

LBUSD Small Learning Communities Evaluation Report

Implementation Year 2

2006-2007

The SRM Evaluation Group
University of California, Los Angeles

Janet Lee, Anne Vo, Ravneet Tiwana

Table of Contents

	Page
I. Introduction.....	1
Program Description.....	1
Evaluation Details.....	2
Staff Survey Participants.....	3
Student Survey Participants.....	5
II. Student Attitudes and Beliefs Towards Achievement.....	6
Academic Behavior.....	6
College Knowledge.....	8
Conclusions.....	11
III. Culture and Climate.....	11
Student Involvement in SLC Development and Implementation.....	11
Personalization.....	13
Student-Teacher Interaction.....	13
Student-Student Interaction.....	17
Conclusions.....	20
IV. Building Leadership Capacity.....	20
Conclusions.....	25
V. Overall Summary and Conclusions.....	26
Appendix A: Logic Models.....	27

I. INTRODUCTION

Amongst the many education reform efforts being implemented across the United States, one that is occurring in many large comprehensive high schools is the implementation of small learning communities. The premise is that small communities eventually lead to student individualization, improved communication and collaboration among teachers, and innovative teaching techniques. This allows students in those small communities to have more positive social and academic experiences at their schools.

This report provides the evaluation results for the implementation of Small Learning Communities during the 2006-2007 academic year for three high schools in Long Beach Unified School District (LBUSD). This is the second year of implementation. These schools – Cabrillo High School, Jordan High School, and Polytechnic High School – received funding from US Department of Education (DOE) Smaller Learning Communities (SLC) implementation grants. To evaluate the Small Learning Community Initiative in Long Beach high schools, LBUSD contracted with UCLA’s Social Research Methodology Evaluation Group (SRM Evaluation Group), directed by Dr. Marv Alkin. As a former director of the national Center for the Study of Evaluation, a professor and scholar of evaluation theory and practice at UCLA for over 30 years, and a leading expert on evaluation utilization, Dr. Alkin brings a wealth of expertise, experience, and knowledge to the evaluation of small learning communities. Project staff members are all graduate level students in the SRM Division of UCLA’s Department of Education, and are specializing in program evaluation. The SRM Evaluation Group is pleased to continue our working relationship with LBUSD as external evaluators.

Program Description

This particular grant for implementing SLCs is supporting activities occurring at three high schools in a large, urban school district (LBUSD). Each school serves a diverse student population that includes significant populations of students from high-poverty backgrounds. District-wide enrollment in 2006-07 by ethnicity shows that students in the district are comprised of approximately 51% Latinos, 18% African Americans, 4% Asians, 17% Whites, 4% Filipinos, 1% Pacific Islanders, and 0.3% Native Americans. Approximately 23% of the total enrollment are English language learners. Each school is also challenged by low achievement, high mobility, and teacher turnover. State and district achievement data show that in 2004, only 25.1% of students in these schools scored at proficient or above in English, 11.6% in mathematics, on the California Content Standards Tests.

In the effort to raise student achievement in all of the high schools in the district, LBUSD is also currently in the midst of a major local reform. The goals for this high school reform initiative include a commitment to improving student achievement while at the same time attempting to close the achievement gap. The third goal is to build the capacity of teachers to lead and a fourth and final goal is to improve the culture and climate of high schools. To support this reform initiative, these three schools (Jordan, Polytechnic, and Cabrillo High Schools) applied for and received a federal grant to implement and support small learning communities (SLC) at each school. SLCs are geared towards raising student achievement through the personalization of education by developing

structures and processes that encourage deeper and more meaningful relationships between teachers, teachers and students, as well as between students themselves.

At the conclusion of the 2006-07 school year, Cabrillo HS had six SLCs, Jordan HS had four SLCs and Polytechnic HS had five SLCs that were supported through this grant. The SLCs at Cabrillo and Jordan were newly developed with the onset of this grant. The SLCs at Poly were previously established and are being further developed through the support of this grant. Jordan and Poly also have specialized secondary programs (SSPs) that essentially function as additional SLCs. Table 1.1, below, details the SLCs for each school. At Cabrillo and Jordan high schools, all 9th and 10th grade students were assigned to an SLC. The plan is to integrate 11th grade students into the SLCs the following year, and 12th grade the year after that. At Poly all students were assigned to an SLC.

Table 1.1. Small Learning Communities at Cabrillo, Jordan, and Polytechnic High Schools, 2006-07.

Cabrillo HS SLCs	Jordan HS SLCs	Polytechnic HS SLCs
- Finance, IT, Hospitality and Tourism	- Business and Entertainment School of Travel, Trade and Tourism	- The Academy of the Humanities
- International Studies at Cabrillo	- Excellence Through the Arts	- Beach Academy of Math and Science
- Cabrillo Health Occupations and Careers	- Jordan’s Media and Communication	- Business and Technology Academy
- Cabrillo Engineering and Design	- Panther Academy	- Center for International Commerce
- Cabrillo School for Social Justice	- Jordan Freshman Academy (<i>all 9th grade</i>)	- Communication Academy
- Cabrillo Arts and Technology	- International Baccalaureate (SSP)	- The Pacific Rim Academy (SSP)
	- Aspiration in Medical Services (SSP)	- Poly Academy of Achievers and Learners (SSP)
		- Program of Additional Curricular Experiences (SSP)

In the Fall of 2005, the leadership teams had begun the process of developing logic models for their respective SLC programs. This activity encouraged the leadership teams to think concretely of, and map out, how the SLCs, as they were being implemented, were to meet the main goals specified in the grant. Created to be a ‘road map’ for SLC implementation, the model informs the evaluators what additional data may need to be collected as well as how to subsequently analyze the data. Moreover, the logic model provides the evaluation team the all-important “compared to what” of the evaluation. In Summer 2006, the Fall 2005 logic model drafts were revisited and finalized. (See Appendix A)

Evaluation Details

There are two general purposes for this SLC evaluation:

- A) To understand how SLCs are being implemented so that we can:
 1. develop “lessons learned”
 2. make mid-course corrections, if needed
 3. monitor progress
 4. understand what aspects may have contributed to effects

and

B) To understand the effects of SLCs on:

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

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

To build on our work with the schools from the previous year, two survey protocols were used to gather data from school staff (administrators and teachers) and students for the evaluation of this second year's implementation. These protocols were very similar to those used in the previous year. A few minor adjustments were made to the survey protocols, however, given that in the previous year the survey instruments had served multiple purposes (i.e. WASC, GEAR UP, and SLC). The adjustments to the survey protocols were made to more closely align the data collected to the interests of the SLC evaluation. The staff survey was administered in the Fall of 2006, and the student survey was administered in the Spring of 2007. A second staff survey was administered in the Spring of 2007, as well. However, because of an extremely poor return rate, this data was not incorporated into this report as it is also likely that this data is not representative of the opinions of the entire staff.¹

Initially, the evaluation plan also called for additional data to be collected through student and staff focus groups and interviews. However, in order to streamline the data collection process with other district needs, the district allowed the evaluation team to observe the student and teacher focus groups conducted at Jordan and Cabrillo by WESTED. Four focus groups were conducted at each site, 2 student (1 SLC students, 1 non-SLC students) and 2 teacher (1 SLC, 1 non-SLC) groups. A focus group of Poly SLC teachers was also conducted. Because the results of these focus groups have already been disseminated in detail elsewhere, for the purposes of this report we will provide a summary of the main findings from the focus groups at the end of sections II, III, and IV of the report.

Staff Survey Participants

The staff survey, intended to measure staff member's perceptions on the implementation of SLCs, was completed by a total of 273 staff members. At Cabrillo, a total of 80 (54% of a possible 149) staff members completed the survey (75-teachers, 2-administrators, and 3 did not indicate a position). At the time, 66 (83%) staff members said that 'yes' they are a part of an SLC, 11 said

¹ In the Spring of 2007, a second staff survey, intended to measure staff perceptions of student achievement and school culture and climate, was administered on-line via a survey administration website. A total of 30 responses were collected (of approximately 500 possible), a return rate of 6%. The poor return rate can likely be explained by the fact that the 2006-2007 school year was a WASC (Western Association of Schools and College) review year for all three schools. Because school administrators were primarily focused on going through WASC, priority was given to preparing for school accreditation. Also, based on conversations with staff members, it is likely that the attempt to administer the survey on-line also resulted in a poor return rate. In subsequent years the staff survey(s) will be administered in person.

