

**Assessing the Impact of UCLA's
School-centered Outreach Activities:
A Delphi Study**

Eric Barela
&
Nicole Eisenberg

Occasional Report #12

August, 2002

Outreach Evaluation Project
Marvin C. Alkin, Project Director
Tina Christie, Co-director

Graduate School of Education and Information Studies
UCLA

Assessing the impact of UCLA’s school-centered outreach activities: A Delphi study

Introduction	4
Method	5
A brief description of the Delphi technique	5
Procedure.....	6
Results.....	9
Conclusion.....	17
References	21
Appendix A. Explanations of the six conditions.....	22
Appendix B. Results from the Delphi study by activity	23
1) Coaches at school sites	23
2) Professional development sessions	23
3) Reading Results institutes and follow-up	24
4) Saturday, additional period, or after-school intervention programs for students	24
5) Core content programs for students	25
6) Summer/intersession middle-to-high school bridge programs	25
7) Data teams	26
8) University field trips for students.....	26
9) Professional development for teachers around college-readiness and counseling	27
10) Teachers serving as site coordinators at schools	27
11) National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) preparation for teachers	28
12) UCLA Parent Project	28
13) Parent college information sessions.....	29
14) Cross-collaborative institutes for teachers, counselors, and administrators.....	29
15) Participation of teachers in regular CSMP summer institutes.....	30
16) Participation of partnership teachers in the coaching symposium.....	30
17) Connecting teachers with emeritus UCLA faculty	30
18) Novice teacher observation and teaching.....	31
19) Community tours and dinners for novice teachers	31
21) Teach LA program for emergency certified teachers	32
22) Advanced Placement Saturday Academies	32
23) Creating a College-going Culture	33
24) Technology and information literacy in the classroom.....	33

Introduction

In an effort to increase the number of educationally disadvantaged students admitted to the university after the elimination of affirmative action, UCLA has developed and instituted a vast network of activities with local school districts centered on educational reform. These efforts basically have two objectives: 1) to implement and sustain programs that assist prospective students in becoming UC eligible and 2) to foster systemic change related to college readiness.

The systemic change effort supports a longer-term solution to increasing the number of students from Los Angeles area school districts who are UC admissible. This was to be achieved by establishing school-university partnerships (SUP's), aiming to better prepare students for the educational opportunities of the University. In 2000-2001, UCLA maintained partnerships with seventeen schools within Los Angeles, Inglewood, and Lynwood Unified School Districts. UCLA developed partnerships with these schools because of their high underrepresented-minority populations and low admission rates to UC campuses. Partnerships were designed to establish six conditions that school districts, with UCLA, identified as essential for achieving long-term systemic change. These six conditions are: 1) college-going culture; 2) rigorous academic curriculum; 3) high-quality teaching; 4) intensive academic and college-going support; 5) a multicultural, college-going identity; and 6) parent-community relations regarding college going and academics. In essence, the six conditions are the proxy measures of systemic change at schools. A description of the six conditions can be found in Appendix A. Understanding that in order to create systemic change, conditions fostering student eligibility to attend the University of California must begin very early on, much of the efforts over the past three years were focused on building partnerships with elementary and middle schools. More recently, the

partnerships developed more activities aimed at high schools and adapted existing programs to meet their needs.

The SUPs are responsible for the implementation of 24 activities aimed at school-centered systemic change. These activities are mainly focused on working with teachers and administrators, with a few targeting students and parents. Of these 24 activities, 17 were designed for school personnel (teachers and administrators), 5 were designed for students, and 2 were designed for parents and community members.

This purpose of this study was to determine the impact that school-centered outreach activities were having on the six conditions deemed necessary to increase the pool of UC-eligible students. That is, are the school-centered programs perceived to be affecting systemic change? In order to accomplish this, the Delphi technique was used. This method attempts to determine group consensus without the use of group meetings. Since outreach is a very political and sensitive topic, findings from group meetings may not accurately assess group consensus because of undue influence of individuals or the “bandwagon” effect. It would also be difficult to convene group meetings because most of the SUP staff work at school sites, not at UCLA. By eliminating group interaction, we hoped to gather more accurate data on the impact of SUP school-centered activities on the six conditions specified as necessary for systemic change.

Method

A brief description of the Delphi technique

The Delphi technique was developed by researchers Dalkey and Helmer from the Rand Corporation in the 1950’s. The purpose of this method is to achieve consensus on an issue with the participation of all interested parties but without confrontation that could compromise the validity of collected data. Frequently, consensus is obtained by holding a round-table discussion with all parties present and is usually reached through compromise with the “weaker” parties yielding to the influence of the louder, more prominent parties (Helmer, 1967). Delphi can be an

important planning aid for educational policy makers that eliminates the bias of overpowering voices and of the “bandwagon effect” (Adelson et al, 1967). Using the Delphi method is usually desirable when there is “a lack of agreement or incomplete state of knowledge concerning either the nature of the program or the components which must be included in a successful solution” (Delbecq, et al., 1975, p. 5). It is also meant to eliminate personal conflicts and allow for a better opportunity to reach consensus due to the small size of the respondent sample (Delbecq, et al., 1975). Additionally, it allows for a representation of diverse views and interests based on experience and expertise (Linstone and Turoff, 1975).

While it is desirable to achieve consensus on every item, it is unlikely that enough members of a group will agree on every item. Another purpose of the Delphi technique, therefore, is to clarify the dissensus within a group. This clarification is important because it allows group members to figure out ways to address the differences in perception and opinion as a group.

Procedure

The Delphi method employed consists of questionnaires that are answered anonymously by a group of respondents. Based on the responses, the researcher determines whether the respondents have reached consensus item by item (for example, if 50% of respondents choose the same response on an item, the researcher can consider that there is consensus among them regarding that item). For those items where consensus is not reached, the researcher solicits feedback from respondents who represent extreme positions of dissensus (for example, feedback is requested from those who consider an activity has “great impact” and from those who consider it has “no impact”, but not from those who consider it has “some impact”). Then a second round of questionnaires—including only the dissensus items—is sent out to the original respondents, this time including descriptive statistics (for example, percentage of respondents who answered a particular alternative) and anonymous examples of feedback statements provided by respondents

from the extremes. This provides respondents with more information to consider when they rethink their responses. If there still are items that lack consensus after analyzing the responses for the second round questionnaires, a third questionnaire—this time reporting second round results and feedback statements—is given out. These iterations continue until there is consensus on virtually all items or until dissensus is clarified.

