll in AP courses. Over half of the teachers (62%) believed that students had equal access to AP courses regardless of SLC membership (see Table 28). Students were more confident in the equity of AP access (75%). This disparity is similar to the previous year, when 58% of teachers and 71% of students believed students had equal access to AP courses. This year, a nearly equal percentage of students (74%) also believed that they, personally, were eligible to enroll in AP courses. Student focus group participants agreed that anyone who wanted to take the AP courses was able to take them. One further specified that either teachers or counselors could recommend that a student take an AP course. All teachers agreed that students mostly learned of AP courses through counselors and that all students were encouraged to take them.

Table 28.

		N	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	N/A
Students in all SLCs have equal access to AP courses.	Staff	168	8%	19%	41%	21%	11%
	Students	1835	6%	19%	47%	28%	---
I am eligible to enroll in AP courses.	Students	2832	4%	22%	41%	33%	---

A smaller, but notable group of students (25%) did not believe that all students had equal access to AP courses nor did they believe that they were personally eligible to enroll (26%). 27% of the teachers disagreed that access was equitable, which may be somehow connected to the corresponding students' perceptions that they were not eligible to enroll. However, this percentage is smaller than in 2008-2009 (36%). Further investigation would be necessary to draw specific conclusions.

As described above, the encouragement of students to enroll in AP courses plays an important role in actual enrollment. According to participants in both the student and teacher focus groups, teachers and counselors have both been acknowledged as the primary promoters of such encouragement. Table 29 shows the results of the survey responses pertaining to encouragement.

Table 29. Survey Responses Pertaining to Encouragement for AP Enrollment.

		N	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	N/A
I encourage my students to enroll in AP courses.	Staff	168	4%	15%	43%	23%	15%
My SLC teachers encourage me to enroll in AP courses.	Students	2826	8%	29%	35%	27%	---
The counselor encourages students to enroll in AP courses.	Staff	168	1%	8%	51%	30%	20%
My counselor encourages me to enroll in AP courses.	Students	2834	8%	31%	36%	25%	---

As may be seen in the table, students believed that teachers (62%) and counselors (61%) offered similar levels of encouragement to enroll in AP courses. Teacher respondents, however, reported that counselors encouraged their students to enroll in AP courses more than teachers reported that they encouraged their own students to enroll (81% and 66%, respectively). Although not included in this table, the parents also responded to the question of encouragement. Two-thirds of the parents (67%) believed that their students were encouraged to enroll in AP courses. Parents were not asked to differentiate between teacher and counselor encouragement.

The above results on students' perceptions of AP eligibility and encouragement were analyzed on a school-wide basis. Variability in student perceptions emerged through the disaggregation of responses by SLC. Referring back to the school-wide results, we found that 74% of students believed they were eligible to enroll in AP courses, 62% were encouraged by their teachers, and 61% were encouraged by their counselors. While the similarities between teacher and counselor encouragement remained, disparities in encouragement emerged among the SLCs. Perceived teacher encouragement to enroll in AP courses was highest for MERIT (94%), mid-range for ATM (62%) and ODYSSEY (65%), and lowest for THE ARTS (44%) and TCB (47%). Perceived counselor encouragement followed a similar pattern. Although it may not be surprising that MERIT was consistently at the top of the range given the goals and structure of the SLC, it may be of practical significance that students from other SLCs differed from MERIT in their responses by as much as 50%. Furthermore, if the grant's goal is to increase AP opportunities for all students, then these findings indicate the need to emphasize AP encouragement across all SLCs.

Another factor that plays a role in AP participation is the awareness of course offerings and their perceptions of what participation entails. Student focus group responses indicated a general awareness of the types of courses that were available at their school. In addition, one student described AP courses in general as requiring time for a substantial amount of homework and added that he would have taken more AP courses but did not feel motivated to do the amount of work necessary. Students spoke of optional AP study sessions and/or tutoring offered by their AP teachers. Table 30 below presents the survey responses corresponding to awareness of courses and availability.

Table 30.

		N	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	N/A
Students are aware of the AP courses available at school.	Teachers	170	2%	12%	51%	22%	13%
I am aware of the AP courses available in my school.	Students	2831	4%	15%	46%	35%	---
The school should offer more AP courses.	Teachers	169	11%	38%	24%	14%	14%
My school should offer more AP courses.	Students	2831	6%	27%	45%	23%	---

As shown above, teachers (73%) and students (81%) were in general agreement that students were aware of the AP courses available at their school. Again, it may be possible that teachers underestimate the awareness that students have because of enrollment or because students may not state this knowledge explicitly. There was more of a disparity across responses pertaining to whether or not the school should offer more AP courses. In contrast to the equal proportion of teachers who agreed/disagreed with offering more AP courses during 2008-2009, 49% of teachers who completed the survey this year disagreed that the school should offer more AP courses while only 38% agreed with this statement. Teacher focus group responses provided little supporting information for either "side." One teacher did, however, speak of challenges that came with the AP program. For example, while this teacher spoke of the potential constraints the school's finances

had on course offerings, stating that some AP courses did not happen because of minimal enrollment. The teacher also mentioned that some classes reached capacity faster than others did, and if this happened, there was a chance that some students could not take that course. All teachers did positively acknowledge that the number of AP sections has increased. Student responses showed a greater variation with 68% in agreement for more AP course offerings and 33% in disagreement. One possibility for the disparity between teachers and students is that students may want more variety in the course offerings and/or more courses in their subjects of interest.

As described in the section introduction, college credits are only earned with a passing score on an AP exam. Survey respondents were asked to respond to whether students' knew how to "sign up for the AP exam." Table 31 presents these results. Just less than one-half of the students (49%) agreed that they knew how to sign up. Parents were slightly more confident (56%), and teachers increasingly more confident than students and parents (72%). Teachers and parents were slightly more confident (72% and 56%, respectively).

Table 31.

		N	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	N/A
Students know how to sign up for the AP exam.	Teachers	168	3%	8%	53%	19%	17%
I know how to sign up for the AP exam.	Students	2818	15%	36%	27%	22%	---
My child knows how to sign up for the AP exam.	Parents	567	6%	15%	31%	25%	23% (DK)

While students were knowledgeable about how to sign up for the exam, there was no mention if students knew how to pay for it.

According to the LBUSD Research office, Lakewood High School offered 14 AP courses during the 2009-10 school year. There were 1,332 students enrolled in these courses, which is an approximate 4% decrease from the previous year. However, there were 1,194 AP exams taken during the school year by 620 students, an increase of about 3% in test-takers. In 2008-2009, there was an approximate 20% increase of test-takers.

Passing scores for granting college credits are typically determined by the post-secondary institution; however, the College Board has determined that a score of three or above is predictive of college success.⁵ Table 31a shows the number and percentage distribution of students and their AP exam scores. As shown in the table, 41% of the scores were at a three or above on their respective exams, which is an increase from 36% in 2008-2009.

⁵ College Board information available on their website <http://www.collegeboard.com>.

Table 31a. 2009-10 AP Exam Scores for Lakewood Students (N=1,194)

AP Exam Score	# Students	%
1	335	28%
2	373	31%
3	248	21%
4	148	12%
5	90	8%
TOTAL	1,194	100%

The evaluation team was unable to acquire disaggregated results by AP content, relevant subgroup, or SLC for this report. The above numbers may only be considered in comparison to the 2008-09 student scores. Overall, there was a very slight increase in the percentage of “passing” scores, and there were increases (though equally slight) in the number of students enrolled and the number of AP exams taken.

MILLIKAN HIGH SCHOOL

A. SLC Membership

During the 2009-10 academic year at Millikan High School, there were eight Small Learning Communities in operation, although one, KIUP, was in the process of phasing out.⁶ KIUP is being replaced by GREEN. Thus, as KIUP membership decreased, GREEN membership increased. Table 32 below illustrates the SLC membership for all of the survey respondents. As noted, approximately one percent of the students as well as the teacher/staff members did not know their assigned SLC while one percent of the parents could not identify their child’s SLC. As expected, the representation across groups for GREEN and KIUP was lower than the other SLCs given their respective phasing in and phasing out status. Similar to last year, STELLAR was also one of the least represented. Perhaps because many in this SLC were also ELD (English Language Development) students, students and their parents may not have felt comfortable responding to an English language survey or were unaware that a Spanish version was available.

Table 32. SLC Membership of all Millikan HS Survey Respondents

	Teachers/Staff	Students	Parents
COMPASS	12%	22%	22%
Global Tech	13%	22%	10%
GREEN	9%	6%	4%
KIUP	1%	2%	1%
MBA	13%	8%	4%
PEACE	15%	17%	25%
QUEST	17%	22%	32%
STELLAR	4%	1%	1%
Don’t Know	1%	1%	1%
Not part of an SLC	17%	0%	0%
TOTAL	127	1,246	426

Of the 13 students who participated in the focus groups, eight reported that they chose their SLC, one reported that he was encouraged to go into his current SLC because his grades in 8th grade weren’t high enough for his first choice, and four did not specify details about their SLC placement.

Before addressing the specifics of SLC development, it is helpful to know how many students were informed about SLCs before coming to Lakewood High School. In Table 33 below, 78% of students and 77% of parents agreed that their high school informed them about SLCs when they or their children were in middle school.

⁶ Millikan administrators reported seven SLCs as they considered KIUP/GREEN as one SLC.

Table 33.