‘no,’ 2 said ‘don’t know,’ and 1 declined to answer. At Jordan, a total of 97 (61% of a possible 160) staff members completed the survey (86-teachers, 5-counselors, 1-administrator, 1-coach, 1-librarian, and 3 did not indicate a position). At the time, 41 (42%) staff members said that ‘yes’ they are a part of an SLC, 49 said ‘no,’ 4 said ‘don’t know,’ and 3 declined to answer. Those who were not part of an SLC were asked in they would like to be a part of an SLC, and of the 24 who responded to the question, 11 said yes. At Poly, a total of 96 (53% of a possible 160) staff members completed the survey (80-teachers, 3-counselors, 8-administrators, and 5 did not indicate a position). At the time, 59 (31%) staff members said that ‘yes’ they are a part of an SLC, 18 said ‘no,’ 14 said ‘don’t know,’ and 5 declined to answer.

Amongst the teachers who did complete the survey, there is a range of teaching experience (see Table 1.2). On average, teachers at Cabrillo and Jordan have approximately 10 years of total teaching experience, with the average total years at their given school being between 2-3 years for Cabrillo, and 4-6 years for Jordan. At Poly, teachers have a total of 10-15 years of experience, with the average years at the school being 7-10 years.

Table 1.2. Percent Distribution of Experience by School, High School Teachers, Long Beach Unified School District High School Survey, Fall 2006.

School	Total Number of Years Teaching							Total
	1 st yr	2-3	4-6	7-10	10-15	16-20	20+	
Cabrillo	4%	14%	22%	17%	20%	9%	15%	100%
	(3)	(11)	(17)	(13)	(16)	(7)	(12)	(79)
Jordan	4%	17%	7%	22%	15%	12%	23%	100%
	(4)	(16)	(7)	(21)	(14)	(11)	(22)	(95)
Polytechnic	2%	5%	13%	18%	18%	13%	32%	100%
	(2)	(5)	(12)	(17)	(17)	(12)	(30)	(95)
Aggregated (N)	3%	12%	13%	19%	18%	11%	24%	100%
	(9)	(32)	(36)	(51)	(47)	(30)	(64)	(269)
School	Total Years at School							Total
	1 st yr	2-3	4-6	7-10	10-15	16-20	20+	
Cabrillo	11%	34%	24%	18%	13%	0%	0%	100%
	(9)	(27)	(19)	(14)	(10)	(0)	(0)	(79)
Jordan	12%	24%	26%	13%	7%	10%	6%	100%
	(12)	(24)	(25)	(13)	(7)	(10)	(6)	(97)
Polytechnic	7%	12%	19%	23%	18%	9%	11%	100%
	(7)	(13)	(18)	(22)	(17)	(8)	(10)	(94)
Aggregated (N)	10%	23%	23%	18%	13%	7%	6%	100%
	(28)	(63)	(62)	(49)	(34)	(18)	(17)	(270)

In Table 1.3 one can see that there is also a wide range of departments in which the respondents teach. Teachers from the English, History/Social Studies, and Math departments do make up slightly more than half of the total teachers. This is no surprise, given that these subjects often make up the core academic curriculum. For staff members who indicated “other” for department, many times these were Special Education teachers (20 of 34). The remaining 14 who indicated “other” either taught another specific subject (health, business, communication, etc.) or held administrative positions.

Table 1.3. Percent Distribution of Department by School, High School Teachers, Long Beach Unified School District High School Survey, Fall 2006.

School	Department									
	Art (F&P)	Eng	His/SS	For Lang	Sci	Math	PE	Tech	Other	Total
Cabrillo	9% (6)	28% (19)	16% (11)	7% (5)	12% (8)	12% (8)	0% (0)	6% (4)	12% (8)	100% (69)
Jordan	11% (9)	26% (22)	15% (13)	5% (4)	8% (7)	14% (12)	5% (4)	3% (3)	14% (12)	100% (86)
Polytechnic	6% (5)	21% (18)	18% (15)	8% (7)	10% (8)	13% (11)	4% (3)	4% (3)	17% (14)	100% (84)
Aggregated (N)	8% (20)	25% (59)	16% (39)	7% (16)	9% (23)	13% (31)	3% (7)	4% (10)	14% (34)	100% (239)

Student Survey Participants

A total of 3,861 (44% of a possible 8,747) students from the three high schools completed the survey, which was intended to measure students' attitudes towards involvement in SLC development and implementation, personalization as it relates to both student/teacher (staff) and peer/peer relations, and student achievement expressed in terms of academic behavior and college preparation/knowledge.

In terms of ethnic breakdown, in both Cabrillo and Jordan the Hispanic/Latino category had the highest percentage of participation, 65% and 62% respectively, followed by African Americans. As Table 1.4 illustrates, the Asian group had the highest percentage of participation at 28% followed by Hispanic/Latino at Poly. A complete ethnic distribution for the student survey participants can be found in Table 1.4.

Table 1.4. Percent of Ethnic Distribution by Schools, High School Students, Long Beach Unified School District High School Survey, Spring 2007.

Ethnicity	Aggregated (Three Schools)	Cabrillo	Jordan	Poly
African American	17.60%	13.63%	19.32%	19.53%
Asian	14.51%	1.75%	7.51%	27.97%
Filipino	6.02%	9.93%	1.32%	6.62%
Hispanic/Latino	46.96%	64.65%	61.92%	24.08%
Pacific Islander	2.74%	2.24%	3.86%	2.27%
White	5.18	0.97%	2.21%	10.32%
American Indian	0.46%	0.39%	0.44%	0.45%
Other	2.30%	2.82%	1.43%	2.53%
Biracial/Multiracial	4.24%	3.60%	1.99%	6.23%
Total	100%	99.98%	100%	100%
N	3,688	1,027	906	1,541

The district-wide grade distribution indicates greater participation among 9th and 10th graders and very little among juniors and seniors. Table 1.5 illustrates the grade breakdown. At Cabrillo and Jordan, the survey was intentionally targeted for 9th and 10th grade students because it is students in those grades that are participating in SLCs. Cabrillo had a total enrollment of 2,492 for 9th (1,249) and 10th (1,243) grade students. Jordan had a total enrollment of 2,117 for 9th (1,085) and 10th (1,032) grade. At Poly, students from all grades took the survey, however, the majority of the students who completed the survey were freshman and sophomores, with 10th graders making up

45% of the participants. Poly had a total enrollment of 4,138 students (9th: 1,234; 10th: 1,115; 11th: 975; 12th: 805). Overall, 50% of all survey respondents were 10th graders.

Table 1.5. Percent of Grade Level Distribution by Schools, High School Students, Long Beach Unified School District High School Survey, Spring 2007.

Grade	Aggregated (Three Schools)	Cabrillo	Jordan	Poly
9 th Grade	36.99%	42.91%	47.18%	27.26%
10 th Grade	49.83%	54.10%	52.62%	44.68%
11 th Grade	8.75%	2.61%	0.00%	18.42%
12 th Grade	4.43%	0.37%	0.21%	9.65%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%
N	3,861	1,072	956	1,607

Students were also asked to indicate to which SLC they belonged. Theoretically, every student who completed the survey (with the exception of perhaps the few 11th and 12th grade students at Cabrillo and Jordan) had been placed into an SLC. Results indicate that at Poly the vast majority (96%) are able to self-identify which SLC they are a member. However, at Jordan approximately 23% and at Cabrillo 57% of students who completed the survey indicate that they are not in an SLC. This would seem to signify that SLC awareness and identity is not yet fully developed at those two schools, which is understandable, given that this is just the 2nd year of implementation.

This report is organized into the following three sections, which reflect the areas in which SLCs are expected to have an effect:

Student Attitudes and Beliefs Toward Achievement - The first section of the report provides a descriptive review of students’ perceptions and attitudes towards their own achievement as well as the achievement of their peers. The results of this section are taken primarily from the student survey.

School Culture and Climate - The second section provides a descriptive review of students’ perceptions of the culture and climate at their school, including student involvement with SLC development and implementation and personalization. This section also draws primarily from the results of the student survey.

Building Leadership Capacity - The third section of the report details staff perceptions of SLC development and implementation. Findings for this section are drawn from the staff survey.

