FR-03-21

HumRRO

Human Resources Research Organization

Independent Evaluation of the California High School Exit Examination (CAHSEE): AB 1609 Study Report—Volume 2 Appendices

Lauress L. Wise
Carolyn DeMeyer Harris
Lisa E. Koger
Emily Dickinson Bacci
J. Patrick Ford
D. E. (Sunny) Sipes
Shaobang Sun
Milton E. Koger
Richard C.Deatz

Prepared for: **California State Department of Education and California Department of Education**
Sacramento, CA

Contract Number: 00-07

May 1, 2003

66 Canal Center Plaza, Suite 400 • Alexandria, VA 22314 • 703.549.3611 • fax. 703.549.9025
www.humrro.org

Independent Evaluation of the California High School Exit Examination (CAHSEE): AB 1609 Study Report—Volume 2 Appendixes

Table of Contents

APPENDIX A **Survey Instruments** **A-1**

APPENDIX B **Interview Protocols** **B-1**

APPENDIX C **Survey Questionnaire Response Frequencies** **C-1**

APPENDIX D **Summary of Interview Responses** **D-1**

APPENDIX A

Survey Instruments

Friday, March 7, 2003

«School_Principal_1st_Name» «School_Principal_last_Name»
«High_School»
«School_Address» «School_Address1»
«School_City», «School_State» «School_Zip»

Dear Principal «School_Principal_last_Name»:

The California state legislature (AB 1609) has directed the State Board of Education and the California Department of Education to conduct a study to determine whether instruction in the California Content Standards in English/Language Arts (ELA) and mathematics has been sufficient to require that students in the Class of 2004 pass the California High School Exit Exam (CAHSEE) in order to receive a high school diploma.

Every district is being asked to participate, and your middle or high school has been selected from your district for this study. You and some of your English-language arts (ELA) and mathematics teachers are being asked to fill out surveys to provide information that we need to complete the study. Because each selected school represents many other schools, each response is very important.

You will find two types of surveys in the accompanying packet. The principal survey is labeled as Part 1 and the teacher survey as Part 2. You or your designated representative, such as an assistant principal for instruction or curriculum, should complete the Part 1 survey before distributing the Part 2 surveys to teachers.

The Part 1 survey (for principals)—

- First asks you to complete a list of courses that offer initial (primary) instruction covering the California Content Standards for ELA and mathematics to students in either Grades 6-9 or Grades 9-12, depending on your school's level. Again, this is instruction most relevant for a student to prepare to pass the CAHSEE in order to receive a high school diploma. (see http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/tg/hs/ for Exam Blueprints)
  The most common courses, as listed in the CBEDS, have already been provided; note that there are separate lists for ELA and mathematics courses. If you offer other courses that are not listed, there is space for you to write in the titles of up to 10 additional courses that offer the initial instruction. High school courses that are beyond the scope of the CAHSEE, such as calculus or British literature, should not be included as additional courses. Note that your selections should be limited to 10 or fewer between the listed courses and additional entries.
- For each initial course offered, indicate the number of sections offered during the last academic year; if you did not offer a particular course that is already listed, fill in the circle under N/A (not applicable).
- Next, the Part 1 survey asks you to provide a list of remedial courses or programs that you may be using. Again, we have provided a list of state-adopted instructional materials or courses, and we also have provided space for you to write in any other remedial courses or programs that have content most closely related to the California Content Standards. Again, your entries should be limited to 10 or fewer.
- For each remedial course or program offered, please indicate the number of sections offered during the last academic year; if you did not offer a particular course, fill in the circle under N/A (not applicable).
- The last section concludes with several general questions.

When you have completed the Part 1 survey, you will need to prepare a Part 2 survey for each ELA/math primary course and remedial course or program that you selected.

- Write in the title of only one course, such as seventh-grade mathematics or Comprehensive English—Grade 9, in Question 1 of a teacher survey (Part 2). Continue doing this until all courses you selected or added in your survey have their own Part 2 survey.
- Once each course has its own Part 2 survey labeled with a course title in Question 1, you should give the survey and a cover letter to a teacher who can best complete it for that particular course, such as a lead teacher or one who has the most experience in teaching that course.
- When teachers have completed their surveys, they will return them to you.

When all surveys have been completed and returned to you, return them to HumRRO in the enclosed FedEx envelope. All evaluation and related materials are conveyed at HumRRO's expense. Instructions are included in this package.

Please return your package by March 21, 2003

We thank you for your time and your cooperation. Your responses are important to the overall results.

Sincerely,

Carolyn DeMeyer Harris, Ph.D.

January/February 2003

Dear Middle or High School English-Language Arts or Mathematics Teacher:

The California state legislature (AB 1609) has directed the State Board of Education and the California Department of Education to conduct a study to determine whether instruction in the California Content Standards in English/Language Arts (ELA) and mathematics has been sufficient to require that students in the Class of 2004 pass the California High School Exit Exam (CAHSEE) in order to receive a high school diploma.

Every district is being asked to participate, and your middle or high school has been selected from your district for this study. Your principal and some English-language arts (ELA) and mathematics teachers are being asked to fill out surveys to provide information that we need to complete the study. Because each selected school represents many other schools, each response is very important.

Your principal has selected you to provide information about the course or program whose title appears in Question 1 of your survey. (If the course or program title does not appear in Question 1, ask your principal to provide it. and you can write the title in.) This course or program was selected because it offers primary or remedial instruction in English-language arts or mathematics included in the California Content Standards and helps prepare students for the CAHSEE. If your principal mistakenly prepared a survey for a course beyond the scope of the CAHSEE, such as calculus or British literature, please return the uncompleted survey to him or her.

All of your responses to the questions on this survey should relate to the course or instructional program identified in Question #1. Please feel free, if needed, to collaborate with other teachers or colleagues to complete any of the questions. Only one survey will be completed at your school to describe this course or program. Note that analysis and reporting will be done at the state level, not at the district or school level.

Once you have completed your survey, return it to your principal, who will return all surveys to HumRRO.

We thank you for your time and your cooperation. Your responses are important to the overall results.

Sincerely,

Carolyn DeMeyer Harris, Ph.D.

California High School Exit Examination Evaluation—Winter 2003
Information on Courses and Programs of Instruction that Cover the California Content Standards—Grades 9–12, High School Principal, PART 1

This survey seeks a listing of courses that offer initial (primary) instruction covering the California Content Standards in English-language arts and mathematics to students in grades 9 through 12. This listing should not include courses that are beyond the scope of the CAHSEE such as geometry or British Literature. The most common courses listed in CBEDS have been included. If you offer other courses that are not listed, space is provided for you to write in the titles of up to 10 additional courses. Select up to 10 English-language arts courses and mathematics courses that have content closely related to the CAHSEE standards.

For each selected English-language arts and mathematics course, enter the number of sections currently offered. If you don't use a listed course, fill in the circle under N/A (not applicable). A sample listing for mathematics is shown below.

The survey also seeks a listing of remedial instruction—instruction that supports/assists students performing below grade level. We have provided a list of state-adopted instructional materials that you might be using. Again, if you offer other programs that are not listed, space is provided to write in titles of up to 10 programs that have content most closely related to the CAHSEE standards. For each selected program, enter the number of sections offered during the current academic year. If you don't use a listed program, fill in the circle under N/A (not applicable).

GENERAL DIRECTIONS: Please answer by writing an appropriate response or filling in the circle of the appropriate response.

SURVEY MARKING INSTRUCTIONS	
•Use a No. 2 pencil only. •Darken the circle completely. •Erase cleanly any mark you wish to change. •Make no stray marks on this form.	CORRECT MARK INCORRECT MARKS

SAMPLE LISTING OF PRIMARY OR SUPPLEMENTAL COURSES

Mathematics Primary or Supplemental Courses	Number of Sections During Current Academic Year	N/A
Course or Program Title: Algebra 1	5	○
Course or Program Title: Pre-Algebra	5	○
Course or Program Title: Algebra A (1st half of course in 1 year)		●
Course or Program Title: Pre-Algebra, Transition—Pre-Algebra for LEP	2	○
Course or Program Title: Resource Specialist Program (RSP) Math	2	○

If you offer the following courses, indicate the number of sections offered during the current academic year. If a particular course is not offered, fill in the circle under N/A (not applicable). If there are other courses that offer primary instruction to students, write in their titles and indicate the number of sections given this year.

English-Language Arts Primary or Supplemental Courses	**Number of Sections During Current Academic Year**	**N/A**
Course Title: Comprehensive English—Grade 9		○
Course Title: Comprehensive English—Grade 10		○
Course Title: Comprehensive English—Grade 11		○
Course Title: Comprehensive English—Grade 12		○
Course Title: English Literature (2106) (from CBEDS)		○
Course Title: World/Other Literature (2107–2109) (from CBEDS)		○
Course Title: Composition (2113) (from CBEDS)		○
Course Title: Language Structure/Language Arts (2116) (from CBEDS)		○
Course Title: English as a Second Language (2110) (from CBEDS)		○
Course Title: Developmental Reading (2100) (from CBEDS)		○
Course Title:		
Course Title:		
Course Title:		
Course Title:		
Course Title:		
Course Title:		
Course Title:		
Course Title:		
Course Title:		

If you offer the following courses, indicate the number of sections offered during the current academic year. If a particular course is not offered, fill in the circle under N/A (not applicable). If there are other courses that offer primary instruction to students, write in their titles and indicate the number of sections given this year.

Mathematics Primary or Supplemental Courses	**Number of Sections During Current Academic Year**	**N/A**
Course Title: General Math (2400) (from CBEDS)		○
Course Title: Math A (2420) (from CBEDS)		○
Course Title: Math B (2421) (from CBEDS)		○
Course Title: Pre-Algebra (2424) (from CBEDS)		○
Course Title: Algebra I		○
Course Title: Beginning Algebra or Algebra A (2403) (from CBEDS)		○
Course Title: Intermediate Algebra or Algebra B (2404) (from CBEDS)		○
Course Title: Integrated Math I (2435) (from CBEDS)		○
Course Title: Integrated Math II (2426) (from CBEDS)		○
Course Title: Consumer Math (2401) (from CBEDS)		○
Course Title: Remedial Math (2402) (from CBEDS)		
Course Title:		
Course Title:		
Course Title:		
Course Title:		
Course Title:		
Course Title:		
Course Title:		
Course Title:		
Course Title:		

BASIC AND INTERVENTION PROGRAMS

Although these English-language arts programs have been adopted by the state for middle school basic and intervention programs, you may be using them at your school. If you offer other programs that are not listed, space is provided to write in titles of up to 10 programs that have content closely related to CAHSEE standards. For each program enter the number of sections offered during the current academic year. If you don't use a listed program, fill in the circle under N/A (not applicable).

ADOPTED ENGLISH-LANGUAGE ARTS PROGRAMS	Number of Sections During Current Academic Year	N/A
Houghton Mifflin Reading: A Legacy of Literacy		○
SRA/Open Court Reading (SRA/McGraw Hill)		○
The Reader's Choice (Glencoe/McGraw Hill)		○
Literature and Language (Holt, Rinehart and Winston)		○
McDougal Littell Reading & Language Arts Program		○
Prentice-Hall Literature: Timeless Voices, Timeless Themes		○
Language! A Literacy Intervention Curriculum (Glencoe/McGraw Hill)		○
High Point (Hampton Brown)		○
High Point for English Learners (Hampton Brown)		○
READ 180 (Glencoe/McGraw Hill)		○
SRA/Reach Program (SRA/McGraw Hill)		○
Fast Track Reading Program (Wright Group/McGraw Hill)		○
OTHER ENGLISH-LANGUAGE ARTS REMEDIATION PROGRAMS		

hs_p1.dew winter 2003

Although these mathematics programs have been adopted by the state for middle school basic and intervention, you may be using them at your school. If you offer other programs that are not listed, space is provided to write in titles of up to 10 programs that have content closely related to CAHSEE standards. For each program enter the number of sections offered during the current academic year. If you don't use a listed program, fill in the circle under N/A (not applicable).

ADOPTED MATHEMATICS PROGRAMS	Number of Sections During Current Academic Year	N/A
Success with Mathcoach (CSL Associates, Inc.)		○
Harcourt Math @ 2002 (w/ Spanish as Alternate Format K–6)		○
Mathematics by Houghton Mifflin		○
Concepts and Skills (McDougal Littell, Inc.)		○
Structure and Method (McDougal Littell, Inc.)		○
McGraw-Hill Mathematics (w/ Spanish as Alternate Format K–6)		○
Prentice Hall Pre-Algebra, CA Edition		○
Prentice Hall Algebra 1, CA Edition		○
Progress in Mathematics, CA Edition (William H. Sadlier, Inc.)		○
Saxon Math K–3, An Incremental Development (w/ Spanish as Alternate Format K–6)		○
Math 54, 65, 76, and 87 (Saxon Publishers, Inc.)		○
Scott Foresman CA Mathematics		○

OTHER MATHEMATICS REMEDIATION PROGRAMS	

CONCLUDING QUESTIONS

1. What proportion of students who did not pass the ELA portion of the CAHSEE by Spring 2002 subsequently enrolled in a remedial summer school course?

- ○ Nearly all (greater than 90%)
- ○ Most (75% to 90%)
- ○ Some (25% to 74%)
- ○ Only a few (less than 25%)
- ○ Did not have summer school courses
- ○ Data not readily available at school level

2. What proportion of students in the ELA-related summer school course passed the ELA portion of the CAHSEE in July or September 2002?

- ○ Nearly all (greater than 90%)
- ○ Most (75% to 90%)
- ○ Some (25% to 74%)
- ○ Only a few (less than 25%)
- ○ Not applicable
- ○ Data not readily available at school level

3. What proportion of students who did not pass the math portion of the CAHSEE by Spring 2002 subsequently enrolled in a remedial summer school course?

- ○ Nearly all (greater than 90%)
- ○ Most (75% to 90%)
- ○ Some (25% to 74%)
- ○ Only a few (less than 25%)
- ○ Did not have summer school courses
- ○ Data not readily available at school level

4. What proportion of students in the math-related summer school course passed the math portion of the CAHSEE in July or September 2002?

- ○ Nearly all (greater than 90%)
- ○ Most (75% to 90%)
- ○ Some (25% to 74%)
- ○ Only a few (less than 25%)
- ○ Not applicable
- ○ Data not readily available at school level

5. How completely did your school cover the California Content Standards contained in the blueprints adopted for CAHSEE for *English-language arts* in each of the following years?

ELA	Nearly Completely Covered (greater than 90%)	Mostly Covered (75 - 90%)	Partially Covered (25 - 74%)	Little Covered (less than 25%)	Do Not Know
2002-2003 (projected)	○	○	○	○	○
2001-2002	○	○	○	○	○
2000-2001	○	○	○	○	○
1999-2000	○	○	○	○	○
Before 1999	○	○	○	○	○

6. How completely did your school cover the CAHSEE Content Standards for *mathematics* in each of the following years?

Mathematics	Nearly Completely Covered (greater than 90%)	Mostly Covered (75 - 90%)	Partially Covered (25 - 74%)	Little Covered (less than 25%)	Do Not Know
2002-2003 (projected)	○	○	○	○	○
2001-2002	○	○	○	○	○
2000-2001	○	○	○	○	○
1999-2000	○	○	○	○	○
Before 1999	○	○	○	○	○

7. What proportion of the teachers at your school participated during the past 12 months in professional development designed to help them teach the California Content Standards?

- ○ Nearly all (greater than 90%)
- ○ Most (75% to 90%)
- ○ Some (25% to 74%)
- ○ Only a few (less than 25%)
- ○ Not applicable

8. What kind of system is used to track each student's mastery of specific content standards? *(Mark all that apply.)*

- ○ District-based tracking system
- ○ School-based tracking system
- ○ Department-based (ELA or Math) tracking system
- ○ Individual teachers keep track of mastery
- ○ Other (describe) _____
- ○ None

9. How developed are systems at your school to coordinate coverage of CAHSEE content standards between the following four groups? *(Please answer for all four groups.)*	Fully developed	Partially developed	Not developed	N/A
Middle School/High School	○	○	○	○
Special Education/General Education	○	○	○	○
EL Staff/General Education	○	○	○	○
Alternative (Continuation)/General Education	○	○	○	○

10. Rate the importance of regular articulation meetings with your feeder middle schools in preparing students for success on the CAHSEE.

Very Important	Important	Neither important nor unimportant	Unimportant	Very Unimportant
○	○	○	○	○

11. Do you have regular articulation meetings with your feeder middle schools?

- ○ Yes, with all of them
- ○ Only with some of them
- ○ No
- ○ Does not apply to our situation

Thank you for your cooperation!

Please prepare a Part 2 survey for each course or program you selected and distribute them to the appropriate teachers.

California High School Exit Examination Evaluation—Winter 2003
Information on Courses and Programs of Instruction that Cover the California Content Standards—Grades 9-12, High School Teacher, PART 2

You have been selected by your principal to compete this teacher survey (Part 2), which covers the course listed in Question 1. As you answer the questions, please make sure you keep only this course in mind.

School Code _____

SURVEY MARKING INSTRUCTIONS

- **Use a No. 2 pencil.**
- **Fill in the circle completely.**
- **Erase cleanly any marks you wish to change.**
- **Do not make any stray marks on this form.**

CORRECT MARK

○ ● ○ ○

INCORRECT MARKS

✓ ✗ ◔ ◒

Title of Course or Instructional Program

1. Course title as listed in principal's survey (Part 1). ***(This question should already be completed by principal.)***

_____

Course Description

2. When was this course or instructional program first offered?

- ○ 2002–2003
- ○ 2001–2002
- ○ 2000–2001
- ○ 1999–2000
- ○ Before 1999

3. How many sections of this course are offered this academic year?

- ○ 1–2
- ○ 3–5
- ○ 6–10
- ○ More than 10

4. What type of course or instructional program is this?

- ○ Primary course in this subject at this grade open to all students who have met prerequisites
- ○ Required alternative to primary course targeted to certain audience
- ○ Required supplemental course targeted to remediation
- ○ Elective course open to all students
- ○ Elective course targeted to remediation
- ○ Other *(specify)*:

_____

5. When is this course or instructional program offered? ***(Select all that apply.)***

- ○ Before/After school course or program
- ○ Summer school course
- ○ Summer program
- ○ During normal school hours
- ○ Intercession breaks
- ○ Other *(specify)*:

_____

6. At what grade level(s) are the majority of students who take this course?

- ○ 9th
- ○ 10th
- ○ 11th
- ○ 12th
- ○ 9th and 10th
- ○ 10th and 11th
- ○ 11th and 12th
- ○ Other *(specify)*:

_____

Student Demographics of this Course

Please answer for the current academic year. Obtain this information from the principal, if necessary.

7. What is the total enrollment in this course? Include all sections in the count.

_____ number enrolled in course

8. What percent of the enrollment are English Learners?

_____ percent English Learners

9. What percent of the enrollment are special needs students?

_____ percent special needs students

10. What percent of the enrollment are "at-risk" (economically disadvantaged) students?

_____ percent "at-risk" students

11. How would you describe students taking this course or program?

- ○ Almost all students are well prepared to succeed
- ○ Some students do not yet have prerequisite skills
- ○ Most students do not yet have prerequisite skills

12. What proportion of students taking this course or instructional program achieved at least basic performance on last year's corresponding STAR CST test?