		N	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	N/A
My high school informed me about SLCs when I was in middle school.	Students	1211	6%	16%	36%	42%	---
My child's high school informed me about SLCs when he/she was in middle school.	Parents	416	4%	12%	36%	41%	6% (DK)

B. SLC Development

Although not explicitly mentioned in the grant, SLC structures are intended to facilitate the implementation of the activities proposed as part of the grant goals. Given the nature of continuous reforms at LBUSD schools, the state of SLCs at Millikan High is also changing. It is critical, therefore, to first examine the state of development of SLCs, as they are the vehicles through which the grant goals will be met, before assessing the implementation of each of the four grant goals. As part of the focus group and interview process, participants were asked questions regarding the general state of SLC development at Millikan High. During these discussions, central themes emerged: SLC culture and climate and in-depth discussions on the challenges faced by administrators and teachers in the continuous development of SLCs. The following are the data findings broken down into three sections: SLC culture and climate and challenges of SLC development.

SLC Culture and Climate

There was consensus among teachers/staff that there was a strong SLC culture on campus that has both students and teachers identifying with their SLCs. This belief was supported by survey responses to items pertaining to understanding SLC purpose, goals, and roles. As evident by the results in Table 34 below, all three respondent groups generally agreed that they understood the purpose and goals of their SLCs. Furthermore, 91% of the teachers who took the survey reported that other staff understood the overall purpose and goals for having SLCs.

Table 34.

		N	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	N/A
I understand the purpose and goals of my SLC.	Staff	120	2%	3%	22%	67%	8%
	Students	1214	1%	4%	48%	46%	---
I understand the purpose and goals of my child's SLC.	Parents	421	1%	4%	47%	45%	3% (DK)
The faculty and staff at this school understand the purpose and goals for SLCs.	Staff	121	2%	4%	46%	45%	2%

Teachers/staff provided a variety of reasons that could explain the strong SLC culture and the above survey findings. There was a strong consensus that every SLC was working hard to tie the individual SLC goals to the Career Technical Education (CTE) Standards, which allowed for a clearer sense of direction for the lead teachers. Several teachers reported that community partnerships allowed for more in-depth projects for the students which helped solidify the unique identities of each SLC. Further, one teacher spoke about how important the grant money has been as it has increased the opportunities for professional development and increased the communication between horizontal and vertical teams.

Focus group students in all grade levels also described a very strong SLC culture on campus. Students attributed the tight-knit community feeling associated with SLCs to the fact that students were able to take core classes with their SLC peers throughout their time at Millikan. Many of the students talked about how it was nice to work with students who had similar interests. One student stated, “You see people at the same classes, so they help you out. People...have the same goals, so they are trying to achieve your destination.” Another student said, “When I am with people in the same SLC, I find it easier to work with them, and we usually think the same ideas and have the same notes and everything.” Further, students attributed the positive SLC culture to the ability to have closer relationships with teachers. One student compared her experience at her previous school with her experience at Millikan: “The school I was at, the teachers would just, if you fail, you fail. They wouldn’t help you at all. And here you see the difference, because they actually get into...helping you succeed.”

According to these students, SLC awareness began at the middle schools. Students reported that some general information about SLCs was provided to them in the 8th grade. Millikan counselors met with them at their middle schools and helped them select an SLC. Teachers who have recruited at the middle schools also reported that eighth graders, and in particular their parents, were concerned about which SLC they should sign up for. While one teacher reported that parents generally asked teachers for their opinion, the teacher replied that he told them it was best to take into account the student’s interest. Despite efforts to properly place a student in the best fitting SLC, some students, nevertheless, switched SLCs at some point. Generally, however, students stayed in their SLC because it was difficult to switch and switching may mean starting all over. According to both students and teachers, it was uncommon for students to switch.

Some survey items were aimed at investigating how all three respondent groups perceived the availability of opportunities to suggest changes to SLCs that would be heard and considered. These opportunities represent a form of support in that they provide members of each group with a voice, membership, and a potential role in SLC development. As shown in the response distribution in Table 35 below, 90% of the teacher respondents and 80% of the students were in general agreement that these opportunities were provided for them at their school. Approximately 75% of the teachers also agreed that students have such opportunities. Parents were asked to respond to a slightly different statement, one that addresses the opportunity to share thoughts/opinions on decisions specifically affecting their children. Although this item differs in scope from the other items, it still provides some indication of the support given to parents and by parents in the development of SLCs. In general, 87% of the parents agreed that they can express themselves with regard to decisions affecting their children.

Table 35.

		N	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	N/A
Faculty and staff at this school can suggest changes to the SLCs that are heard and considered.	Staff	121	2%	4%	47%	43%	3%
Students at this school can suggest changes to the SLCs that are heard and considered.	Students	1202	4%	16%	59%	21%	---
Parents can share their thoughts about decisions that affect their children.	Parents	394	2%	5%	51%	36%	6% (DK)
Students at this school can suggest changes to the SLCs that are heard and taken into consideration.	Staff	120	3%	12%	55%	20%	11%

The following items in Table 36 address the involvement of parents and community members in connection with SLC development. The item addresses the support Millikan provided to involve families and community members. Teachers (89%) and students (87%) generally agreed that the school supported this involvement. 56% of parents agreed with the statement, while 35% of parents had a “don’t know” response. It is possible that the inclusion of both families and community members in the same statement limited the parents’ responses.

Table 36.

		N	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	N/A
The school supports the involvement of families and community members in planning, reviewing, and improving SLC programs.	Staff	120	3%	5%	54%	35%	31%
	Students	1206	3%	11%	52%	35%	---
Families and people from the community help plan, review, or improve SLC programs.	Parents	413	1%	8%	38%	18%	35% (DK)

In the staff survey, respondents were asked to describe changes to the culture and climate of their school that could be attributed to SLCs. The specific question stated, “*Since the implementation of this grant (F2007), in what ways are SLCs changing the culture/climate of this school?*” Seventy-five teachers responded to this question. The main categories that resulted from the analysis were “Student-focused,” “Teacher/Staff-focused,” “Parent/Community-focused,” “Academic-focused,” and “School-focused.” The described changes varied by focus and level of positivity. Below is a list of the most common responses by focus.

Student-focused changes

- More personalized attention
- SLC pride
- Better student-student relationships

- More focused students
- More student buy-in

Teacher/Staff –focused changes

- More divisiveness between staff

Academic-focused changes

- More focus on college/academics

School-focused changes

- SLC inequity/divisiveness

The above responses reflect varying teacher perspectives of the overall culture and climate of their school since the implementation of the SLC grant. As previously mentioned, there was general agreement that students felt a sense of belonging and teacher collaboration/involvement has improved. Despite reporting that there were more positive interactions among both students and staff, there were nevertheless some teachers who indicated that divisiveness existed within the student body and among staff. Teachers discussed academic-focused changes as a greater focus on college/academics. This corresponds to focus group responses in which teachers of pure classes indicated that they constantly worked on action plans every year to “build and add more rigor and structure to our SLC.” This year, as had been done in 2008-2009, they continued to introduce rigor to the courses taught at Millikan by working towards establishing more AP classes. As they discussed these actions, teachers recognized that they needed to address how to provide academic support to tutor students so they can meet those academic challenges.

Another negative finding was a perceived divisiveness or inequity among SLCs. In the “Challenges to SLC Development” section of this report, there is an in-depth discussion of the findings regarding the identified student and teacher divisiveness as well as the perceived stratified SLC culture. As illustrated by the list above, most changes were student-related.

Challenges to SLC Development

Teachers, students, and administrators were asked to describe the challenges to SLC development. The responses varied by group. Teachers were most concerned with the limited number of electives students were able to take, not having an SLC aligned with an industry sector, and staying true to the idea of small learning communities. Yet, there was one teacher who commented that the SLCs need to find a way to “open things up” and make SLC activities accessible to the entire campus. While not explicitly stated, these last two issues seemed to reflect conflicting ideas as to whether it was best to maintain “pure” SLC classes, or to allow for a greater mixture of students, especially when it came to larger projects. The teachers were also very concerned about potentially losing one-third of the teaching staff for the 2010-2011 year due to budgetary restraints.

While many of the teachers had different ideas of the greatest challenges facing successful SLC implementation, at least two of the teachers spoke about their concern that the A through G requirements made it difficult for students to take classes like art. Specifically, one teacher noted, “If kids can only take six classes, there’s not room for an art elective where they could go, because they will take their foreign language before they take an art elective.” The teacher who mentioned the

lack of alignment with an industry sector also noted that this was a “catch-22.” On one hand, it was difficult to not have the clear-cut pathways that coincide with being aligned with an industry sector, but also that “in the tradition of GATE programs [and in order to] maintain that potentiality of the gifted student, we don’t really want to align with a certain industry sector.”

As previously mentioned, teachers reported a concern regarding funding. For this year in particular, teachers were aware of a potential loss of one-third of the teaching staff. One teacher worried that this would negatively impact the progress that the SLCs have made thus far, “We’re faced with losing up to 49 staff members out of 180 which is nearly one third of our staff. That will have a significant impact on that knowledge base if we in fact lose that many. It will be probably a five year setback I think because it’s been a good five years that we’ve had this ship up and running.”

While students did not elaborate extensively on perceived differences among SLCs, they did briefly mention that there were subtle stereotypes. One student openly stated, “There is definitely a hierarchy between the SLCs. It goes, this is what people generally think, but it’s QUEST, PEACE, Compass, MBA, I think Global, then Green. Certain people project more than others.” Another student mentioned that some people in certain SLCs claimed to be better than others, but also said that this ultimately did not matter, as the school has students from each SLC that have the “same brightness, intelligence, so you can’t say that one is better...” While not a direct reference to perceived hierarchies, one student described his experience selecting his SLC in 8th grade:

I pretty much got into [Green] because in 8th grade, when we were getting talked to about our grades and...what we would be assigned to, they said, because in 6th and 7th my grades weren’t as good as 8th grade, and they thought Green would be best for me, so I could like work that back up.

It was clear that students, at least on some level, understood the academic differences between the SLCs, and that some were more appropriate for students with higher GPAs.