II. STUDENT ATTITUDES AND BELIEFS TOWARD ACHIEVEMENT

Academic Behavior

In an effort to look at Student Academic Behavior we see (in Table 2.1) that when students were asked how often they talked to someone at school about how to get into college, most students across the three schools responded, 2-3 times a year (18.21%). When looking within schools, students at Cabrillo (18.76%) and Jordan High School (21.50%) never talked to someone at school

about how to get into college. Most students at Poly High School (21.14%) spoke to someone about 2-3 times a year. When students were asked how frequently they talked to someone at school about how to pay for college, most students responded across high schools that they never (37.84%) spoke to someone. This trend was also reflected within the three schools.

Most students felt that they never (21.26%) go to tutoring when they needed to. However, most students at Cabrillo believed that they go to tutoring every other week (15.93%) when they needed it. Most students at Jordan (41.11%) and Poly High Schools (35.70%) believed that they never go to tutoring when needed. When students were asked if they meet with their counselor to discuss their class schedule, most students across schools responded 2-3 times a year (24.86%). Within schools, Cabrillo students met with their counselor 2-3 times a year (25.02%); however, students at Jordan (41.11%) and Poly (35.70%) High Schools never met with their counselors to discuss their schedules.

A summary of results indicating student agreement with various statements regarding their academic behavior can be found in Table 2.1.

Table 2.1. Percent of Student Academic Behavior by Schools by Frequency, High School Students, Long Beach Unified School District High School Survey, Spring 2007.

	Always	Once A Week	Every Other Week	Once A Month	2-3 Times A Year	Once A Year	Never	N
I talk to someone at school about how to get into college.								
Aggregated (Three Schools)	17.95%	8.94%	9.77%	16.94%	18.21%	11.06%	17.12%	3,860
Cabrillo	15.10%	9.29%	10.98%	15.48%	18.48%	11.91%	18.76%	1,066
Jordan	18.79%	8.04%	9.39%	15.03%	14.09%	13.15%	21.50%	958
Poly	19.40%	9.27%	9.14%	19.03%	21.14%	9.39%	12.62%	1,608
I talk to someone at school about how to pay for college.								
Aggregated (Three Schools)	10.48%	5.53%	7.25%	12.28%	14.20%	12.43%	37.84%	3,873
Cabrillo	9.59%	5.03%	8.64%	12.35%	15.48%	11.78%	37.13%	1,053
Jordan	10.77%	5.13%	6.38%	12.13%	10.67%	13.81%	41.11%	956
Poly	11.21%	5.86%	6.67%	12.65%	15.58%	12.34%	35.70%	1,605
I got to tutoring when I need to.								
Aggregated (Three Schools)	30.38%	11.83%	11.25%	11.41%	7.98%	5.89%	21.26%	3,786
Cabrillo	31.27%	14.48%	15.93%	13.51%	7.72%	4.83%	12.26%	1,036
Jordan	10.77%	5.13%	6.38%	12.13%	10.67%	13.81%	41.11%	956
Poly	11.21%	5.86%	6.67%	12.65%	15.58%	12.34%	35.70%	1,605
I meet with my counselor to discuss my class schedule.								
Aggregated (Three Schools)	10.75%	4.74%	5.83%	12.48%	24.86%	20.07%	21.27%	3,822
Cabrillo	10.60%	4.39%	6.97%	14.90%	25.02%	21.87%	16.24%	1,047
Jordan	10.77%	5.13%	6.38%	12.13%	10.67%	13.81%	41.11%	956
Poly	11.21%	5.86%	6.67%	12.65%	15.58%	12.34%	35.70%	1,605

When asked if students asked for help when they did not know how to do their homework, most students across the three schools agreed (52.26%) with the statement. This same trend was also

reflected within the three schools. (See Table 2.2) However, across schools approximately 25% of the students disagreed, or strongly disagreed with the statement. At Jordan, the percentage of students in disagreement was even higher, at 34%. At Poly it was the lowest at 18%.

Table 2.2. Percent of Student Academic Behavior by Schools by Agreement Degree, High School Students, Long Beach Unified School District High School Survey, Spring 2007.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N
When I do not know how to do my homework, I ask for help.					
Aggregated (Three Schools)	23.06%	52.26%	18.68%	6.00%	3,764
Cabrillo	20.39%	53.30%	20.39%	5.92%	1,030
Jordan	18.06%	48.39%	24.09%	9.46%	930
Poly	27.97%	54.20%	14.21%	3.66%	1,583

When asked what is the highest level of education students think they will complete, most students across the three schools responded a BA/BS Degree from a 4-Year College (34.23%). (see Table 2.3) Within schools, students from Cabrillo and Jordan High Schools believed they would receive a BA/BS Degree from A 4-Year College; however, most students at Poly High School believed that they would get a Graduate-Level Degree (40.48%). Almost all (98-99%) students indicated that they expect to at least graduate from high school, with 90% of students expecting to have some sort of post-secondary experience.

Table 2.3. Percent of Degree Expectancy by Schools by Frequency, High School Students, Long Beach Unified School District High School Survey, Spring 2007.

	Less Than High School	High School Graduate	Some College	Technical/Trade College	AA Degree from a 2-Yr Community College	BA/BS Degree from a 4-Yr College	Graduate-Level Degree	N
What is the highest level of education you think you will complete?								
Aggregated (Three Schools)	1.12%	7.25%	12.43%	3.00%	9.67%	34.23%	32.29%	3,298
Cabrillo	1.45%	8.12%	15.13%	3.78%	11.35%	33.15%	27.03%	899
Jordan	1.90%	7.96%	14.66%	3.41%	10.11%	37.29%	24.65%	791
Poly	0.48%	6.00%	8.41%	2.28%	8.00%	34.34%	40.48%	1,450

College Knowledge

Students were also asked to state to what degree they agreed with seven statements that were intended to better understand students’ college knowledge across and within schools. The results are summarized in Table 2.4.

When students were asked, “Immediately after high school, I want to go to college”, most students across the three schools strongly agreed (53.82%) with the statement. This trend remained the same also within schools; however, Poly High School had the highest percentage (60.95%) of strong agreement.

Most students across the three high schools Strongly Agreed (44.11%) with the statement, “I know the difference between a 2nd and a 4-year college”. This trend remained the same within three schools; with Poly High School have the largest percentage of strongly agree (50.79%).

Most students across the three schools Agreed (39.75%) with the statement “I know which standardized test(s) I need to take to apply for college”. This trend remained the same for Cabrillo and Jordan High Schools; however, most students Strongly Agreed (40.82%) with the statement at Poly High School.

When asked, “I understand how taking AP courses will help me in college”, most students across the three schools Strongly Agreed (41.96%) with the statement. Most students at Cabrillo and Jordan High Schools Agreed with the statement; whereas, most students at Poly High School Strongly Agreed (49.33%) with the statement.

Most students across the three schools, Strongly Agreed (45.32%) with the statement, “I know about the A-G requirements to get into a CSU/UC”. This trend remained the same within three schools; however, Poly High School (53.66%) had the most students Strongly Agreeing to this statement. When asked, “I am prepared to succeed in college”, most students across the three schools, Agreed (43.35%), with the statement. This trend remained within the three schools.

Most students across the three high schools, Agreed (45.37%) with the statement, “I think I can afford to attend a public, 4-year college using financial aid, scholarships, or family resources”. This trend remained the same within the three schools.

Table 2.4. Percent of Student College Knowledge by Schools by Agreement Degree, High School Students, Long Beach Unified School District High School Survey, Spring 2007.