In the present study, the extent of participation was extremely disappointing. The first-round questionnaire was mailed to eleven UCLA SUP staff members—including all partnership coordinators—and to thirty-six coaches and consultants involved in partnership activities in partner schools. Eight of the UCLA SUP staff members returned the questionnaires, and only nine of these thirty-six coaches/consultants returned the questionnaire. Our response rate for the first-round questionnaire was 36% (17 of 47). The second round questionnaire was only sent to first round respondents plus one new employee and the response rate was 50% of that group. The process went on for months as we tried to phone, ask, cajole staff into responding, to little avail. Thus, because of the poor response, we do not have great confidence in the findings, but present this report for whatever insight it might provide to the reader.

In this study, the first-round questionnaire asked the respondents to rate each outreach activity's impact on each of the six conditions. Respondents were to indicate whether the activity had little or no impact, some impact, or great impact on each condition, or if it was not applicable to the condition. For example, the respondents were asked to rate the impact of a particular activity, such as the professional development sessions, on the conditions of *Culture*, *Identity*, *Curriculum*, *Teaching*, *Support*, and *Connections*.

There were twenty-four activities that respondents needed to consider, so the first-round SUP Delphi questionnaire consisted of 144 items (24 x 6). The first round questionnaire is located in Appendix C.

If 50% or more of respondents answered that an activity had a particular impact on a specific condition, we determined that to be consensus. After the first round, respondents were not able to reach consensus on 89 of 144 items, that is, fewer than 50% of respondents had agreed on the impact of those activities on those specific conditions. We determined that there were enough items for a second-round questionnaire.

For the second-round questionnaire, we gathered feedback for the extremes of each item from the first-round questionnaire where consensus was not reached. Respondents were to justify their points of view regarding their answers on the first-round questionnaire. (For example, we asked those who responded that having coaches at school sites had little or no impact on the condition of *Culture*, as well as those who responded that it had great impact, to justify and explain their responses.) During the feedback-gathering process, several respondents changed their opinions when asked to justify their first-round answers. Because of this, we were able to collect feedback statements for only 46 of the 89 disputed items.

The second-round questionnaire consisted of the feedback for each extreme, as well as the mean rating (average) and mode rating (rating that occurred most frequently) for each of the 89 items. This questionnaire is located in Appendix D. We asked each of the respondents who sent in the first-round questionnaire, as well as new SUP staff members, to fill out the second-round questionnaire.¹ Nine UCLA SUP staff members and nine coaches/consultants were given the second-round questionnaire. Seven UCLA SUP staff members and two coaches/consultants returned the questionnaire for a response rate of 50% (9 of 18). After the second round, respondents were still unable to reach consensus on 42 items. Due to low response rates, we decided that the second round would be the final iteration in the SUP staff Delphi study.

¹ From the time we did the first round questionnaire, one SUP staff member no longer worked for SUP, one had been replaced by a new person, and there were two additional staff members now working. For this reason, the second round questionnaire was not answered by exactly the same staff members as the first round.

Results

Table 1 shows SUP staff consensus by each condition. Beside each activity is the consensus determination under each condition. The consensus entries beginning with (2) were reached in the second round. Respondents did not reach consensus for those items with “No” in the cell. Additionally, Appendix D presents the detailed results by activity, as well as a description of each SUP activity.

Table 1. Consensus on SUP activities by each of the six conditions.

Activity	Culture	Identity	Curriculum	Teaching	Support	Connections
Coaches at school site	No	No	Great	Great	(2) Some	(2) Some
Professional development sessions	Great	No	Great	Great	Great	(2) Some
Reading Results institutes and follow-up	(2) Not Applicable	(2) Not Applicable	(2) Not Applicable	(2) Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Saturday, additional, or after-school programs for students	(2) Some	No	(2) Some	(2) Some	(2) Some	(2) Some
Core content programs for students	(2) Some	(2) Some	(2) Some	(2) Some	No	(2) Some
Summer/intersession middle-to-high school bridge programs	(2) Some	(2) Some	(2) Some	No	No	No
Data teams	No	No	(2) Great	(2) Great	No	No
University field trips for students	No	Great	No	No	No	(2) Some
Professional development for teachers around college-readiness and counseling	Great	No	No	No	No	No
Teachers serving as site coordinators at schools	No	No	Not Applicable	(2) Some	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
NBPTS preparation for teachers	(2) Not Applicable	(2) Not Applicable	No	No	(2) Not Applicable	(2) Not Applicable
UCLA parent project	(2) Some	(2) Some	(2) Some	No	(2) Some	No
Parent college information sessions	(2) Some	(2) Some	No	No	No	(2) Some
Cross-collaborative institutes for teachers, counselors, and administrators	Some	(2) Some	(2) Some	Some	(2) Some	(2) Little or No
Participation of teachers in regular CSMP summer institutes	(2) Some	No	Great	Great	No	Little or No
Participation of partnership teachers in the coaching symposium	(2) Some	No	Great	Great	No	(2) Little or No
Connecting teachers with emeritus UCLA faculty	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Novice teacher observation and teaching	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Community tours and dinners for novice teachers	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Resident teacher placement in partner schools	No	No	No	(2) Great	No	No
Teach LA program for emergency certified teachers	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Advanced Placement Saturday academies	No	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Creating a college-going culture	(2) Great	No	(2) Great	No	(2) Great	(2) Some
Technology and information literacy in the classroom	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable

Of the 24 activities being examined in this study, five are specifically directed at students, two are directed specifically at parents, and seventeen are directed at school personnel, such as teachers, administrators, school staff, and district staff, as shown in the list below.

Activities Aimed at School Personnel

- Coaches at school site
- Professional development sessions
- Reading Results institutes and follow-up
- Data teams
- Professional development for teachers around college-readiness and counseling
- Teachers serving as site coordinators at schools
- NBPTS preparation for teachers
- Cross-collaborative institutes for teachers, counselors, and administrators
- Participation of teachers in regular CSMP summer institutes
- Participation of partnership teachers in the coaching symposium
- Connecting teachers with emeritus UCLA faculty
- Novice teacher observation and teaching
- Community tours and dinners for novice teachers
- Resident teacher placement in partner schools
- Teach LA program for emergency certified teachers
- Creating a college-going culture
- Technology and information literacy in the classroom

Activities Aimed at Students

- Saturday, additional, or after-school programs for students
- Core content programs for students
- Summer/intersession middle-to-high school bridge programs
- University field trips for students
- Advanced Placement Saturday academies

Activities Aimed at Parents

- UCLA parent project
- Parent college information sessions

SUP staff was able to reach consensus on the majority of the items. However, consensus was not reached on 42 items. Six activities are characterized by strongest dissensus: summer/intersession middle-to-high school bridge programs; data teams; university field trips for students; professional development for teachers around college-readiness and counseling; parent college information sessions; and resident teacher placement in partner schools.