With regard to SLC challenges, administrators spoke mostly about budget and the difficulty of maintaining equity when finances were problematic. There was also mention of how these financial difficulties might lead to SLC inequity. When asked what he saw as the biggest challenges for SLC, the principal replied:

Doing it at a time when there’s no money. Luckily the grant comes with money, but it still doesn’t cover everything. The finances are an issue, because we’re constantly losing something. For instance...in the PEACE academy, they’re slated to lose something like...four of their brightest teachers. We don’t know if they’ll be able to keep them. That’s all because those teachers are low on the seniority totem pole. [A] Big issue is keeping it so that we have the continuity. The other thing is having some of the SLCs who are just forging forward, and then having others that...don’t have all the bells and whistles that others do, and the kids look at them and say, ‘Why can’t I have that?’

To address some of these challenges, teacher/staff were asked, “*What additional resources do you feel you will need to meet the goals of the SLC grant?*” Sixty-nine teachers responded to this question. The most common responses by theme are summarized below.

Teacher/Staff-focused resources:

- More time for teacher collaboration
- Small class size
- Adequate staffing
- Need head SLC counselors

Student-focused:

- Proper placement of students
- Better student AP preparation
- More tutoring for students
- More mentoring opportunities

School-focused resources:

- Better access to modern technology

Scheduling resources:

- Keep 4x4 schedule

Other resources:

- Funding for parent workshops regarding college
- Community partnerships
- Supplies

To summarize, teachers, students, and administrators reported that there was a strong SLC culture on campus. Teachers indicated that there have been improvements in the understanding of SLCs, personalization, and academic rigor. According to teachers and administrators, increased test scores served as evidence that SLCs were leading to improved student achievement. Students reported enjoying their SLCs and believed they were placed appropriately. Challenges to SLC development, however, persisted. There was consensus among teachers and administrators that the master schedule continued to pose challenges in generating pure classes as well as limiting the number of electives each student could take. Teachers and administrators acknowledged their anxiety with funding for continuous professional development and SLC identity- building activities. There was a lengthy discussion by students regarding the hierarchical SLC structure they detected at their school. It is important to recognize and understand these successes and challenges as they illustrate the state of development of SLCs at Millikan High. Because this state of development provides the context under which the grant goals are being implemented, it is critical to review it continuously when investigating if and how the grant goals are being met.

C. Overall Grant Awareness

The individuals most familiar with details of the grant were the two primary administrators (principal and SLC coordinator). Both were very familiar with the grant goals and indicated that they adhered primarily to the sections of the management action plan that aligned with other district and school-

wide initiatives. Some of the activities of other grants implemented at the school also worked towards meeting the SLC grant's goals despite not being listed in the management action plan. The administrators each discussed the status of each goal and highlighted the successes and challenges of each. The status of the four goals is presented below:

- Goal 1 – *Through a comprehensive guidance and academic advising program for students and their parents, prepare all students to succeed in postsecondary education and careers.*
According to the administrators, the school has done well in terms of meeting the activities stated under this goal. Specifically, the principal emphasized that Goal 1 was also the goal of the high school, the SLC grant, the WASC document, and that it was also included in their AVID demonstration school grant piece. He continued, “We’re pushing forward with that on a daily basis to increase the rigor, to increase the opportunities, to increase the graduation rate, and to increase the students who have A through G requirements so that they can go on to whatever they want after high school.” One teacher commented that her SLC was trying to incorporate a college and career unit in which students could explore different colleges and careers, and a different teacher spoke about the intent to align with CTE standards and incorporating them into the classrooms and outcome charts.
- Goal 2 – *Provide intensive interventions in reading/ language arts and math skills.*
Administrators mentioned that many student interventions existed and that they were doing well. One administrator noted that Millikan had a comprehensive math program with “everything for the top-end student to the struggling student,” and commented that they were working on interventions all the time with students struggling in math and English. The double-dose math and literacy program was mentioned by both administrators as an intervention that was successful. Further, the principal spoke about the development of a similar double-dose program for English learners, where reading and English would be emphasized.
- Goal 3 – *Enroll and support students in a coherent sequence of rigorous English, math and science courses to succeed in postsecondary education and/or careers.*
According to one administrator, Millikan was the high school in LBUSD with the highest attainment of A through G requirements. However, there was concern that maintaining this would be difficult without the extra money from a different grant that allowed for more full-time employment. Specifically, the money allowed for some student to have eight-period days instead of six-period days, and this would likely discontinue without the proper funds.
- Goal 4 – *Increase opportunities for students to earn postsecondary credit through AP courses.*
Administrators and teachers alike spoke of the success of the AP program. While one administrator mentioned that enrollment for certain AP courses was weaker than they’d like, there were efforts in the form of classroom visits that sought to improve those numbers. Further, the principal remarked that when he began working at Millikan ten years prior, there were 200 students taking the AP tests. In 2009-2010, there were approximately 1,000 students taken the AP tests. One teacher commented, “The program, which used to be exclusive, has opened up. There has been a cultural paradigm shift at this school where when I started AP it was only...that group and it was a select group. And now everyone wants to take AP.” A different teacher spoke about the increased school-wide focus on taking AP classes, “The number of sessions has improved. We’ve seen a growth in the

number of students taking AP classes for three or four years now, [and] it's just continuing to go up and up.”

Teachers in the focus groups acknowledged that they had a general awareness of the grant but could not provide details and did not seem to think it necessary to know the specific details by memory. Furthermore, although not explicitly stated, some teachers, counselors, and administrators credited the grant for allowing SLCs to further develop their identity, a goal they seemed to perceive as part of the grant. One administrator explained that as SLCs worked towards achieving the goals set forth in the grant, they consequently strengthened SLCs. They seemed to go hand-in-hand. However, one administrator was clear that the purpose of the SLC initiative was to achieve the four goals proposed in the grant. Teachers did mention activities in which they participated that did work towards meeting the grant goals but they did not necessarily link them directly to the grant. Because some initiatives overlapped, it was difficult for teachers and counselors to distinguish which activity was connected to which reform.

D. Goal #1: Prepare all students for success in postsecondary education and careers without the need for remediation.

The goal of preparing students for success in postsecondary education and careers is very broad and encompasses school-wide as well as SLC-specific efforts. The majority of the activities under this goal are geared toward postsecondary success and do not directly emphasize the objective of preparing students “without the need for remediation.” Nevertheless, two major areas emerged through the data that supported achievement of this goal: student expectations and post-secondary knowledge, support, and preparedness. Under these major themes, survey results associated with academic support and remediation are also addressed. It is important to note that while remediation is not specifically addressed here, efforts such as tutoring are discussed under subsequent goals.

Goal-Related Activities

Several activities are listed under Goal #1 in the grant’s action plan. These activities are as follows:

- Bi-Annual Saturday Report Card Parent Meetings
- College Preparedness Workshops
- SLC Parent Booster Club
- Parent Institutes
- Training and Use of School Loop Program
- Training and Use of Tele-Parent Program
- Middle School Outreach Regarding SLC Pathways
- Increased Connections to Faith and Community-Based Organizations and Businesses

Data pertaining to a portion of the above activities were generated through interviews, focus groups, and survey items. Not all of the above activities could be addressed through the data collection efforts. Reasons primarily included time limitations for interviews/focus groups and generalized descriptions by respondents. Furthermore, absence of specific activities does not necessarily indicate that they did not occur; rather, it may be that since they were not specifically part of the interview,

respondents may not have discussed them. It should also be noted that not all activities were designed for 100% participation by staff.

- 50% (of 127) of the staff survey respondents reported participation in Bi-Annual Saturday Report Card Parent Meetings. One administrator talked about the difficulty with Saturday Report Cards: “I think that design of that activity originally was that parents would be motivated to come get a report card, and then be motivated to have conferences...and what we realized is that the motivation to get the report card is actually not very strong.” As a result of this lack of involvement, this administrator spoke of a potential restructuring of the activity.
- 7% (of 127) of the staff reported that they participated in College Preparedness Workshops. However, such workshops or similar activities may have been geared toward the students. Various college preparedness activities did take place (e.g. field trips, AVID activities) and are discussed more fully in the subsequent section “Post-secondary Support, Knowledge, and Preparedness.”
- 10% (of 127) of the staff reported that they participated in Bi-Annual Parent Institutes. There was no other data to support whether or not these institutes were implemented.
- 65% (of 127) of the staff reported that they participated in training for School Loop and 89% (of 127) of staff reported having used the School Loop Program. Two teachers mentioned School Loop, referring to various items (AP exam dates and college speakers) that had been posted on the site over the year.
- 50% (of 127) of the staff reported that they participated in Training and 41% (of 127) of staff reported having used the Tele-Parent Program.
- 26% (of 127) of the staff reported that they participated in Middle School Outreach Regarding SLC Pathways.
- 11% (of 127) of the staff reported that they participated in Increased Connections to Faith and Community-Based Organizations and Businesses. During focus groups, teachers spoke of a community partnership with Meals on Wheels, Heavyweight Car Club, and Comprehensive Child Development Center.

In addition to the list above, administrators, and teachers spoke of college field trips, counseling websites, career research, and other career-related activities that students were engaged in that align to this goal. Relevant activities will be discussed more fully in the subsequent section “Post-secondary Support, Knowledge, and Preparedness.”

Expectations of Students

Research has shown that establishing high expectations for students leads to high academic achievement (NCREL, 2004).⁷ As shown in Table 37, 93% of the staff survey respondents generally agreed with the statement, “Teachers have high expectations for all students.” Similarly, 91% of the students and 90% of the parents also believed that teachers held high expectations for all students.

Table 37.