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N
Immediately after high school, I want to go to college.	Aggregated (Three Schools)	53.82%	32.16%	10.90%	3.12%	3,753
	Cabrillo	48.58%	35.29%	12.81%	3.32%	1,023
	Jordan	50.75%	31.83%	13.01%	4.41%	930
	Poly	60.95%	29.40%	7.70%	1.96%	1,585
I know the difference between a 2-year and a 4-year college.	Aggregated (Three Schools)	44.11%	40.29%	11.59%	4.01%	3,770
	Cabrillo	39.90%	40.77%	15.07%	4.25%	1,035
	Jordan	40.02%	41.96%	12.62%	5.39%	927
	Poly	50.79%	38.45%	8.43%	2.33%	1,589
I know which standardized test(s) I need to take to apply for college.	Aggregated (Three Schools)	32.41%	39.75%	22.17%	5.66%	3,761
	Cabrillo	26.45%	42.64%	25.29%	5.62%	1,032
	Jordan	27.01%	38.61%	26.46%	7.92%	922
	Poly	40.82%	38.99%	16.73%	3.46%	1,590
I understand how taking AP courses will help me in college.	Aggregated (Three Schools)	41.96%	39.42%	14.41%	4.21%	3,727
	Cabrillo	38.45%	42.87%	14.26%	4.42%	1,017
	Jordan	36.64%	37.08%	20.39%	5.89%	917
	Poly	49.33%	38.49%	9.83%	2.35%	1,577
I know about the A-G requirements to get into a CSU/UC.	Aggregated (Three Schools)	45.32%	36.69%	13.81%	4.18%	3,707
	Cabrillo	42.45%	41.57%	12.06%	3.92%	1,020
	Jordan	38.43%	34.61%	20.85%	6.11%	916
	Poly	53.66%	34.83%	9.32%	2.19%	1,556
I am prepared to succeed in college.	Aggregated (Three Schools)	35.46%	43.35%	16.89%	4.30%	3,677
	Cabrillo	32.50%	43.40%	19.70%	4.40%	1,000
	Jordan	33.77%	42.76%	17.65%	5.81%	912
	Poly	39.97%	43.65%	13.73%	2.64%	1,551
I think I can afford to attend a public, 4-year college using financial aid, scholarships, or family's resources.	Aggregated (Three Schools)	33.68%	45.37%	15.20%	5.75%	3,670
	Cabrillo	30.07%	45.65%	18.38%	5.89%	1,001
	Jordan	30.92%	46.05%	15.79%	7.24%	912
	Poly	38.80%	45.14%	12.24%	3.82%	1,544

Conclusions

Interestingly, students' academic behavior, for example, seeking tutoring when needed or meeting with someone often to go over their high school plan, was relatively infrequent; however, it was not reflective of their relatively strong knowledge of college knowledge (i.e. types of tests that needed to be taken and the importance of AP courses). Furthermore, students at Poly High Schools seemed to have slightly stronger knowledge of college than students at Cabrillo and Jordan High Schools, but their academic behavior was relatively the same. Students also appear to hold high self-expectations when it comes to high school graduation and college attendance.

The main findings from the student and teacher focus groups indicate that at Cabrillo significant progress has been made towards establishing mentoring and tutoring programs, despite the fact that students may not yet report frequent use of such services. According to the teachers, students receive recognition as an incentive for getting good grades. Parent notification letters are also sent out when students need interventions during any marking period. Cabrillo teachers also indicate positive changes in student grades and students taking more responsibility for their academics and their behavior. Challenges with regard to affecting students' academic behavior and attitudes include finding ways for all students to be motivated to take advantage of their options.

At Jordan, the main findings of the focus groups indicate that SLCs have also increased the number of parent contacts for students who might be struggling academically. Mentor and tutoring programs are being coordinated with the counselors in order to increase student achievement. All core teachers have been trained in AVID techniques and are being infused into all of the SLCs. Challenges include continuing to develop effective academic support systems to ensure achievement and making sure that teachers get grades in a timely manner in order to collaborate on changes. Teachers also expressed concern over the integration of Special Education and English Learner students.

III. SCHOOL CULTURE AND CLIMATE

LBUSD's second district goal is to create a high school culture and climate among students and staff that supports improved achievement. To address whether SLCs have been conducive to fostering a culture of trust and collaboration, data around 1) student involvement in SLC development and implementation and 2) personalization were collected through the 2007 Spring Student Surveys. Variables of interest included students' sense of belonging; positive and supportive relationships amongst students and staff; and staff collegiality and collaboration.

Student Involvement in SLC Development and Implementation

Similar to last year's survey, two statements were used to gauge students' involvement in school-wide and SLC-related decision-making processes. Table 3.1 lists statements that have been re-worded in this year's survey to more accurately capture students' responses.

Aggregated responses indicate that majority of students feel they always have opportunities to partake in decision making processes at their schools; whereas, approximately 19% of students never

do. A similar pattern exists for the three schools when the data is disaggregated with students feeling more frequently involved in school-wide decision-making at Poly and less involved at Cabrillo. About 40% of students at Jordan indicated they have opportunities to engage in making decisions about their schools.

Table 3.1. Percentage of Involvement by School by Frequency, High School Students, Long Beach Unified School District High School Survey, Spring 2007.

	Always	Once A Week	Every Other Week	Once A Month	2-3 Times A Year	Once A Year	Never	N
Students have opportunities to make decisions about their school that affect them.								
Aggregated (Three Schools)	40.18%	11.77%	6.94%	7.87%	8.03%	6.44%	18.76%	3,848
Cabrillo	37.44%	12.80%	8.06%	8.72%	8.34%	6.45%	18.20%	1,055
Jordan	40.23%	12.92%	7.67%	6.41%	5.36%	5.88%	21.53%	952
Poly	41.85%	10.66%	5.83%	8.62%	9.61%	6.88%	16.55%	1,613
Students have opportunities to make suggestions about how to change their SLC.								
Aggregated (Three Schools)	7.10%	7.04%	6.01%	8.35%	6.32%	7.74%	57.45%	3,593
Cabrillo	5.67%	6.23%	6.01%	5.78%	4.45%	5.78%	66.07%	899
Jordan	8.34%	7.57%	7.24%	8.56%	4.94%	5.93%	57.41%	911
Poly	7.02%	6.70%	5.63%	9.87%	8.41%	10.56%	51.80%	1,581

Students’ responses to the second statement reflect an inverse pattern compared to those of the first. Specifically, aggregated data show that majority of students indicated never having opportunities to engage in decision-making in their SLCs while approximately 7% of students always feel they do. When disaggregating the data, majority of students at Cabrillo indicated never being involved in making decisions about their SLCs while about 52% of students at Poly reported this. Jordan, again, is the intermediate school – about 57% of students indicated not participating in SLC decision-making processes.

Students were also asked to what extent they agreed or disagreed with several statements pertaining to their SLCs, as well. (see Table 3.2) When asked if students were comfortable in their SLC community, the majority of students, a total of 78%, agreed or strongly agreed with that statement, with Cabrillo having the lowest percent (64) and Poly having the highest (88). When asked if students liked participating in their SLC activities, we see that 78% of Poly students agree or strongly agree, at Cabrillo it is 53% and at Jordan it is 64%. The disparity in agreement could stem from the fact that the SLCs at Cabrillo and Jordan are only in their second year of implementation, and therefore, still in development. Interestingly, when asked if immediately after high school students were interested in entering the workforce in the focus area of their SLC, less than half (40-45%) of students at the three schools agreed or strongly agreed with that statement. It could be that most students see themselves entering college immediately after high school, and thus disagreed with the statement. Or, it could be that students are not sure of their possible career path. Further investigation will be needed to see if in fact students do not see their SLCs as pathways to a career or, if the survey statement should be modified.

Table 3.2. Percent of Student SLC Identity by Schools by Agreement Degree, High School Students, Long Beach Unified School District High School Survey, Spring 2007.

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N
I feel comfortable in my SLC community.	Aggregated (Three Schools)	25.06%	53.42%	13.55%	7.97%	3,499
	Cabrillo	14.53%	48.96%	22.34%	14.16%	819
	Jordan	24.35%	51.41%	14.43%	9.81%	887
	Poly	32.25%	56.52%	8.16%	3.07%	1,594
I like participating in my SLC activities.	Aggregated (Three Schools)	15.68%	51.61%	23.37%	9.34%	3,457
	Cabrillo	10.75%	41.78%	30.90%	16.56%	809
	Jordan	18.44%	45.93%	25.00%	10.63%	884
	Poly	17.58%	60.13%	17.90%	4.39%	1,570
Immediately after high school, I want to enter the workforce in the area of focus of my SLC.	Aggregated (Three Schools)	11.90%	31.10%	39.58%	17.42%	3,444
	Cabrillo	10.89%	29.43%	42.11%	17.58%	836
	Jordan	10.80%	32.17%	39.02%	18.00%	861
	Poly	13.73%	30.72%	38.74%	16.81%	1,559

Personalization

Personalization was addressed by collecting information around student to teacher interaction and student to student interaction. These sub-sections will be elaborated on below.

Student-Teacher Interaction

To ascertain the degree of student-teacher interactions, students were asked to respond to questions pertaining to the level of communication and quality of support they receive from their teachers.

Students were asked to rate their level of agreement in terms of the amount of instructional changes they perceived occurring in their classes. (see Table 3.3) In general, majority of students agree that they are encouraged to think critically and that their teachers use various instructional approaches to meet the needs of different students. Specifically, about 80% of students at Cabrillo and Jordan, and approximately 86% of students at Poly reported the former. Conversely, about 77% and 80% reported the latter, respectively.