- ○ Nearly all (greater than 90%)
- ○ Most (75% to 90%)
- ○ Some (25% to 74%)
- ○ Only a few (less than 25%)
- ○ The course or program is too new to tell.
- ○ Not sure

13. To what extent do the following factors limit the overall effectiveness of this course?

	Very great extent	Great extent	Moderate extent	Slight extent	Not at all
Low attendance	○	○	○	○	○
Low motivation	○	○	○	○	○
Low English proficiency	○	○	○	○	○
Low parental support	○	○	○	○	○
Lack of materials/resources	○	○	○	○	○
Lack of trained instructor(s)	○	○	○	○	○

Instructional Resources for this Course

14. Do instructors for this course use a textbook?

- ○ Yes
- ○ No

15. If a textbook is used, provide the title of the current textbook, author's or publisher's name, and the copyright date.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

16. If a textbook is the primary content source, when did your school adopt this textbook?

- ○ 2002–2003
- ○ 2001–2002
- ○ 2000–2001
- ○ 1999–2000
- ○ Before 1999
- ○ Not applicable

17. If a textbook is used, approximately how much of it do instructors use?

- ○ All
- ○ Most
- ○ About half
- ○ Some
- ○ Too variable to categorize
- ○ Not applicable

18. Indicate how often this course uses the following materials. *(Mark all that apply.)*

	Less than once a month	Once a month	Once a week	2-3 times a week	Daily
Other text(s)	○	○	○	○	○
Commercially prepared material(s) [not computer-based]	○	○	○	○	○
Computer-based program(s)	○	○	○	○	○

20. From the resources used for this course, what is the overall alignment with the California Content Standards?

- ○ Very great [greater than 90%]
- ○ Great [75-90%]
- ○ Moderate [25-74%]
- ○ Slight [less than 25%]
- ○ Not at all

19. If you selected any supplemental materials in Question 18 (above), please describe them.

Other text(s)
Title: _____

Commercially prepared material(s) [not computer-based]
Description: _____

_____

_____

Computer-based program(s)
Description: _____

_____

_____

Please continue on the next page.

About the Instructor(s) of this Course

Obtain this information from the principal or by collaborating with colleagues who teach this course.

21. How many instructors of this course or program have as their most advanced degree:

	Number of ELA instructors	Number of Math instructors
Bachelor's degree	_____	_____
Some graduate school	_____	_____
Master's degree	_____	_____
Doctoral degree	_____	_____
Other *(specify)* _____	_____	_____

22. How many sections of this course or program are taught by a teacher with an appropriate subject area credential?

- ○ Nearly all
- ○ Most
- ○ About half
- ○ Some
- ○ None

23. How many sections of this course or program are taught by a teacher with an emergency credential or by a district intern?

- ○ Nearly all
- ○ Most
- ○ About half
- ○ Some
- ○ None

24. How many instructors have experience teaching this course or program for:

_____ 1 year or less	_____ 6-10 years
_____ 2-3 years	_____ 11-20 years
_____ 4-5 years	_____ More than 20 years

25. How many instructors have a total teaching experience in this subject area of:

_____ 1 year or less	_____ 6-10 years
_____ 2-3 years	_____ 11-20 years
_____ 4-5 years	_____ More than 20 years

26. How are subgroups of students who may be challenged to meet the CHASEE standards placed in sections of this course?

	Students are distributed across most or all sections	Students are clustered in one or a few sections
"At-risk" (economically disadvantaged) students in general	○	○
English Learners	○	○
Remedial students in general	○	○
Special Needs students	○	○

27. To what extent are instructors of this course in general experienced in working with subgroups of students who may be challenged to meet CAHSEE standards?

	Not at all	Slight extent	Moderate extent	Great extent	Very great extent
Working with "at-risk" (economically disadvantaged) students in general	○	○	○	○	○
Working with English Learners	○	○	○	○	○
Working with Remedial students in general	○	○	○	○	○
Working with Special Needs students	○	○	○	○	○

Thanks for your help!

Please return this completed survey to your principal.

R19224-PFI-54321

California High School Exit Examination Evaluation—Winter 2003
Information on Courses and Programs of Instruction that Cover the California Content Standards—Grades 6–9, Middle School Principal, PART 1

This survey seeks a listing of courses that offer initial (primary) instruction covering the California Content Standards in English-language arts and mathematics to students in grades 6 through 9. In the first section, we ask you to identify the primary courses in these subjects taught at each grade, as appropriate to your school level. The most common courses listed in CBEDS have been included. If you offer other courses that are not listed, space is provided for you to write in the titles of up to 10 additional courses. Select up to 10 English-language arts courses and mathematics courses that have content closely related to the California Content Standards.

For each selected English-language arts and mathematics course, enter the number of sections currently offered. If you don't use a listed course, fill in the circle under N/A (not applicable). A sample listing for mathematics is shown below.

The survey also seeks a listing of remedial instruction. We have provided a list of state-adopted instructional materials that you might be using. Again, if you offer other programs that are not listed, space is provided to write in titles of up to 10 programs that have content most closely related to the California Content Standards. For each selected program, enter the number of sections offered during the current academic year. If you don't use a listed program, fill in the circle under N/A (not applicable).

GENERAL DIRECTIONS: Please answer by writing an appropriate response or filling in the circle of the appropriate response.

SURVEY MARKING INSTRUCTIONS	
•Use a No. 2 pencil only. •Darken the circle completely. •Erase cleanly any mark you wish to change. •Make no stray marks on this form.	CORRECT MARK INCORRECT MARKS

SAMPLE LISTING OF PRIMARY OR SUPPLEMENTAL COURSES

Mathematics Primary or Supplemental Courses	Number of Sections During Current Academic Year	N/A
Course or Program Title: Algebra 1	5	○
Course or Program Title: Pre-Algebra	5	○
Course or Program Title: Algebra A (1st half of course in 1 year)		●
Course or Program Title: Pre-Algebra, Transition—Pre-Algebra for LEP	2	○
Course or Program Title: Resource Specialist Program (RSP) Math	2	○

If you offer the following courses, indicate the number of sections offered during the current academic year. If a particular course is not offered, fill in the circle under N/A (not applicable). If there are other courses that offer primary instruction to students, write in their titles and indicate the number of sections given this year.

English-Language Arts Primary or Supplemental Courses	Number of Sections During Current Academic Year	N/A
Course Title: Comprehensive English—Grade 6		○
Course Title: Comprehensive English—Grade 7		○
Course Title: Comprehensive English—Grade 8		○
Course Title: Comprehensive English—Grade 9		○
Course Title: English as a Second Language (2110)		○
Course Title:		
Course Title:		
Course Title:		
Course Title:		
Course Title:		
Course Title:		
Course Title:		
Course Title:		
Course Title:		
Course Title:		

If you offer the following courses, indicate the number of sections offered during the current academic year. If a particular course is not offered, fill in the circle under N/A (not applicable). If there are other courses that offer primary instruction to students, write in their titles and indicate the number of sections given this year.

Mathematics Primary or Supplemental Courses	**Number of Sections During Current Academic Year**	**N/A**
Course Title: Seventh Grade Mathematics		○
Course Title: Pre-Algebra		○
Course Title: Algebra I		○
Course Title: Beginning Algebra or Algebra A		○
Course Title: Intermediate Algebra or Algebra B		○
Course Title: Integrated Math I		○
Course Title: Integrated Math II		○
Course Title: Math A		○
Course Title: Math B		○
Course Title:		
Course Title:		
Course Title:		
Course Title:		
Course Title:		
Course Title:		
Course Title:		
Course Title:		
Course Title:		

BASIC AND INTERVENTION PROGRAMS

These English-language arts programs have been adopted by the state for middle school basic and intervention programs, and you may be using them at your school. If you offer other programs that are not listed, space is provided to write in titles of up to 10 programs that have content closely related to California Content Standards. For each program enter the number of sections offered during the current academic year. If you don't use a listed program, fill in the circle under N/A (not applicable).

ADOPTED ENGLISH-LANGUAGE ARTS PROGRAMS	Number of Sections During Current Academic Year	N/A
Houghton Mifflin Reading: A Legacy of Literacy		○
SRA/Open Court Reading (SRA/McGraw Hill)		○
The Reader's Choice (Glencoe/McGraw Hill)		○
Literature and Language (Holt, Rinehart and Winston)		○
McDougal Littell Reading & Language Arts Program		○
Prentice-Hall Literature: Timeless Voices, Timeless Themes		○
Language! A Literacy Intervention Curriculum (Glencoe/McGraw Hill)		○
High Point (Hampton Brown)		○
High Point for English Learners (Hampton Brown)		○
READ 180 (Glencoe/McGraw Hill)		○
SRA/Reach Program (SRA/McGraw Hill)		○
Fast Track Reading Program (Wright Group/McGraw Hill)		○
OTHER ENGLISH-LANGUAGE ARTS REMEDIATION PROGRAMS		

ms_p1.dew winter 2003

These mathematics programs have been adopted by the state for middle school basic and intervention, and you may be using them at your school. If you offer other programs that are not listed, space is provided to write in titles of up to 10 programs that have content closely related to California Content Standards. For each program enter the number of sections offered during the current academic year. If you don't use a listed program, fill in the circle under N/A (not applicable).

ADOPTED MATHEMATICS PROGRAMS	Number of Sections During Current Academic Year	N/A
Success with Mathcoach (CSL Associates, Inc.)		○
Harcourt Math @ 2002 (w/ Spanish as Alternate Format K–6)		○
Mathematics by Houghton Mifflin		○
Concepts and Skills (McDougal Littell, Inc.)		○
Structure and Method (McDougal Littell, Inc.)		○
McGraw-Hill Mathematics (w/ Spanish as Alternate Format K–6)		○
Prentice Hall Pre-Algebra, CA Edition		○
Prentice Hall Algebra 1, CA Edition		○
Progress in Mathematics, CA Edition (William H. Sadlier, Inc.)		○
Saxon Math K–3, An Incremental Development (w/ Spanish as Alternate Format K–6)		○
Math 54, 65, 76, and 87 (Saxon Publishers, Inc.)		○
Scott Foresman CA Mathematics		○

OTHER MATHEMATICS REMEDIATION PROGRAMS	

ms_p1.dew winter 2003

CONCLUDING QUESTIONS

1. **How completely did your school cover the California Content Standards for *English-Language Arts* in each of the following years?**

ELA	Nearly Completely Covered (greater than 90%)	Mostly Covered (75 - 90%)	Partially Covered (25 - 74%)	Little Covered (less than 25%)	Do Not Know
2002-2003 (projected)	○	○	○	○	○
2001-2002	○	○	○	○	○
2000-2001	○	○	○	○	○
1999-2000	○	○	○	○	○
Before 1999	○	○	○	○	○

2. **How completely did your school cover the California Content Standards for *mathematics* in each of the following years?**

Mathematics	Nearly Completely Covered (greater than 90%)	Mostly Covered (75 - 90%)	Partially Covered (25 - 74%)	Little Covered (less than 25%)	Do Not Know
2002-2003 (projected)	○	○	○	○	○
2001-2002	○	○	○	○	○
2000-2001	○	○	○	○	○
1999-2000	○	○	○	○	○
Before 1999	○	○	○	○	○

3. **What is the highest level mathematics course completed by your 8th grade students? Please enter the percent of students at each level from "No Pre-Algebra" through "Algebra I". Percents in each row should total to 100%.**

Year Completing Grade 8	No Pre-Algebra, Algebra A, or Algebra 1	Pre-Algebra Only	Algebra A (1st Year of a 2-year Algebra Course)	Algebra 1 (or higher)
2003–2004 (projected)	○	○	○	○
2002–2003 (projected)	○	○	○	○
2001–2002	○	○	○	○

4. **What proportion of the teachers at your school participated during the past 12 months in professional development designed to help them teach the California Content Standards?**
   - ○ Nearly all (greater than 90%)
   - ○ Most (75% to 90%)
   - ○ Some (25% to 74%)
   - ○ Only a few (less than 25%)
   - ○ Not applicable

5. **What kind of system is used at your school to track each student's mastery of specific content standards? *(Mark all that apply.)***
   - ○ District-based tracking system
   - ○ School-based tracking system
   - ○ Department-based (ELA or Math) tracking system
   - ○ Individual teachers keep track of mastery
   - ○ Other (describe)_____
   - ○ None

ms_p1.dew winter 2003

6. **How developed are systems at your school to coordinate coverage of California Content Standards between the following four groups? *(Please answer for all four groups.)***	**Fully developed**	**Partially developed**	**Not developed**	**N/A**
Middle School/High School	○	○	○	○
Special Education/General Education	○	○	○	○
EL Staff/General Education	○	○	○	○
Alternative (Continuation)/General Education	○	○	○	○

7. **Rate the importance of regular articulation meetings with your feeder middle schools in preparing students for success on the CAHSEE.**

Very Important	Important	Neither important nor unimportant	Unimportant	Very Unimportant
○	○	○	○	○

8. **Do you have regular articulation meetings with your receiving high schools?**
   - ○ Yes, with all of them
   - ○ Only with some of them
   - ○ No
   - ○ Does not apply to our situation

Thank you for your cooperation!

Please prepare a Part 2 survey for each course or program you selected and distribute them to the appropriate teachers.

California High School Exit Examination Evaluation—Winter 2003
Information on Courses and Programs of Instruction that Cover the California Content Standards—Grades 6-9, Middle School Teacher, PART 2

You have been selected by your principal to compete this teacher survey (Part 2), which covers the course listed in Question 1. As you answer the questions, please make sure you keep only this course in mind.

School Code _____

SURVEY MARKING INSTRUCTIONS

- **Use a No. 2 pencil.**
- **Fill in the circle completely.**
- **Erase cleanly any marks you wish to change.**
- **Do not make any stray marks on this form.**

CORRECT MARK

○●○○

INCORRECT MARKS

✓✗◔◕

ABOUT THE COURSE OR INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM

Title of Course or Instructional Program

1. Course title as listed in principal's survey (Part 1). ***(This question should already be completed by principal.)***

_____

Course Description

2. When was this course or instructional program first offered?

- ○ 2002–2003
- ○ 2001–2002
- ○ 2000–2001
- ○ 1999–2000
- ○ Before 1999

3. How many sections of this course are offered this academic year?

- ○ 1–2
- ○ 3–5
- ○ 6–10
- ○ More than 10

4. What type of course or instructional program is this?

- ○ Primary course in this subject at this grade open to all students who have met prerequisites
- ○ Required alternative to primary course targeted to certain audience
- ○ Required supplemental course targeted to remediation
- ○ Elective course open to all students
- ○ Elective course targeted to remediation
- ○ Other *(specify)*:

_____

5. When is this course or instructional program offered? ***(Select all that apply.)***

- ○ Before/After school course or program
- ○ Summer school course
- ○ Summer program
- ○ During normal school hours
- ○ Intercession breaks
- ○ Other *(specify)*:

_____

Student Demographics of this Course

Please answer for the current academic year. Obtain this information from the principal, if necessary.

6. What is the total enrollment in this course? Include all sections in the count.

_____ number enrolled in course

7. What percent of the enrollment are English Learners?

_____ percent English Learners

8. What percent of the enrollment are special needs students?

_____ percent special needs students

9. What percent of the enrollment are "at-risk" (economically disadvantaged) students?

_____ percent "at-risk" students

10. How would you describe students taking this course or program?

- ○ Almost all students are well prepared to succeed
- ○ Some students do not yet have prerequisite skills
- ○ Most students do not yet have prerequisite skills

11. What proportion of students taking this course or instructional program achieved at least basic performance on last year's corresponding STAR CST test?

- ○ Nearly all (greater than 90%)
- ○ Most (75% to 90%)
- ○ Some (25% to 74%)
- ○ Only a few (less than 25%)
- ○ The course or program is too new to tell.
- ○ Not sure

12. To what extent do the following factors limit the overall effectiveness of this course?

	Very great extent	Great extent	Moderate extent	Slight extent	Not at all
Low attendance	○	○	○	○	○
Low motivation	○	○	○	○	○
Low English proficiency	○	○	○	○	○
Low parental support	○	○	○	○	○
Lack of materials/resources	○	○	○	○	○
Lack of trained instructor(s)	○	○	○	○	○

Instructional Resources for this Course

13. Do instructors for this course use a textbook?

- ○ Yes
- ○ No

14. If a textbook is used, provide the title of the current textbook, author's or publisher's name, and the copyright date.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

15. If a textbook is the primary content source, when did your school adopt this textbook?

- ○ 2002–2003
- ○ 2001–2002
- ○ 2000–2001
- ○ 1999–2000
- ○ Before 1999
- ○ Not applicable

16. If a textbook is used, approximately how much of it do instructors use?

- ○ All
- ○ Most
- ○ About half
- ○ Some
- ○ Too variable to categorize
- ○ Not applicable

17. Indicate how often this course uses the following materials. *(Mark all that apply.)*

	Less than once a month	Once a month	Once a week	2-3 times a week	Daily
Other text(s)	○	○	○	○	○
Commercially prepared material(s) [not computer-based]	○	○	○	○	○
Computer-based program(s)	○	○	○	○	○

19. From the resources used for this course, what is the overall alignment with the California Content Standards?

- ○ Very great [greater than 90%]
- ○ Great [75-90%]
- ○ Moderate [25-74%]
- ○ Slight [less than 25%]
- ○ Not at all

18. If you selected any supplemental materials in Question 17 (above), please describe them.

Other text(s)
Title: _____

Commercially prepared material(s) [not computer-based]
Description: _____

_____

_____

Computer-based program(s)
Description: _____

_____

_____

Please continue on the next page.

About the Instructor(s) of this Course

Obtain this information from the principal or by collaborating with colleagues who teach this course.

20. How many instructors of this course or program have as their most advanced degree:

	Number of ELA instructors	Number of Math instructors
Bachelor's degree	_____	_____
Some graduate school	_____	_____
Master's degree	_____	_____
Doctoral degree	_____	_____
Other *(specify)* _____	_____	_____

21. How many sections of this course or program are taught by a teacher with an appropriate subject area credential?

- ○ Nearly all
- ○ Most
- ○ About half
- ○ Some
- ○ None

22. How many sections of this course or program are taught by a teacher with an emergency credential or by a district intern?

- ○ Nearly all
- ○ Most
- ○ About half
- ○ Some
- ○ None

23. How many instructors have experience teaching this course or program for:

_____ 1 year or less _____ 6-10 years

_____ 2-3 years _____ 11-20 years

_____ 4-5 years _____ More than 20 years

24. How many instructors have a total teaching experience in this subject area of:

_____ 1 year or less _____ 6-10 years

_____ 2-3 years _____ 11-20 years

_____ 4-5 years _____ More than 20 years

25. How are subgroups of students who may be challenged to meet the California Content Standards placed in sections of this course?

	Students are distributed across most or all sections	Students are clustered in one or a few sections
"At-risk" (economically disadvantaged) students in general	○	○
English Learners	○	○
Remedial students in general	○	○
Special Needs students	○	○

26. To what extent are instructors of this course in general experienced in working with subgroups of students who may be challenged to meet California Content Standards?

	Not at all	Slight extent	Moderate extent	Great extent	Very great extent
Working with "at-risk" (economically disadvantaged) students in general	○	○	○	○	○
Working with English Learners	○	○	○	○	○
Working with Remedial students in general	○	○	○	○	○
Working with Special Needs students	○	○	○	○	○

Thanks for your help!

Please return this completed survey to your principal.

R19223-PFI-54321

APPENDIX B

Interview Protocols

January/February 2003

Dear High School Principal:

As you may know, Assembly Bill (AB) 1609 (Ch. 716, Statutes of 2001) requires that an independent study be conducted to determine whether the Class of 2004 should be held accountable on the California High School Exit Examination (CAHSEE). The Human Resources Research Organization (HumRRO), who is the independent evaluator for the CAHSEE, is conducting this study of the implementation of standards-based instruction. HumRRO is required to make a recommendation to the State Board of Education based on its independent assessment. After reviewing study results, the SBE may—or may not—decide to delay CAHSEE accountability for the Class of 2004.

The study has two parts. The first part is a survey that is being sent to 1,200 schools (600 high schools and a main feeder middle school/junior high for each of the 600 high schools). While a selected high school may not be representative of its district, the 600 high schools were carefully selected to be representative of the state as a whole. The second part of the study involves a follow-up site visit to a subsample of approximately 70 schools (40–50 high schools and 20–30 feeder middle schools/junior highs). The site visits will allow researchers to obtain more detailed information about standards-based instruction .

Your school has been selected to take part in both parts of this study. You will receive a survey packet in the next week, and we hope that you will respond promptly. For the site visit, HumRRO researchers will visit your school for one day. Please expect a phone call soon to set up a visit date.