		N	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	N/A
Teachers have high expectations for all students.	Staff	118	3%	3%	49%	44%	1%
	Students	1176	2%	7%	47%	44%	---
	Parents	420	2%	6%	47%	43%	2% (DK)

Teacher survey respondents were asked to indicate what percentage of their students they believed would achieve each potential educational level. It was intended that each educational option would stand alone; however, analyses of the data revealed response overlap and therefore could not be appropriately or reliably interpreted.

Post-secondary Support, Knowledge, and Preparedness

The results in this section specifically address the support, knowledge, and preparation necessary for post-secondary success. The first series of survey items are about the staff-student communication that would support students in their understanding of the application and financial requirements of post-secondary education. As shown in Table 38, the majority of teachers/staff (87%) responded that they spoke with their students about how to get into college; however, this percentage has decreased from 96% in 2008-2009. In contrast, 65% of students reported that they talked to their teacher about how to get into college, while 35% reported that they did not. These numbers show a shift in the number of students who are talking with their teachers, as approximately 45% reported that they talked with their teacher in 2008-2009. In considering the disparity in responses between staff and students, it may be important to note that these items were written with the respondent in the active role. In other words, had the student item been written as “Teachers talk to me about how to get into college,” there may have been less of a disparity. It is highly possible that the students were considering their own active role in engaging teachers in these conversations and less about whether or not these conversations took place at all. With regard to paying for college, 80% of the staff generally agreed that students spoke to teachers and/or counselors, while only 50% of the students were likely to agree. As expected, students at higher grade levels were more likely to agree than their younger counterparts. Finally, although 20-26% of the parents responded that they did not know whether these communications occurred, they were more likely to agree than disagree that their children communicated with teachers about getting into college (53%), but more likely to disagree than agree that their children talk to his/her counselor or teacher about how to pay for

⁷ North Central Regional Educational Laboratory (2004). High Expectations. Available online: <http://www.ncrel.org/sdrs/areas/issues/students/atrisk/at6lk11.htm>. Retrieved July 2009.

college (42% and 32%, respectively). For this question in particular, there was a notable percentage of parents (26%) who did not know whether these conversations about paying for college were taking place.

Table 38.

		N	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	N/A
I talk with my students about how to get into college.	Staff	117	0%	3%	33%	54%	9%
I talk to my teacher about how to get into college.	Students	1138	6%	29%	40%	25%	---
My child talks to his/her teacher about how to get into college.	Parents	414	4%	23%	36%	17%	20% (DK)
Students talk to teachers and/or counselors about how to pay for college.	Staff	115	1%	10%	43%	37%	9%
I talk to my teacher or counselor about how to pay for college.	Students	1125	8%	41%	34%	16%	---
My child talks to his/her teacher or counselor about how to pay for college.	Parents	415	7%	35%	20%	12%	26% (DK)

Providing students with post-secondary support was evident through the emphases on college preparedness. Several teachers from the focus group interviews spoke about college field trips, and one teacher discussed how she helped her students gain experience with the CSUs:

I'm having the students create an account with CSU so they go through the process. Their junior year they create portfolios. I work with them on creating a resume, an introduction letter. They start applying for certain scholarships and also looking at alternatives, alternate programs if they're not going for traditional academic four year college."

Another teacher reiterated, "Everything we do is A through G, and a lot of the capstones are now A through G as well." While many teachers spoke of the importance of college visits (both taking field trips and having representatives on campus), one teacher expressed concern about the potential decrease in these activities due to budgetary restrictions. Specifically, "universities [cut] staff by 50 percent and they're cutting the people who go out [to the schools] by another 50 percent, which means we are only getting 25 percent of the visitations [compared to previous years]."

As presented in table 39 below, 78% of parents agreed that they had read a school-wide newsletter that highlighted SLCs, while a smaller percentage of students (61%) reported having read a school-wide newsletter highlighting SLCs. It is likely that a higher percentage of parents read the newsletter due to the fact that these newsletters were often sent to the home of the student with the primary purpose of informing the parents. An almost equal percentage of students (66%) and parents (62%) agreed that they had read a school-wide newsletter that highlighted college information. Similarly, a nearly equal percentage of students (52%) and parents (50%) agreed that they had read a school-wide newsletter that highlighted career information. The reason for a higher percentage of parents and students reading SLC-themed newsletters as opposed to career- or college-themed newsletter is unknown.

Table 39.

		N	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	N/A
I have read a school-wide newsletter that highlights SLCs.	Students	1200	7%	32%	38%	23%	---
	Parents	418	3%	12%	48%	30%	8% (DK)
I have read a school-wide newsletter that highlights college information.	Students	1133	12%	32%	37%	29%	---
	Parents	415	4%	22%	40%	22%	11% (DK)
I have read a school-wide newsletter that highlights career information.	Students	1131	13%	35%	36%	16%	---
	Parents	416	6%	31%	35%	15%	13% (DK)

AVID and Pathways are two programs that Millikan students also engaged in toward college preparedness. These programs were implemented school-wide and not SLC-specific. As explained by a few teachers, AVID targeted “underrepresented students” that focused on college-ready skills (e.g. note-taking, organization). The majority of focus group students attributed their post-secondary knowledge and preparation to their participation in AVID. Pathways is a separate course sequence, funded by another grant, which takes 11th grade students through the application process (including essay writing). The goal was for students to have a collection of sample application essays and research into their schools of interest. During focus groups, two teachers directly spoke of Pathways. One talked about changing the mission and objectives of Global Tech, stating, “The biggest change we made going into this year was we changed our 10th grade technology class and focused more on a rigorous program with having all of our students take computer programming in 10th grade before leading into their pathways.” A different teacher spoke of an effort to create a district-wide cohesion with The Academic and Career Success Initiative, which is in line with the multiple pathways.

Post-secondary support was also evident in helping students to research and prepare for careers as well as college. One teacher spoke of using Millikan’s career center to give presentations on writing resumes, getting recommendation letters, and completing applications. Teachers also described similar efforts. A different teacher confirmed, “All of our SLCs, we all do CTE stuff related to students being able to fill out job applications, creating resumes. All that stuff is built in to all our SLCs as well. We use the career center a lot. All of us send our students over there to fill out the FAFSA financial aid forms and everything else, research colleges and so forth.”

Staff and student survey respondents were asked about field trips and guest speakers. As may be expected, all of the following student responses increased in percentage with increasing grade levels.

- 32% (of 127) of the staff agreed, “at least one speaker visited my classroom to talk to students about careers.” 76% (of 1132) of the students agreed with this statement.
- 28% (of 127) of the staff indicated, “at least one speaker visited my classroom to talk to students about college/university.” 80% (of 1134) of the students agreed with this statement.

- 20% (of 127) of the staff reported, “I have taken my students on at least one trip to visit a college/university.” 43% (of 1132) of the students agreed that they had taken at least one trip to a college/university.
- 10% (of 127) of the staff reported, “I have taken my students on at least one trip somewhere to explore careers.” 33% (of 1132) of the students agreed that they had taken at least one trip to explore careers.

Student focus group respondents were asked how their teachers and counselors helped prepare them for college. Other than what has already been described, various students explained that many teachers spoke with them about their own personal college/career experiences and backgrounds. According to students, many teachers also geared lessons to include skills that would prepare them for college-level work. One student spoke of the importance of having an entire unit on college preparedness, stating, “It just helps you get prepared for college.”

State universities in California, whether in the UC or the CSU systems, have specific course requirements (A-G requirements) that students must complete prior to admission. In addition, successful completion of one or more standardized tests is required. These test requirements are not limited to state universities and may also be used for placement into particular majors and programs. Table 40 contains the results of the two items that address students’ knowledge of these two critical requirements for application and admission into universities. As the table shows, close to 95% of teacher and student respondent groups agreed that students were aware of the A-G requirements, while 86% of parents agreed that their students were aware of these requirements. In general, teacher and counselors acknowledged the school-wide emphasis on meeting the A-G requirements.

Table 40 also shows that similar proportions of students (82%) and parents (76%) agreed that students were aware of what standardized tests were required. These proportions were lower in comparison to the first item. Disaggregating student responses by grade level, student awareness of standardized tests did increase by grade level. However, the disparities across the grades were slightly smaller for this current year than for 2008-09, suggesting that more students were made aware of this particular testing during their first years at Millikan.

Table 40.

		N	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	N/A
Students are aware of the A-G requirements needed to get into a UC or CSU.	Staff	116	0%	4%	43%	49%	3%
I am aware of the A-G requirements needed to get into a UC or CSU.	Students	1136	1%	5%	39%	55%	---
My child knows about the A-G requirements needed to get into a UC or CSU.	Parents	415	2%	6%	45%	41%	6% (DK)
My child knows which standardized test(s) he/she needs to take to apply for college.	Parents	415	3%	11%	45%	31%	11% (DK)
I know which standardized test(s) he/she needs to take to apply for college.	Students	1128	3%	16%	46%	36%	---

Survey respondents were asked about students' preparation for post-secondary success in two ways: subsequent to high school graduation and overall. It was implied, in this first item in Table 41 below, that time and engagement in high school has provided the necessary preparation for either a post-secondary education or a career. Of all three respondent groups, students and parents were the most confident in this preparation (92% and 87%, respectively). Staff members were also generally confident albeit to a lesser degree (82%).

Table 41.

		N	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	N/A
By the time students graduate from this school, they will be prepared to succeed at the college or career of their choice.	Staff	117	2%	15%	55%	27%	3%
By the time I graduate from this school, I will be prepared to succeed at the college or career of my choice	Students	1139	2%	5%	46%	46%	---
By the time my child graduates from this school, s/he will be prepared to succeed at the college or career of his/her choice.	Parents	416	1%	6%	50%	37%	6% (DK)

The items in Table 42 address the students' and parents' perceptions of their ability to pay for a post-secondary education from various sources. In general, students were generally more confident (79%) that they could afford attendance at a 4-year institution than their parents (66%). It is possible that although parents have a great awareness of the family resources, they may not be as aware of scholarship and financial aid opportunities. Conversely, students may not be aware of the actual status of the family resources and therefore may be more confident in that particular source of income than the parents.