Table 3.3. Percent of Changes in Instruction by Schools by Agreement Degree, High School Students, Long Beach Unified School District High School Survey, Spring 2007.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N
My teachers' lessons are designed to encourage me to think critically.					
Aggregated (Three Schools)	25.46%	58.19%	13.08%	3.27%	3,791
Cabrillo	21.82%	58.95%	15.50%	3.73%	1,045
Jordan	23.50%	58.55%	13.35%	4.59%	936
Poly	29.42%	57.28%	11.23%	2.07%	1,594
Teachers use a variety of teaching approaches to help students with different learning styles.					
Aggregated (Three Schools)	22.13%	56.14%	17.30%	4.43%	3,746
Cabrillo	19.98%	55.63%	19.00%	5.39%	1,021
Jordan	21.29%	57.74%	15.38%	5.59%	930
Poly	24.27%	56.10%	16.45%	3.18%	1,574
Teachers sometimes change their lesson plans because of student suggestions.					
Aggregated (Three Schools)	10.84%	44.23%	34.30%	10.62%	3,746
Cabrillo	9.64%	43.43%	35.35%	11.59%	1,027
Jordan	11.70%	39.98%	35.43%	12.89%	923
Poly	10.84%	48.26%	32.66%	8.24%	1,577

On the other hand, lower rates of agreement were reported (approximately 55% overall) when students were asked whether teachers would occasionally make changes to lessons according to their suggestions. About 57% of Poly students and 53% of students at Cabrillo and Jordan reported noticing this change. (see Table 3.2)

In terms of student-teacher communication, aggregated data in Table 3.4 indicate that most students always communicate or do so on a weekly basis with their teachers about their school work while about 14% never do. Similar patterns exist across the three schools when the data is disaggregated with majority of students indicating they discuss their academic work with teachers at least once a week at Poly and least frequently at Cabrillo. Approximately 44% of students at Jordan reported communicating with their teachers about school work once a week or more.

Table 3.4. Percent of Teacher Communication by Schools by Frequency, High School Students, Long Beach Unified School District High School Survey, Spring 2007.

	Always	Once A Week	Every Other Week	Once A Month	2-3 Times A Year	Once A Year	Never	N
I talk to my teachers about my academic work.								
Aggregated (Three Schools)	26.78%	17.28%	14.63%	14.77%	7.74%	4.62%	14.19%	3,813
Cabrillo	23.08%	16.25%	15.67%	13.27%	8.08%	6.25%	17.40%	1,040
Jordan	27.14%	16.68%	12.99%	14.78%	7.50%	5.07%	15.84%	947
Poly	30.04%	18.05%	15.49%	15.74%	7.75%	3.12%	9.81%	1,601

On the other hand, aggregated data, as presented below in Table 3.5, do not provide a clear indication of whether students in general are speaking to their teachers about personal matters. About 50% of students never discuss personal issues with teachers while the remainder of students vary in terms of how often these conversations take place. Disaggregated data reveal a similar pattern with students most frequently speaking to teachers about such issues at Poly (about 18% of the time) and least frequently doing so at Cabrillo (about 16% of the time). Again, Jordan falls into the middle category with 15% of students engaging in these types of conversations.

Table 3.5. Percent of Teacher Support by Schools by Frequency, High School Students, Long Beach Unified School District High School Survey, Spring 2007.

	Always	Once A Week	Every Other Week	Once A Month	2-3 Times A Year	Once A Year	Never	N
I talk to my teachers about my problems.								
Aggregated (Three Schools)	10.26%	6.49%	7.13%	8.57%	9.94%	7.63%	49.99%	3,803
Cabrillo	10.05%	6.32%	7.75%	7.56%	8.71%	6.60%	53.01%	1,045
Jordan	8.62%	6.81%	6.06%	7.34%	7.35%	6.49%	57.23%	940
Poly	11.49%	6.40%	7.34%	9.86%	12.81%	8.85%	43.25%	1,593

Thus far, survey questions pertaining to student-teacher communication seem to indicate that conversations are more academically oriented. While majority of students are speaking with teachers about issues related to school work, a high percentage of students are not. In contrast, most students indicate that they tend not to discuss personal matters with teachers, which may suggest individual preference or insufficient time for interaction amongst a host of other possibilities.

Students were also asked to provide information on how much support they receive from their teachers. Statements were scaled from “strongly agree” to “strongly disagree”. Survey results, in aggregate form as presented in Table 3.6 below, indicate most students “agree” or “strongly agree” that their teachers demonstrate interest in their overall academic performance while about 14% of students feeling otherwise. Results at the school level indicate that approximately 90% of students at Poly, compared to about 85% at Jordan, feel their teachers are interested in their performance in general.

Table 3.6. Percent of Teacher Support by Schools by Agreement Degree, High School Students, Long Beach Unified School District High School Survey, Spring 2007.

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N
My teachers care about how I do in school.	Aggregated (Three Schools)	35.53%	50.76%	9.87%	3.83%	3,808
	Cabrillo	32.66%	51.96%	11.56%	3.82%	1,047
	Jordan	34.68%	49.10%	10.39%	5.83%	943
	Poly	38.53%	50.63%	8.40%	2.44%	1,596
I feel supported by my teachers in my academic performance in class.	Aggregated (Three Schools)	27.13%	54.56%	14.44%	3.87%	3,774
	Cabrillo	24.63%	55.70%	15.09%	4.58%	1,027
	Jordan	23.24%	53.04%	15.97%	5.75%	939
	Poly	30.96%	54.75%	12.08%	2.20%	1,589
I feel supported by my teachers in my plans after high school.	Aggregated (Three Schools)	18.96%	50.83%	23.33%	6.88%	3,750
	Cabrillo	17.15%	49.81%	24.95%	8.09%	1,026
	Jordan	18.27%	47.24%	25.73%	8.76%	925
	Poly	20.82%	53.61%	21.08%	4.49%	1,580

The statement pertaining to teacher support in class reveals a similar pattern, in aggregate, with a small percentage (about 17%) of students “disagreeing” or “strongly disagreeing” and majority of students “agreeing” or “strongly agreeing” (about 83%). Consistent results are found when survey data are disaggregated with Poly having the highest positive response rates and Jordan trailing with 76% of students responding positively with the statement.

Table 3.6 also reflects students’ response regarding their perception of teachers’ support of their post-secondary plans. In general, students tended to agree feeling supported by teachers in their plans. Disaggregated data reveals similar results such that Poly leads with majority of students feeling supported and Jordan trailing behind with fewer students feeling supported.

In essence, the table above reveals that most students feel they are supported by their teachers in school in general and in class and about their post-graduation plans in particular. Poly appears to be the leading school in these three areas; whereas, Jordan seems to reflect fewer positive responses.

To better understand the quality of student-teacher communication, students were asked whether they felt their teachers appropriately guided them to helpful resources. Similar to results of questions related to instructional changes (Table 3.3 above), about 80% of students in general reported they felt adequately guided to resources that would provide relevant help.

Table 3.7. Percent of Understanding Student Needs by Schools by Agreement Degree, High School Students, Long Beach Unified School District High School Survey, Spring 2007.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N
Teachers do a good job of making sure students know how they can get help if they fall behind.					
Aggregated (Three Schools)	25.93%	53.57%	16.18%	4.32%	3,752
Cabrillo	24.37%	53.88%	16.99%	4.76%	1,030
Jordan	24.05%	51.35%	18.63%	5.96%	923
Poly	28.42%	55.44%	13.35%	2.78%	1,580

Again, the most number of students who reported “strongly agree” or “agree” to this question were those at Poly (about 83%). Relatively fewer Jordan and Cabrillo students, on the other hand, shared this perception (approximately 71% and 78%, respectively).

The SLC structure should theoretically limit the number of different students teachers should have to interact with on a daily basis and should, therefore, foster a more personalized learning environment for teachers and students alike. To get a better handle on this idea, students were asked to report, on a 4-point agreement scale, about student monitoring amongst teachers.

Table 3.8 indicates that approximately 60% of students in general felt they knew of their teachers talking to each other about their performance in their classes. Jordan and Poly students provided similar responses such that about 61% of students at both schools indicated they “strongly agree” or “agree” to the statement. Cabrillo, on the other hand, had the lowest percentage of students in agreement (about 57%) compared to the other 2 schools.