1. The HumRRO site visit team would like to **interview** the following people while at your school:
   - The person who completes Part 1 of the survey. Typically, this will be either the principal or a vice principal of instruction or curriculum.
   - 1–3 math and 1– 3 English-language arts teachers whose courses prepare students for the CAHSEE, such as Algebra 1 or 9th grade English. Due to time restraints, we regret that we cannot interview teachers whose courses are beyond the scope of the CAHSEE, such as AP English or Calculus.
   - 1–2 teachers who teach CAHSEE remediation classes in mathematics and English-language arts. Typically, these courses are for students who have taken but not passed at least one part of the CAHSEE.
   - 1–2 special education teachers of students who are working towards a high school diploma.
   - 1–2 teachers who work with students classified as English Language Learners.
   - If time permits, we would like to interview 1–2 teachers involved in special tutoring or after-school education programs.

   Teacher interviews will last about 30 minutes and can take place at the teacher's convenience, such as during a planning period or after school. We request that teachers bring their textbooks and other commercial/packaged instructional materials to their interviews, as well as any documents that show how the California Content Standards are being covered.

2. We also are interested in obtaining the **names of students who were enrolled in a CAHSEE remediation class** during the 2001–02 academic year, the 2002 summer school session, or the fall 2002 semester and who then retook the CAHSEE in July, September, or November, 2002 or January 2003. This will help us determine the impact that CAHSEE remediation courses may have on subsequent CAHSEE pass rates. While we will not use student names in this study, the names are needed so we can link them to their later CAHSEE scores. California Education Code 49076(a)3 allows "state education officials, or their respective designees" access to pupil records "where the information is necessary to audit or evaluate a state or federally mandated program" while requiring that such data be protected from release and destroyed when no longer needed. If you are able to provide these student names, we ask that you prepare them before our arrival.

Thank you for your cooperation in this important endeavor. For questions regarding HumRRO's visit, please contact Pat Ford at (831) 647-9650 or email him at jpford@montereybay.com or for more information you can contact Dr. Carolyn Harris at HumRRO's Virginia office (800-301-1508 or charris@humrro.org).

Sincerely,

Pat Ford

January/February 2003

Dear Middle School Principal:

As you may know, Assembly Bill (AB) 1609 (Ch. 716, Statutes of 2001) requires that an independent study be conducted to determine whether the Class of 2004 should be held accountable on the California High School Exit Examination (CAHSEE). The Human Resources Research Organization (HumRRO), who is the independent evaluator for the CAHSEE, is conducting this study of the implementation of standards-based instruction. HumRRO is required to make a recommendation to the State Board of Education based on its independent assessment. After reviewing study results, the SBE may—or may not—decide to delay CAHSEE accountability for the Class of 2004.

The study has two parts. The first part is a survey that is being sent to 1,200 schools (600 high schools and a main feeder middle school/junior high for each of the 600 high schools). While a selected high school may not be representative of its district, the 600 high schools were carefully selected to be representative of the state as a whole. The second part of the study involves a follow-up site visit to a subsample of approximately 70 schools (40–50 high schools and 20–30 feeder middle schools/junior highs). The site visits will allow researchers to obtain more detailed information about standards-based instruction .

Your school has been selected to take part in both parts of this study. You will receive a survey packet in the next week, and we hope that you will respond promptly. For the site visit, HumRRO researchers will visit your school for one day. Please expect a phone call soon to set up a visit date.

The HumRRO site visit team would like to **interview** the following people while at your school:

- The person who completes Part 1 of the survey. Typically, this will be either the principal or a vice principal of instruction or curriculum.
- 1–2 math and 1– 2 English-language arts teachers whose courses cover the California Content Standards for grades 6–9 (as appropriate to your school).
- 1–2 teachers who teach remediation classes in mathematics and English-language arts. Typically, these courses are for students who are at risk of falling behind in mastering the California Content Standards for ELA and mathematics in grades 6-9.
- 1–2 special education teachers of students in grades 6–9 who are likely to work towards a diploma in high school.
- 1–2 teachers who work with students in grades 6–9 classified as English Language Learners.
- If time permits, we would like to interview 1–2 teachers involved in special tutoring or after-school education programs for students in grades 6–9 .

Teacher interviews will last about 30 minutes and can take place at the teacher's convenience, such as during a planning period or after school. We request that teachers bring their textbooks and other commercial/packaged instructional materials to their interviews, as well as any documents that show how the California Content Standards are being covered.

Thank you for your cooperation in this important endeavor. For questions regarding HumRRO's visit, please contact Pat Ford at (831) 647-9650 or email him at jpford@montereybay.com or for more information you can contact Dr. Carolyn Harris at HumRRO's Virginia office (800-301-1508 or charris@humrro.org).

Sincerely,

Pat Ford

Principal Interview Questions

Introduction

(You will be interviewing the principal or someone appointed by the principal, such as a vice principal for curriculum or instruction.)

You will need to explain the purpose of the visit—that HumRRO is the independent evaluator hired by California Department of Education. Specifically, this study (AB 1609) will provide information to the State Board of Education, and the SBE will use it to determine whether to hold the Class of 2004 accountable on the CAHSEE or to delay accountability. Remind them that the surveys they received are a part of this study, and that we are visiting a sampling of surveyed schools so we can get more in-depth information.

Standards-based instruction

Definition

First of all, I'd like you to tell me in your own words what is standards-based instruction? Based on that definition, do you think that your school is implementing standards-based instruction?

When did this process start (academic year)?

Implementation rating

How far are you in this process of implementing standards-based instruction (1 not at all, 5 completely implemented).

When do you think it will be fully in effect?

Is there a system in place that allows administrators or teachers to monitor student mastery of the standards? How does that work? Was this developed by the district, the school, or individual teachers?

What happens to students who do not master the standards? Anything in place to assist them?

Curriculum issues

Have there been any changes made to the regular math and English/Language Arts (ELA) curriculum in response to standards-based instruction in general? To CAHSEE, more specifically? (Look for things like adding/deleting certain courses.)

When did these curriculum changes come about (academic year)?

Are any more curriculum changes anticipated in response to standards-based instruction or CAHSEE?

What has happened to courses beyond the scope of CAHSEE as a result of curriculum changes made in response to standards-based instruction/CAHSEE?

Have any math/ELA remediation courses been added or changed significantly in response to standards-based instruction/CAHSEE?

How are students placed in these courses (optional or required)?

Student preparation issues

Incoming students

Have there been any changes in student preparation of incoming students since the development of the CA Content Standards (better/less prepared than previously?)

Given what you see in the prep level of your incoming students, where in the process of implementing standards-based instruction do you think your feeder school is?

How long will it take for you and your feeder school to be working together in fully implementing the CA Content Standards?

What will have to happen to make sure that (working together) happens?

Within your school

I'd like to ask about the work that takes place within the math and ELA departments to prepare students for the next level or course—how is that done? Formal or informal? What do teachers use to connect instruction from one year to the next?

Do teachers at this school have copies of the California Content Standards/Blueprints? Are they using the standards to help plan instruction?

Student subpopulations

What student subpopulations do you have at this school?

Have you seen any (positive or negative) changes in their general academic performance since the development and implementation of the CA Content Standards/standards-based instruction? (High schools only--) In their performance on the CAHSEE?

Have you seen any changes in motivation, drop out rates, etc. since CAHSEE? What will happen to motivation, drop out rates when CAHSEE is put into effect?

How do you coordinate coverage of the Content Standards between the following groups?

- Middle school/high school
- Special ed/general ed
- EL staff/general ed
- Alternative (continuation)/general ed

Of those four paired groups, for which pairing is it easiest/most difficult to coordinate coverage?

Challenges

Challenges (issues like low attendance, motivation, English proficiency, parental support, materials/resources, trained instructors) school has had to overcome (or still is in process of overcoming) in implementing standards-based instruction. How were/are these challenges overcome?

Anything else…

Is there anything else you would like to add?

English/Math Teachers Interview Questions

Introduction—why we're here and what we're doing

The company that I work for—the Human Resources Research Organization, or HumRRO—has been hired by the California Department of Education as the independent evaluator for the CAHSEE. We are interested in learning about how California schools are using standards-based instruction in classes and what impact that may have on the California High School Exit Exam. Basically, we're trying to find out if the Class of 2004 is ready to be held accountable for the CAHSEE, or if the CAHSEE should be delayed. The State Board of Education will make the final decision on that.

We're interviewing teachers who are teaching courses that contain content that may be included on the CAHSEE, such as Algebra 1 and below for math teachers or the standard English courses of 10th grade and below—not courses like AP English or Calculus.

Course description

We'd like to start by asking you to tell us about the course you teach that prepares your students for the CAHSEE—

Course name/grade level

How many sections of this course do you teach? How many sections of this course are there in total?

What type of student takes this specific course? If I went and observed a section, who would I see in class? Would I see a variety of student abilities in a single section, or would students be in similar ability groupings? Any ELL or special ed (mainstreamed) students?

What books/other commercial material do you use? (Get name of text/publisher/year published and adopted at this school and whether it is aligned to the California Content Standards).

Do all teachers of this course use the same materials, or is there a certain amount of flexibility in choice of materials?

Standards-based instruction

Definition

When you hear the expression "standards-based instruction," what does it mean to you? Can you define that term for me?

Based on that definition, does this course use standards-based instruction?

When did this course begin using standards-based instruction?

Show them the CAHSEE blueprints and the California Content Standards—ask if they have a copy of them and if they use them in planning instruction. If they don't use them, ask if they use anything else.

Implementation rating

I'd like you to rate the level of implementation of standards-based instruction in this course (1-5 scale—1 not at all implemented, 5 completely implemented).

Use across and within grades

Has the instruction in earlier grades prepared students for this course?

- How much time (class periods) do you spend at the beginning of the school year teaching concepts for the first time that they should already know? (Make sure teachers understand the difference between the normal "beginning of the school year" review and first-time instruction on concepts they should already know.)

When students leave this class, are they prepared to jump right in to the follow-on course, or will that teacher have to spend time teaching concepts the students should already know?

- How do you ensure coverage across grades? Describe any communication or coordination between grades/courses that takes place.

I asked earlier if materials used differed among teachers of this course, and now I'd like to ask if sections of this course differ in any other ways among teachers…(they may describe different instructional methods, for example…)

- How does a teacher go about designing the course? Work with other teachers? Use anything as a guideline?
- If next year the teacher of the follow-on course gets some of your former students and some of another teacher's former students, will those students be similarly prepared? Describe any communication or coordination within this course that takes place.

Do teachers in this course keep track of the standards that are being covered? Do teachers also look beyond coverage to mastery of standards? What is done for those students who do not master a particular standard?

Student preparation

Have you seen any changes for better or worse in the level of student preparation for this course since your school implemented standards-based instruction?

Think about the Class of 2004—the current juniors. When they were taking this course or equivalent, were similar standards covered in their instruction? What about for the Classes of 2005 and 2006?

Challenges

What challenges does a teacher at this school face in preparing students for the CAHSEE/ or in using standards-based instruction at this time?

How is the school working to overcome these challenges?

What about any staff development to address these challenges?

Is progress being made?

How long realistically will it take to overcome these challenges? (This is the low motivation, low attendance, low English proficiency, low parental support, lack of materials/resources, and lack of trained instructors question, plus any others they volunteer.)

Anything else…

Is there anything that you would like to add?

Special Education Teacher Interview Questions

(Interviewer info: California typically classifies special education students as "special day" students if they are severely handicapped and are pretty much not working toward a high school diploma. "Resource" students are those who are able to work in regular classrooms—"mainstreamed"—for at least ½ of the school day. They may need special support—aides, etc.—while in the regular classroom. We're mostly focusing our attention on the resource students, as some of them are working toward a high school diploma.)

Special ed numbers

What percent of students at this school receive special education services—ask them to break out by resource and by special day.

What percentage of the resource students are able to be mainstreamed (with support) in math? In ELA? (So these students would be exposed to CA content standards for whatever grade they are in, is that correct?) What percentage of the special day students are able to be mainstreamed (with support) in math? In ELA?

CA content standards issues

I know that special education students have IEPs (Individual Education Plans) that guide student education—does the special education department use the CA Content Standards in developing a student's IEP? How does the department use those standards? (If the department doesn't use the CA Content Standards, ask if they use anything else.)

How familiar are you with the CAHSEE, the CA content standards, and the blueprints for math/ELA (show them your copies…)?

How does the department keep track of the mastery (note: make a distinction between mastery and simply being exposed to the standards) of the standards? So at any given time, the department can determine "where" a student is in terms of mastery?

Is there any particular content that these students will likely not have been exposed to by the time they take the CAHSEE for the first time?

Is there any particular content that these students will likely not have mastered by the time they take the CAHSEE for the first time?

High school only

Does the department provide any extra support or assistance if a special ed student does not pass a portion of the CAHSEE? Tell me about that…

Of your current students, how many have taken the CAHSEE? How many have passed it? How many do you expect will pass it eventually?

Middle school only

How aware of the CAHSEE are special ed teachers at the middle school level?

Anything else?

ELL/ELD Teacher Interview Questions

(A school's English Language Learner—ELL—program can also be called "sheltered language" or English Language Development—ELD. Depending on the needs of students, it has about four levels ranging from the "intro to English" classes to more advanced English courses for those who have moved beyond the intro classes. I would imagine that some schools may not have all four levels, while others would. The EL program has its own CA content standards. Students must take the CAHSEE in English.)

Program description

Tell me about your school's ELL program…

Numbers taking part

How many students at this school are ELL students (ask to break down by levels—how many at the earliest stages of learning English through nearly mastery)?

Materials used

What texts/materials are used in this course? (If they have the materials with them, note text name/publisher, date of publication, if aligned to CA content standards, and when adopted.)

CA content standards issues

Familiarity

How familiar are EL teachers at this school with the CAHSEE and the blueprints for ELA and the CA content standards (show them your copies)?

Integration of standards

How does the EL program integrate the CA content standards into the curriculum?

Differences

How much difference is there between the ELD content standards and the regular (ELA) content standards?

Coverage by level

For each level, how much of the regular CA content standards are students able to cover?

Preparation for test

Is there anything specific that the EL department does to help students prepare for the CAHSEE?

Any specific test-prep activities, such as working with generic testing vocabulary?

If so, when were these activities developed? How were the activities developed? What did the department use to help develop the curriculum?

Prediction

What will happen to your current students if CAHSEE is maintained for the Class of 2004?

Anything else?

Is there anything else you would like to add?

For middle school ELL teachers: Ask the above questions and this:

How aware of the CAHSEE are ELL teachers at the middle school level?

CAHSEE Remediation Teacher Interview Questions

(This interview is directed toward those teachers who are working with students—probably mostly juniors—who have already failed one or both parts of the CAHSEE. It is possible that not all schools will have these CAHSEE remediation courses, however. You may also be asked to interview teachers who work with students who the school considers to be in danger of not passing the CAHSEE, although they haven't taken the test yet. If you are, please use the protocol titled "Special programs".)

Program description

How many students are currently taking this math/English CAHSEE remediation course?

How is a student placed in a CAHSEE remediation class at this school (voluntary or required?)

If attendance is voluntary, are there any challenges in getting students to take the course?

When is the first opportunity that a student would have to be placed in a CAHSEE remediation class? (summer session? First semester of the next school year?)

Does this course count as an elective or as a math/ELA credit toward graduation?

How many times can a student take the remediation class? What does that do to the opportunity to take other courses a student may need?

What materials are used in the course? (Get text name/publisher/date published/adopted, whether aligned to CA content standards)

Program development

How was the curriculum developed for this course? What was used to determine what content would be covered? When was it developed? Is it self-paced or taught to the class as a whole?

Standards-based instruction

How familiar are teachers of this course with the CAHSEE, the CA content standards, and the blueprints for math/ELA? (Show your copies…) Have you ever seen sample CAHSEE questions?

What does standards-based instruction mean to you? Can you give me a definition?

Based on that definition, is this course implementing standards-based instruction?

Evaluation

Are any records kept on student performance on CAHSEE after having had the remediation course? (Do some students retake CAHSEE without the remediation course and others after the remediation course?)

Subpopulations

Do students in the remediation course cut across the school population as a whole, or do they appear to be clustered in a few subpopulations? If the second scenario is the case, is there anything special the school is doing to address this issue? Explain…

Anything else?

Special Programs Teacher Interview Questions

(This protocol is for those teachers who either work with students who are considered to be at risk of not passing the CAHSEE—although they haven't taken it yet—or those teachers who are involved with special tutoring to help prepare students for the CAHSEE. These courses/programs may not be as structured as the CAHSEE remediation courses.)

Program description

Tell me about the program—how long does it last (a few weeks? An entire semester?), when die it meet, how many students regularly take part>

Student targeting

How are students targeted for this program?

Voluntary/required?

Is it voluntary or required? Any credit for taking it?

Student subpopulation

Do students from a cross section of the school's population take this, or do you see mostly students from a particular subpopulation? If so, what subpopulation do you work with in this program?

Program design

How was this program designed? Did the designers use the CA content standards in setting up the curriculum or something else?

Materials

What texts/materials does the program use? (Try to get name of text/publisher, year published/adopted, whether aligned to CA content standards.)

Evaluation

Has the school been able to measure the program's success yet? (If they answer "too early yet," follow up with "Are there any plans to do so?")

Pass potential

What proportion of the students in this program are likely to pass the CAHSEE?

Challenges

What challenges does this program face—student participation/attendance (if voluntary), transportation, financial, etc.

When you talk to these students about the CAHSEE, what do they say about it—what do they say they will do if they don't pass it? Are they nervous

Anything else?

Is there anything else you would like to add?

APPENDIX C

Results of School Surveys

Appendix C List of Tables

Results of High School (HS) Principal Survey C-7
Table C. HS Principal.1. Percent in Remedial ELA Summer School Course C-7
Table C. HS Principal.2. Percent in ELA Summer Course Who Later Passed..... C-7
Table C. HS Principal.3. Percent in Remedial Math Summer School Course..... C-8
Table C. HS Principal.4. Percent in Math Summer Course Who Later Passed..... C-8
Table C. HS Principal.5 Coverage of ELA Standards in 2003 ..... C-8
Table C. HS Principal.6. Coverage of ELA Standards in 2002 ..... C-9
Table C. HS Principal.7. Coverage of ELA Standards in 2001 ..... C-9
Table C. HS Principal.8. Coverage of ELA Standards in 2000 ..... C-9
Table C. HS Principal.9. Coverage of ELA Standards Before 2000 ..... C-10
Table C. HS Principal.10. Coverage of Math Standards in 2003..... C-10
Table C. HS Principal.11. Coverage of Math Standards in 2002..... C-10
Table C. HS Principal.12. Coverage of Math Standards in 2001..... C-11
Table C. HS Principal.13. Coverage of Math Standards in 2000..... C-11
Table C. HS Principal.14. Coverage of Math Standards Before 2000..... C-11
Table C. HS Principal.15. Percent of Teachers with Prof. Dev. in Teaching the Standards C-12
Table C. HS Principal.16. District Tracks Mastery of Content Standards..... C-12
Table C. HS Principal.17. School Tracks Mastery of Content Standards..... C-12
Table C. HS Principal.18. Department Tracks Mastery of Content Standards..... C-12
Table C. HS Principal.19. Teachers Track Mastery of Content Standards..... C-13
Table C. HS Principal.20. Other System Tracks Mastery of Content Standards..... C-13
Table C. HS Principal.21. No System Tracks Mastery of Content Standards C-13
Table C. HS Principal.22. Highest Level for Tracking Student Mastery..... C-13
Table C. HS Principal.23. Coordination of Middle School and High School..... C-14
Table C. HS Principal.24. Coordination of Special Ed. and General Ed..... C-14
Table C. HS Principal.25. Coordination of EL Staff and General Ed..... C-14
Table C. HS Principal.26. Coordination of Alt./Cont. Ed.and General Ed..... C-15
Table C. HS Principal.27. Importance of Articulation with Middle Schools C-15
Table C. HS Principal.28. Regular Meetings with Middle Schools..... C-15

Results of Middle-Grade Feeder School (FS) Principal Survey C-17
Table C. FS Principal.1. Coverage of ELA Standards in 2003..... C-17
Table C. FS Principal.2. Coverage of ELA Standards in 2002..... C-17
Table C. FS Principal.3. Coverage of ELA Standards in 2001..... C-17
Table C. FS Principal.4. Coverage of ELA Standards in 2000..... C-18
Table C. FS Principal.5. Coverage of ELA Standards Before 2000 ..... C-18
Table C. FS Principal.6. Coverage of Math Standards in 2003 ..... C-18
Table C. FS Principal.7. Coverage of Math Standards in 2002 ..... C-19
Table C. FS Principal.8. Coverage of Math Standards in 2001 ..... C-19
Table C. FS Principal.9. Coverage of Math Standards in 2000 ..... C-19
Table C. FS Principal.10. Coverage of Math Standards Before 2000 ..... C-20
Table C. FS Principal.11. Percent of Teachers with Prof. Dev. in Teaching Standards..... C-20
Table C. FS Principal.12. District Tracks Mastery of Content Standards C-20