Table 42.

		N	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	N/A
I think I can afford to attend a public, 4-year college using financial aid, scholarships, or my family's resources.	Students	1135	5%	16%	48%	31%	---
I think I can pay to send my child to a public, 4-year college with my income, financial aid, or scholarships.	Parents	416	11%	13%	44%	22%	9% (DK)

Support and Remediation

The following survey items address academic support. As described earlier, the portion of the goal that specifies support without the need for remediation was not evaluable since both the activities listed under this goal and the data collected was not sufficient to draw valid conclusions. The items presented in Table 43 below give some indication as to the academic support given to and perceived by the students and may serve as an indirect indicator of this portion of the goal.

Table 43.

		N	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	N/A
The administration, teachers, and staff at this school work together to assist students who may be at risk of failing.	Staff	117	2%	5%	53%	39%	1%
	Students	1170	3%	11%	53%	33%	---
	Parents	413	4%	9%	41%	30%	15% (DK)
I talk with other teachers about students who might be struggling academically.	Staff	117	1%	2%	32%	62%	3%
I feel supported by my teachers in my academic performance in class.	Students	1185	3%	8%	47%	43%	---
My child feels supported by his/her teachers in his/her academic performance in class.	Parents	414	2%	11%	50%	31%	5% (DK)

The first item addresses a school-wide effort at supporting students deemed at risk of failing. As shown, the majority of the staff (92%) agreed that all work together to provide this support. Students and parents also agreed, although to a lesser extent (86% and 71%, respectively). It is possible that parents do not have as much awareness within the context of the school as teachers, administrators and students do. Furthermore, 94% of the staff agreed that they personally talked with other teachers regarding struggling students. Finally, 90% of the students agreed felt they received academic support from their classroom teachers. Parents also agreed (81%) that their children felt supported by their teachers.

E. Goal #2: Provide intensive interventions in reading/language arts and math skills.

The objectives for Millikan’s intervention endeavors were for all students to have access to support and preventative measures that are academic, emotional, and social. Intervention was an area that has received attention since the beginning of the grant.

Goal-Related Activities

Several activities are listed under goal #2 in the grant’s action plan.

- Implement School-wide Literacy Strategies
- Implement School-wide Numeracy Strategies
- Math Department Lesson Study
- Support Language!, Literacy Workshop, and Stretch Algebra AB/CD Classes with College Aides
- Carnegie Lab Training and Computer Support
- Provide after school tutoring

Data pertaining to a portion of the above activities was generated through interviews, focus groups, and survey items. Not all of the above activities could be addressed through the data collection efforts. Reasons primarily included time limitations for interviews/focus groups and generalized descriptions by respondents. It should also be noted that not all activities were designed for 100% participation by staff.

- 57% (of 127) of the staff reported that they implemented literacy strategies.
- 35% (of 127) of the staff reported that they implemented numeracy strategies.
- 12% (of 127) of the staff reported that they had participated in the Math Department Lesson Study.
- 8% (of 127) of the staff reported that a college aide was assigned to their classroom. Two teachers spoke of the option of receiving extra help from either the teacher or a college aide, and one reported that college aides were helpful to the intervention goals.
- 3% (of 1,249) of the students reported that they had used the Carnegie Lab for math improvement, while 6% (of 127) of staff reported that they had participated in training for the Carnegie Lab. One administrator spoke of the difficulty of accomplishing all the components of this second goal. In particular, the potential benefits of the Carnegie Lab were up for debate. Specifically, he noted that there was a lack of data and overt interest from teachers to show that the Carnegie Lab would be an essential aspect of this grant goal.
- 58% (of 127) of the staff reported that they had provided after school tutoring, while 28% (of 1,249) of the students reported that they had participated in after school tutoring. When asked about interventions provided by Millikan, almost all teachers and students spoke about after school tutoring as an effective option for extra help.

Other intervention-related activities described by both administrators and staff that are not explicitly listed in the grant's action plans included the use of School Loop and LROIX to identify students in need, a new CAHSEE lab for teachers to assist students at various levels, and intervention reading and math classes designed to help student at the lower levels.

Tutoring emerged as a predominant intervention effort that Millikan has engaged in during the school year. Tutoring is not listed under this goal as an intervention activity; rather, it was written in the grant under Goal #3. However, the majority of the data that were collected on tutoring emerged as part of the school's intervention efforts and therefore is discussed under this goal.

Tutoring

Tutoring and related efforts at Millikan took place for various subjects and at different times. The following is a list of tutoring activities, both general and SLC-specific, mentioned within the teacher focus groups:

- After-school tutoring in all subjects (library)

- Algebra tutoring (peer tutoring and teacher-guided)
- Peer tutoring – older students help younger students
- Math Department – teachers scheduled for 2-3 hours, tutor before lunch or after school
- SLC teachers post tutoring schedules for students and parents
- Informal mentoring for top 10 program (10 students at lowest levels per grade)
- Teachers tutoring in classrooms before, during, and after school
- SLC study halls
- One-on-one tutoring for CAHSEE with seniors
- CAHSEE study lab (various grade levels)
- English and Reading coaches

Focus group students also spoke of tutoring in its many forms. They expressed awareness that their own teachers as well as others were available to them when they needed help. A few students also expressed the awareness that students did not have to be referred for tutoring; rather, it was available to anyone who wanted it. All of the students were very aware of the tutoring opportunities available to them. Two students acknowledged the efforts that teachers put into tutoring students. One student commented, “I know all the PEACE teachers are really dedicated to helping kids along who are struggling, like my math teacher, she will stay until five or six helping the kids and doing stuff, so that’s a big help.” Another echoed, “My teacher encourages a lot of people go to tutoring because not a lot of people [have good grades]. But she offers it to everyone, that’s cool.”

Staff, students, and parents responded to several survey items which addressed tutoring and other academic help. The first series of items pertained to the tutoring efforts provided by the school in both reading/language arts and mathematics. As shown in Table 44 on the following page, staff was in general agreement that Millikan provided additional tutoring in reading/language arts (94%) and math (98%). Students also agreed about additional tutoring, albeit to a lesser extent than the staff (84% and 86% for reading and math, respectively). It is possible that students had different perceptions of the survey item that included the phrase “outside the school day.” Data on tutoring showed that these activities took place both during and after school and therefore, some students may have considered only after school tutoring as falling outside the school day. Responses to the parent survey showed that 76% generally agreed that the school offered reading or math to students who need it. A smaller proportion of parents (48%) agreed that it occurred outside of the classroom, and a notable 33% of parents disagreed that their children got more academic help in reading or math outside of the classroom, while 19% reported that they did not know whether this occurred. This lower proportion may also be attributed to inconsistent interpretation of the phrase “outside his/her class.”

Table 44.

		N	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	N/A
For students who need it, the school provides additional tutoring in reading/language arts.	Staff	117	1%	2%	32%	62%	3%
For those who need it, the school gives them more tutoring in reading/language arts outside the school day.	Students	1165	2%	13%	53%	31%	---
For students who need it, the school provides additional tutoring in math.	Staff	118	1%	0%	29%	69%	2%
For those who need it, the school gives them more tutoring in math outside the school day.	Students	1168	3%	12%	53%	33%	---
The school provides more academic tutoring in reading or math for those who need it.	Parents	419	3%	4%	45%	31%	16% (DK)
My child got more academic help (like tutoring) in reading or math outside his/her class.	Parents	412	7%	26%	30%	18%	19% (DK)

More students were likely to disagree that they received more help in reading (62%) and math (56%) through tutoring or by having more than one class in that subject per semester (see Table 45 below). Given that students positively reported on the availability of tutoring, it was possible that students were responding to the additional class portion of the statement.

Table 45.

		N	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	N/A
I got more help in reading/language arts through tutoring or by having more than one English class per semester.	Students	1166	17%	45%	26%	12%	---
I got more academic help in math through tutoring or by having more than one math class per semester.	Students	1159	15%	41%	30%	14%	---

Finally, all three groups responded to the tutoring support provided by the students' individual teachers. All respondents similarly agreed that the staff was personally involved in tutoring students – staff (73%), students' (78%), and parents (68%). (See Table 46).

Table 46.

		N	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	N/A
I am involved in tutoring students who need additional academic support.	Staff	117	0%	6%	41%	32%	21%
My teachers tutor me when I need more academic support.	Students	1136	4%	18%	51%	27%	---
My child's teachers tutor him/her when s/he needs some additional academic support.	Parents	413	5%	15%	47%	21%	12% (DK)

College Aides

As listed in the above section on Goal #2 activities, Millikan has employed college aides to provide support to students in need.⁸ During interviews and focus groups, students spoke positively of college aides, and to some extent, their responsibilities, “We have college tutors in all the time for tutorial or if you have a question in any subject we can ask them and they give us individual help and prepare you for college.” Another student pointed to the benefits of having different instructional techniques from the college aides, “If you don’t understand something, or if the teacher is not explaining it to the point where you can understand, you can ask them and they can break it down for you.”

College aides have indeed been used as an intervention strategy to support teachers and 76% of the staff survey respondents believed that Millikan employed the assistance of college aides to improve literacy and/or numeracy achievement. However, only 8% of the teachers indicated that a college aide was placed into their specific classroom. Nevertheless, teachers positively discussed the contributions made by the employment of college aides.

F. Goal #3: Enroll and support students in a coherent sequence of rigorous English, Math, and Science courses to succeed in postsecondary education and/or careers.

The administrators at Millikan both agreed that rigor and relevance provided a push for focus in the instruction and curriculum within the SLCs. According to these administrators, the SLCs have spent at least four years working on creating backwards mapping and coherent sequences of courses. Staff has participated in professional development to further develop these efforts. It was also explained that although much of the planning time has been covered through the SLC grant, this work was also built into the SLC Monday meeting times.