The results presented in Table 1 indicate that nine of the activities were perceived as having great impact on at least one of the six conditions. SUP staff determined that the professional development sessions were having a great impact on the conditions of *Culture*, *Curriculum*, *Teaching* and *Support*. They also agreed that Creating a College-going Culture—a program for college counselors, site coordinators, teachers, and other key administrative personnel—was having a great impact on the conditions of *Culture*, *Curriculum* and *Support*. Having coaches at school sites, organizing data teams, participation of teachers in regular CSMP

summer institutes and participation of partnership teachers in the coaching symposium all were determined to have a great impact on *Curriculum* and *Teaching*. Placing resident teachers in partner schools has a great impact on *Teaching*, the university field trips have a great impact on *Identity*, and the professional development for teachers around college-readiness and counseling has a great impact on *Culture*.

By contrast, three activities were considered as having little or no impact on at least one condition: cross-collaborative institutes for teachers, counselors and administrators; participation of teachers in regular CSMP summer institutes; and participation of partnership teachers in the coaching symposium. In all three cases, the activities were viewed as having practically no impact on *Connections*, but having either some or great impact on other conditions. This seems reasonable, since these particular activities are specifically designed for school personnel, while the condition of *Connections* refers to parent/community relationships

Furthermore, several activities were considered not applicable to *any* of the six conditions. Respondents indicated that eight SUP activities are not applicable to most or all of the six conditions. These activities are: Reading Results institutes and follow-up; NBPTS preparation for teachers; connecting teachers with emeritus UCLA faculty; novice teacher observation and teaching; community tours and dinners for novice teachers; Teach LA program for emergency certified teachers; Advanced Placement Saturday academies; and technology and information literacy in the classroom.² Of these eight activities, seven are directed at school personnel and one (Advanced Placement Saturday academies) is directed at students.

Even though the consensus was that these eight activities were not applicable, a few respondents indicated that they were having an impact. One possible explanation is that SUP activities are not being implemented at all partner schools in the same way. It is plausible that some programs are not being implemented at particular sites, or that they are being implemented,

but not in the way described in the Delphi questionnaire. SUP staff should engage in a discussion about these eight activities to determine if they are being implemented and how. From this study, it is unclear why these activities were determined to be not applicable to the conditions.

If the activities are not applicable to any of the conditions, does this mean that they are not applicable because of how they are designed or implemented? For example, a program aimed at parents may be not applicable to the conditions of teaching and curriculum simply because it was designed and conceptualized to impact parent-community relations and not high quality teaching. But it is also possible that the activity is not applicable because of how it is being implemented. It may be that the activity is designed to impact a condition but because it is not being implemented (or not being implemented appropriately), it is not applicable. For example, the Teach LA program for emergency certified teachers was considered by respondents to be not applicable to any condition, but most likely this is because it is not being implemented in either Inglewood nor Lynwood.³ Furthermore, it is our impression that the respondents did not always interpret the response alternatives in the same way. For example, some respondents may think that an activity aimed at parents has “little or no impact” on teaching, while others may think that it is “not applicable” to that condition. This is probably due to a limitation in the questionnaire, which failed to adequately differentiate the alternatives and explain when each one should be used.

UCLA staff should thoroughly review those activities that were considered “not applicable” to any condition. If the programs are not aimed at fostering any of the conditions that the school-university partnership is trying to reach, then should those activities be

² Additionally, having teachers serving as site coordinators at schools was perceived as not applicable to most conditions, but having some impact on *Teaching*.

³ The program was sponsored by UTLA and LAUSD, and not implemented in the other school districts.

implemented at all? And if the programs are correctly designed but incorrectly implemented, should efforts be carried out to put them into practice appropriately?

Under the condition of *Culture*, respondents determined that eleven of the SUP activities were having at least some impact on that condition in the partnerships. Of these activities, six were directed at teachers and administrators, three were directed at students, and two were directed at parents. SUP staff was unable to reach consensus on the impact of six activities.⁴ Two activities were seen as especially contributing to this condition: professional development sessions and professional development for teachers around college-readiness and counseling.

The condition of *Culture* is directed at a student's identity development. Its description is "where adults and peers see college-going as expected and attainable, and where they see the effort and persistence that preparation for college requires as normal." Of the five activities specifically directed at students, SUP staff reached consensus on the impact of three of these activities on *Culture*, a student-centered condition. For the other two, most respondents said that they were having at least some impact, but not enough to reach consensus. Given the response patterns, respondents indicated that overall, many SUP activities were helping students nurture a college-going culture within themselves.

Identity is another student-centered condition intended to bridge students' multiple worlds. Under this condition activities attempt to develop students' "confidence and skills to negotiate college without sacrificing one's own identity and connections with one's home community." SUP staff determined that only six activities are having at least some impact on this condition, with one (university field trips for students) having the greatest impact. Respondents were unable to determine consensus on the impact of ten of the activities. Of the five student-directed activities, respondents indicated that three of them were having at least some impact on the condition. Of the seventeen activities directed at school personnel,

⁴ Of these, four were directed at teachers and administrators and two were directed at students.

respondents determined that only one (cross-collaborative institutes for teachers counselors and administrators) was having an impact on the condition. Results seem to show that while the student-directed activities are having an impact, the impact of the personnel-directed activities is unclear. Perhaps this is because these activities are aimed at school personnel and not students, and are therefore are not designed to have an impact on this condition. Overall, and since respondents were only able to reach consensus on six activities, it is possible that SUP activities were not having too much of an impact on bridging students' multiple worlds.

Under the conditions of *Curriculum* and *Teaching*, respondents determined that most of the activities that were applicable to each condition were having at least some impact, with six activities having a great impact. That is, SUP staff determined that their activities, on the whole, were having a positive impact on the conditions of *Curriculum* and *Teaching*.

Eleven of the activities had at least some impact on the condition of *Curriculum*. Of the five activities where consensus was not determined, only three concerned school personnel. Additionally, none of the activities were determined to have little or no impact, and very few considered not applicable. Respondents consider that overall, SUP staff is successfully working with school personnel to create and improve high-quality curricula for students.

The same holds true for activities for the condition of *Teaching*. This condition concerns activities attempting to nurture “well-qualified teachers, instruction that engages students in work of high intellectual quality.” Since most SUP activities are aimed at teachers and other school personnel, they should be concerned with the development of high-quality teaching. SUP staff determined that ten of their activities are having at least some impact on this condition. Where consensus was not reached, it was often where the activities were aimed at students and parents.