Table 3.8. Percent of Teacher-Student Monitoring by Schools by Agreement Degree, High School Students, Long Beach Unified School District High School Survey, Spring 2007.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N
I know my teachers talk to each other about my academic performance in their classes.					
Aggregated (Three Schools)	16.72%	43.29%	32.15%	7.85%	3,733
Cabrillo	14.89%	42.41%	32.32%	10.38%	1,021
Jordan	17.66%	42.80%	30.99%	8.56%	923
Poly	17.77%	43.89%	32.80%	5.54%	1,570

Student-Student Interaction

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

When students were asked to rate their level of agreement about the amount of positive peer interactions that take place at school, results suggest that slightly more students “strongly agree” or “agree” (about 55%) than those who “disagree” or “strongly disagree” overall. However,

approximately 64% of students at Poly reported feeling respected by their peers compared to 50% of students at Cabrillo.

Table 3.9. Percent of Positive School Interaction by Schools by Agreement Degree, High School Students, Long Beach Unified School District High School Survey, Spring 2007.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N
Students treat each other with respect.					
Aggregated (Three Schools)	10.52%	43.91%	32.89%	12.68%	3,792
Cabrillo	8.75%	41.34%	36.58%	13.33%	1,028
Jordan	8.43%	35.97%	37.35%	18.25%	937
Poly	13.08%	51.21%	27.48%	8.22%	1,605
I feel closer to my SLC peers than to peers not in my SLC.					
Aggregated (Three Schools)	13.26%	29.04%	40.97%	16.73%	3,461
Cabrillo	5.54%	22.78%	47.04%	24.63%	812
Jordan	12.66%	27.14%	41.73%	18.47%	877
Poly	18.50%	33.21%	37.07%	11.22%	1,578

Additionally, when asked about how they felt about their peers inside versus those outside their SLCs, students in general stated they do not perceive being closer to peers inside their SLC. Specifically, more students (about 72%) at Cabrillo reported this feeling compared to those at Poly (about 48%).

However, when students were asked about peers and peer-support in general, about 53% overall reported speaking to each other about school work once a week or more. Disaggregation of data, as presented in Table 3.10, shows that students at Poly engage in these types of conversations more frequently (about 65% of the time) compared to students at Jordan and Cabrillo (45% and 42%, respectively).

Table 3.10. Percent of Resource for Support by Schools by Frequency, High School Students, Long Beach Unified School District High School Survey, Spring 2007.

	Always	Once A Week	Every Other Week	Once A Month	2-3 Times A Year	Once A Year	Never	N
I talk to my peers about my academic work.								
Aggregated (Three Schools)	36.10%	16.57%	11.83%	9.74%	4.58%	3.72%	17.46%	3,820
Cabrillo	27.19%	15.33%	13.40%	10.41%	6.27%	5.30%	22.08%	1,037
Jordan	30.43%	14.63%	14.74%	11.13%	5.09%	4.45%	19.51%	943
Poly	46.06%	19.16%	9.49%	8.49%	3.10%	2.29%	11.41%	1,613
I talk to my peers about my plans after high school.								
Aggregated (Three Schools)	30.92%	11.56%	10.87%	12.27%	9.69%	6.59%	18.10%	3,807
Cabrillo	27.59%	10.34%	12.36%	11.21%	10.06%	7.85%	20.59%	1,044
Jordan	30.87%	9.62%	10.68%	11.52%	8.67%	7.61%	21.04%	946
Poly	33.61%	13.82%	10.24%	14.07%	10.30%	4.77%	13.19%	1,592

Students' responses reflect a similar pattern when asked about the conversations with peers regarding their post-secondary plans. Specifically, about 43% of students overall stated they spoke with their peers "once a week" or "always" about plans after high school. Similar to results reported for the previous question, fewer students at Cabrillo and Jordan stated engaging in conversations about post-secondary plans (approximately 38% and 41%, respectively) compared to students at Poly (about 48%).

Two additional questions were asked to obtain a more accurate idea of what peer support looked like at the three sites. Students were asked to rate their agreement level about how they perceived their peers supporting them academically. In general, the majority of students reported feeling their peers caring about their performance. Again, responses provided by students at Cabrillo and Jordan (approximately 69% and 67%, respectively) were similar in the sense that about the same proportion of students indicated they "strongly agree" or "agree" that their peers cared about their academic performance; whereas, relatively more students at Poly (about 76%) stated feeling this way.

Table 3.11. Percent of Resource of Support by Schools by Agreement Degree, High School Students, Long Beach Unified School District High School Survey, Spring 2007.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N
My peers care about how I do in school.					
Aggregated (Three Schools)	19.63%	51.22%	21.39%	7.77%	3,811
Cabrillo	16.73%	51.92%	24.52%	6.83%	1,040
Jordan	18.52%	47.62%	23.28%	10.58%	945
Poly	21.75%	54.00%	18.31%	5.94%	1,600

The other question asked pertained to perceived peer influence on academics and results are presented in Table 3.12 below. Compared to the previous statement, slightly more students reported feeling encouraged by their peers to value their education (approximately 75% across the three sites). However, when data were disaggregated, results show that more students at Poly feel encouraged to value their education (about 79%) than those at Cabrillo (about 73%). Similar survey results were found in student responses at Jordan compared to Cabrillo.

Table 3.12. Percent of Academic Oriented Influence by Schools by Agreement Degree, High School Students, Long Beach Unified School District High School Survey, Spring 2007.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N
My peers encourage me to value my education.					
Aggregated (Three Schools)	23.75%	51.13%	18.79%	6.33%	3,810
Cabrillo	20.71%	51.53%	20.52%	7.25%	1,048
Jordan	24.13%	47.51%	20.74%	7.62%	945
Poly	25.49%	53.91%	15.90%	4.70%	1,597

Conclusions

While most students indicated they participate in making decisions about their schools, a high percentage of students also reported not partaking in similar processes within their SLCs. This disparate relationship may indicate that students are not yet fully aware of available opportunities on their campuses. Alternately, there are small percentages of students who indicated being sporadically involved in making decisions about the school in general and about their SLC in particular. Students are feeling comfortable in their SLCs, and the majority of students do like participating in their SLC activities. However, it is not clear if students see participation in their SLCs as a stepping stone to a possible career.

Survey results about student-teacher communication reflect that though students in general do not feel as though their recommendations for instructional changes are considered, they reported feeling academically challenged and supported by their teachers. Also, while factors inhibiting student-teacher communication remains unclear, it appears that a small percentage of students across the three sites feel comfortable discussing academic as well as personal problems with their instructors. The concern now is how to bridge the communication gap between remaining students and teachers so that academic support can continue to be fostered.

In general, results from the student survey pertaining to student-student interaction show little variation in terms of students' respect for each other and no clear affinity for peers enrolled in the same SLC over those who are not, with the exception of students at Poly who reported feeling closer to peers within their SLC. Additionally, while survey results indicated that students do not frequently speak with their peers about academically-oriented issues, most feel their peers support and encourage them to do well and to value educational opportunities that are available.

The main findings from the focus groups help illuminate findings from the survey. At Jordan, teachers report that personalization and mentoring help keep students on track. SLC student focus groups members expressed a high level of belief that their SLC teachers cared deeply about their academic and personal well-being. Students also indicated that they feel that there are more opportunities to express themselves among their peers because they know one another. SLC students at Cabrillo also expressed satisfaction with their SLC programs.

IV. BUILDING LEADERSHIP CAPACITY

On the Fall 2006 staff survey, staff members were asked to rate the extent of their agreement or disagreement with a series of statements pertaining to SLC implementation at their school. (see Table 4.1) In general, for all three schools, at both the school and individual SLC level, the majority of staff members (80%) agreed or strongly agreed that they understood the purpose, vision and goals for implementing SLCs. However, survey results indicate that staff members are not in as strong agreement when it comes to being comfortable with the way SLCs are being implemented. In particular, at Cabrillo, approximately 50% of staff members who responded to the survey agreed with the statements about comfort levels around implementation. At Jordan, about 2/3 of the survey respondents agreed they felt comfortable with the SLC implementation, and at Poly it was about 75% agreement.

Nevertheless, it is clear that staff members at all three schools do believe that SLCs will help raise student achievement (87% agree or strongly agree). However, there is not as strong agreement on whether SLCs will help improve the systems and processes at the school. At Jordan, approximately 43% of teachers disagreed that their SLC provided teachers opportunities to collaborate on decision that will improve systems and processes at the school and department level. At Cabrillo, 37% disagreed for the school level, but 45% disagreed with regard to the department level. At Poly the staff was a little more optimistic with only 26% disagreement for the school level and 30% disagreement at the department level.