Teachers were asked about their understanding of what a coherent sequence meant to them. It was evident through focus group discussion that teachers believed coherence was related to the collaborative efforts made by staff. Rigor was expressed as “integrating the career and academic goals of every student,” and it was clear that the term was tied closely with student achievement.

⁸ The use of college aides in Science courses is listed as a Goal #3 activity and is discussed in that section.

Vertical teaming across grade levels, horizontal teaming and cross-curricular projects were discussed as the primary endeavors engaged in by school staff toward achieving this goal.

Goal-Related Activities

Several activities are listed under goal #3 in the grant's action plan. These activities are as follows:

- Summer Curriculum Institutes to Further Refine Curriculum
- District and Site-Based Professional Learning Community Workshops
- Train and Support Link Crew Program
- Training on Differentiated Instructional Techniques
- Develop and Modify Curriculum to Provide More Connections to SLC Themes/Careers
- Master Schedule Building
- Develop strategies for working with SLCs

Data pertaining to a portion of the above activities was generated through interviews, focus groups, and survey items. Not all of the above activities could be addressed through the data collection efforts. Reasons primarily included time limitations for interviews/focus groups and generalized descriptions by respondents. It should also be noted that not all activities were designed for 100% participation by staff.

- 23% (of 127) of staff indicated that they participated in Summer Curriculum Institutes.
- 34% (of 127) of staff participated in District Professional Learning Community Workshops; 51% participated in Site-based workshops.
- 2% (of 127) of staff participated in training for Link Crew.
- 51% (of 127) of staff reported receiving training on Differentiated Instructional Techniques.
- 46% (of 127) of staff reported that they worked to develop and modify curriculum with greater connections to SLC themes/careers (related discussion appears in subsequent section on Vertical/Horizontal Teaming).
- 22% (of 127) of staff helped with Master Schedule building.

Teacher Collaboration

The occurrence and extent of teacher collaboration may be considered indicators of the overall goal of coherence as well as the activity related to the development and modification of curriculum with greater SLC connections. One teacher described the potential benefits of increased teacher collaboration:

I think there's a lot of power behind [collaboration]. It's very subtle. It's very important. The next layer I think really happens when teachers start talking and collaborating and

working together to do some of the [activities and projects] you've heard today. I mean there's some great, great stuff that really happens when teachers have the time to collaborate.

Several focus group teachers spoke positively about collaboration across both grade levels and departments. One teacher added that the students realized that through teaming, teachers spoke with one another regarding students and therefore worked to raise students' effort levels. Teachers and students both experienced greater connection to the SLCs. Teachers reported greater collaboration among teachers with the teaming efforts and an increase in intercurricular projects. Several students also discussed various cross-curricular projects that they have engaged in at their school. They acknowledged that teachers did plan classes together, and one student gave an example of intercurricular studies:

In my English class, we are reading a book called *Animal Farm*...and they related it with history, because my history teacher was talking about the same thing. But *Animal Farm* is based off real life events that happened in Russia during the Communist Party. And in History we were actually talking about what was going on in there, while in English we were talking about the events that were happening in the book that were related to that.

Two items on the staff survey specifically addressed collaboration in both grade-level and department-level teams within the SLC context. As may be seen in Table 47 below, staff respondents were equally likely to agree that they collaborated in SLC department-level teams (67%) as the SLC grade-level teams (68%). Further, based on focus groups and survey responses, it was evident that the majority of teachers engaged in teaming toward the goal of creating coherence.

Table 47.

		N	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	N/A
I collaborate with other members of my SLC grade-level teams.	Staff	120	6%	9%	40%	28%	17%
I collaborate with other members of my SLC department-level teams.	Staff	120	4%	10%	35%	32%	19%

One item on the student survey addressed teaming and cross-curricular projects and the ability for students to earn multiple credits. Over two-thirds of the students (65%) generally agreed, "because of the way teachers in my SLC work together, I have done assignments for which I received credit in more than one class." Alternatively, 35% of the students generally disagreed, which does not indicate that teachers did not work across curriculum but only suggests that students may not have received credit in more than one class.

Both staff and students responded to a survey item about lesson design and the connection to SLC themes. As Table 48 shows, staff (77%) and slightly more students (86%) agreed that lessons were designed with the SLC theme in mind. While reasons for this disparity were not offered during the focus groups, it is possible that students may draw connections between lessons and SLC themes that the teachers do not make explicit during the planning stages. The staff and students equally agreed (both 91%) that teachers' lessons were designed to encourage critical thinking. Finally, more than three-quarters of the students agreed (79%) that their SLC courses were challenging.

Table 48.

		N	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	N/A
Lessons are designed with the SLC theme in mind.	Staff	121	3%	10%	47%	30%	10%
	Students	1186	2%	12%	52%	34%	---
Teachers' lessons are designed to encourage students to think critically.	Staff	121	2%	0%	45%	46%	7%
My teachers' lesson are designed to encourage me to think critically	Students	1189	1%	7%	50%	41%	---
My SLC courses are challenging.	Students	1185	4%	18%	50%	29%	---

Course Selection and SLC Requirements

This section addresses course selection and SLC course requirements. These two areas pertain to goal #3 in that they support students' in their enrollment of appropriate and rigorous courses. Table 49 below shows both staff and student responses to corresponding survey items.

Table 49.

		N	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	N/A
I talk to, or refer students to talk to a counselor, about their course selection.	Staff	118	3%	3%	39%	47%	8%
I talk to my teachers or counselor about my course selection.	Students	1168	4%	16%	45%	35%	---
I inform my students about SLC course requirements.	Staff	118	3%	11%	35%	37%	14%
I know which courses are required by my SLC.	Students	1170	2%	10%	45%	43%	---

The majority of staff (86%) indicated that they talked to, or referred students to a counselor, about course selection. A slightly smaller percentage of students (80%) agreed that they talked to their teachers or their counselor about course selection. A greater disparity in responses may be seen regarding information and knowledge about SLC course requirements. Only 72% of the staff agreed that they informed students about SLC required courses whereas 88% of the students agreed that they knew which courses were required by their SLC. It is possible that students received this information through other sources such as a counselor or other students.

G. Goal #4: Increase opportunities for students to earn postsecondary credit through AP courses.

Advanced placement (AP) exams offer students the opportunity to earn college credits while still attending high school. The state offers AP courses in over 20 subject areas. Successful completion of the classes and the culminating exam provide students with credits as well as advantages in competitive admissions processes of many universities. Participation in AP courses also provides students an accelerated academic environment which may foster postsecondary academic success. It is important to note that students may take the AP course and not take the exam as well as take an AP exam without necessarily participating in the course. Nevertheless, college credit is only granted with successful completion of an AP exam.

Goal-Related Activities

Several activities are listed under this goal in the grant's action plan. These activities are as follows:

- Participate in College Board Conferences
- Develop and Implement an AP Faire for Students and Parents
- Annual PSAT Parent Workshop to Explain 10th Grade Students Scores
- AP Teacher Training
- Offer SAT Preparation Programs
- AVID Path Training

Data pertaining to a portion of the above activities was generated through interviews, focus groups, and survey items. Not all of the above activities could be addressed through the data collection efforts. Reasons primarily included time limitations for interviews/focus groups and generalized descriptions by respondents. It should be noted that not all activities were designed for 100% participation by staff.

- 13% (of 127) of the staff reported having participated in College Board Conferences.
- 7% (of 127) of the staff reported that they helped with the development of an AP Faire. 21% of the staff reported that they did not have any knowledge of an AP Faire.
- 5% (of 127) of the staff reported that they helped with the annual PSAT parent workshop in 2009-2010. 7% reported that they did not have any knowledge about the annual PSAT workshop.
- 10% (of 127) of the staff reported that they helped with the development of an AP Bridge Program. 9% of the staff reported that they did not have any knowledge of an AP Bridge Program, which is an approximate 60% decrease from 2008-2009. Two students mentioned AP Bridge as an opportunity for better AP preparation for those who might not necessarily be prepared for their first AP course.

- 10% (of 127) of the staff reported having participated in AP Teacher Training professional development. One teacher discussed the AP Summer Institutes for teachers and commented that no teacher had ever been denied AP training if he/she applied for it.
- Offer SAT Preparation Programs – although no data was provided to indicate whether or not there were programs targeted specifically to the SAT, two teachers mentioned that many of the English classes offered preparation for the SAT as well as other standardized tests. 8% (of 1,121) students reported that they had participated in an SAT preparation program.
- 6% (of 127) of the staff reported having participated in AVID Path Training professional development.

Additional activities related to this goal were described by respondents. Teachers spoke of “AP study groups,” and a website that listed all AP course offerings and requirements. Further, one teacher mentioned that AP exam dates were always listed on School Loop. Both administrators stated that one of the goals for the AP program was to increase the number of AP classes and exams. One administrator added that the higher the enrollment, the more access to funding they would receive from the district which would provide more students with financial assistance for the exams. While one teacher acknowledged that the AP exam fee might be a hindrance for some students, two teachers spoke about ways in which this was remedied during the 2009-2010 school year. First, various SLCs held fundraisers to raise money for AP exams, and one teacher mentioned that the superintendent promised AP exam money for any student who wanted to take one. Finally, communication to parents and students regarding the AP program was described as an ongoing effort.

AP Program – Implementation and Outcomes

All respondents were asked several questions regarding the AP program ranging from access and encouragement to awareness and knowledge. This section provides a synthesis of the results that illuminates various aspects of the implementation as well as some outcomes of this AP goal.