Table C. FS Principal.14. Department Tracks Mastery of Content Standards..... C-21
Table C. FS Principal.15 Teachers Track Mastery of Content Standards..... C-21
Table C. FS Principal.16. Other System for Tracking Mastery of Content Standards C-21
Table C. FS Principal.17. No System for Tracking Mastery of Content Standards C-21
Table C. FS Principal.18. Coordination Between Middle School and High School..... C-21
Table C. FS Principal.19. Coordination Between Special Ed. and General Ed..... C-22
Table C. FS Principal.20. Coordination Between EL Staff and General Ed..... C-22
Table C. FS Principal.21. Coordination Between Alt./Cont. Ed. and General Ed..... C-22
Table C. FS Principal.22. Importance of Articulation with High Schools..... C-23
Table C. FS Pincipal.23. Do You Have Articulation Meetings with Receiving High Schools? C-23
Table C. FS Principal.24. Average Percent of Completing Algebra During 2002-2004.... C-23

Results of High School (HS) Teacher Survey..... C-25
Table C. HS Teacher.1. When was Course First Offered? C-25
Table C. HS Teacher.2. How Many Sections This Year?..... C-25
Table C. HS Teacher.3. Type of Course or Program..... C-25
Table C. HS Teacher.4. When is the Course Offered? C-26
Table C. HS Teacher.5. Grade of Students..... C-26
Table C. HS Teacher.6. How Well Prepared Are Students?..... C-26
Table C. HS Teacher.7. Percent of Proficiency on STAR CST Test..... C-27
Table C. HS Teacher.8. Result Limited by Low Attendance..... C-27
Table C. HS Teacher.9. Result Limited by Low Motivation..... C-27
Table C. HS Teacher.10. Result Limited by English Proficiency..... C-28
Table C. HS Teacher.11. Result Limited by Low Parental Support C-28
Table C. HS Teacher.12. Result Limited by Lack of Materials..... C-28
Table C. HS Teacher.13. Result Limited by Lack of Teachers C-29
Table C. HS Teacher.14. Do Different Instructors Use the Same Textbook? C-29
Table C. HS Teacher.15. When Was Text Adopted?..... C-29
Table C. HS Teacher.16. How Much of Text is Used?..... C-30
Table C. HS Teacher.17. Other Text is Used..... C-30
Table C. HS Teacher.18. Commercial Material Used..... C-30
Table C. HS Teacher.19. Computer-Based Program Used..... C-31
Table C. HS Teacher.20. Overall Alignment with Standards C-31
Table C. HS Teacher.21. Teachers with Appropriate Credentials..... C-31
Table C. HS Teacher.22. Teachers with Emergency Credentials C-32
Table C. HS Teacher.23. Tracking At-Risk Students C-32
Table C. HS Teacher.24. Tracking English Learners C-32
Table C. HS Teacher.25. Tracking Remedial Students..... C-33
Table C. HS Teacher.26. Tracking Special Needs Students C-33
Table C. HS Teacher.27. Teacher Experience: At-Risk Students..... C-33
Table C. HS Teacher.28. Teacher Experience: English Learner C-34
Table C. HS Teacher.29. Teacher Experience: Remedial Students..... C-34
Table C. HS Teacher.30. Teacher Experience: Special Needs Students..... C-34
Table C. HS Teacher.31. Descriptive Statistics of Some Variables in HS Teacher Survey C-35

Table C. HS Teacher.32. Average Percent of Student Groups in Different Types of Courses C-35

Results of Middle-Grade Feeder School (FS) Teacher Survey..... C-37
Table C. FS Teacher.1. When Was Course First Offered? C-37
Table C. FS Teacher.2. How Many Sections This Year? C-37
Table C. FS Teacher.3. Type of Course or Program..... C-37
Table C. FS Teacher.4. Offered Before/After School..... C-38
Table C. FS Teacher.5. Summer School Course..... C-38
Table C. FS Teacher.6. Summer Program..... C-38
Table C. FS Teacher.7. During School Hours..... C-38
Table C. FS Teacher.8. During Session Breaks C-38
Table C. FS Teacher.9. Offered Some Other Time..... C-39
Table C. FS Teacher.10. How Well Prepared are Stduents?..... C-39
Table C. FS Teacher.11. Percent of Proficient on STAR CST Test..... C-39
Table C. FS Teacher.12. Result Limited by Low Attendance C-40
Table C. FS Teacher.13. Result Limited by Low Motivation..... C-40
Table C. FS Teacher.14. Result Limited by English Proficiency..... C-40
Table C. FS Teacher.15. Result Limited by Low Parental Support..... C-41
Table C. FS Teacher.16. Result Limited by Lack of Materials C-41
Table C. FS Teacher.17. Result Limited by Lack of Teachers C-41
Table C. FS Teacher.18. Do Different Instructors Use Same Textbook?..... C-42
Table C. FS Teacher.19. When Was Text Adopted? C-42
Table C. FS Teacher.20. How Much of Text is Used? C-42
Table C. FS Teacher.21. Other Text is Used C-43
Table C. FS Teacher.22. Commercial Material Used C-43
Table C. FS Teacher.23. Computer-based Program Used C-43
Table C. FS Teacher.24. Overall Alignment with Standards..... C-44
Table C. FS Teacher.25. Teachers with Appropriate Credentials..... C-44
Table C. FS Teacher.26. Teachers with Emergency Credentials C-44
Table C. FS Teacher.27. Tracking: At-Risk Students..... C-45
Table C. FS Teacher.28. Tracking: English Learners..... C-45
Table C. FS Teacher.29. Tracking: Remedial Students C-45
Table C. FS Teacher.30. Tracking: Special Needs Stuents..... C-45
Table C. FS Teacher.31. Teacher Experience: At-Risk Students C-46
Table C. FS Teacher.32. Teacher Experience: EL..... C-46
Table C. FS Teacher.33. Teacher Experience: Remedial Students..... C-46
Table C. FS Teacher.34. Teacher Experience: Special Needs Students..... C-47
Table C. FS Teacher.35. Descriptive Statistics of Some Variables in Middle-Grade Feeder School Teacher Survey..... C-47

Results of High School (HS) Principal Survey

Table C. HS Principal.1. Percent in Remedial ELA Summer School Course

	Remedial ELA Summer Course	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Unknown	23	8.24	8.81	8.81
	0. N / A	62	22.22	23.75	32.57
	1. < 25%	102	36.56	39.08	71.65
	2. 25-74%	54	19.35	20.69	92.34
	3. 75-90%	11	3.94	4.21	96.55
	4. > 90%	9	3.23	3.45	100.00
	Total	261	93.55	100.00	
Missing		18	6.45		
Total		279	100.00		

Table C. HS Principal.2. Percent in ELA Summer Course Who Later Passed

	ELA Passed Later	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Unknown	38	13.62	14.62	14.62
	0. N / A	97	34.77	37.31	51.92
	1. < 25%	71	25.45	27.31	79.23
	2. 25-74%	43	15.41	16.54	95.77
	3. 75-90%	8	2.87	3.08	98.85
	4. > 90%	3	1.08	1.15	100.00
	Total	260	93.19	100.00	
Missing		19	6.81		
Total		279	100.00		

Table C. HS Principal.3. Percent in Remedial Math Summer School Course

	Remedial Math Summer Course	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Unknown	21	7.53	7.98	7.98
	0. N / A	60	21.51	22.81	30.80
	1. < 25%	103	36.92	39.16	69.96
	2. 25-74%	57	20.43	21.67	91.63
	3. 75-90%	14	5.02	5.32	96.96
	4. > 90%	8	2.87	3.04	100.00
	Total	263	94.27	100.00	
Missing		16	5.73		
Total		279	100.00		

Table C. HS Principal.4. Percent in Math Summer Course Who Later Passed

	Math Passed Later	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Unknown	40	14.34	15.21	15.21
	0. N / A	87	31.18	33.08	48.29
	1. < 25%	77	27.60	29.28	77.57
	2. 25-74%	50	17.92	19.01	96.58
	3. 75-90%	5	1.79	1.90	98.48
	4. > 90%	4	1.43	1.52	100.00
	Total	263	94.27	100.00	
Missing		16	5.73		
Total		279	100.00		

Table C. HS Principal.5 Coverage of ELA Standards in 2003

	ELA Standards Coverage in 2003	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Unknown	6	2.15	2.24	2.24
	2. 25-74%	30	10.75	11.19	13.43
	3. 75-90%	96	34.41	35.82	49.25
	4. > 90%	136	48.75	50.75	100.00
	Total	268	96.06	100.00	
Missing		11	3.94		
Total		279	100.00		

Table C. HS Principal.6. Coverage of ELA Standards in 2002

	ELA Standards Coverage in 2002	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Unknown	12	4.30	4.46	4.46
	1. < 25%	5	1.79	1.86	6.32
	2. 25-74%	63	22.58	23.42	29.74
	3. 75-90%	117	41.94	43.49	73.23
	4. > 90%	72	25.81	26.77	100.00
	Total	269	96.42	100.00	
Missing		10	3.58		
Total		279	100.00		

Table C. HS Principal.7. Coverage of ELA Standards in 2001

	ELA Standards Coverage in 2001	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Unknown	23	8.24	8.71	8.71
	1. < 25%	17	6.09	6.44	15.15
	2. 25-74%	102	36.56	38.64	53.79
	3. 75-90%	88	31.54	33.33	87.12
	4. > 90%	34	12.19	12.88	100.00
	Total	264	94.62	100.00	
Missing		15	5.38		
Total		279	100.00		

Table C. HS Principal.8. Coverage of ELA Standards in 2000

	ELA Standards Coverage in 2000	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Unknown	49	17.56	18.63	18.63
	1. < 25%	37	13.26	14.07	32.70
	2. 25-74%	95	34.05	36.12	68.82
	3. 75-90%	63	22.58	23.95	92.78
	4. > 90%	19	6.81	7.22	100.00
	Total	263	94.27	100.00	
Missing		16	5.73		
Total		279	100.00		

Table C. HS Principal.9. Coverage of ELA Standards Before 2000

	ELA Standards Coverage Before 2000	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Unknown	89	31.90	34.77	34.77
	1. < 25%	41	14.70	16.02	50.78
	2. 25-74%	74	26.52	28.91	79.69
	3. 75-90%	42	15.05	16.41	96.09
	4. > 90%	10	3.58	3.91	100.00
	Total	256	91.76	100.00	
Missing		23	8.24		
Total		279	100.00		

Table C. HS Principal.10. Coverage of Math Standards in 2003

	Math Standards Coverage in 2003	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Unknown	6	2.15	2.26	2.26
	1. < 25%	3	1.08	1.13	3.38
	2. 25-74%	30	10.75	11.28	14.66
	3. 75-90%	87	31.18	32.71	47.37
	4. > 90%	140	50.18	52.63	100.00
	Total	266	95.34	100.00	
Missing		13	4.66		
Total		279	100.00		

Table C. HS Principal.11. Coverage of Math Standards in 2002

	Math Standards Coverage in 2002	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Unknown	12	4.30	4.48	4.48
	1. < 25%	7	2.51	2.61	7.09
	2. 25-74%	62	22.22	23.13	30.22
	3. 75-90%	106	37.99	39.55	69.78
	4. > 90%	81	29.03	30.22	100.00
	Total	268	96.06	100.00	
Missing		11	3.94		
Total		279	100.00		

Table C. HS Principal.12. Coverage of Math Standards in 2001

	Math Standards Coverage in 2001	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Unknown	24	8.60	9.16	9.16
	1. < 25%	18	6.45	6.87	16.03
	2. 25-74%	97	34.77	37.02	53.05
	3. 75-90%	87	31.18	33.21	86.26
	4. > 90%	36	12.90	13.74	100.00
	Total	262	93.91	100.00	
Missing		17	6.09		
Total		279	100.00		

Table C. HS Principal.13. Coverage of Math Standards in 2000

	Math Standards Coverage in 2000	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Unknown	53	19.00	20.08	20.08
	1. < 25%	39	13.98	14.77	34.85
	2. 25-74%	84	30.11	31.82	66.67
	3. 75-90%	65	23.30	24.62	91.29
	4. > 90%	23	8.24	8.71	100.00
	Total	264	94.62	100.00	
Missing		15	5.38		
Total		279	100.00		

Table C. HS Principal.14. Coverage of Math Standards Before 2000

	Math Standards Coverage Before 2000	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Unknown	86	30.82	33.59	33.59
	1. < 25%	38	13.62	14.84	48.44
	2. 25-74%	76	27.24	29.69	78.13
	3. 75-90%	41	14.70	16.02	94.14
	4. > 90%	15	5.38	5.86	100.00
	Total	256	91.76	100.00	
Missing		23	8.24		
Total		279	100.00		

Table C. HS Principal.15. Percent of Teachers with Prof. Dev. in Teaching the Standards

	Prof. Dev. in Teaching Standards	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0. N / A	7	2.51	2.63	2.63
	1. < 25%	39	13.98	14.66	17.29
	2. 25-74%	55	19.71	20.68	37.97
	3. 75-90%	49	17.56	18.42	56.39
	4. > 90%	116	41.58	43.61	100.00
	Total	266	95.34	100.00	
Missing		13	4.66		
Total		279	100.00		

Table C. HS Principal.16. District Tracks Mastery of Content Standards

	District Tracks Mastery	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	75	26.88	100.00	100.00
Missing		204	73.12		
Total		279	100.00		

Table C. HS Principal.17. School Tracks Mastery of Content Standards

	School Tracks Mastery	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	95	34.05	100.00	100.00
Missing		184	65.95		
Total		279	100.00		

Table C. HS Principal.18. Department Tracks Mastery of Content Standards

	Department Tracks Mastery	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	85	30.47	100.00	100.00
Missing		194	69.53		
Total		279	100.00		

Table C. HS Principal.19. Teachers Track Mastery of Content Standards

	Teachers Track Mastery	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	155	55.56	100.00	100.00
Missing		124	44.44		
Total		279	100.00		

Table C. HS Principal.20. Other System Tracks Mastery of Content Standards

	Other System Tracks Mastery	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	13	4.66	100.00	100.00
Missing		266	95.34		
Total		279	100.00		

Table C. HS Principal.21. No System Tracks Mastery of Content Standards

	No System Tracks Mastery	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	14	5.02	100.00	100.00
Missing		265	94.98		
Total		279	100.00		

Table C. HS Principal.22. Highest Level for Tracking Student Mastery

	Highest Level Tracking Mastery	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1. District	75	26.88	28.30	28.30
	2. School	49	17.56	18.49	46.79
	3. Department	43	15.41	16.23	63.02
	4. Teachers	78	27.96	29.43	92.45
	5. Other Sys.	6	2.15	2.26	94.72
	6. None	14	5.02	5.28	100.00
	Total	265	94.98	100.00	
Missing		14	5.02		
Total		279	100.00		

Table C. HS Principal.23. Coordination of Middle School and High School

	Coordination of HS and MS	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Applicable	9	3.23	3.40	3.40
	Not Developed	46	16.49	17.36	20.75
	Partially Developed	173	62.01	65.28	86.04
	Fully Developed	37	13.26	13.96	100.00
	Total	265	94.98	100.00	
Missing		14	5.02		
Total		279	100.00		

Table C. HS Principal.24. Coordination of Special Ed. and General Ed.

	Coordination of Special Ed. and General Ed.	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Applicable	9	3.23	3.40	3.40
	Not Developed	16	5.73	6.04	9.43
	Partially Developed	192	68.82	72.45	81.89
	Fully Developed	48	17.20	18.11	100.00
	Total	265	94.98	100.00	
Missing		14	5.02		
Total		279	100.00		

Table C. HS Principal.25. Coordination of EL Staff and General Ed.

	Coordination of EL Staff and General Ed.	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Applicable	33	11.83	12.55	12.55
	Not Developed	34	12.19	12.93	25.48
	Partially Developed	153	54.84	58.17	83.65
	Fully Developed	43	15.41	16.35	100.00
	Total	263	94.27	100.00	
Missing		16	5.73		
Total		279	100.00		

Table C. HS Principal.26. Coordination of Alt./Cont. Ed.and General Ed.

	Coordination of Alt. Ed. and General Ed.	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Applicable	49	17.56	18.70	18.70
	Not Developed	64	22.94	24.43	43.13
	Partially Developed	125	44.80	47.71	90.84
	Fully Developed	24	8.60	9.16	100.00
	Total	262	93.91	100.00	
Missing		17	6.09		
Total		279	100.00		

Table C. HS Principal.27. Importance of Articulation with Middle Schools

	Articulation with Middle Schools	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very Unimportant	5	1.79	1.85	1.85
	Unimportant	3	1.08	1.11	2.95
	Neutral	27	9.68	9.96	12.92
	Important	111	39.78	40.96	53.87
	Very Important	125	44.80	46.13	100.00
	Total	271	97.13	100.00	
Missing		8	2.87		
Total		279	100.00		

Table C. HS Principal.28. Regular Meetings with Middle Schools

	Meetings with Middle Schools	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Applicable	29	10.39	10.62	10.62
	No	78	27.96	28.57	39.19
	Only some of them	57	20.43	20.88	60.07
	Yes, all of them	109	39.07	39.93	100.00
	Total	273	97.85	100.00	
Missing		6	2.15		
Total		279	100.00		

Results of Middle-Grade Feeder School (FS) Principal Survey

Table C. FS Principal.1. Coverage of ELA Standards in 2003

	ELA Standards Coverage in 2003	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	2. 25-74%	8	5.03	5.19	5.19
	3. 75-90%	68	42.77	44.16	49.35
	4. > 90%	78	49.06	50.65	100.00
	Total	154	96.86	100.00	
Missing		5	3.14		
Total		159	100.00		

Table C. FS Principal.2. Coverage of ELA Standards in 2002

	ELA Standards Coverage in 2002	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Unknown	5	3.14	3.27	3.27
	1. < 25%	1	0.63	0.65	3.92
	2. 25-74%	35	22.01	22.88	26.80
	3. 75-90%	80	50.31	52.29	79.08
	4. > 90%	32	20.13	20.92	100.00
	Total	153	96.23	100.00	
Missing		6	3.77		
Total		159	100.00		

Table C. FS Principal.3. Coverage of ELA Standards in 2001

	ELA Standards Coverage in 2001	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Unknown	11	6.92	7.28	7.28
	1. < 25%	9	5.66	5.96	13.25
	2. 25-74%	61	38.36	40.40	53.64
	3. 75-90%	50	31.45	33.11	86.75
	4. > 90%	20	12.58	13.25	100.00
	Total	151	94.97	100.00	
Missing		8	5.03		
Total		159	100.00		

Table C. FS Principal.4. Coverage of ELA Standards in 2000

	ELA Standards Coverage in 2000	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Unknown	21	13.21	14.00	14.00
	1. < 25%	24	15.09	16.00	30.00
	2. 25-74%	62	38.99	41.33	71.33
	3. 75-90%	33	20.75	22.00	93.33
	4. > 90%	10	6.29	6.67	100.00
	Total	150	94.34	100.00	
Missing		9	5.66		
Total		159	100.00		

Table C. FS Principal.5. Coverage of ELA Standards Before 2000

	ELA Standards Coverage Before 2000	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Unknown	48	30.19	32.88	32.88
	1. < 25%	23	14.47	15.75	48.63
	2. 25-74%	48	30.19	32.88	81.51
	3. 75-90%	21	13.21	14.38	95.89
	4. > 90%	6	3.77	4.11	100.00
	Total	146	91.82	100.00	
Missing		13	8.18		
Total		159	100.00		

Table C. FS Principal.6. Coverage of Math Standards in 2003

	Math Standards Coverage in 2003	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	2. 25-74%	11	6.92	7.14	7.14
	3. 75-90%	70	44.03	45.45	52.60
	4. > 90%	73	45.91	47.40	100.00
	Total	154	96.86	100.00	
Missing		5	3.14		
Total		159	100.00		