At each school, there is also agreement about the difficulty of navigating the district's administrative procedures. Approximately one-third of the staff respondents at Jordan and Poly found the districts administrative procedures difficult to navigate, and this was true for one-half of the staff respondents at Cabrillo.

Table 4.1. Percent of Staff Perceptions of SLC Implementation by Agreement Degree, High School Students, Long Beach Unified School District High School Survey, Spring 2007.

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N
I understand the vision and goals for implementing small learning communities at this school.	Aggregated	30%	51%	16%	4%	250
	Cabrillo	26%	51%	18%	5%	74
	Jordan	24%	55%	18%	4%	84
	Poly	38%	47%	12%	3%	92
I understand the vision and goals for my SLC.	Aggregated	38%	42%	15%	5%	210
	Cabrillo	40%	44%	13%	3%	70
	Jordan	38%	37%	20%	5%	60
	Poly	35%	45%	14%	6%	80
I am comfortable with how my school is implementing small learning communities.	Aggregated	11%	55%	25%	9%	238
	Cabrillo	8%	42%	38%	12%	74
	Jordan	8%	59%	27%	7%	75
	Poly	16%	63%	13%	8%	89
I am comfortable with how my SLC is being implemented.	Aggregated	19%	46%	25%	10%	206
	Cabrillo	13%	39%	35%	13%	69
	Jordan	21%	47%	22%	10%	58
	Poly	24%	51%	18%	8%	79
I believe that forming small learning communities will help this school raise student achievement.	Aggregated	38%	49%	9%	4%	225
	Cabrillo	41%	44%	12%	3%	66
	Jordan	26%	61%	8%	4%	72
	Poly	46%	43%	8%	4%	87
The school provides time on a regular basis for the sharing of information, ideas, and instructional strategies.	Aggregated	17%	46%	29%	8%	230
	Cabrillo	11%	49%	29%	11%	72
	Jordan	13%	48%	32%	7%	69
	Poly	26%	43%	26%	6%	89
I am able to navigate through the district's administrative procedures.	Aggregated	10%	52%	32%	6%	218
	Cabrillo	7%	44%	41%	7%	68
	Jordan	8%	55%	32%	6%	66
	Poly	13%	56%	25%	6%	84
I am able to navigate through the school's administrative procedures.	Aggregated	16%	61%	17%	5%	219
	Cabrillo	13%	54%	27%	6%	70
	Jordan	12%	65%	19%	5%	65
	Poly	23%	64%	8%	5%	84

Table 4.1. Cont'd.

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N
My SLC provides teachers with opportunities to collaborate on decisions that will: improve student achievement.	Aggregated	23%	52%	19%	6%	194
	Cabrillo	20%	50%	24%	6%	66
	Jordan	21%	49%	25%	6%	53
	Poly	28%	56%	11%	5%	75
improve systems and processes at the school level.	Aggregated	15%	51%	25%	10%	194
	Cabrillo	12%	51%	25%	12%	65
	Jordan	15%	42%	34%	9%	53
	Poly	17%	57%	18%	8%	76
improve systems and processes at the department level.	Aggregated	16%	46%	29%	9%	190
	Cabrillo	11%	44%	31%	15%	62
	Jordan	15%	43%	36%	6%	53
	Poly	20%	49%	23%	8%	75
identify areas for professional development.	Aggregated	17%	53%	22%	7%	191
	Cabrillo	16%	45%	27%	13%	64
	Jordan	19%	52%	23%	6%	52
	Poly	17%	61%	17%	4%	75

Staff members were also asked: What has been most rewarding, so far, when it comes to Small Learning Communities?, What has been the biggest challenge, so far, in implementing Small Learning Communities?, and What are your expectations for your SLC? The responses are summarized below, by school.

Cabrillo High School

For the staff at Cabrillo, the most rewarding aspect of implementing SLCs has been the collaboration with teachers. Other rewarding facets have been working with a supportive and energetic team, student growth over time, and the collaboration between students and teachers.

Under challenges, the staff at Cabrillo indicated that the biggest challenge was mixed student ability groups, and making sure that all students are being served appropriately. Other challenges include a lack of organization, the need for a clear purpose for implementation, the need for more buy-in from teachers, the amount of time needed to invest in SLCs, and scheduling issues.

As for the expectations for SLCs, the most common expectation by the staff at Cabrillo was that SLCs would help raise student personal and academic achievement. Other responses did include helping develop a sense of community and encourage greater collaboration across and within teachers and students, raising graduation rates, helping students prepare for college and immediate employment, and developing a cohesive academic program.

When it came to additional resources, the most frequent response by the staff at Cabrillo was the need for additional time to meet and plan for SLC implementation. Professional development and administrative support was also a common response. Five staff members also mentioned that continual funding would be needed. One staff member mentioned technology resources, and one mentioned the need for fieldtrips to get first hand experience.

Jordan High School

So far, for the staff at Jordan, the most rewarding aspect of implementing SLCS has been the smaller groups of students which has provided a more intimate atmosphere. Other rewarding facets have been the collaboration with teachers, student growth over time, the collaboration between students and teachers, and having a supportive and energetic team to work with.

Under challenges, the staff at Jordan indicated that the biggest challenge was mixed student ability groups, and making sure that all students are being served appropriately. Other challenges include a lack of organization, the need for more buy-in from teachers, the amount of time needed to invest in SLCs, and scheduling issues.

As for the expectations for SLCs, the largest expectation by the staff at Jordan was that SLCs would help develop a sense of community and encourage greater collaboration across and within teachers and students. Other responses did include helping raise student achievement and graduation rates, helping students prepare for college and immediate employment, and developing a cohesive academic program.

When it came to additional resources, the most frequent response by the staff at Jordan was the need for professional development and administrative support. Time to meet and plan was also a common response. Two staff members also mentioned technology resources, and one mentioned funding.

Polytechnic High School

So far, for the staff at Poly, the most rewarding aspect of implementing SLCS has been the collaboration with teachers. Other rewarding facets have been the smaller groups which have provided for more intimate interactions, student growth over time, the collaboration between students and teachers, and having a supportive and energetic team.

Under challenges, the staff at Poly indicated that the biggest challenges were buy-in from the teachers and amount of time needed to invest in SLCs. Other challenges include a lack of organization, scheduling issues, the need for a clear purpose, and mixed student ability grouping.

As for the expectations for SLCs, the largest expectation by the staff at Poly was that SLCs would help students' personal and academic achievement. Other responses did include helping students graduate, developing a sense of community, greater collaboration across and within teachers and students, developing a cohesive academic program, and increasing school-wide buy-in.

Conclusions

In summary, the staff at Cabrillo does understand the purpose and vision behind implementing SLCs and they do strongly believe that SLCs will help raise student achievement. However, there is not as strong agreement on whether SLCs will help improve the systems and processes at the school. Approximately half of the staff is feeling comfortable with the implementation of SLCs at the school and/or their own SLC. The most rewarding aspect seems to be the increase in collaboration and better relationships with both teachers and students. The biggest challenge is providing time to the staff to share ideas and instructional strategies, and opportunities for collaboration. Another challenge is to make sure that the staff becomes comfortable with how SLCs are being implemented. A third challenge is the need to make sure that all student groups are being adequately served. Approximately one-half of the staff also found the district's administrative procedures difficult to navigate.

At Jordan the staff also does understand the purpose and vision behind implementing SLCs and they do strongly believe that SLCs will help raise student achievement. However, there is not as strong agreement on whether SLCs will help improve the systems and processes at the school. Here also, the most rewarding aspect seems to be the increase in collaboration and better relationships with both teachers and students. The biggest challenges are providing time to the staff to share ideas and instructional strategies, and opportunities for collaboration. Another challenge is the need to make sure that all student groups are being adequately served. Approximately one-third of the staff also found the district's administrative procedures difficult to navigate.

Lastly, similar to the other two schools, the staff at Poly does understand the purpose and vision behind implementing SLCs and believe that SLCs will help raise student achievement. Likewise, there is not as strong agreement on whether SLCs will help improve the systems and processes at the school. Again, the most rewarding aspect seems to be the increase in collaboration and better relationships with both teachers and students. The biggest challenges are providing time to the staff to share ideas and instructional strategies, and opportunities for collaboration. Another challenge is the need to get increased buy-in from staff members. Approximately one-third of the staff also found the district's administrative procedures difficult to navigate.