School administrators and staff at Millikan HS were positive with regard to how the AP programs were working in the 2009-2010 school year. As described earlier, a major goal was to increase AP offerings and the number of exams taken. One administrator spoke of the “push” that was given to 10th grade students to enroll in AP courses. Other efforts have included specific SLCs increasing their required AP enrollment as well as increasing the offerings within the SLCs. One administrator shared that as the enrollment has increased, there has been more of an “AP culture,” and that even students in middle schools were becoming aware that AP was “a good thing.” Encouragement to enroll in AP is further discussed in subsequent paragraphs.

In terms of the benefits and advantages of taking AP courses, it was evident that all three respondent groups were very confident that students understood how these courses would help them in college. Table 50 shows that this was the case for 86% of the staff, 94% of the students, and 85% of the parents. Examples of this understanding were evident in the student focus groups. Several 9th/10th grade students explained that taking AP courses made students “more competitive for the universities,” and gave students the ability to earn both high school and college credits.

Table 50.

		N	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	N/A
Students understand how taking AP courses will help them in college.	Staff	117	0%	8%	52%	34%	6%
I understand how taking AP courses will help me in college.	Students	1137	2%	4%	34%	60%	---
My child understands how taking AP courses will help him/her in college.	Parents	414	3%	6%	47%	38%	6% (DK)

Teachers and students spoke of the efforts made to support students in AP success. One such effort included AP study groups in which students engaged in skills practice and mock exams. Students were aware of and/or participated in such study sessions.

Access to AP courses may also play a role in student enrollment and the encouragement students receive to enroll in AP courses. Over two-thirds of the staff (73%) believed that students had equal access to AP courses regardless of SLC membership (see Table 51). Students were more confident in the equity of AP access (84%). A slightly smaller percentage of students (79%) also believed that they, personally, were eligible to enroll in AP courses.

Table 51.

		N	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	N/A
Students in all SLCs have equal access to AP courses.	Staff	115	5%	15%	44%	29%	7%
	Students	1130	4%	12%	44%	40%	---
I am eligible to enroll in AP courses.	Students	1125	3%	17%	34%	45%	---

As described in the above sections, there was a school-wide goal to increase AP course offerings and enrollment. Also mentioned were efforts made toward identifying potential students for AP and the increase in offerings for specific SLCs. The encouragement of students to enroll in AP courses plays an important role in actual enrollment. According to participants in both the student and teacher focus groups, teachers and counselors have both been acknowledged as the promoters of such encouragement. Table 52 shows the results of the survey responses pertaining to encouragement.

Table 52.

		N	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	N/A
I encourage my students to enroll in AP courses.	Staff	117	0%	10%	34%	38%	17%
My SLC teachers encourage me to enroll in AP courses.	Students	1128	4%	21%	35%	39%	---
The counselor encourages students to enroll in AP courses.	Staff	116	1%	3%	49%	34%	13%
My counselor encourages me to enroll in AP courses.	Students	1132	5%	23%	35%	38%	---

As may be seen in the table, students believed that teachers and counselors were roughly equal in their encouragement to enroll in AP courses (74% and 73%, respectively). These results also corresponded with student focus group responses. Students described both teachers and counselors as the primary sources for information about AP courses and exams. Interestingly, the staff respondents were slightly less positive than students about the encouragement offered by teachers and more positive about the encouragement offered by counselors (72% and 83%, respectively). Although not included in this table, the parents also responded to the question of encouragement. Almost three-quarters of the parents (73%) believed that their students were encouraged to enroll in AP courses. Parents were not asked to differentiate between teacher and counselor encouragement.

The above results on students' perceptions of AP eligibility and encouragement were analyzed on a school-wide basis. Variability in student perceptions emerged through the disaggregation of responses by SLC. Referring back to the school-wide results, we found that 79% of students believed they were eligible to enroll in AP courses, 74% were encouraged by their teachers, and 73% were encouraged by their counselors. While the similarities between teacher and counselor encouragement remained, disparities in encouragement emerged among the SLCs. Perceived teacher encouragement to enroll in AP courses was highest for QUEST (95%), PEACE (83%), and COMPASS (79%) while 55% to 59% of the students from the remaining SLCs agreed that their teachers encouraged them. Perceived counselor encouragement followed a similar pattern. If the grant's goal is to increase AP opportunities for all students, then these findings indicate the need to emphasize AP encouragement across all SLCs.

Another factor that plays a role in AP participation is the awareness of course offerings and their perceptions of what participation entails. While students spoke openly about the availability of AP courses, no student elaborated on the actual work that was expected while enrolled in these courses. Table 53 below presents the survey responses corresponding to awareness of courses and availability.

Table 53.

		N	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	N/A
Students are aware of the AP courses available at school.	Staff	117	1%	9%	54%	32%	5%
I am aware of the AP courses available in my school.	Students	1129	2%	7%	41%	49%	---
The school should offer more AP courses.	Staff	116	4%	28%	39%	15%	14%
My school should offer more AP courses.	Students	1126	5%	29%	42%	25%	---

As shown above, staff (86%) and students (90%) were in general agreement that students were aware of the AP courses available at their school. There was more variability across responses pertaining to AP course offerings at Millikan. Just over half of the staff (54%) agreed that their school should offer more courses while 32% disagreed. In terms of students, 67% of students reported that the school should offer more AP courses. One possibility for the disparity between teachers and students is that students may want more variety in the course offerings and/or more courses in their subjects of interest. Neither teacher nor student focus groups provided any clarification for this variation.

As described in the section introduction, college credits are only earned with a passing score on an AP exam. Survey respondents were asked to respond to whether students' knew how to "sign up for the AP exam." Table 54 presents these results. Less than one-half of the students (48%) and 52% of parents agreed that they knew how to sign up for AP exams. Staff respondents (83%) were much more confident that students had this knowledge. This disparity might be due to the possibility that teachers are more aware of their efforts to inform students about the AP exam in multiple ways while students may not know where to find that information.

Table 54.

		N	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	N/A
Students know how to sign up for the AP exam.	Staff	117	0%	5%	56%	27%	1%
I know how to sign up for the AP exam.	Students	1129	12%	39%	25%	23%	---
My child knows how to sign up for the AP exam.	Parents	416	6%	19%	29%	23%	23% (DK)

While students in the focus groups knew how to sign up for an AP exam, only one teacher discussed the issue of paying for the exams. It was unclear whether the majority of the students were aware of the opportunities for AP exam funding assistance. However, one student indicated an awareness of the exam fees as well as the process for obtaining fee waivers. These students also explained that taking the exam was a choice. Several upper grade students also explained that some students would

not make the effort if they did not believe they could pass the exam, or that some students simply had no desire to take the exam. Overall, survey and interview results showed that knowledge of the exam, how to sign up and its benefits, should also be emphasized when providing students and their parents with AP course information.

According to the LBUSD Research office, Millikan High School offered 19 AP courses during the 2009-10 school year. There were 1,308 students enrolled in these courses, an increase of approximately 12% from the previous year. In addition, there were 1,085 AP exams taken during the school year by 561 students. There was a nearly 15% increase in number of exams taken from 2008-2009 as well as a smaller increase (nearly 4%) in number of test-takers.

Passing scores for granting college credits are typically determined by the post-secondary institution; however, the College Board has determined that a score of 3 or above is predictive of college success.⁹ Table 54a below shows that 48% of the students received a score of 3 or above, which is a slight increase from 45% in 2008-2009..

Table 54a. 2009-10 AP Exam Scores for Millikan Students (N=1,085)

AP Exam Score	# Students	%
1	254	23%
2	303	28%
3	276	25%
4	188	17%
5	64	6%
TOTAL	1,085	100%

The evaluation team was unable to acquire disaggregated results by AP content, relevant subgroup, or SLC for this report. The above numbers may only be considered in comparison to the 2008-09 student scores. Overall, although there was not an appreciable increase in the percentage of “passing” scores, there were increases in the number of students enrolled and the number of AP exams taken.

REPORT SUMMARY

This evaluation report presents the results of the Year 3 evaluation activities pertaining to the SLC-related grant and the implementation of goal-related activities at both Lakewood and Millikan High Schools during the 2009-2010 school year. The evaluators continued to work with designated program and school staff in structuring the evaluation activities and clarifying some of the grant’s ambiguous language. All of the data collection instruments were revised and, therefore, in alignment with the grant and action plan. Low numbers of participants in some student focus groups did not allow for the desired student and SLC representation. Nevertheless, every effort was made to provide evaluation findings that were meaningful and useful to all levels of stakeholders.

⁹ College Board information available on their website <http://www.collegeboard.com>.

The two questions that guided this Year 3 evaluation are:

- 1) What is the nature of SLC development/implementation at the two schools?
- 2) To what extent have the four goals of the grant been implemented?

At the district level, monthly and quarterly meetings/workshops have been established by LBUSD's SLC Director to support grant implementation and monitor school progress. In these contexts, SLC coordinators and lead teachers have shared successes and challenges, gathered information about resources, and had opportunities for discussion and collaboration. The purposes for these meetings were multi-fold and included many data-driven and strategic topics. Overall, these meetings were consistently well-attended and provided support and feedback for implementing the grant's goals.

At the school level, the nature of SLC development at both Lakewood and Millikan High Schools can be described through the categories and themes that emerged through qualitative interviews and survey responses of administrators, staff, and teachers. These categories included SLC culture and climate, SLC governance, class structures and interventions, and challenges of SLC development.