Table C. FS Principal.7. Coverage of Math Standards in 2002

	Math Standards Coverage in 2002	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Unknown	5	3.14	3.29	3.29
	1. < 25%	2	1.26	1.32	4.61
	2. 25-74%	29	18.24	19.08	23.68
	3. 75-90%	77	48.43	50.66	74.34
	4. > 90%	39	24.53	25.66	100.00
	Total	152	95.60	100.00	
Missing		7	4.40		
Total		159	100.00		

Table C. FS Principal.8. Coverage of Math Standards in 2001

	Math Standards Coverage in 2001	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Unknown	12	7.55	7.95	7.95
	1. < 25%	4	2.52	2.65	10.60
	2. 25-74%	59	37.11	39.07	49.67
	3. 75-90%	58	36.48	38.41	88.08
	4. > 90%	18	11.32	11.92	100.00
	Total	151	94.97	100.00	
Missing		8	5.03		
Total		159	100.00		

Table C. FS Principal.9. Coverage of Math Standards in 2000

	Math Standards Coverage in 2000	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Unknown	22	13.84	14.86	14.86
	1. < 25%	18	11.32	12.16	27.03
	2. 25-74%	56	35.22	37.84	64.86
	3. 75-90%	42	26.42	28.38	93.24
	4. > 90%	10	6.29	6.76	100.00
	Total	148	93.08	100.00	
Missing		11	6.92		
Total		159	100.00		

Table C. FS Principal.10. Coverage of Math Standards Before 2000

	Math Standards Coverage Before 2000	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Unknown	49	30.82	33.11	33.11
	1. < 25%	20	12.58	13.51	46.62
	2. 25-74%	48	30.19	32.43	79.05
	3. 75-90%	25	15.72	16.89	95.95
	4. > 90%	6	3.77	4.05	100.00
	Total	148	93.08	100.00	
Missing		11	6.92		
Total		159	100.00		

Table C. FS Principal.11. Percent of Teachers with Prof. Dev. in Teaching Standards

	Prof. Dev. in Teaching Standards	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1. < 25%	7	4.40	4.46	4.46
	2. 25-74%	26	16.35	16.56	21.02
	3. 75-90%	38	23.90	24.20	45.22
	4. > 90%	86	54.09	54.78	100.00
	Total	157	98.74	100.00	
Missing		2	1.26		
Total		159	100.00		

Table C. FS Principal.12. District Tracks Mastery of Content Standards

	District Tracks Mastery	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	83	52.20	100.00	100.00
Missing		76	47.80		
Total		159	100.00		

Table C. FS Principal.13. School Tracks Mastery of Content Standards

	School Tracks Mastery	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	78	49.06	100.00	100.00
Missing		81	50.94		
Total		159	100.00		

Table C. FS Principal.14. Department Tracks Mastery of Content Standards

	Department Tracks Mastery	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	61	38.36	100.00	100.00
Missing		98	61.64		
Total		159	100.00		

Table C. FS Principal.15 Teachers Track Mastery of Content Standards

	Teachers Track Mastery	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	117	73.58	100.00	100.00
Missing		42	26.42		
Total		159	100.00		

Table C. FS Principal.16. Other System for Tracking Mastery of Content Standards

	Other System Tracks Mastery	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	8	5.03	100.00	100.00
Missing		151	94.97		
Total		159	100.00		

Table C. FS Principal.17. No System for Tracking Mastery of Content Standards

	No System Tracks Mastery	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	8	5.03	100.00	100.00
Missing		151	94.97		
Total		159	100.00		

Table C. FS Principal.18. Coordination Between Middle School and High School

	Coordination of HS and MS	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Developed	20	12.58	12.90	12.90
	Partially Developed	95	59.75	61.29	74.19
	Fully Developed	40	25.16	25.81	100.00
	Total	155	97.48	100.00	
Missing		4	2.52		
Total		159	100.00		

Table C. FS Principal.19. Coordination Between Special Ed. and General Ed.

	Coordination of Special Ed. and General Ed.	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Applicable	2	1.26	1.31	1.31
	Not Developed	9	5.66	5.88	7.19
	Partially Developed	98	61.64	64.05	71.24
	Fully Developed	44	27.67	28.76	100.00
	Total	153	96.23	100.00	
Missing		6	3.77		
Total		159	100.00		

Table C. FS Principal.20. Coordination Between EL Staff and General Ed.

	Coordination of EL Staff and General Ed.	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Applicable	11	6.92	7.24	7.24
	Not Developed	11	6.92	7.24	14.47
	Partially Developed	93	58.49	61.18	75.66
	Fully Developed	37	23.27	24.34	100.00
	Total	152	95.60	100.00	
Missing		7	4.40		
Total		159	100.00		

Table C. FS Principal.21. Coordination Between Alt./Cont. Ed. and General Ed.

	Coordination of Alt. Ed. and General Ed.	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Applicable	64	40.25	44.76	44.76
	Not Developed	29	18.24	20.28	65.03
	Partially Developed	42	26.42	29.37	94.41
	Fully Developed	8	5.03	5.59	100.00
	Total	143	89.94	100.00	
Missing		16	10.06		
Total		159	100.00		

Table C. FS Principal.22. Importance of Articulation with High Schools

	Articulation with High Schools	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very Unimportant	2	1.26	1.44	1.44
	Unimportant	2	1.26	1.44	2.88
	Neutral	8	5.03	5.76	8.63
	Important	67	42.14	48.20	56.83
	Very Important	60	37.74	43.17	100.00
	Total	139	87.42	100.00	
Missing		20	12.58		
Total		159	100.00		

Table C. FS Pincipal.23. Do You Have Articulation Meetings with Receiving High Schools?

	Meetings with High Schools	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Applicable	6	3.77	3.82	3.82
	No	53	33.33	33.76	37.58
	Only some of them	26	16.35	16.56	54.14
	Yes, all of them	72	45.28	45.86	100.00
	Total	157	98.74	100.00	
Missing		2	1.26		
Total		159	100.00		

Table C. FS Principal.24. Average Percent of Completing Algebra During 2002-2004

Variable	N	Mean	SD
Percent in 2004 completing no Algebra	159	3.81	10.85
Percent in 2004 completing Pre-Algebra	158	19.65	30.30
Percent in 2004 completing Algebra A (1or 2)	159	21.55	29.16
Percent in 2004 completing Algebra 1	159	25.92	28.07
Percent in 2003 completing no Algebra	159	5.88	14.73
Percent in 2003 completing Pre-Algebra	159	22.49	32.45
Percent in 2003 completing Algebra A (1or 2)	158	21.50	30.37
Percent in 2003 completing Algebra 1	159	21.30	23.30
Percent in 2002 completing no Algebra	159	8.89	20.93
Percent in 2002 completing Pre-Algebra	159	24.39	33.61
Percent in 2002 completing Algebra A (1or 2)	159	14.48	28.21
Percent in 2002 completing Algebra 1	159	17.20	21.56

Results of High School (HS) Teacher Survey

Table C. HS Teacher.1. When Was Course First Offered?

	Course First Offered	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	02-03	428	11.69	12.19	12.19
	01-02	345	9.42	9.82	22.01
	00-01	182	4.97	5.18	27.19
	99-00	190	5.19	5.41	32.60
	Bef99	2367	64.64	67.40	100.00
	Total	3512	95.90	100.00	
Missing		150	4.10		
Total		3662	100.00		

Table C. HS Teacher.2. How Many Sections This Year?

	Course Sections	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	01-02	1094	29.87	31.09	31.09
	03-05	798	21.79	22.68	53.77
	06-10	709	19.36	20.15	73.91
	11+	918	25.07	26.09	100.00
	Total	3519	96.10	100.00	
Missing		143	3.90		
Total		3662	100.00		

Table C. HS Teacher.3. Type of Course or Program

	Type of Course	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1. Primary Course	1878	51.28	52.71	52.71
	2. Required Alt.	888	24.25	24.92	77.63
	3. Required Supp.	388	10.60	10.89	88.52
	4. Elective – All	61	1.67	1.71	90.23
	5. Elective – Remedial	241	6.58	6.76	97.00
	6. Other	107	2.92	3.00	100.00
	Total	3563	97.30	100.00	
Missing		99	2.70		
Total		3662	100.00		

Table C. HS Teacher.4. When is the Course Offered?

	Course Time	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1. Regular Hours	2686	38.38	76.76	76.76
	3. Summer Course	699	9.99	19.98	96.74
	4. Summer Program	99	1.41	2.83	99.57
	6. Other Time	15	0.21	0.43	100.00
	Total	3499	50.00	100.00	
Missing		163	2.33		
Total		6998	100.00		

Table C. HS Teacher.5. Grade of Students

	Grade of Students	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	9th	1105	30.17	31.94	31.94
	10th	570	15.57	16.47	48.41
	11th	399	10.90	11.53	59.94
	12th	227	6.20	6.56	66.50
	9-10	580	15.84	16.76	83.27
	10-11	234	6.39	6.76	90.03
	11-12	144	3.93	4.16	94.19
	Other	201	5.49	5.81	100.00
	Total	3460	94.48	100.00	
Missing		202	5.52		
Total		3662	100.00		

Table C. HS Teacher.6. How Well Prepared Are Students?

	Students Well Prepared	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1. Few	1075	29.36	31.62	31.62
	2. Some	1680	45.88	49.41	81.03
	3. Almost All	645	17.61	18.97	100.00
	Total	3400	92.85	100.00	
Missing		262	7.15		
Total		3662	100.00		

Table C. HS Teacher.7. Percent of Proficiency on STAR CST Test

	STAR CST Test	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Unknown	651	17.78	20.68	20.68
	0. N / A	101	2.76	3.21	23.89
	1. < 25%	909	24.82	28.88	52.76
	2. 25-74%	996	27.20	31.64	84.40
	3. 75-90%	312	8.52	9.91	94.31
	4. > 90%	179	4.89	5.69	100.00
	Total	3148	85.96	100.00	
Missing		514	14.04		
Total		3662	100.00		

Table C. HS Teacher.8. Result Limited by Low Attendance

	Low Attendance	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1. Not at All	484	13.22	14.07	14.07
	2. Slight	1036	28.29	30.12	44.19
	3. Moderate	794	21.68	23.08	67.27
	4. Great	569	15.54	16.54	83.81
	5. Very Great	557	15.21	16.19	100.00
	Total	3440	93.94	100.00	
Missing		222	6.06		
Total		3662	100.00		

Table C. HS Teacher.9. Result Limited by Low Motivation

	Low Motivation	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1. Not at All	183	5.00	5.25	5.25
	2. Slight	589	16.08	16.88	22.13
	3. Moderate	909	24.82	26.05	48.18
	4. Great	947	25.86	27.14	75.32
	5. Very Great	861	23.51	24.68	100.00
	Total	3489	95.28	100.00	
Missing		173	4.72		
Total		3662	100.00		

Table C. HS Teacher.10. Result Limited by English Proficiency

	Low English Proficiency	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1. Not at All	710	19.39	20.64	20.64
	2. Slight	1211	33.07	35.20	55.84
	3. Moderate	868	23.70	25.23	81.08
	4. Great	365	9.97	10.61	91.69
	5. Very Great	286	7.81	8.31	100.00
	Total	3440	93.94	100.00	
Missing		222	6.06		
Total		3662	100.00		

Table C. HS Teacher.11. Result Limited by Low Parental Support

	Low Parental Support	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1. Not at All	363	9.91	10.52	10.52
	2. Slight	992	27.09	28.74	39.25
	3. Moderate	1082	29.55	31.34	70.60
	4. Great	641	17.50	18.57	89.17
	5. Very Great	374	10.21	10.83	100.00
	Total	3452	94.27	100.00	
Missing		210	5.73		
Total		3662	100.00		

Table C. HS Teacher.12. Result Limited by Lack of Materials

	Lack of Materials	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1. Not at All	1822	49.75	53.15	53.15
	2. Slight	914	24.96	26.66	79.81
	3. Moderate	403	11.00	11.76	91.57
	4. Great	181	4.94	5.28	96.85
	5. Very Great	108	2.95	3.15	100.00
	Total	3428	93.61	100.00	
Missing		234	6.39		
Total		3662	100.00		

Table C. HS Teacher.13. Result Limited by Lack of Teachers

	Lack of Teachers	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1. Not at All	2370	64.72	69.52	69.52
	2. Slight	652	17.80	19.13	88.65
	3. Moderate	201	5.49	5.90	94.54
	4. Great	112	3.06	3.29	97.83
	5. Very Great	74	2.02	2.17	100.00
	Total	3409	93.09	100.00	
Missing		253	6.91		
Total		3662	100.00		

Table C. HS Teacher.14. Do Different Instructors Use the Same Textbook?

	Same Textbook	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	667	18.21	18.88	18.88
	Yes	2865	78.24	81.12	100.00
	Total	3532	96.45	100.00	
Missing		130	3.55		
Total		3662	100.00		

Table C. HS Teacher.15. When was Text Adopted?

	Text Adopted	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	636	17.37	19.35	19.35
	02-03	533	14.55	16.22	35.56
	01-02	597	16.30	18.16	53.73
	00-01	345	9.42	10.50	64.22
	99-00	238	6.50	7.24	71.46
	Before 99	938	25.61	28.54	100.00
	Total	3287	89.76	100.00	
Missing		375	10.24		
Total		3662	100.00		

Table C. HS Teacher.16. How Much of Text is Used?

	Text Used	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N / A	460	12.56	13.71	13.71
	0. Varies	239	6.53	7.13	20.84
	1. Some	447	12.21	13.33	34.17
	2. Half	553	15.10	16.49	50.66
	3. Most	1079	29.46	32.17	82.83
	4. All	576	15.73	17.17	100.00
	Total	3354	91.59	100.00	
Missing		308	8.41		
Total		3662	100.00		

Table C. HS Teacher.17. Other Text is Used

	Other Text Used	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1. < 1 a Month	920	25.12	31.77	31.77
	2. Once a Month	359	9.80	12.40	44.16
	3. Once a Week	536	14.64	18.51	62.67
	4. 2-3 a Week	639	17.45	22.06	84.74
	5. Daily	442	12.07	15.26	100.00
	Total	2896	79.08	100.00	
Missing		766	20.92		
Total		3662	100.00		

Table C. HS Teacher.18. Commercial Material Used

	Commercial Material Used	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1. < 1 a Month	715	19.52	24.64	24.64
	2. Once a Month	460	12.56	15.85	40.49
	3. Once a Week	691	18.87	23.81	64.30
	4. 2-3 a Week	608	16.60	20.95	85.25
	5. Daily	428	11.69	14.75	100.00
	Total	2902	79.25	100.00	
Missing		760	20.75		
Total		3662	100.00		

Table C. HS Teacher.19. Computer-Based Program Used

	Computer-based Program	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1. < 1 a Month	1498	40.91	56.02	56.02
	2. Once a Month	469	12.81	17.54	73.56
	3. Once a Week	339	9.26	12.68	86.24
	4. 2-3 a Week	205	5.60	7.67	93.90
	5. Daily	163	4.45	6.10	100.00
	Total	2674	73.02	100.00	
Missing		988	26.98		
Total		3662	100.00		

Table C. HS Teacher.20. Overall Alignment with Standards

	Alignment with Standards	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very Great	28	0.76	0.86	0.86
	Great	90	2.46	2.76	3.62
	Moderate	428	11.69	13.14	16.77
	Slight	1077	29.41	33.08	49.85
	Not at all	1633	44.59	50.15	100.00
	Total	3256	88.91	100.00	
Missing		406	11.09		
Total		3662	100.00		

Table C. HS Teacher.21. Teachers with Appropriate Credentials

	Teacher Credentials	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0. None	230	6.28	6.70	6.70
	1. Some	104	2.84	3.03	9.73
	2. About Half	146	3.99	4.25	13.98
	3. Most	283	7.73	8.24	22.22
	4. Nearly All	2671	72.94	77.78	100.00
	Total	3434	93.77	100.00	
Missing		228	6.23		
Total		3662	100.00		

Table C. HS Teacher.22. Teachers with Emergency Credentials

	Teachers Emergency Credentials	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0. None	2346	64.06	68.64	68.64
	1. Some	737	20.13	21.56	90.20
	2. About Half	148	4.04	4.33	94.53
	3. Most	24	0.66	0.70	95.23
	4. Nearly All	163	4.45	4.77	100.00
	Total	3418	93.34	100.00	
Missing		244	6.66		
Total		3662	100.00		

Table C. HS Teacher.23. Tracking At-Risk Students

	At-Risk Tracking	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Clustered	342	9.34	11.37	11.37
	Spread	2665	72.77	88.63	100.00
	Total	3007	82.11	100.00	
Missing		655	17.89		
Total		3662	100.00		

Table C. HS Teacher.24. Tracking English Learners

	EL Tracking	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Clustered	936	25.56	32.05	32.05
	Spread	1984	54.18	67.95	100.00
	Total	2920	79.74	100.00	
Missing		742	20.26		
Total		3662	100.00		

Table C. HS Teacher.25. Tracking Remedial Students

	Remedial Tracking	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Clustered	575	15.70	19.33	19.33
	Spread	2400	65.54	80.67	100.00
	Total	2975	81.24	100.00	
Missing		687	18.76		
Total		3662	100.00		

Table C. HS Teacher.26. Tracking Special Needs Students

	Special Needs Tracking	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Clustered	916	25.01	30.84	30.84
	Spread	2054	56.09	69.16	100.00
	Total	2970	81.10	100.00	
Missing		692	18.90		
Total		3662	100.00		

Table C. HS Teacher.27. Teacher Experience: At-Risk Students

	At-Risk Experience	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1. Not at All	41	1.12	1.29	1.29
	2. Slight	329	8.98	10.36	11.65
	3. Moderate	1086	29.66	34.20	45.86
	4. Great	942	25.72	29.67	75.53
	5. Very Great	777	21.22	24.47	100.00
	Total	3175	86.70	100.00	
Missing		487	13.30		
Total		3662	100.00		

Table C. HS Teacher.28. Teacher Experience: English Learner

	EL Experience	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1. Not at All	123	3.36	3.89	3.89
	2. Slight	547	14.94	17.30	21.19
	3. Moderate	1175	32.09	37.16	58.35
	4. Great	787	21.49	24.89	83.24
	5. Very Great	530	14.47	16.76	100.00
	Total	3162	86.35	100.00	
Missing		500	13.65		
Total		3662	100.00		

Table C. HS Teacher.29. Teacher Experience: Remedial Students

	Remedial Experience	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1. Not at All	38	1.04	1.19	1.19
	2. Slight	286	7.81	8.97	10.16
	3. Moderate	1122	30.64	35.19	45.36
	4. Great	1046	28.56	32.81	78.17
	5. Very Great	696	19.01	21.83	100.00
	Total	3188	87.06	100.00	
Missing		474	12.94		
Total		3662	100.00		

Table C. HS Teacher.30. Teacher Experience: Special Needs Students

	Special Needs Experience	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1. Not at All	85	2.32	2.65	2.65
	2. Slight	627	17.12	19.56	22.22
	3. Moderate	1195	32.63	37.29	59.50
	4. Great	741	20.23	23.12	82.62
	5. Very Great	557	15.21	17.38	100.00
	Total	3205	87.52	100.00	
Missing		457	12.48		
Total		3662	100.00		

Table C. HS Teacher.31. Descriptive Statistics of Some Variables in HS Teacher Survey

Variable	N	Mean	SD
7. Total enrollment in course	3,326	173.11	206.74
8. Percent in course who are EL	3,257	26.27	33.57
9. Percent in course who are Special Needs	3,211	18.94	30.10
10. Percent in course who are economically disadvantaged	2,982	43.46	35.52
24. Number with < 2 years experience teaching this course	3,320	0.73	1.48
24. Number with 2-3 years experience teaching this course	3,320	0.90	1.42
24. Number with 4-5 years experience teaching this course	3,318	0.58	1.35
24. Number with 6-10 years experience teaching this course	3,317	0.63	1.29
24. Number with 11-20 years experience teaching this course	3,317	0.54	1.22
24. Number with > 20 years experience teaching this course	3,316	0.37	0.90
25. Number with < 2 years total teaching experience	3,300	0.45	1.05
25. Number with 2-3 years total teaching experience	3,305	0.76	1.32
25. Number with 4-5 years total teaching experience	3,307	0.60	1.19
25. Number with 6-10 years total teaching experience	3,308	0.77	1.38
25. Number with 11-20 years total teaching experience	3,306	0.78	1.40
25. Number with > 20 years total teaching experience	3,138	0.61	1.12

Table C. HS Teacher.32. Average Percent of Student Groups in Different Types of Courses

Course Type	EL	Special Needs	Economic Disad.
Primary	18.45	9.09	38.27
Required Alternative	37.60	33.05	46.56
Required Supplementary	33.54	26.45	57.69
Elective- All	19.06	11.17	35.95
Elective- Remedial	30.07	26.37	51.28
Other	30.98	33.27	47.67

Results of Middle-Grade Feeder School (FS) Teacher Survey

Table C. FS Teacher.1. When Was Course First Offered?