SUP staff was able to reach consensus on only six of the activities under the condition of *Support*. Activities under this condition are concerned with academic support for students beyond the classroom through “academic tutoring, SAT preparation, coaching about college

admissions, financial aid, etc.” Of the five student-directed activities, SUP staff was not able to determine consensus for three of them. It is possible that respondents viewed the SUP activities as not having much of an impact on this condition. When we examined the response patterns for most activities where respondents were unable to reach consensus, many respondents indicated that the activity was having either little or no impact or some impact on *Support*. One potential reason for this is that respondents thought EAOP activities are more closely aligned with the goals of this condition, precisely because EAOP activities are student-centered and explicitly address issues of extracurricular support, while SUP activities are primarily directed at school personnel.

Under the condition of *Connections*, SUP staff reached consensus on ten of the activities. This condition is concerned with establishing parent/community connections with students and schools through “parent seminars on curriculum, teaching, and college going.” SUP staff were able to reach consensus on the impact of only one of the two activities directed at parents (parent college information sessions). For the other activity (UCLA Parent Project), they did not reach consensus, but many respondents indicated that it was having at least some impact on this condition. This is an indication that the activities specifically aimed at parents are having an impact on this condition. Respondents indicated that only seven SUP activities have at least some impact on the condition, but no activities were have a great impact and two have little or no impact. Apparently, SUP staff are aware that their activities are not having too much of an impact on building parent/community relations.

Overall, the SUP activities seemed to be having a greater impact on the conditions of *Culture, Curriculum and Teaching* than on the conditions of *Identity, Support, and Connections*. It is clear that SUP activities were having a positive effect on the creation of an internal college-going culture in students, of rigorous curricula and of high-quality teaching. The effects of SUP

activities on bridging students' multiple worlds, providing out-of-classroom academic assistance, and fostering parent/community relations were unclear.

Conclusion

The activities implemented by the school-university partnerships are guided by six conditions that were designed to lead to systemic change within schools. These six conditions are: 1) college-going culture; 2) rigorous academic curriculum; 3) high-quality teaching; 4) intensive academic and college-going support; 5) a multicultural, college-going identity; and 6) parent-community relations regarding college going and academics. The present study used the Delphi technique to evaluate the impact that SUP activities were having on each of these conditions.

Although there are general indications about the impact of SUP activities on the six conditions, results from this study regarding the impact of each activity on each condition are unclear. Overall, it seems that the activities are having a greater impact on the conditions of *Culture, Curriculum* and *Teaching*, and less of an impact on the conditions of *Identity, Support* and *Connections*. Further discussion by SUP staff is needed in order to accurately determine whether the SUP activities are being implemented in partner schools and the extent of the implementation.

Some methodological issues of the Delphi procedure are worth examining before concluding this report. A successful Delphi study satisfies the following two criteria: 1) the results should be stable from round to round and 2) consensus should be reached on most items (Helmer, 1967).

With respect to the first of these criteria, we can say that for the most part, results were stable from one round to the next. This is important because the second round of a Delphi study is not intended to generate dramatic reversals in opinion; rather, future iterations of the Delphi

are intended to modify stable views in order to allow for the coalescence of consensus and the clarification of dissensus. In our study, changes that occurred from one round to the next were usually minor (for example, from “great impact” to “some impact”). However, there were a few exceptions to this, resulting in major shifts in opinion. One possible explanation for these major shifts has to do with the nature of our respondent pool. As was mentioned earlier, we did not have the exact same pool of respondents in the first and second rounds. Due to lack of response, creation of new positions, and personnel changes, some of the respondents in our second round changed, and this might have caused some of the major shifts in opinion.

On the matter of the second criterion, consensus was achieved on 102 out of 144 items (71%) after the second round. While a third-round questionnaire may have led to SUP staff reaching consensus on more items, we did not think it would be very successful due to low response rates in preceding rounds. For those items where consensus was not reached, the nature of the dissensus was somewhat clarified, in the sense that we have a better idea of how many people think a particular activity is having a particular impact. On many items, the dissensus was often between those respondents who indicated the activity was not applicable and those who determined that the activity was having an impact. However, the lack of feedback statements did not allow us to clarify *why* the respondents believed the activities had the impact they did. While it is important for a group to understand its consensus, it is just as important for a group to understand where individual members do not agree and if there are patterns within this dissensus.

Additionally, it is also important to examine the low response rate. All UCLA SUP staff and all school site coaches were given the first-round questionnaire, but only 36% of those given the questionnaire responded. When so few people from the organization are represented in a Delphi study, it is unclear if the consensus that are reached are truly those of the entire organization.

Moreover, several practical issues that were encountered while carrying out the study must be mentioned. First, it is important to note that the present Delphi study was conducted while SUP activities were being funded and run by UCLA. However, due to recent budget cuts (which occurred during the report-writing process), the future of many of the activities we examined is uncertain.

Another issue refers to the difficulties encountered in conducting this study. We did not anticipate several of the barriers we faced in the completion of this evaluation. For instance, we were surprised by the lack of response. We would have liked to collect the opinion of as many SUP staff members, coaches and consultants as possible. Yet despite intense and persistent work in contacting them, we got less than half of our sample to respond in the first round (17 out of 47). Similarly, in the second round we only got 9 out of 18 respondents to return the questionnaire. With such a small response rate, we feel that the success of our Delphi study is undermined.

A comparable situation occurred when we set out to collect feedback statements after the first round of responses. In several, if not most cases, it was impossible to get respondents to provide feedback. And when we did talk to the respondents in the extremes about their responses—asking them to explain and justify their opinions—many of them *changed* their opinions instead of offering justification for their original statements. Due to these changes in opinion, we had to go back and re-rate their responses, recalculate frequencies, and in some cases, require additional feedback statements that were even more difficult to obtain the second time around.

Because of the lack of response and the extreme difficulty in contacting the respondents, we were posed with some qualms regarding our groups' responses. Despite the fact that all respondents were actively involved in SUP, it is possible that they were not all equally familiar with each of the activities. It is also possible that not all staff members accurately understood

each of the conditions. Additionally, it is possible that they might have felt some kind of pressure to affirm that activities were having at least some impact on the conditions, possibly because admitting that they did not have any impact could reflect negatively on SUP or on their own job performance. While it is clear that many SUP activities had an obvious and strong impact on the six conditions, we have to be mindful of this potential problem when interpreting our findings.