There was a consensus among teachers/staff at both schools that a strong SLC culture on campus supported SLC identification among students and teachers. The majority of teachers/staff, students, and parents at both schools were in general agreement that they understood the purpose and goals for SLCs and their roles within their SLCs. The improved school culture was attributed to an increase in teacher investment in the SLC structure. At both Lakewood and Millikan, buy-in was attributed to increased collaboration and communication among teachers, greater cohesion due to common goals, and a greater sense of community shared by the students. Students from both schools spoke of culture and climate in terms of the connectedness they felt to their SLC peers and teachers. At Lakewood, students with special needs and their teachers were incorporated into the SLC communities during the 2009-2010 school year. One teacher spoke about the difficulties and inequities that students with special needs faced within the SLC structure. Namely, many of these students had fewer opportunities for school-wide recognition. Millikan students spoke of greater cohesion as a result of activities and opportunities to interact with various grade levels within SLCs. Teachers described several ways that they believed SLCs have changed the culture and climate at their respective schools. Most of the responses were positive (for both schools) and focused on teacher and student changes such as increased teacher collaboration and greater student connectedness. Millikan teachers reported that SLCs have led to greater sense of school pride among students. These Millikan teachers also reported SLCs led to greater community and parent involvement as well as a greater school-wide focus on college and academics. Less positive responses, common to both schools, included inequity, divisiveness, and stratification as a result of SLCs. Moreover, many teachers reported that SLCs had not led to any changes in their schools' culture and climate.

Discussions related to governance and structures revealed that staff from both schools believed that the grant afforded them opportunities to re-focus SLCs as well as provide them with more opportunities to suggest changes and have a role in SLC development. The primary challenge of SLC development at both schools pertained to the Master Schedule, which continued to impact teacher collaboration, student-teacher personalization, and somewhat restricted class options. Another common challenge discussed was the perceived hierarchical structure of SLCs.

In conclusion, it is evident that SLC development and implementation has continued to head in a constructive direction. The results were generally positive and, for the most part, similar between schools. Positive findings and areas of concern emerging from these results may be used to further develop SLCs and improve the levels of implementation to meet the goals of this grant.

The second evaluation question concerned the extent of implementation of the four grant goals. In order to frame the response to this question, the evaluators sought to assess the overall awareness of the grant and its goals among the administrators, staff, and teachers at both schools. As may be expected, the schools' principals and SLC coordinators demonstrated the greatest understanding of this grant and its goals. Moreover, all spoke of adherence to the affiliated management action plan, which had been integrated into the schools' site action plans as had other district- and school-wide initiatives. The lead teachers at both schools, although demonstrating general awareness, did not appear concerned with the grant's details. During focus groups, non-lead teachers referenced the specifics of the grant goals even less.

Goal 1. The first goal, "Prepare all students for success in postsecondary education and careers without the need for remediation," was broken down into three components: student expectations; post-secondary support, preparedness, and guidance; and support and remediation. These areas prepare students, in various ways, for future success. With respect to this first goal's activities, Millikan took the lead in implementation. This was determined by greater participation in Bi-Annual Saturday Report Card Parent Meetings, training and use of Tele-Parent programs and School Loop, Middle School Outreach, and School-wide Newsletters. Both schools were similar in their implementation of College Preparedness Workshops, Bi-Annual Parent Institutes, SLC Parent Booster Clubs, and Increased Connections to Faith and Community-Based Organizations and Businesses.

In terms of student expectations, the data supported the belief among all three groups that clear communication of student expectations existed at both schools. With respect to teacher-student communication to support students in their understanding of the application and financial requirements of post-secondary education, the vast majority of teachers at both schools responded that they discussed how to get into college with students. Parents were more likely to disagree than agree that their children communicated with teachers about getting into and paying for college. Reasons for this disparity are not known at this time.

It was evident that both schools implemented activities, in addition to those in the grant and management action plan, which supported post-secondary preparation. Discussions revealed that Lakewood's emphasis was not solely college preparation but post-college success. Millikan discussions revealed the emphasis on college preparation through alignment to UC/CSU requirements. Both schools engaged students in college and career research activities, which prepared students for applications, resumes, and interviews as well as learning about prerequisites and required pathways. Teachers at Millikan discussed the greater emphasis on the Pathways program. In addition to widespread engagement in various college and career preparation, teachers and students at both schools reported similar frequencies of career-focused field trips and guest speakers in their classrooms, though twice as many teachers at Millikan reported having taken students on a field trip to a college or university.

A large majority of teachers from both schools agreed that students possessed knowledge and understanding of A-G course requirements, necessary for most college admissions. Furthermore, students strongly believed that they would have completed the necessary courses for college application. As expected, older students were slightly more likely to be aware of necessary standardized tests. Finally, students were, in general, more confident that they could afford attendance at a 4-year institution than their parents. This was likely due to disparities in awareness of family income and financial aid opportunities between both groups.

Although this first goal specifies support without the need for remediation, the activities listed under this goal and the data collected were not sufficient to draw valid conclusions. Nevertheless, academic support given to and perceived by students may serve as an indirect indicator for this portion of the goal. Significant proportions of teachers reported that they personally spoke to one another and worked together to provide academic support for students at risk of failing. Student and parent responses corroborated these teacher statements and acknowledged that students did receive support from their classroom teachers, albeit to a lesser degree than teachers reported.

Goal 2. The second grant goal addressed interventions in reading and math skills. Intervention has been a continuous focus of both schools. Administrators at Lakewood and Millikan spoke about the success of peer tutoring programs, while one administrator at Lakewood noted that a school-wide tutoring effort was unsuccessful due to a lack of organization.

This goal's first listed activity pertains to school-wide data analyses on literacy and numeracy needs and development of strategies. In both schools, teachers reported the implementation of literacy and numeracy strategies, where applicable. A higher percentage of teachers at Lakewood reported implementing literacy strategies, while a higher percentage of teachers at Millikan reported implementing numeracy strategies. There were a greater proportion of Lakewood teachers that reported the use of college aides in their schools and classrooms. Finally, there was no data to support the implementation of Math Department Lesson Study or Carnegie Lab training at either school. Other activities such as CAHSEE programs and study labs, although not listed in the grant, were implemented. Tutoring emerged as the major intervention area.

Both schools instituted various tutoring efforts during the school year. Some were reportedly successful, while others, such as some school-wide after-school tutoring, were not. Overall, staff attributed this to student transportation issues and conflict with other after-school activities. Consequently, many teachers offered tutoring in their classrooms, to their own students as well as those from other classes. Both schools worked to ensure that students and parents were aware of tutoring availability. In addition, the schools implemented study labs for various subjects and peer mentoring programs. In terms of how college aides were used to support intervention efforts, both schools reported their use in study labs, with AVID curriculum, and individual student assistance. Despite the fact that the data indicated limited classroom responsibilities, all respondents spoke positively about their contributions, though discussions about college aides were very limited this year.

Goal 3. The third grant goal addressed the support of students in a coherent sequence of rigorous courses. Staff at both schools reported similar participation rates in District-wide Professional Learning Community workshops and in the development/modification of curriculum tied to SLC themes. Millikan staff reported greater participation, in some cases almost double, in Summer

Curriculum Institutes, School-based Professional Learning Community workshops, and training on Differentiated Instructional Techniques.

Administrators and teachers at the two schools differed somewhat in their understanding of this goal. At Lakewood there appeared to be less clarity and consistency in its interpretation. Millikan, on the other hand, reportedly has spent the past four years working on “backwards mapping” and coherent sequences of courses. Despite these disparities, staff at both schools engaged in collaborative efforts, specifically increased teacher collaboration, toward supporting the implementation of this goal.

In general, staff at both schools clearly placed a lot of emphasis on increasing teacher collaboration. Although many teachers spoke of within-SLC teaming, it appeared that greater teaming occurred school-wide, within departments and across grade levels. Staff and students spoke of intercurricular projects as well as their benefits. These projects resulted in greater collaboration among teachers, greater connectedness within SLCs, and the ability for students to learn topics more in-depth. Millikan staff and students reported greater connections between lessons and SLC themes; Lakewood students were seemingly more aware of the collaborative efforts of their teachers.

Goal 4. The fourth goal addressed an increase in opportunities to earn postsecondary credit through AP courses. Both schools had an AP coordinator during the school year. In addition, very small but comparable proportions of staff from both schools reported helping with the development of an AP Faire while less than one quarter of Millikan teachers and one third of Lakewood teachers reported that they had not heard of this activity. Similar patterns were seen regarding the AP Bridge Program and AP Teacher training, though the percentage of teachers who reported no knowledge of the AP Bridge program at Millikan decreased significantly from the 2008-2009. For both schools, the implementation of these activities hinged on adequate funding. Low participation rates were also reported for College Board Conferences and AVID Path training. There was little to no data to support the implementation of Annual PSAT Parent Workshop to Explain 10th Grade Students Scores or SAT Preparation programs. Both schools were firm in their commitment to increasing AP success, and administrators were very specific in their efforts and motivation.

Both schools reported school-wide efforts and successes for increasing AP enrollment and AP test-taking. Tutoring and other activities were in place to provide information to both parents and students. While the majority of students from both schools reported knowing how AP courses would help them in college, a slightly higher percentage of Millikan students agreed to this statement. More students than teachers believed that there was equity in AP access. In terms of encouragement, it was found that students reported similar levels of encouragement from teachers, and reported receiving the most encouragement from counselors. Overall, students were reportedly less knowledgeable about how to sign up for the AP exams than staff expected.

Consistent with school reports, AP data from the LBUSD Research Office showed that both schools increased their AP enrollment and the number of exams taken during the 2009-10 school year. For Lakewood, 41% of students scored a 3 or above, while for Millikan, 48% of students scored a 3 or above. Last year about 45% of both schools’ test-takers achieved scores of 3 or above.

As may be seen through the discussions and perceptions of administrators, teachers/staff, students, and parents, both schools have made efforts at implementing the grant’s four goals. Future evaluation activities will continue to focus specifically on activities of this implementation in order to

directly assess this progress. This third-year evaluation and its findings provide an indicator of the grant's implementation in the areas of SLC development and the goals for student academic growth and post-secondary preparation.