	Course First Offered	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	02-03	232	11.29	11.66	11.66
	01-02	210	10.22	10.56	22.22
	00-01	174	8.47	8.75	30.97
	99-00	119	5.79	5.98	36.95
	Before 99	1254	61.02	63.05	100.00
	Total	1989	96.79	100.00	
Missing		66	3.21		
Total		2055	100.00		

Table C. FS Teacher.2. How Many Sections This Year?

	Course Sections	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	01-02	593	28.86	29.59	29.59
	03-05	534	25.99	26.65	56.24
	06-10	446	21.70	22.26	78.49
	11+	431	20.97	21.51	100.00
	Total	2004	97.52	100.00	
Missing		51	2.48		
Total		2055	100.00		

Table C. FS Teacher.3. Type of Course or Program

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1. Primary Course	1285	62.53	63.96	63.96
	2. Required Alt.	409	19.90	20.36	84.32
	3. Required Supp.	144	7.01	7.17	91.49
	4. Elective – All	11	0.54	0.55	92.04
	5. Elective – Remedial	93	4.53	4.63	96.67
	6. Other	67	3.26	3.33	100.00
	Total	2009	97.76	100.00	
Missing		46	2.24		
Total		2055	100.00		

Table C. FS Teacher.4. Offered Before/After School

	Before/After School	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	68	3.31	100.00	100.00
Missing		1987	96.69		
Total		2055	100.00		

Table C. FS Teacher.5. Summer School Course

	Summer School	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	163	7.93	100.00	100.00
Missing		1892	92.07		
Total		2055	100.00		

Table C. FS Teacher.6. Summer Program

	Summer Program	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	47	2.29	100.00	100.00
Missing		2008	97.71		
Total		2055	100.00		

Table C. FS Teacher.7. During School Hours

	During School Hours	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	1996	97.13	100.00	100.00
Missing		59	2.87		
Total		2055	100.00		

Table C. FS Teacher.8. During Session Breaks

	During Session Breaks	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	24	1.17	100.00	100.00
Missing		2031	98.83		
Total		2055	100.00		

Table C. FS Teacher.9. Offered Some Other Time

	Other Time	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	15	0.73	100.00	100.00
Missing		2040	99.27		
Total		2055	100.00		

Table C. FS Teacher.10. How Well Prepared are Stduents?

	Students Well Prepared	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1. Few	511	24.87	26.25	26.25
	2. Some	972	47.30	49.92	76.17
	3. Almost All	464	22.58	23.83	100.00
	Total	1947	94.74	100.00	
Missing		108	5.26		
Total		2055	100.00		

Table C. FS Teacher.11. Percent of Proficient on STAR CST Test

	STAR CST Test	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Unknown	184	8.95	10.09	10.09
	0. N / A	62	3.02	3.40	13.49
	1. < 25%	421	20.49	23.09	36.59
	2. 25-74%	655	31.87	35.93	72.52
	3. 75-90%	304	14.79	16.68	89.19
	4. > 90%	197	9.59	10.81	100.00
	Total	1823	88.71	100.00	
Missing		232	11.29		
Total		2055	100.00		

Table C. FS Teacher.12. Result Limited by Low Attendance

	Low Attendance	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1. Not at All	467	22.80	23.88	23.88
	2. Slight	785	38.33	40.13	64.01
	3. Moderate	311	15.19	15.90	79.91
	4. Great	199	9.72	10.17	90.09
	5. Very Great	194	9.47	9.92	100.00
	Total	1956	95.51	100.00	
Missing		92	4.49		
Total		2048	100.00		

Table C. FS Teacher.13. Result Limited by Low Motivation

	Low Motivation	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1. Not at All	194	9.44	9.82	9.82
	2. Slight	420	20.44	21.26	31.07
	3. Moderate	573	27.88	29.00	60.07
	4. Great	449	21.85	22.72	82.79
	5. Very Great	340	16.55	17.21	100.00
	Total	1976	96.16	100.00	
Missing		79	3.84		
Total		2055	100.00		

Table C. FS Teacher.14. Result Limited by English Proficiency

	Low English Proficiency	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1. Not at All	447	21.75	22.85	22.85
	2. Slight	738	35.91	37.73	60.58
	3. Moderate	467	22.73	23.88	84.46
	4. Great	181	8.81	9.25	93.71
	5. Very Great	123	5.99	6.29	100.00
	Total	1956	95.18	100.00	
Missing		99	4.82		
Total		2055	100.00		

Table C. FS Teacher.15. Result Limited by Low Parental Support

	Low Parental Support	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1. Not at All	269	13.09	13.75	13.75
	2. Slight	530	25.79	27.10	40.85
	3. Moderate	614	29.88	31.39	72.24
	4. Great	353	17.18	18.05	90.29
	5. Very Great	190	9.25	9.71	100.00
	Total	1956	95.18	100.00	
Missing		99	4.82		
Total		2055	100.00		

Table C. FS Teacher.16. Result Limited by Lack of Materials

	Lack of Material	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1. Not at All	1152	56.06	59.05	59.05
	2. Slight	469	22.82	24.04	83.09
	3. Moderate	190	9.25	9.74	92.82
	4. Great	86	4.18	4.41	97.23
	5. Very Great	54	2.63	2.77	100.00
	Total	1951	94.94	100.00	
Missing		104	5.06		
Total		2055	100.00		

Table C. FS Teacher.17. Result Limited by Lack of Teachers

	Lack of Teachers	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1. Not at All	1431	69.64	73.72	73.72
	2. Slight	277	13.48	14.27	88.00
	3. Moderate	113	5.50	5.82	93.82
	4. Great	64	3.11	3.30	97.11
	5. Very Great	56	2.73	2.89	100.00
	Total	1941	94.45	100.00	
Missing		114	5.55		
Total		2055	100.00		

Table C. FS Teacher.18. Do Different Instructors Use Same Textbook?

	Same Textbook	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	197	9.59	9.79	9.79
	Yes	1816	88.37	90.21	100.00
	Total	2013	97.96	100.00	
Missing		42	2.04		
Total		2055	100.00		

Table C. FS Teacher.19. When Was Text Adopted?

	Text Adopted	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	208	10.12	10.77	10.77
	02-03	543	26.42	28.11	38.87
	01-02	521	25.35	26.97	65.84
	00-01	193	9.39	9.99	75.83
	99-00	125	6.08	6.47	82.30
	Before 99	342	16.64	17.70	100.00
	Total	1932	94.01	100.00	
Missing		123	5.99		
Total		2055	100.00		

Table C. FS Teacher.20. How Much of Text is Used?

	Text Used	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	139	6.76	7.07	7.07
	0. Varies	128	6.23	6.51	13.59
	1. Some	210	10.22	10.69	24.27
	2. Half	299	14.55	15.22	39.49
	3. Most	791	38.49	40.25	79.75
	4. All	398	19.37	20.25	100.00
	Total	1965	95.62	100.00	
Missing		90	4.38		
Total		2055	100.00		

Table C. FS Teacher.21. Other Text is Used

	Other Text Used	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1. < 1 a Month	717	34.89	42.05	42.05
	2. Once a Month	249	12.12	14.60	56.66
	3. Once a Week	330	16.06	19.35	76.01
	4. 2-3 a Week	273	13.28	16.01	92.02
	5. Daily	136	6.62	7.98	100.00
	Total	1705	82.97	100.00	
Missing		350	17.03		
Total		2055	100.00		

Table C. FS Teacher.22. Commercial Material Used

	Commercial Material Used	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1. < 1 a Month	431	20.97	24.56	24.56
	2. Once a Month	311	15.13	17.72	42.28
	3. Once a Week	387	18.83	22.05	64.33
	4. 2-3 a Week	390	18.98	22.22	86.55
	5. Daily	236	11.48	13.45	100.00
	Total	1755	85.40	100.00	
Missing		300	14.60		
Total		2055	100.00		

Table C. FS Teacher.23. Computer-based Program Used

	Computer-based Program	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1. < 1 a Month	881	42.87	53.59	53.59
	2. Once a Month	262	12.75	15.94	69.53
	3. Once a Week	226	11.00	13.75	83.27
	4. 2-3 a Week	142	6.91	8.64	91.91
	5. Daily	133	6.47	8.09	100.00
	Total	1644	80.00	100.00	
Missing		411	20.00		
Total		2055	100.00		

Table C. FS Teacher.24. Overall Alignment with Standards

	Alignment with Standards	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very Great	6	0.29	0.32	0.32
	Great	37	1.80	1.97	2.29
	Moderate	214	10.41	11.41	13.71
	Slight	522	25.40	27.84	41.55
	Not at all	1096	53.33	58.45	100.00
	Total	1875	91.24	100.00	
Missing		180	8.76		
Total		2055	100.00		

Table C. FS Teacher.25. Teachers with Appropriate Credentials

	Teacher Credentials	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0. None	74	3.60	3.89	3.89
	1. Some	44	2.14	2.31	6.20
	2. About Half	74	3.60	3.89	10.09
	3. Most	146	7.10	7.67	17.76
	4. Nearly All	1565	76.16	82.24	100.00
	Total	1903	92.60	100.00	
Missing		152	7.40		
Total		2055	100.00		

Table C. FS Teacher.26. Teachers with Emergency Credentials

	Teacher Emergency Credentials	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0. None	1445	70.32	75.81	75.81
	1. Some	320	15.57	16.79	92.60
	2. About Half	46	2.24	2.41	95.02
	3. Most	21	1.02	1.10	96.12
	4. Nearly All	74	3.60	3.88	100.00
	Total	1906	92.75	100.00	
Missing		149	7.25		
Total		2055	100.00		

Table C. FS Teacher.27. Tracking: At-Risk Students

	At-Risk Tracking	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Clustered	266	12.94	15.54	15.54
	Spread	1446	70.36	84.46	100.00
	Total	1712	83.31	100.00	
Missing		343	16.69		
Total		2055	100.00		

Table C. FS Teacher.28. Tracking: English Learners

	EL Tracking	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Clustered	722	35.13	42.32	42.32
	Spread	984	47.88	57.68	100.00
	Total	1706	83.02	100.00	
Missing		349	16.98		
Total		2055	100.00		

Table C. FS Teacher.29. Tracking: Remedial Students

	Remedial Tracking	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Clustered	444	21.61	26.75	26.75
	Spread	1216	59.17	73.25	100.00
	Total	1660	80.78	100.00	
Missing		395	19.22		
Total		2055	100.00		

Table C. FS Teacher.30. Tracking: Special Needs Stuents

	Special Needs Tracking	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Clustered	804	39.12	47.72	47.72
	Spread	881	42.87	52.28	100.00
	Total	1685	82.00	100.00	
Missing		370	18.00		
Total		2055	100.00		

Table C. FS Teacher.31. Teacher Experience: At-Risk Students

	At-Risk Experience	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1. Not at All	18	0.88	0.99	0.99
	2. Slight	123	5.99	6.78	7.78
	3. Moderate	583	28.37	32.16	39.93
	4. Great	613	29.83	33.81	73.75
	5. Very Great	476	23.16	26.25	100.00
	Total	1813	88.22	100.00	
Missing		242	11.78		
Total		2055	100.00		

Table C. FS Teacher.32. Teacher Experience: EL

	EL Experience	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1. Not at All	37	1.80	2.02	2.02
	2. Slight	283	13.77	15.46	17.48
	3. Moderate	651	31.68	35.55	53.03
	4. Great	506	24.62	27.64	80.67
	5. Very Great	354	17.23	19.33	100.00
	Total	1831	89.10	100.00	
Missing		224	10.90		
Total		2055	100.00		

Table C. FS Teacher.33. Teacher Experience: Remedial Students

	Remedial Experience	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1. Not at All	16	0.78	0.88	0.88
	2. Slight	111	5.40	6.13	7.01
	3. Moderate	561	27.30	30.98	37.99
	4. Great	644	31.34	35.56	73.55
	5. Very Great	479	23.31	26.45	100.00
	Total	1811	88.13	100.00	
Missing		244	11.87		
Total		2055	100.00		

Table C. FS Teacher.34. Teacher Experience: Special Needs Students

	Special Needs Experience	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1. Not at All	35	1.70	1.91	1.91
	2. Slight	251	12.21	13.72	15.64
	3. Moderate	671	32.65	36.69	52.32
	4. Great	455	22.14	24.88	77.20
	5. Very Great	417	20.29	22.80	100.00
	Total	1829	89.00	100.00	
Missing		226	11.00		
Total		2055	100.00		

Table C. FS Teacher.35. Descriptive Statistics of Some Variables in Middle-Grade Feeder School Teacher Survey

Variable	N	Mean	SD
6. Total enrollment in course	1,875	164.28	178.48
7. Percent in course who are EL	1,802	25.92	32.85
8. Percent in course who are SD	1,791	17.21	31.55
9. Percent in course who are Econ. Disadvantageous	1,690	43.22	32.82
23. Number with < 2 years experience teaching this course	1,845	0.63	1.75
23. Number with 2-3 years experience teaching this course	1,847	0.83	1.26
23. Number with 4-5 years experience teaching this course	1,847	0.47	0.98
23. Number with 6-10 years experience teaching this course	1,847	0.65	1.33
23. Number with 11-20 years experience teaching this course	1,847	0.63	1.14
23. Number with > 20 years experience teaching this course	1,847	0.28	0.66
24. Number with < 2 years total teaching experience	1,822	0.33	0.76
24. Number with 2-3 years total teaching experience	1,822	0.61	0.98
24. Number with 4-5 years total teaching experience	1,822	0.44	0.86
24. Number with 6-10 years total teaching experience	1,822	0.81	1.39
24. Number with 11-20 years total teaching experience	1,822	0.77	1.16
24. Number with > 20 years total teaching experience	1,822	0.45	0.83

APPENDIX D

Summary of Interview Responses

Appendix D Table of Contents

Summary of Interview Responses D-5
Site Visits and Interviews D-5
Coding Procedures D-6

Analysis of Principal Interviews D-9
Standards-based instruction D-9
When was standards-based instruction implemented? D-9
Implementation rating D-9
When will SBI be fully in effect? D-10
Mastery D-11
Curriculum Issues D-13
Changes in the curriculum as a result of SBI D-13
When did these changes occur? D-15
Are there any anticipated changes to the curriculum? D-15
Have there been any changes to courses beyond the scope of CAHSEE? D-16
Student Preparation Issues D-17
Incoming student preparation D-17
Within school articulation/preparation efforts D-18
Articulation between middle-grade feeder school and responding school D-19
Teacher familiarity with content standards and/or CAHSEE blueprints D-21
Student Subpopulations D-22
Changes in performance D-23
Changes in motivation D-23
Coordination D-24
Challenges D-25
CAHSEE Opinion D-27

Analysis of English-Language Arts (ELA) and Math Teacher Interviews D-31
Standards-Based Instruction D-31
When did this course begin using SBI? D-31
Implementation rating D-32
How familiar are teachers with California Content Standards and CAHSEE Blueprints? D-33
Materials used in class D-34
How much freedom to use additional materials do teachers have? D-36
How prepared are incoming students for the teacher's course? D-37
How do teachers ensure coverage both across and within grades? D-40
How do teachers track mastery of standards, and what do they do for students who fail to master certain standards? D-42
How prepared are students for subsequent courses? D-46
Challenges in Implementing SBI D-48
CAHSEE Opinion D-50

Analysis of CAHSEE Remediation Teacher Interviews D-55
Increasing Alignment to California Content Standards D-55
Is course/program using SBI? D-55
Texts/materials used and aligned with standards D-55
Copies/use of California Content Standards D-56
Prediction/statement regarding 2004 requirement D-56

Remediation Program Targeting the CAHSEE D-57
Course/program description D-57
Elective D-57
How students are placed in remediation D-57
Demographic cross-sectional participation D-58
How many times can students take remediation? D-58
How course/program was developed D-59
System to monitor subsequent CAHSEE performance D-59

Analysis of Special Education Teacher Interviews D-61
Increasing Alignment to California Content Standards D-61
Use of standards in IEP and 504 plans D-61
How many special education students were mainstreamed/exposed to standards? D-62
Department system to monitor coverage and mastery of standards D-63
Text/materials used and aligned with standards D-64
Content not exposed to students D-65
Particular content will not have mastered D-66
Copies/use of California Content Standards D-67
How many special education students have passed/will pass the CAHSEE? D-67
Department provides extra support to help pass D-68
Prediction/statement regarding 2004 requirement D-69

Analysis of English Learner (EL) Teacher Interviews D-71
Increasing Alignment to California Content Standards D-71
How to integrate standards into EL curriculum D-71
EL student population D-72
How many regular standards able covered? D-72
Text/materials used and aligned with standards D-73
Copies/use of California Content Standards D-74
Prediction/statement regarding 2004 exit exam requirement D-75
Targeted Programs for English Learners D-76
How does teacher design test prep activities? D-76

Analysis of Special Program Teacher Interviews D-79
Increasing Alignment to California Content Standards D-79
Is course/program using SBI? D-79
Challenges in implementing program D-79
Texts/materials used and aligned with standards D-80
What proportion are likely to pass the CAHSEE? D-81
Prediction/statement regarding 2004 exit exam requirement D-81
Special Programs Targeting Remediation D-82
Course/program description D-82
How students are placed in remediation D-82
Demographic cross-sectional participation D-83
Method to measure program's success D-83

Summary of Interview Responses

Site Visits and Interviews

Table D.1 presents the number of interviews conducted at each school. Interview totals varied greatly among schools, with as few as a single interview to as many as 16 at a single school. In large part, this is based on the size of the school. We note that in some cases, interviews were conducted with more than one teacher present. Generally, we counted that as a single interview.

Table D.1. Number of interviews conducted at individual schools

High school interviews			
High school	**Number interviewed**	**High school**	**Number interviewed**
A	4	AA	8
B	8	BB	8
C	12	CC	12
D	14	DD	6
E	9	EE	6
F	10	FF	5
G	12	GG	7
H	6	HH	6
I	9	II	8
J	4	JJ	11
K	12	KK	5
L	10	LL	7
M	5	MM	15
N	1	NN	11
O	13	OO	4
P	11	PP	11
Q	8	QQ	10
R	9	RR	5
S	8	SS	5
T	5	TT	8
U	9	UU	13
V	6	VV	11
W	8	Total HS interviewed	375

Table 1 continues

Table 1 continued

Middle-grade feeder school interviews			
Feeder school	**Number interviewed**	**Feeder school**	**Number interviewed**
AAA	13	JJJ	6
BBB	6	KKK	4
CCC	5	LLL	3
DDD	6	MMM	6
EEE	16	NNN	11
FFF	6	OOO	4
GGG	15	PPP	5
HHH	2	QQQ	6
III	10	Total FS interviewed	124
	Total number interviewed		499

Interviews generally were scheduled for teachers' planning periods; in a few instances, however, schools hired substitute teachers to cover classes while teachers were interviewed. We tried to limit teacher interviews to no more than 30 minutes; in some instances, interviews were shortened either due to a prior agreement with the administration or due to a last-minute change of plans, such as having to meet with a parent.

Respondents were told that interviews were confidential; therefore, names of respondents, schools, and districts were not used in this report, nor were other features that might help identify a school. In order to eliminate the "chilling effect" that recording interviews can have on respondents, interviews were not recorded. The relatively short turnaround time between site visits and report submission dates also made recording and transcribing interviews impractical. Therefore, comments that appear in this section are paraphrased unless they appear in quotation marks.