References

- Adelson, M., M. Alkin, C. Carey & O. Helmer. 1967. "Planning Education for the Future," *American Behavioral Scientist*, vol. 10, number 7.
- Dalkey, N., D. L. Rourke, R. Lewis, & D. Snyder. 1972. *Studies in the quality of life: Delphi and decision-making*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Delbecq, A. L., A. H. Van de ven, & D. H. Gustafson. 1975. *Group techniques for program planning: A guide to nominal group and Delphi processes*. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman and Company.
- Helmer, O. 1967. *Analysis of the future: The Delphi method*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation.
- Linstone, H. A., & M. Turoff. 1975. *The Delphi method: Techniques and applications*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Appendix A. Explanations of the six conditions

- CULTURE -- *college-going culture*: where adults and peers see college-going as expected and attainable, and where they see the effort and persistence that preparation for college requires as normal (identity development).
- IDENTITY -- *a multicultural college-going identity*: confidence and skills to negotiate college without sacrificing one's own identity and connections with one's home community (bridging students' multiple worlds).
- CURRICULUM -- *rigorous academic curriculum*: A-G courses, honors/AP courses, engagement with significant subject matter (access to knowledge).
- TEACHING -- *high quality teaching*: well-qualified teachers, instruction that engages students in work of high intellectual quality (opportunity to learn).
- SUPPORT -- *intensive academic and college-going support*: academic tutoring, SAT prep, coaching about college admissions, financial aid, etc. (support beyond the classroom and access to the "hidden curriculum" of the college track).
- CONNECTIONS -- *parent/community connections regarding college-going and academics*: parent seminars on curriculum, teaching, and college going (access to knowledge about college preparation and to college-savvy social networks).

Appendix B. Results from the Delphi study by activity

Results are presented by activity. For each activity there is a table that lists the proportion of participants' responses followed by the consensus determination based on our 50% rule. For those items where consensus was not reached, a second table lists the second-round results. Discussion follows each table. All feedback statements are located in the second-round questionnaire, located in Appendix D.

1) Coaches at school sites

California Subject Matter Project (CSMP) fellows observe teachers, model lessons, debrief with teachers, and share resources.

Condition	Little or No Impact	Some Impact	Great Impact	Not Applicable	Consensus
Culture	11.8%	47.1%	29.4%	11.8%	Second Round
Identity	11.8%	47.1%	23.5%	17.6%	Second Round
Curriculum	0%	29.4%	52.9%	17.6%	Great Impact
Teaching	0%	17.6%	70.6%	11.8%	Great Impact
Support	17.6%	23.5%	29.4%	29.4%	Second Round
Connections	17.6%	35.3%	17.6%	29.4%	Second Round

Second Round Condition	Little or No Impact	Some Impact	Great Impact	Not Applicable	Second Round Consensus
Culture	33.3%	22.2%	33.3%	11.1%	No Consensus
Identity	33.3%	44.4%	11.1%	11.1%	No Consensus
Support	11.1%	55.6%	11.1%	22.2%	Some Impact
Connections	33.3%	55.6%	0%	11.1%	Some Impact

2) Professional development sessions

Consultants (CSMP fellows) share content knowledge, instructional strategies, student assessment strategies, and guide curriculum development.

Condition	Little or No Impact	Some Impact	Great Impact	Not Applicable	Consensus
Culture	12.5%	37.5%	50.0%	0%	Great Impact
Identity	20.0%	46.7%	33.3%	0%	Second Round
Curriculum	0%	17.6%	76.5%	5.9%	Great Impact
Teaching	0%	18.8%	81.3%	0%	Great Impact
Support	25.0%	18.8%	50.0%	6.2%	Great Impact
Connections	25.0%	43.8%	18.8%	12.5%	Second Round

Second Round Condition	Little or No Impact	Some Impact	Great Impact	Not Applicable	Second Round Consensus
Identity	33.3%	44.4%	11.1%	11.1%	No Consensus
Connections	33.3%	55.6%	0%	11.1%	Some Impact

3) Reading Results institutes and follow-up

This program, designed for K-3 teachers, helps them teach reading strategies and monitor student progress.

Condition	Little or No Impact	Some Impact	Great Impact	Not Applicable	Consensus
Culture	11.8%	17.6%	23.5%	47.1%	Second Round
Identity	17.6%	5.9%	29.4%	47.1%	Second Round
Curriculum	0%	17.6%	35.3%	47.1%	Second Round
Teaching	0%	17.6%	41.2%	41.2%	Second Round
Support	17.6%	5.9%	11.8%	64.7%	Not Applicable
Connections	23.5%	11.8%	11.8%	52.9%	Not Applicable

Second Round Condition	Little or No Impact	Some Impact	Great Impact	Not Applicable	Second Round Consensus
Culture	25.0%	0%	0%	75.0%	Not Applicable
Identity	33.3%	0%	0%	66.7%	Not Applicable
Curriculum	11.1%	11.1%	11.1%	66.7%	Not Applicable
Teaching	12.5%	12.5%	12.5%	62.5%	Not Applicable

4) Saturday, additional period, or after-school intervention programs for students

These enrichment/motivation programs are for students selected as having UC potential but performing below UC criteria.

Condition	Little or No Impact	Some Impact	Great Impact	Not Applicable	Consensus
Culture	11.8%	29.4%	29.4%	29.4%	Second Round
Identity	5.9%	29.4%	35.3%	29.4%	Second Round
Curriculum	11.8%	29.4%	29.4%	29.4%	Second Round
Teaching	12.5%	37.5%	12.5%	37.5%	Second Round
Support	5.9%	29.4%	29.4%	35.3%	Second Round
Connections	11.8%	35.3%	23.5%	29.4%	Second Round

Second Round Condition	Little or No Impact	Some Impact	Great Impact	Not Applicable	Second Round Consensus
Culture	11.1%	55.6%	22.2%	11.1%	Some Impact

Identity	11.1%	44.4%	33.3%	11.1%	No Consensus
Curriculum	12.5%	62.5%	0%	25.0%	Some Impact
Teaching	22.2%	55.6%	0%	22.2%	Some Impact
Support	0%	50.0%	37.5%	12.5%	Some Impact
Connections	22.2%	55.6%	0%	22.2%	Some Impact

5) Core content programs for students

This is an enrichment program that deepens student knowledge in core content areas.