Findings from the focus groups confirm findings from the survey. At Cabrillo, teachers expressed that there has been an increase in collaboration and there is a culture of 'shared decision-making' amongst the faculty. At Jordan, teachers spoke of the commitment on the part of the site administrators and SLC leaders to the goals of the SLCs. Non-SLC teachers also reported a new sense of school pride and the positive benefits of SLC structures and strategies for both teachers and students.

One particular challenge expressed by teachers at all three schools during the focus groups included finding the necessary time to meet in SLC teams and work collaboratively. At Cabrillo, teachers wondered how to build effective ownership and leadership within the SLC for both the teachers and students. Teachers at Jordan expressed their desire to develop a plan to rotate teacher lead amongst the SLC teachers to sustain and create continued leadership.

V. OVERALL SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

In this second year of implementation, the SLCs at Cabrillo, Jordan, and Polytechnic High Schools are well on their way to being developed or further supported. As evidenced by the logic models, the leadership team at each school has thoughtfully considered what activities are to be conducted and what outputs and outcomes should be evident as a result of these activities. However, the results of the student survey do indicate that awareness of SLCs and their identities will need to continue to be developed, particularly at Jordan and Cabrillo.

When looking at academic behavior, the student survey results seem to indicate that academic behavior is not reflective of college knowledge. Students at Poly High School seem to be more aware of college issues. Academic behavior across schools is relatively the same, but there is some variation in college knowledge. Poly High School students seem to have more college knowledge, but academic behavior is similar to students at the two other schools.

While most students indicated they participate in making decisions about their schools, a high percentage of students also reported not partaking in similar processes within their SLCs. However, students are feeling comfortable in their SLCs, and the majority of students do like participating in their SLC activities.

Survey results about student-teacher communication reflect that though students in general do not feel as though their recommendations for instructional changes are considered, they reported feeling academically challenged and supported by their teachers. Also, a small percentage of students across the three sites feel comfortable discussing academic as well as personal problems with their instructors. Results from the student survey pertaining to student-student interaction show little variation in terms of students' respect for each other and no clear affinity for peers enrolled in the same SLC over those who are not, with the exception of students at Poly who reported feeling closer to peers within their SLC. Additionally, while survey results indicated that students do not frequently speak with their peers about academically-oriented issues, most feel their peers support and encourage them to do well and to value educational opportunities that are available.

In general, the staff members at each school do understand the purpose and vision behind implementing SLCs and they do strongly believe that SLCs will help raise student achievement. However, there is not as strong agreement on whether SLCs will help improve the systems and processes at the school. The most rewarding aspect for the staff seems to be the increase in collaboration and better relationships with both teachers and students.

The biggest challenge to implementation appears to be finding time for the staff to share ideas and instructional strategies, and opportunities for collaboration. Another challenge is to make sure that the staff becomes comfortable with how SLCs are being implemented and that there is full staff buy-in. A third challenge is the need to make sure that all student groups are being adequately served.

Appendix A – 1 (Cabrillo High School)



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

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

<p>(motivation)</p> <p>Team Building 21. Across SLC meetings 22. Team Building - teachers/students/parents - ropes course - collaboration - professional development</p> <p>Academic & Career Development 23. Tutorials (subject, peer, grade) 24. Extended school day 25. Guest speakers 26. Service Learning 27. Fieldtrips 28. Business/Community Advisory 29. Interdisciplinary Projects - lessons - college fair - p.s. speakers - university fieldtrips - internships 30. Job shadowing/internship</p>	<p>SLC - student direction for future</p> <p><u>Team Building</u> - implementation of strategies - trust & collaboration & respect between SLC teachers</p> <p><u>Academic & Career Development</u></p>			
---	--	--	--	--

Appendix A – 2 (Jordan High School)

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

<p>Career orientation a. Career Bridges (on-line)</p> <p>7. Recruiting a. Publicize b. Meet with counselors at the middle school level and counselors at Jordan</p> <p>8. Build Relationships with local post-secondary schools</p> <p>9. Celebrations a. Awards b. Attendance c. Senior capstone project</p> <p>10. <u>Personalization/SLC identity activities</u> a. <u>T-shirts</u> b. <u>Logo items</u> c. <u>Contest to develop logo</u></p> <p>11. <u>SLC recognition/awareness</u> a. Link on school website <u>b. SLC kick-off</u> <u>c. SLC newsletter</u> <u>d. Video Bulletin</u> <u>e. SLC student of the month</u> <u>f. SLC night/social</u> <u>g. SLC lunch gathering/rally?</u></p> <p>12. Fundraising a. Booster Club?</p>	<p>10a. 10b. 10c. Students wear t-shirts, use logo items</p> <p>10a. 10b. 10c. Students design logos, submit for review, and choose a logo</p> <p>10a. 10b. 10c. Students in the SLC begin to identify with that SLC</p> <p>11a-11g. Students, Staff, etc. at Jordan are more aware of SLCs on campus</p>		
--	---	--	--

Appendix A-3 (Poly High School)

<u>Activities</u>	→ Immediate Outputs	→ Short-term Intermediate Outcomes	→ Long-term Intermediate <u>Outcomes</u>	→ Ultimate Goal
<p>1. Personalization Activities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Back to School Night b. Tailgate parties c. Academy picnic d. Teambuilding activities e. Fieldtrips f. Community service (10th grade project linked) g. Student academy club? h. Academy assembly/ Awards Night i. Academy fair <p>2. College/Career Activities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. College night b. College and career talks c. College visits d. College fair e. Career Center modules <p>3. Monitoring</p> <p>Academic & Social</p> <p>Progress Activities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Mandatory tutorials b. SLC student portfolio activities c. Sessions in which students assess their 	<p>1a. Capture audience. Parents get introduced to teachers of all academies and receive an SLC contact sheet. Students and parents learn SLC and classroom expectations. Parent involvement opportunities. Teachers know their kids are part of this academy.</p> <p>1f. Teambuilding; Networking; Community Awareness</p> <p>2a. Inform parents how college going goals connect to SLCs and more strongly reinforced by giving parents information, reinforcement, students get extra credit. Raise awareness of future activities and events.</p> <p>2b. Have college reps inform students how SLC theme/specialty leads to degree, particular job, income.</p> <p>2c. Communications SLC visits communication dept at local college. All the 10th graders visit the UCs. During school day or after school and can involve parents, all related to</p>	<p>1. Building Community Activities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Form connections with parents, students and teachers -Students and parents id with SLC -Raise parental knowledge and awareness - Satisfy requirements -Reflection <p>2. College & Career Activities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Know requirements (A-G requirements) -Networking -Increase school/community connectedness -Increase parental involvement in child's education <p>4. Professional Development for Teachers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Teachers learn not to rate SLCs, because it undermines SLC/school culture. <p>-10th grade project specific to SLCs, Academy specific project that is req'd should also be linked to community service and they present that as senior year project and also finish their hours for graduation.</p>	<p>1. Building Community Activities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Personalization -Identification with SLC -Increase graduation rate -Increase teacher involvement -Increase parent involvement -Increase community and college involvement -Looking at students as a whole and academies trying to support that, e.g. student grades -Decrease truancy -Decrease Ds and Fs (letter grades) -Increase teacher communication about student -Increase study skills -Developing plan for after high school, post-graduation plan -Increase collaboration -Respect and appreciation of academies - Teacher effective habits -Support a college going culture 	<p>Through each SLC, students will be in an inclusive group to increase personal connections between peers and adults to identify and support the abilities of each student to develop a post- graduation plan which increases future life success.</p>

<p>academic record d. Sessions in which teachers assess student grades by SLC</p> <p>4. Professional</p> <p>Development for Teachers</p> <p>a. How to help students to use planners. b. Poverty training c. Understanding SLCs d. Have teachers assign selves to SLC</p>	<p>colleges or careers, academies can choose what to emphasize college v. career,</p> <p>2d. Senior teachers take responsibility for college admissions paperwork, i.e. teachers do applications in class. Students talk to vendors and guest speakers. Raise awareness of future activities and events</p> <p>2e. Teachers to modules to give that expectation.</p> <p>3a. Help students get a minimum C grade.</p> <p>3c. Students review their own transcript.</p> <p>3d. Monitoring student grades to see which relationships between students/teachers are working or not.</p> <p>4c. Teachers learn what academies hope to accomplish. Show results from research; show what teachers have done differently, why they need to do differently.</p>			
--	---	--	--	--