Coding Procedures

Interviews were analyzed using N5, produced by QSR International Pty. Ltd. (QSR), (formerly known as NUD*IST, or Non-numerical Unstructured Data Indexing Searching and Theorizing), the fifth version of a qualitative data analysis software program that allows researchers to develop their own coding system, using a hierarchical tree design. Even before site visits began, we knew that we would need to code interviews with some demographic information, such as interview type (principal, math teacher, special education teacher, etc.) and school level (high school, middle-grade feeder school, etc.). QSR calls this information "base data." We also knew that we would need to code by content, or what was being said. This is called "content data" in QSR. Each item in the hierarchical tree is called a "node," and each node has a unique "address." The hierarchical tree can be changed as needed during the life of the project; for example, nodes can be added, deleted, moved, or merged with one another.

QSR also allows coding to take place automatically or by highlighting information in the document on the computer. Each of these methods was used on this project. For example, as a document was entered into the QSR program, it was automatically identified as a particular

type of interview, and it had some broad content data coding applied to it, as well. We then examined each document and applied more detailed content and base data coding as needed.

Once documents have been entered and coded, they can be analyzed. The analysis ranges from the very basic, such as selecting the "principal" node to determine how many documents have been coded at this node, to the more complex. For example, one can restrict a search to a certain type of document and then examine the intersection of various nodes within the document. We did this type of analysis when we restricted our search to only those documents identified as "principal" interviews, and then selected "high school" and "implementation rating." In this way, we calculated the implementation ratings from high school principals.

Due to the size of this project, we divided it, with one person handling the coding for the principal and math/English-language arts (ELA) teacher interviews and a second person handling the coding for English Language Development (ELD), special education (SE), special program, and CAHSEE remediation interviews. Four people (the two original coders and two others) then analyzed the coded data.

Summaries of interview results by interview type are presented in the remainder of this section. The formatting of each interview type roughly follows the applicable interview protocol.

Analysis of Principal Interviews

Sixty-five documents were coded as principal interviews. Of those documents, 50 were coded as high school principals and 15 as middle-grade feeder school principals. In five high schools, researchers conducted separate interviews with the principal and an assistant principal; both these interviews were coded as principal interviews, thus accounting for the difference between the number of principals (50) and the number of high schools (45). At only one middle-grade feeder school did we fail to obtain a principal interview.

Standards-based instruction

Principals were asked a series of questions regarding the use of standards-based instruction (SBI) in their schools. First, they discussed when SBI had been implemented. Next, the principals rated on a 1-to-5 scale (1-not at all implemented, 5-fully implemented) where they felt they were in the implementation process and how long it would take before they were fully implemented. Finally, there were questions regarding how they monitored students' mastery of standards and how they assisted students who did not master standards. Results of these questions are presented in the following sections.

When was standards-based instruction implemented?

Responses to this question varied from as recently as 1 year ago to as many as 6 years ago, with 34 high school principals and 13 middle-grade feeder school principals responding. There was a difference between the middle-grade feeder and high school responses, with the average response for high school principals at 3.0 years and 3.8 years for middle-grade feeder school principals; however, there was no obvious explanation for it.

It is important to note that some responses were difficult to interpret cleanly or with absolute certainty. For example, some schools or districts began implementing standards-based instruction in only one department and gradually phased it in over several years in the remaining departments. There was evidence that in some instances a motivated teacher served as the initiator of SBI within his or her department, then it gradually spread to other departments at the school. So, while one department may indeed have been using SBI for 4 or 5 years, other departments in the same school may have less experience with it.

In other cases, principals who had arrived at their school in the past couple of years typically found that SBI had already been implemented at least to some degree, but they were unable to state with certainty when SBI actually began at their school. In those cases, the time frame was used that the principal could answer with certainty. For example, a middle-grade feeder school principal said that he had been at the school for 2 years, but that his staff was already working on SBI when he arrived. The response of "2 years" was used.

Implementation rating

Principals were asked how far along they are with the standards-based instruction implementation. A 5-point Likert scale was used to describe their progress, 1 being not implemented at all and 5 being fully implemented. Again, several responses were difficult to

interpret; some gave an overall rating for the school and individual ratings for content areas, for example, while others gave imprecise figures such as “3-plus” or “high 3” for their rating. In these cases, we “translated” a “3-plus” or “high 3” into a 3.5 rating. If an overall rating was given, that was used in the analysis.

Many principals reported that implementation varies among content areas, therefore providing different ratings for specific content areas. This raised the question of whether one particular content area, English or Mathematics, would have consistently high or low implementation ratings. After further review, no such pattern was found.

High schools

The high school principals responding to this question, a total of 36, gave themselves a rating of 3.60. Many felt that with a little more time, perhaps 2 years or so, they would be able to report higher numbers. Typical comments that were received are as follows.

- It’s a long process for people to change their behaviors.
- Some teachers won’t do SBI once they’re behind closed doors.
- Continued staff development should help raise the numbers.

Middle-grade feeder schools

Twelve middle-grade feeder school principals responded to this question with an average rating of 3.7—very similar to the high school principal ratings. One middle-grade feeder school principal noted that some students have low skills coming in, and teachers are having trouble learning how to cover the standards at grade level when students are below grade level.

When will SBI be fully in effect?

Considering where they are in implementing standards-based instruction, principals were asked when they felt they would have standards-based instruction fully implemented. This question not only provided answers in specific time frames, but also prompted principals to discuss challenges they faced with implementing school-wide change.

High schools

Twenty-four principals gave specific time frame estimates resulting in an average response of 1.8 years. Five principals discussed the difficulty of getting teachers to “buy into” SBI, while one each mentioned the importance of working with the teachers’ union and ensuring that other supporting changes are made. In this case, the supporting change was the creation of a standards-based report card. The following comments exemplify issues that the principals face.

- People have to believe that CAHSEE is not going away before they will buy into SBI. The school is still not where it needs to be in terms of SBI and CAHSEE.
- It involves working within union guidelines. There is a very strong teachers’ union, and there are teachers who aren’t doing what they should be. But it takes a long time to do anything about it.
- The primary issue is trying to eventually move toward a standards-based report card.

Middle-grade feeder schools

The average middle-grade feeder school principal response was very similar to the high school principal responses, 1.8 years to fully implement standards-based instruction. Their challenges were, again, similar to what the high schools reported.

- A few teachers are into their pet projects and aren't reaching the level they should be doing with the standards.
- It will take time to get all teachers on board; there are so many standards to cover, and there is a debate about quantity vs. quality.

Mastery

Mastery of standards goes beyond simply being exposed to the standards. It implies that students are being held to a certain level of performance before being able to advance to other classes and are provided with opportunities for remediation if they do not achieve mastery. The principals we interviewed reported a variety of methods being used to track student mastery as well as to remediate students who do not master the standards.

High schools

Thirty-three high school principals discussed systems either in place or currently being developed to track student mastery of the California Content Standards. They were free to describe a variety of tracking methods instead of being limited to a single method; therefore, numbers of responses and numbers of respondents will not necessarily coincide.

The most frequently mentioned method of tracking student mastery is the development of common semester finals, end-of-course finals, or benchmark exams, with 18 responses.

- All math classes have a common final assessment that is standards aligned.
- …district has a benchmark exam quarterly; have pacing charts in all core content areas.

The second most commonly mentioned method described, with 13 responses, is the use of standardized tests to track student mastery.

- More than half of students are not "proficient" (according to API) in math and ELA. Proficiency is used as an indicator of mastery of the standards.
- At this point, the new state mandates are driven by the STAR testing…

Eight principals described tracking methods that were currently being developed or which were brand new.

- We review test info and try to sort it by student for each class. Next year want to do this for each English and math class.
- The school will be doing staff development and will have it all in place in September, and then teachers will be able to do directed assessment and keep track of where kids are in mastery of content standards…

Seven principal responses dealt with tracking of mastery done at the individual teacher level.

- …Also, they continue to use a variety of standard assessment techniques in the classroom.

- …Teachers are starting to look at assessing kids on mastery—currently probably a B grade rather than a C grade.

Five principals described mastery tracking methods that varied by department.

- …depends on department. Said that math and science are ahead of the curve.
- Monitoring system is not schoolwide; however, there is one in math and science…

Five principals also described computer programs to aid tracking.

- …there is a commercial assessment software by (company name) they are considering buying.
- The district is working with (company name) on their product to track student progress and mastery…

There were two responses that mentioned using tests in general and two that mentioned general efforts at the school level. Finally, there was only one response stating that the school had no method of tracking student mastery of the standards.

- No system of tracking student mastery of standards is in place. The school has not yet adopted standards-based report cards.

Middle-grade feeder schools

There were 13 middle-grade feeder school principal responses to the "mastery of standards" question. As we found in the high school principal responses, most middle-grade feeder school principals reported using several methods, ranging from individual teacher efforts to those imposed by the district.

Six principals reported using or currently developing some form of common assignment, rubrics, or benchmark tests to measure the mastery of standards. These common measures may have been created at the school or district level.

- We have a 4-point writing rubric to show proficiency—this is district based and has operated for the last 2 years…
- Benchmarks have been created for math in August 2003. It has gotten teachers' attention…

Six principals also reported using results from standardized tests as a measure of mastery.

- The content standards tests that are given every year are one type of assessment...
- We use STAR and California standards tests…

Five principals described individual teacher efforts to measure mastery of standards.

- A teacher will see the students in his/her class that are having problems with the standards.
- We track mastery within departments or classes; there is no formal structure but we think teachers are working hard to meet standards.

Three principals described principal-level efforts to track mastery, such as observations, Walk Throughs, or study groups.

- I don't feel that the focus on the standards has been evident in our district. That's why I developed this study group with our English teachers. I designed this group to address this issue.
- In this district, the primary system of monitoring student mastery of standards is the Walk Through, which is many frequent visits to the classroom. The district provides training for administrators in what to look for in classrooms' bell-to-bell teaching.

We also asked principals to describe how they assist students who fail to master the standards. Again, most principals described a variety of programs, which we categorized as taking place during the school day, taking place outside the regular school day, and retention.

Nine principals described programs taking place outside the regular school day.

- Intercession classes are designed for students who have failed one or more classes. We also have tutoring and Saturday classes.
- Extended day program ended last week due to budget constraints.

Six principals described programs that take place during the regular school day.

- For 6th grade we have a (specific name) program that focuses on the students' needs. This replaces electives that students would otherwise take.
- This is the first semester for remediation courses really targeted at "at risk" students. In Math Concepts they have three sections of lowest level students, then there are double block courses of Concept with pre-Algebra for 7th grade and Concepts with Algebra 1A for 8th grade.

Four principals mentioned retention when other intervention methods are not successful.

- Students who don't master the standards, if it is the end of year the school looks to place the student in summer school and then if doesn't pass s/he will be held back.
- When students don't master the standards they are placed into a retention program; in the fall of 8th grade, we send a warning to parents about their child, and in spring if the student hasn't improved grades s/he will be placed in retention.

Curriculum Issues

Principals answered a series of questions about the curriculum at their schools. The questions focused on changes made in their curriculum, when these changes occurred, anticipated changes to their curriculum based on SBI, and (for high school principals only) if courses beyond the scope of CAHSEE have been changed based on SBI or CAHSEE.

Changes in the curriculum as a result of SBI

Forty-five high school (four were alternative or charter schools) and 14 middle-grade feeder school principals described changes their school had made as a result of SBI. With the number and variety of comments received, they were grouped in common themes. Because some principals described more than one change, comment totals may not correspond to the number of principals. On the other hand, it is important to note that six high schools reported little or no change to their curricula. Reasons for this were from two extremes; that the schools were high performing and would continue with what works and that two alternative

schools stated they were already doing all they could for their predominantly low performing students.

High schools

High school principals described efforts to target students considered at risk of not passing the CAHSEE (14 comments) as well as efforts to remediate students who had already failed the CAHSEE (20 comments) by placing them in CAHSEE remediation courses. One alternative school noted that focusing on at-risk students and those who failed the CAHSEE is not anything different than what they have always done.

Principals then described their efforts to coordinate instruction across the curriculum, a total of 11 principal comments. Examples are as follows.

- In math there is greater consistency from class to class; project work probably has been cut back somewhat.
- Changes have been based mostly on SBI movement where classes are more aligned across the board. There is more consistency across curricula at school and district.
- One high school is doing a tutoring/mentor program with students going to elementary schools to help students having difficulty.

Another issue that six high school principals commented on was the apparent narrowing of the curriculum in response to SBI. The concern was for the loss of elective classes that are important to many students.

- We have lost lots of our elective program because of interventions that are needed to meet SBI—especially language programs.
- Students scoring less than 40 percent on SAT 9 have to take supplemental language class, and it replaces their elective, so now they have art and music teachers teaching sections of language development…they must make sure there are sufficient sections for all the students who meet the placement criterion.
- No new elective courses are being added because they need the resources to go toward classes that pass the CAHSEE.
- One school noted that they have not lost the electives program and vocational courses by getting creative with master schedules. To help students keep some electives, another school lets students sign up for remedial classes on the weekends or after school.

Other issues mentioned by high school principals begin with comments regarding their efforts to make Algebra more accessible to students (19 comments). This entailed the addition of various math programs (e.g., Essentials in Math), two-year Algebra I classes, and a variety of after school and weekend workshops. Another issue, five principal comments, covered the concern to provide good professional development opportunities for teachers. And finally, there were two comments regarding new programs that are geared to parents. These programs provide information on parenting, life skills, reading, and job seeking skills.

One final interesting observation was that only three high schools mentioned anything regarding new textbooks. Six middle-grade feeder schools specifically noted they have or are planning to obtain textbooks that are aligned with the state standards.

Middle-grade feeder schools

Other than differences on the textbook issue and that CAHSEE remediation classes do not apply to middle-grade feeder schools, principals presented similar comments on similar topics as the high school principals. One issue mentioned by 8 principals was the effort being placed to coordinate instruction across the curriculum.

- A big emphasis is on class organization, not so much on the curriculum, but how we organize it throughout the day.
- The school hired an external evaluator to work with departments building standards and consistency within the school.

Middle-grade feeder school principals also reported targeting at risk students (5 comments), concerns with the loss of electives in response to focusing more on SBI (5 comments), and efforts to bring Algebra into their programs (5 comments). Although, high school principals did mention efforts at strengthening the ELA curriculum, these efforts were described in more general terms by middle-grade feeder school principals and were categorized as targeting at risk students.

- In ELA much more focus on expository texts, also more emphasis on vocabulary and morphemes.
- More writing is going on and different types of writing are being done; greater emphasis on structure of English such as grammar.
- ELA had the SRA Corrective Reading program but they found that teachers were just reaching decoding and not comprehension, so the school added three sections of SRA Reading Comprehension.

When did these changes occur?

Fifteen high school and six middle-grade feeder school principals responded to this question; however, it was difficult to pinpoint their answers to specific actions. Generally speaking, the high schools reported the changes in curriculum have taken place within the last 1.9 years, while the middle-grade feeder schools reported changes in the last 2.5 years. Comparing this to when the schools implemented standards-based instruction, it appears these changes occurred about 1 year later.

Are there any anticipated changes to the curriculum?

In additional to identifying changes made to the curriculum, principals were also asked if additional changes are planned. Twenty-nine high schools and 11 middle-grade feeder school principals responded to this question.

High schools

Of the 29 high schools responding to this question, 10 principals indicated they were planning additional math or ELA CAHSEE remediation classes for those students who have already failed the exit exam. Also, there were seven schools that were adding math and ELA classes for students who are at risk. Provided below are additional comments that focus on the addition of special programs and professional development. Six principals indicated that they do not anticipate any additional changes.

- We will get university students to come in and tutor students.

- They are partnering students with industry to receive certification in their field when completing the partnership.
- One alternative school reports the next step is to make sure the staff is on the same page regarding implementation.

Middle-grade feeder schools

Middle-grade feeder school principals spoke in more general terms than did high school principals, with five comments relating to such things as continued articulation or constantly looking at things that will help the students. One middle-grade feeder school principal stated that no changes were anticipated, while another stated that expanding the curriculum to offer a double block in ELA was a goal of the school. Two principals said they anticipate expanding efforts to target instruction for individual students.

Have there been any changes to courses beyond the scope of CAHSEE?

Only high school principals were asked about any impact that the CAHSEE may be having on courses beyond the scope of the exit exam. Generally, principals reported that it was too early to see any impact yet, while a few reported already seeing some changes. Some principals predicted that they will likely have to reduce the number of electives or the number of sections offered in order to find a place within their master schedules for CAHSEE remediation courses. A few predicted that budget cuts will also have an impact on what they are able to offer.

It is expected that the impact of CAHSEE on courses beyond the scope of CAHSEE will vary by the percentage of students who are having trouble passing the exit exam. Those schools with large percentages of students requiring CAHSEE remediation, for example, will probably find that they need more sections of CAHSEE remediation classes than do high schools with a low percentage of students requiring remediation. The decision on when to offer the courses—during the school day or outside of school hours—may impact courses, as well. Some principals reported that they strive to meet the needs of both types of students—offering remediation courses for those struggling to pass the CAHSEE and more advanced courses for those who have already passed.

Twenty-two of 31 high school principals commented about the impact on courses beyond the scope of CAHSEE. Their comments were categorized by determining first whether the comment was something they were now seeing or whether they were predicting what would happen. Next, the comment was categorized by whether it was having (or would have) a negative or positive impact or if it had no change. The remaining nine comments were too general or unclear, and we were unable to analyze them. Table D.2 presents the results of this analysis, with most principals reporting no change at this time. We also include comments following the table.

Table D.2. Impact of CAHSEE on courses beyond the scope of CAHSEE

Impact seen	No change	Positive change	Negative change
Now	12	5	1
In the future	0	1	5

No change now

- Instruction for the CAHSEE has not resulted in reduced advanced courses.
- There has been little impact on grades 11 and 12.

Positive change now

- In a positive way standards-based instruction has been helping students meet standards, and this is incorporated into other classes.
- Expanded AP offerings were implemented in response to SBI.

Negative change now

- Basically, we've taken from our elective program—art, band, athletics, drivers ed—so we have fewer sections of them.

Positive change future

- We anticipate having to strengthen upper level math courses since students coming up through the system will be better prepared at the lower levels. Students must have three math credits, and if they begin with Algebra 1 they will need more challenging courses at the upper level.

Negative change future

- The principal feels that electives will be squeezed due to corrective courses, also due to budget cuts.
- …it will affect them next year as the courses are moved into part of the regular curriculum during the school day rather than after school. Elective teachers will be moved into more intervention courses.

There were four comments relating to the impact that budget cuts would have on electives.

- Budget cuts will also push elective courses out of the program.
- Class size not affected yet because of auxiliary funds.

Student Preparation Issues

Principals were then asked a series of questions concerning student preparation. Specifically, they were asked whether they and their middle-grade feeder schools were working together to articulate their curriculum based on the California Content Standards, and they were also asked whether articulation was paying off in improved preparation of incoming students. Finally, they were asked about articulation efforts within the school.

Incoming student preparation

Forty-three high school and 12 middle-grade feeder school principals responded to this question. It was interesting to note the difference between both groups of principals. A far higher percentage of high school principals (51%) reported little or no change in incoming students than did the middle-grade feeder school principals (33%). Additional details are provided below.

High schools

Most of the high school principals (27) reported they either saw little change with the incoming students or they have not had enough time to tell if there has been a change. Ten principals reported that incoming students were better prepared than in the past. Additionally, there were 12 principals that made comments regarding articulation between the high schools and middle-grade feeder schools; seven reported articulation was poor or needed improvement and six reported articulation was good and improving. Although it should not be considered conclusive, it was interesting to note that generally the same schools that reported student improvement also reported good articulation. The same was true for principals reporting the need to improve articulation, where they also noted finding little change with incoming students.

- It is not possible to bridge the gap within a 4-year period.
- There has been no improvement in incoming student performance…articulation has been difficult to set-up or maintain due to turnover.
- Incoming students seem better prepared in math. Students are similarly prepared in ELA.
- Both middle schools are strong, and we are doing joint planning and training.