Condition	Little or No Impact	Some Impact	Great Impact	Not Applicable	Consensus
Culture	5.9%	35.3%	41.2%	17.6%	Second Round
Identity	17.6%	29.4%	35.3%	17.6%	Second Round
Curriculum	5.9%	47.1%	23.5%	23.5%	Second Round
Teaching	17.6%	17.6%	41.2%	23.5%	Second Round
Support	11.8%	35.3%	29.4%	23.5%	Second Round
Connections	11.8%	47.1%	11.8%	29.4%	Second Round

Second Round Condition	Little or No Impact	Some Impact	Great Impact	Not Applicable	Second Round Consensus
Culture	11.1%	55.6%	22.2%	11.1%	Some Impact
Identity	11.1%	55.6%	22.2%	11.1%	Some Impact
Curriculum	11.1%	55.6%	22.2%	11.1%	Some Impact
Teaching	22.2%	55.6%	11.1%	11.1%	Some Impact
Support	11.1%	44.4%	33.3%	11.1%	No Consensus
Connections	22.2%	55.6%	11.1%	11.1%	Some Impact

6) Summer/intersession middle-to-high school bridge programs

These programs are designed to provide transition between middle school and high school.

Condition	Little or No Impact	Some Impact	Great Impact	Not Applicable	Consensus
Culture	11.8%	29.4%	41.2%	17.6%	Second Round
Identity	23.5%	17.6%	41.2%	17.6%	Second Round
Curriculum	18.8%	31.3%	31.3%	18.8%	Second Round
Teaching	18.8%	25.0%	37.5%	18.8%	Second Round
Support	11.8%	29.4%	41.2%	17.6%	Second Round
Connections	29.4%	29.4%	17.6%	23.5%	Second Round

Second Round Condition	Little or No Impact	Some Impact	Great Impact	Not Applicable	Second Round Consensus
Culture	0%	66.7%	11.1%	22.2%	Some Impact
Identity	11.1%	55.6%	11.1%	22.2%	Some Impact
Curriculum	12.5%	50.0%	0%	37.5%	Some Impact
Teaching	11.1%	44.4%	11.1%	33.3%	No Consensus

Support	0%	37.5%	25.0%	37.5%	No Consensus
Connections	11.1%	44.4%	0%	44.4%	No Consensus

7) Data teams

Teams of teachers, administrators, and others at each school site learn how to use data to inform curricular and instructional decisions.

Condition	Little or No Impact	Some Impact	Great Impact	Not Applicable	Consensus
Culture	5.9%	29.4%	35.3%	29.4%	Second Round
Identity	17.6%	23.5%	29.4%	29.4%	Second Round
Curriculum	5.9%	23.5%	35.3%	35.3%	Second Round
Teaching	0%	29.4%	41.2%	29.4%	Second Round
Support	11.8%	23.5%	35.3%	29.4%	Second Round
Connections	17.6%	23.5%	23.5%	35.3%	Second Round

Second Round Condition	Little or No Impact	Some Impact	Great Impact	Not Applicable	Second Round Consensus
Culture	33.3%	22.2%	33.3%	11.1%	No Consensus
Identity	44.4%	11.1%	33.3%	11.1%	No Consensus
Curriculum	11.1%	22.2%	55.6%	11.1%	Great Impact
Teaching	11.1%	22.2%	55.6%	11.1%	Great Impact
Support	22.2%	44.4%	22.2%	11.1%	No Consensus
Connections	44.4%	22.2%	11.1%	22.2%	No Consensus

8) University field trips for students

Student groups visit the University to experience a college academic environment and learn about college admissions.

Condition	Little or No Impact	Some Impact	Great Impact	Not Applicable	Consensus
Culture	0%	35.3%	47.1%	17.6%	Second Round
Identity	0%	29.4%	52.9%	17.6%	Great Impact
Curriculum	29.4%	29.4%	17.6%	23.5%	Second Round
Teaching	29.4%	29.4%	17.6%	23.5%	Second Round
Support	11.8%	29.4%	41.2%	17.6%	Second Round
Connections	17.6%	23.5%	41.2%	17.6%	Second Round

Second Round Condition	Little or No Impact	Some Impact	Great Impact	Not Applicable	Second Round Consensus
Culture	11.1%	44.4%	33.3%	11.1%	No Consensus
Curriculum	33.3%	44.4%	0%	22.2%	No Consensus
Teaching	33.3%	44.4%	0%	22.2%	No Consensus
Support	11.1%	44.4%	33.3%	11.1%	No Consensus

Connections	11.1%	66.7%	11.1%	11.1%	Some Impact
-------------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------------

9) Professional development for teachers around college-readiness and counseling

Presentations are made to school professional staff about higher education requirements and UCLA performance expectations.

Condition	Little or No Impact	Some Impact	Great Impact	Not Applicable	Consensus
Culture	12.5%	12.5%	50.0%	25.0%	Great Impact
Identity	17.6%	23.5%	35.3%	23.5%	Second Round
Curriculum	18.8%	18.8%	37.5%	25.0%	Second Round
Teaching	17.6%	11.8%	47.1%	23.5%	Second Round
Support	5.9%	29.4%	41.2%	23.5%	Second Round
Connections	23.5%	23.5%	29.4%	23.5%	Second Round

Second Round Condition	Little or No Impact	Some Impact	Great Impact	Not Applicable	Second Round Consensus
Identity	11.1%	33.3%	33.3%	22.2%	No Consensus
Curriculum	11.1%	22.2%	44.4%	22.2%	No Consensus
Teaching	22.2%	11.1%	44.4%	22.2%	No Consensus
Support	11.1%	33.3%	33.3%	22.2%	No Consensus
Connections	11.1%	44.4%	22.2%	22.2%	No Consensus

10) Teachers serving as site coordinators at schools

Teachers are selected and paid to serve as liaisons between their schools and UCLA.

Condition	Little or No Impact	Some Impact	Great Impact	Not Applicable	Consensus
Culture	11.8%	17.6%	23.5%	47.1%	Second Round
Identity	17.6%	17.6%	17.6%	47.1%	Second Round
Curriculum	23.5%	5.9%	17.6%	52.9%	Not Applicable
Teaching	17.6%	11.8%	23.5%	47.1%	Second Round
Support	17.6%	11.8%	17.6%	52.9%	Not Applicable
Connections	17.6%	17.6%	11.8%	52.9%	Not Applicable

Second Round Condition	Little or No Impact	Some Impact	Great Impact	Not Applicable	Second Round Consensus
Culture	12.5%	25.0%	25.0%	37.5%	No Consensus
Identity	25.0%	25.0%	12.5%	37.5%	No Consensus
Teaching	12.5%	50.0%	0%	37.5%	Some Impact

11) National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) preparation for teachers

Volunteer teachers participate in a support group designed to prepare them for NBPTS certification.

Condition	Little or No Impact	Some Impact	Great Impact	Not Applicable	Consensus
Culture	11.8%	11.8%	29.4%	47.1%	Second Round
Identity	17.6%	11.8%	23.5%	47.1%	Second Round
Curriculum	5.9%	17.6%	29.4%	47.1%	Second Round
Teaching	0%	11.8%	41.2%	47.1%	Second Round
Support	11.8%	11.8%	29.4%	47.1%	Second Round
Connections	23.5%	11.8%	17.6%	47.1%	Second Round

Second Round Condition	Little or No Impact	Some Impact	Great Impact	Not Applicable	Second Round Consensus
Culture	25.0%	25.0%	0%	50.0%	<i>Not Applicable</i>
Identity	25.0%	25.0%	0%	50.0%	<i>Not Applicable</i>
Curriculum	0%	37.5%	25.0%	37.5%	No Consensus
Teaching	0%	25.0%	37.5%	37.5%	No Consensus
Support	12.5%	25.0%	12.5%	50.0%	<i>Not Applicable</i>
Connections	25.0%	25.0%	0%	50.0%	<i>Not Applicable</i>

12) UCLA Parent Project

Parents are provided with information about curriculum, standards, instruction, and assessment leading to development of an action plan in their communities.

Condition	Little or No Impact	Some Impact	Great Impact	Not Applicable	Consensus
Culture	5.9%	29.4%	35.3%	29.4%	Second Round
Identity	5.9%	29.4%	35.3%	29.4%	Second Round
Curriculum	11.8%	35.3%	17.6%	35.3%	Second Round
Teaching	31.3%	25.0%	6.3%	37.5%	Second Round
Support	11.8%	41.2%	17.6%	29.4%	Second Round
Connections	5.9%	17.6%	47.1%	29.4%	Second Round

Second Round Condition	Little or No Impact	Some Impact	Great Impact	Not Applicable	Second Round Consensus
Culture	0%	55.6%	22.2%	22.2%	<i>Some Impact</i>
Identity	0%	55.6%	22.2%	22.2%	<i>Some Impact</i>
Curriculum	11.1%	55.6%	11.1%	22.2%	<i>Some Impact</i>
Teaching	22.2%	44.4%	11.1%	22.2%	No Consensus
Support	0%	55.6%	22.2%	22.2%	<i>Some Impact</i>
Connections	0%	33.3%	44.4%	22.2%	No Consensus

13) Parent college information sessions

Information sessions about colleges, requirements, financial aid, and other related matters are provided to parents.

Condition	Little or No Impact	Some Impact	Great Impact	Not Applicable	Consensus
Culture	0%	35.3%	29.4%	35.3%	Second Round
Identity	0%	41.2%	23.5%	35.3%	Second Round
Curriculum	23.5%	23.5%	11.8%	41.2%	Second Round
Teaching	35.3%	11.8%	11.8%	41.2%	Second Round
Support	5.9%	35.3%	23.5%	35.3%	Second Round
Connections	0%	29.4%	35.3%	35.3%	Second Round

Second Round Condition	Little or No Impact	Some Impact	Great Impact	Not Applicable	Second Round Consensus
Culture	0%	77.8%	0%	22.2%	Some Impact
Identity	11.1%	66.7%	0%	22.2%	Some Impact
Curriculum	22.2%	44.4%	0%	33.3%	No Consensus
Teaching	22.2%	44.4%	0%	33.3%	No Consensus
Support	33.3%	33.3%	11.1%	22.2%	No Consensus
Connections	0%	66.7%	11.1%	22.2%	Some Impact

14) Cross-collaborative institutes for teachers, counselors, and administrators

Teachers, counselors, and administrators from all collaboratives (or partnerships) attend sessions to engage in conversations pertinent to school reform.

Condition	Little or No Impact	Some Impact	Great Impact	Not Applicable	Consensus
Culture	5.9%	52.9%	35.3%	5.9%	Some Impact
Identity	17.6%	41.2%	35.3%	5.9%	Second Round
Curriculum	0%	47.1%	47.1%	5.9%	Second Round
Teaching	0%	58.8%	35.3%	5.9%	Some Impact
Support	17.6%	47.1%	23.5%	11.8%	Second Round
Connections	29.4%	35.3%	23.5%	11.8%	Second Round

Second Round Condition	Little or No Impact	Some Impact	Great Impact	Not Applicable	Second Round Consensus
Identity	25.0%	50.0%	25.0%	0%	Some Impact
Curriculum	12.5%	50.0%	37.5%	0%	Some Impact
Support	25.0%	50.0%	25.0%	0%	Some Impact
Connections	75.0%	12.5%	12.5%	0%	Little or No Impact

15) Participation of teachers in regular CSMP summer institutes

Teachers participate in CSMP institutes to share best practices, deepen content knowledge, and build leadership.

Condition	Little or No Impact	Some Impact	Great Impact	Not Applicable	Consensus
Culture	11.8%	29.4%	47.1%	11.8%	Second Round
Identity	23.5%	29.4%	29.4%	17.6%	Second Round
Curriculum	5.9%	23.5%	58.8%	11.8%	Great Impact
Teaching	5.9%	23.5%	58.8%	11.8%	Great Impact
Support	35.3%	23.5%	23.5%	17.6%	Second Round
Connections	52.9%	11.8%	11.8%	23.5%	Little or No Impact

Second Round Condition	Little or No Impact	Some Impact	Great Impact	Not Applicable	Second Round Consensus
Culture	11.1%	55.6%	22.2%	11.1%	Some Impact
Identity	33.3%	44.4%	11.1%	11.1%	No Consensus
Support	44.4%	33.3%	11.1%	11.1%	No Consensus

16) Participation of partnership teachers in the coaching symposium

Teachers participate in three-day weekend institutes to share best practices, deepen content knowledge, and build leadership.

Condition	Little or No Impact	Some Impact	Great Impact	Not Applicable	Consensus
Culture	23.5%	29.4%	41.2%	5.9%	Second Round
Identity	29.4%	23.5%	35.3%	11.8%	Second Round
Curriculum	11.8%	29.4%	52.9%	5.9%	Great Impact
Teaching	5.9%	35.3%	52.9%	5.9%	Great Impact
Support	29.4%	29.4%	29.4%	11.8%	Second Round
Connections	41.2%	11.8%	23.5%	23.5%	Second Round

Second Round Condition	Little or No Impact	Some Impact	Great Impact	Not Applicable	Second Round Consensus
Culture	22.2%	55.6%	11.1%	11.1%	Some Impact
Identity	37.5%	25.0%	25.0%	12.5%	No Consensus
Support	33.3%	44.4%	11.1%	11.1%	No Consensus
Connections	50.0%	25.0%	12.5%	12.5%	Little or No Impact

17) Connecting teachers with emeritus UCLA faculty

Emeritus UCLA professors work with teachers from partnership schools to develop content expertise.

Condition	Little or No Impact	Some Impact	Great Impact	Not Applicable	Consensus
Culture	6.3%	6.3%	25.0%	62.5%	Not Applicable
Identity	18.8%	0%	18.8%	62.5%	Not Applicable
Curriculum	0%	6.3%	31.3%	62.5%	Not Applicable
Teaching	6.3%	0%	31.3%	62.5%	Not Applicable
Support	18.8%	0%	18.8%	62.5%	Not Applicable
Connections	18.8%	0%	18.8%	62.5%	Not Applicable

18) Novice teacher observation and teaching

First-year teacher credential candidates observe and teach under the supervision of selected faculty at participating schools.

Condition	Little or No Impact	Some Impact	Great Impact	Not Applicable	Consensus
Culture	0%	12.5%	37.5%	50.0%	Not Applicable
Identity	6.2%	6.2%	37.5%	50.0%	Not Applicable
Curriculum	6.2%	18.8%	25.0%	50.0%	Not Applicable
Teaching	6.2%	12.5%	31.2%	50.0%	Not Applicable
Support	6.2%	12.5%	25.0%	56.3%	Not Applicable
Connections	18.8%	6.2%	12.5%	62.5%	Not Applicable

19) Community tours and dinners for novice teachers

Novice teachers tour communities near participating schools and meet to have dinner with community members.

Condition	Little or No Impact	Some Impact	Great Impact	Not Applicable	Consensus
Culture	0%	12.5%	25.0%	62.5%	Not Applicable
Identity	0%	12.5%	25.0%	62.5%	Not Applicable
Curriculum	6.3%	18.8%	12.5%	62.5%	Not Applicable
Teaching	6.3%	18.8%	12.5%	62.5%	Not Applicable
Support	0%	12.5%	18.8%	68.8%	Not Applicable
Connections	6.3%	12.5%	18.8%	62.5%	Not Applicable

20) Resident teacher placements in partner schools

Resident teachers (second-year full-time teachers) take jobs and teach in partner schools.

Condition	Little or No Impact	Some Impact	Great Impact	Not Applicable	Consensus
Culture	0%	18.8%	43.8%	37.5%	Second Round
Identity	0%	25.0%	37.5%	37.5%	Second Round
Curriculum	6.3%	18.8%	37.5%	37.5%	Second Round
Teaching	6.3%	12.5%	43.8%	37.5%	Second Round

Support	6.3%	18.8%	31.3%	43.8%	Second Round
Connections	18.8%	18.8%	18.8%	43.8%	Second Round

Second Round Condition	Little or No Impact	Some Impact	Great Impact	Not Applicable	Second Round Consensus
Culture	0%	44.4%	22.2%	33.3%	No Consensus
Identity	0%	44.4%	22.2%	33.3%	No Consensus
Curriculum	0%	22.2%	44.4%	33.3%	No Consensus
Teaching	0%	11.1%	55.6%	33.3%	Great Impact
Support	22.2%	33.3%	11.1%	33.3%	No Consensus
Connections	22.2%	33.3%	11.1%	33.3%	No Consensus

21) Teach LA program for emergency certified teachers

Emergency credential teachers participate in a credential program sponsored jointly by UCLA, Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD), and United Teachers – Los Angeles (UTLA).

Condition	Little or No Impact	Some Impact	Great Impact	Not Applicable	Consensus
Culture	6.3%	18.8%	18.8%	56.3%	Not Applicable
Identity	18.8%	12.5%	12.5%	56.3%	Not Applicable
Curriculum	0%	18.8%	25.0%	56.3%	Not Applicable
Teaching	0%	18.8%	25.0%	56.3%	Not Applicable
Support	18.8%	6.3%	12.5%	62.5%	Not Applicable
Connections	18.8%	12.5%	6.3%	62.5%	Not Applicable

22) Advanced Placement Saturday Academies

Saturday academies are held for students and teachers from participating schools who are enrolled in Advanced Placement classes. They are designed to increase performance on Advanced Placement examinations.

Condition	Little or No Impact	Some Impact	Great Impact	Not Applicable	Consensus
Culture	5.9%	5.9%	41.2%	47.1%	Second Round
Identity	0%	12.5%	37.5%	50.0%	Not Applicable
Curriculum	11.8%	5.9%	29.4%	52.9%	Not Applicable
Teaching	12.5%	6.3%	25.0%	56.3%	Not Applicable
Support	6.3%	0%	43.8%	50.0%	Not Applicable
Connections	18.8%	12.5%	12.5%	56.3%	Not Applicable

Second Round Condition	Little or No Impact	Some Impact	Great Impact	Not Applicable	Second Round Consensus
Culture	11.1%	33.3%	22.2%	33.3%	No Consensus

23) Creating a College-going Culture

An ongoing program for college counselors, site coordinators, teachers, and other key administrative personnel designed to refocus the school's efforts toward promoting college-going for students.

Condition	Little or No Impact	Some Impact	Great Impact	Not Applicable	Consensus
Culture	0%	35.3%	41.2%	23.5%	Second Round
Identity	6.3%	31.3%	37.5%	25.0%	Second Round
Curriculum	18.8%	12.5%	43.8%	25.0%	Second Round
Teaching	17.6%	17.6%	41.2%	23.5%	Second Round
Support	6.3%	25.0%	43.8%	25.0%	Second Round
Connections	12.5%	18.8%	43.8%	25.0%	Second Round

Second Round Condition	Little or No Impact	Some Impact	Great Impact	Not Applicable	Second Round Consensus
Culture	12.5%	25.0%	50.0%	12.5%	Great Impact
Identity	12.5%	37.5%	37.5%	12.5%	No Consensus
Curriculum	25.0%	12.5%	50.0%	12.5%	Great Impact
Teaching	25.0%	25.0%	37.5%	12.5%	No Consensus
Support	12.5%	25.0%	50.0%	12.5%	Great Impact
Connections	12.5%	62.5%	12.5%	12.5%	Some Impact

24) Technology and information literacy in the classroom

This program is designed to help teachers integrate technology into the curriculum.

Condition	Little or No Impact	Some Impact	Great Impact	Not Applicable	Consensus
Culture	11.8%	17.6%	17.6%	52.9%	Not Applicable
Identity	11.8%	17.6%	17.6%	52.9%	Not Applicable
Curriculum	5.9%	11.8%	29.4%	52.9%	Not Applicable
Teaching	5.9%	11.8%	29.4%	52.9%	Not Applicable
Support	11.8%	17.6%	11.8%	58.8%	Not Applicable
Connections	11.8%	17.6%	11.8%	58.8%	Not Applicable