Middle-grade feeder schools.

Middle-grade feeder school principals reported findings contrary to the high schools. Eight of the 12 middle-grade feeder schools responding to this question stated that their incoming students appeared to be better prepared while four principals reported no changes. The same correlation found with the high schools holds true for the middle-grade feeder schools—that the same schools reporting improved incoming students reported good articulation with their middle-grade feeder schools.

- Incoming students appear to be pretty prepared in all subject areas with math being most dramatic improvement.
- This is the first year we are starting to see changes in student preparation.
- The 6th graders are better prepared and this coincides with the reduction in elementary school class size to 20 to 1.
- For articulation, on paper it may look like we've done something, but we haven't.
- The impact of preparation of incoming students has to do with their ability to word call or decode, and their comprehension and writing skills are lagging.

Within school articulation/preparation efforts

This question was asked to determine the ways that principals use within their schools to connect instruction from 1 year to the next. Sixteen high school and eight middle-grade feeder school principals responded to this question.

High schools

The most common response to this question, more than half of the principals, was the use of regular departmental meetings in which teachers work to prepare students for following courses. These meetings can be either formal or informal, but more often they are some type of formal gathering that is regularly scheduled with a planned agenda. One school described these meetings as an attempt to break the teachers out of isolation. Three principals also described using pacing guides and common assessments in math and ELA. There were two

principals that mentioned vertical teaming techniques, and another had the teachers cover several grades over time to help them better understand what is necessary to prepare students for following courses.

Middle-grade feeder schools

Like high schools, middle-grade feeder schools primarily use departmental meetings to coordinate instruction within their schools. Again, most meetings were conducted formally; however, one principal encouraged only informal collaboration between teachers. Two principals reported they are planning additional opportunities for professional development.

Articulation between middle-grade feeder school and responding school

High schools

Twenty-eight high school principals commented about articulation efforts taking place between their high schools and middle-grade feeder schools. We categorized the comments as positive, negative, or preliminary articulation. Positive comments showed evidence of face-to-face meetings with teachers from middle-grade feeder and high schools, while negative comments described little or no activity between the schools. Preliminary comments showed evidence of some relationship between schools, such as meetings with administrators, but they typically described little or no direct communication among teachers at different schools.

Twelve high school principals made positive comments about articulation.

- They are working with their middle school and created a 2-year Algebra 1 with the first year in middle-grade feeder school and second year in high school.
- We have seen the linking between high school, middle school, and down to fifth grade. There has been a realization that articulation is critical.

Eight high school principals made negative comments about articulation.

- Articulation has been difficult to set up. If it is set up, it is difficult to maintain because of staff turnover.
- She really doesn’t know about middle-grade feeder schools; they don’t talk to each other—it’s really bad.

Eight high school principals made preliminary comments about articulation.

- We requested a meeting between math and English teachers, but they’ve only had one meeting.
- The first time, the feeder (school) was resistant. Teachers at feeder resist change.

In addition, we examined comments that expand our understanding of articulation.

Seven principals commented on the challenges that non-unified districts bring to the articulation process.

- Historically, the two middle school and high school districts have been very separate and articulation has been non-existent.
- Part of the problem is they are not part of the same district.

Six high school principals said that middle-grade feeder schools do not take articulation efforts seriously enough because they are not accountable on the CAHSEE.

- The middle schools look at CAHSEE as a high school problem. The CAHSEE does not affect them at the middle school.
- What we don't have control of is the middle school and whether they are teaching the standards. We are left with the end results. The exit exam is given in the high schools, but most of the content is stuff taught before you get to high school.

Five principals commented about the problems that staff, administrator, or student transience contribute to effective articulation.

- Kids we get from (middle-grade feeder school) are deficient in math with not a very good background. The (middle-grade feeder school) principal is a fairly new principal…
- Our district has a 25% transient population. Do not see the benefits of our work.

Four principals commented that articulation varies across departments.

- Students are getting much better in ELA. This has been targeted for the past several years. Math has lagged.
- …coordination is increasing particularly in math…

Three high school principals said that having many middle-grade feeder schools (five or more) contribute to problems with articulation.

- In the past there were only two main middle schools; there are five middle schools, making articulation very difficult.
- There are nine middle schools and there is no control over what materials the middle schools are using.

Finally, three principals commented on funding issues that contribute to articulation.

- We would like more time for articulation, and money becomes a major stumbling block (to pay for subs)…
- We are applying for a grant to hold articulation meetings over the summer.

Middle-grade feeder schools

We found little evidence that middle-grade feeder schools have much articulation with their feeder elementary schools. While eight of 13 middle-grade feeder school principals stated that they were seeing improvements in their incoming students' performance, only four described articulation efforts with their feeder elementary schools. Of those four responses, we categorized one as positive and three as preliminary. We include an example of a preliminary response.

- There is currently articulation between one group of sixth-grade teachers and the feeder elementary school but it needs to be improved with the other groups.

As we saw in the high school principal articulation, middle-grade feeder school principals also report challenges such as student transience, large numbers of middle-grade feeder schools, and middle-grade feeder schools that are in different school districts, as well as available time in which to hold articulation meetings.

Teacher familiarity with content standards and/or CAHSEE blueprints

Finally, for understanding about student preparation issues, principals were asked how familiar their teachers were with the California Content Standards and the CAHSEE blueprints. They were also asked if teachers were using these documents to aid in planning instruction.

High schools.

Twenty-four high school principals commented about teacher familiarity with California Content Standards. We analyzed their responses by determining if principals thought they had both the standards and the CAHSEE blueprints, or if they had only one or the other. We also looked for evidence that principals thought their teachers used the standards or blueprints in planning instruction, as well as evidence that only a few teachers were familiar with standards or were using them to plan instruction.

Ten high school principals reported that their teachers had copies of the standards and blueprints, while 12 said they had standards and four said they had blueprints. In addition, nine principals said they use them in planning instruction and six described situations in which only some of their teachers were familiar with them.

Have standards and blueprints

- …All teachers have an assessment binder with blueprint, sample items, performance data, and standards addressed for each assessment.
- Teachers are pretty familiar with the California Content Standards and are very familiar with CAHSEE blueprint standards.

Have blueprints

- Teachers are aware of blueprints and the percentages of questions that come from the different areas of the blueprint.

Have standards

- People knew about the standards before, but CAHSEE provided an impetus toward implementation.

Using to plan instruction

- Teachers use standards in planning instruction. They must use them in their syllabi.
- Teachers are working with the standards and blueprints in developing their departmental pacing plans.

Uneven familiarity with standards

- About 60% of our faculty has identified the standards.
- Teachers have resisted being forced to use the standards. Teachers resent not being able to teach what they have traditionally taught. Teachers add on extras to the standards.

Middle-grade feeder schools

There were 13 comments from middle-grade feeder school principals regarding teacher familiarity with California Content Standards. Only one principal specifically mentioned

teacher familiarity with both the standards and the CAHSEE blueprints, while eight mentioned familiarity with the standards and six mentioned the use of standards in planning instruction or posting them in classrooms. Five principals stated that their teachers were less familiar with the CAHSEE blueprints. Since much of the CAHSEE content, particularly in math, is found in the middle-grade feeder school content standards, this lack of familiarity with the blueprints at the middle-grade feeder school level would appear to be a disconnect.

Most middle-grade feeder school principal comments were similar to those expressed by high school principals. We include some comments from those middle-grade feeder school principals who said their teachers were not familiar with the blueprints.

- Teachers are not really that familiar with CAHSEE standards; district had some training and about 1/3 of our staff took (it); we believe it is important for them to know about the CAHSEE so they know what they need to teach for kids when they get to high school.
- The middle school teachers are somewhat less familiar with California Content Standards and less so with CAHSEE standards.

Student Subpopulations

Principals were asked a series of questions to probe the composition of student subpopulations, changes they have detected in student performance and motivation that may be attributed to CAHSEE or standards-based instruction, and how they coordinate coverage of the standards internally and externally.

Thirty-seven high schools and 13 middle-grade feeder schools responded with data regarding the composition of the student populations. Since there were few differences between the schools, this information is not reported separately for middle-grade feeder and high schools. Particularly striking was the large number of English Learners (EL) reported by the schools. One-third of both high schools and middle-grade feeder schools reported at least 30% of the student population in EL programs, with one high school and middle-grade feeder school indicating more than 65% were EL. Two thirds of the principals reported they have a Hispanic population of at least 30% with half of those reporting a Hispanic population of over 65%. Six schools reported an Asian population of at least 30%. Nearly half of the schools specifically stated that Whites comprise less than 50% of the entire student population. Thus, many schools are concerned about the performance of their EL students on CAHSEE.

In addition to EL, other students that principals were particularly concerned about were the special education students. In general, schools reported special education populations of at least 9-11%. One high school indicated its special education students were 15% of the student body. It appears that resource students make up about two-thirds of the special education population.

Nearly one-third of the schools reported they had student populations of at least 30% for those with socioeconomic challenges. Of those schools, four principals reported nearly 70% of their students qualified for the free or reduced lunch program. Finally, there were a few schools that indicated they had significant populations of transient students.

Changes in performance

Many principals reported they had not seen much change in student performance levels, from those 27 high school and 10 middle-grade feeder school principals responding to this question. Comments ranged from CAHSEE having not made a whit of difference in student performance to principals stating that there have been remarkable improvements.

High schools

As stated above, over half of the principals (18 high schools) have not seen improvement in student performance, but 13 of those did state that there hasn't been enough time yet to get the numbers. Four principals discussed concerns that the EL students are having difficulty keeping up and one specifically mentioned that special education students are not passing, that they are the ones suffering the most. Only two stated there has been a negative change in performance with one comment stating that the problem was likely due to a change in the schedule.

There were, however, six high schools (22%) indicating CAHSEE and standards-based instruction have made a difference. They indicated that they were on the right path and should continue to see improvement because of the standards in the future.

- Students are more aware of the standards and how they relate to what is being taught, the scores for STAR and API increased.
- Performance is better as evidenced by the quality of incident reports from students with behavior problems; reports contain fewer spelling errors and are more coherent.

It should be noted that three high school principals stated that, although they had not seen improvement in student performance, there is improvement in the level of instruction from the teachers. The instruction is more consistent due to the standards and better focused, therefore improvements in student performance will be seen in a few years.

Middle-grade feeder schools.

The middle-grade feeder schools seem to report a more positive outlook regarding student performance than the high schools. About half of the schools felt there has been little change, but 40% of the principals felt there were positive changes in student performance. One school noted that all the sub-populations had seen improvements this year. One school did note that EL students were having trouble.

- Expectations for student performance are higher and students will meet expectations; the new ELD/SDAIE (English Learner Standards/Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English) standards give more meat to our EL standards.
- They have not seen statistics from the high schools yet, so they are unsure of performance, but they understand that special ed students are doing really well.

Changes in motivation

There are some interesting differences between high schools and middle-grade feeder schools with this issue—asking principals if they have seen changes in student motivation or dropout rates. There were 31 high school and 11 middle-grade feeder school principals commenting on this question. Although they both responded with a majority stating they

have detected no change or there has not been enough time to detect changes, high schools had several principals stating motivation has improved with the advent of CAHSEE.

High schools

Of the 31 principals, 13 stated they had seen little or no change in student motivation and five stated they had not had enough time yet to tell. Of both those responses, several made comments to indicate that they felt they were on the right path to see improvement in the future. Eight principals stated that students appear more motivated now, and two of those felt students were more motivated for CAHSEE than other tests. There was one principal who felt motivation has decreased, stating the EL students are now realizing they will never pass the CAHSEE and have quit trying.

Three principals stated there has been no impact on dropout rates; however, three stated that CAHSEE will negatively impact it in the future. One reported that the dropout rate has already increased because of CAHSEE.

Middle-grade feeder schools

Eight of the 11 principals reported they have seen no change in student motivation and dropout rates. We note that, because most middle-grade feeder school students are too young to drop out yet, it is unlikely that middle-grade feeder school principals would see much increase, if any, in dropout rates. Although the principals stated they talk to students about the importance of CAHSEE, it is just too far in the future for them to be very concerned. Three stated that motivation has gone down, but supporting comments indicated it was because of teacher frustration trying to implement another new program (standards) or that the students, particularly minority, do not care about performing well in school. No principals indicated that students' motivation has increased.

- The standards movement is trying to create generalists and students aren't encouraged to specialize, not everyone is suited for the college environment.
- Middle school students are not really concerned about CAHSEE yet, unless they have a brother or sister in high school.

Coordination

This question focuses on how the principals coordinate coverage of the content standards internally (between general education programs and special education, EL, and alternative programs) and externally (between middle-grade feeder schools and high schools). It should be noted that nearly all comments regarding alternative programs indicated they were handled off-site or were under district level supervision; therefore, there was little input on that group. There were 23 high school and 10 middle-grade feeder school principals providing responses to this question.

In general, principals felt the internal groups were easier to coordinate coverage of the standards than external groups, between schools. And, within the internal group comments, it was noticed that several principals mentioned that one subject was further ahead in the process than the other. Further review of the comments found there was no significant difference between departments; however, Mathematics may be a little further along than ELA with integrating the standards.

With regard to coordination between middle-grade feeder and high schools, there is an even split between those experiencing good coordination and those that don't. Most principals indicated that the districts have the responsibility to drive the train for articulation between the schools, whether or not they indicated coordination was adequate or inadequate. It was interesting that one school reported a challenge in coordination, more difficult, that was due to the great variability in start times for the schools in their area.

High schools

Most of the principals indicated that there are coordination efforts being made between their special education or EL and general education groups. Only two schools indicated that coordination was inadequate. Two-thirds of the principals responding to this question specifically mentioned efforts to include special education and EL teachers in general education staff meetings, team teaching situations, and internal articulation efforts.

- Special education teachers attend general education department meetings; they receive copies of the standards, and include the standards in Individualized Education Plan (IEP) development.
- Special education and EL teachers are all part of the departmental team.

Middle-grade feeder schools

These principals also indicated that coordination between the EL or special education and general education teachers has been pretty well established. Often comments include something about how coordination could always be better, but generally there is a good effort to coordinate between programs.

- The EL teachers are ELA teachers, too.
- Mainstreaming students keep the EL and ELA teachers talking and communicating regularly.

Challenges

Principals were given the opportunity to discuss the challenges they face in implementing standards-based instruction and to discuss potential or known solutions. Thirty-one high school principals (three were alternative or charter schools) and 13 middle-grade feeder school principals responded to this question. This question produced a wide range of answers, from teacher support to testing logistics. Although there was similarity in the responses of middle-grade feeder and high school principals, a few issues unique to each surfaced.

High schools

There were four challenges that were addressed multiple times by high school principals. They included increasing parental support (10 principals), gaining teacher support for making changes (8 principals), meeting the needs of the special education and EL students (10 principals), and logistical challenges for testing (9 principals). These four challenges alone impact most everyone involved in education—students and their families, teachers, schools, districts and state administrators.

The first challenge involves trying to improve parental support. This addresses issues such as the level of parental education and family economic conditions, all of which have a

huge impact on student motivation. One alternative school stated that although they have problems in this area, one way they are trying to reduce the negative impact is through a program for parents that provides information on parenting skills, job skills, school events, and business management skills.

- It is difficult to get parents to understand that they need to look at long-term goals for their children.
- One parent signed the form turning down the remediation course that was offered.
- Student attendance and parent involvement are challenges.
- The low expectations we see from the kids come from the parents.

The second challenge is that teachers are being asked to accept, embrace, and use a standards-based approach when instructing their students. Although many teachers are working towards that goal, there still are many who resist losing instructional control and their "pet projects." One school felt they found a solution through training—by taking advantage of several district-level training programs that provided teachers with suggestions and tools to help them adapt their instruction.

The third challenge involves meeting the needs for the special education and EL students. The concerns expressed by the principals seem to center around the availability of resources to provide the extra help students will need. One principal offered that remediation is the big issue, but how that was going to be done is the problem.

- Special education and EL students are a big concern because the test really means something to this small population and much effort will be needed.
- Another principal reported concern about building an underclass without a diploma (i.e. the military won't take people without a diploma).
- Continuation students are a concern; all are 11th and 12th graders and are likely to need to re-take one or both parts of CAHSEE.

The last often mentioned challenge is about the logistics surrounding CAHSEE, as reported by over one-third of the high school principals. These concerns involve test giving, reporting and tracking scores, and reducing the number of tests the students must take. Examples of responses are listed below and the only solution offered was to request additional funding and support from the district and state.

- The school must juggle student schedules, rent extra space and furniture, pay for pencils, and pay additional staff to administer the CAHSEE.
- Scheduling the testing is almost impossible so that the school had to bring in an assistant superintendent to help; it takes away from teaching time, and teachers feel overwhelmed, as do the students.
- Reduce the number of tests students must take, or combine them to serve multiple purposes.
- It is difficult to try to track student scores without a centralized database.
- The test's timing is poor because the students have already set their schedules or have just started classes before the test results are in; if they need remedial help, they have to wait to get it.

Other challenges mentioned by principals included finding and keeping good teachers, creating the time needed for teachers to work on articulation and standards (one is recommending the addition of 6 days where the students leave early), and helping to build better community support.

Middle-grade feeder schools

The middle-grade feeder school principals echoed similar challenges that the high school principals did with regarding to parental support issues and getting teachers to embrace the standards. Over half of the principals mentioned both challenges. They also discussed the ways they are trying to address those challenges, which is through training and education. They are trying to provide classes geared to parents for life skills as well as additional teacher professional development opportunities.

- There are some students with little support at home evidenced by after-school tutoring classes for which only 10% attended.
- Two-thirds of the parents are not high school graduates and don't have the skills to help the students.
- Poverty is a huge problem and really hurts the student's performance.
- Teachers have the responsibility to find ways to differentiate instruction to bridge the gap between standards…a difficult challenge.
- There are so many standards that it is difficult for teachers to figure out how to include depth on topics, rather than just skimming the surface.
- Lack of qualified teachers, they have only 50% of the teachers in math that are fully credentialed.

Middle-grade feeder school principals were also concerned with the challenges EL students present to the staff. Not only is it difficult for those students to get caught up after becoming familiar with the language, but one principal stated that they had many students who are not educated in their own language, either. Primarily, the principals discussed the need for more resources in order to provide special programs to help these students succeed. One principal summed up the difficulties by stating that for many of their students, school is the only place they have to speak, read, or even listen to English.

CAHSEE Opinion

Although there was no specific question about holding the Class of 2004 accountable to the CAHSEE on the principal interview protocol, we found that principals often volunteered their opinions about this topic.

High schools

We categorized principal responses in a simple "No, don't hold them accountable," "Yes, hold them accountable," "Modify the exam in some way," and "Unclear." For high school principals, we found 13 "No" responses, four "Yes" responses, eight "Modify" responses, and six "Unclear" responses. A sample of responses appears under the following headings.

"No" responses

- The concept of a standardized test instrument where students can demonstrate proficiency, I can live with that concept. Not there for the Class of 2004. There are many reasons. Within 2 to 3 years, we at this site will get there.
- There should be full alignment of the standards for 4 years before the test should be implemented. That would be valid. Now, it is a confused melee of standards in California high schools—various degrees of alignment. All the things that define a curriculum need to be in place for 4 years so students go through the standards-based process as freshmen through seniors. It ought to be our freshmen or sophomores who should be accountable—that would be fairer.

"Yes" responses

- The state absolutely should hold firm with the 2004 date; it would be disastrous if they move the date; people will say they'll never do what they say; it's fine to make exceptions where justifiable but be cautious with the exceptions.
- They should make it count in order to maintain integrity of the test.

"Modify" responses

- There is no need for CAHSEE; the state could select items from STAR (CAT6 and content standards) and Golden State and add a writing sample piece.
- Believes exit exam is good idea but not sure the current one is the best. We should be able to say a student who graduated from a California school has certain basic skills, but we need some safety net for EL and special ed students.

"Unclear" responses

- …said that the HSEE is a good thing, but many students are not ready for it yet.
- Very afraid of the large number of students who will not graduate if the CAHSEE requirement is enforced.

Middle-grade feeder schools

We followed a similar analysis of the opinions that middle-grade feeder school principals expressed about holding the Class of 2004 accountable for the CAHSEE. There were four responses categorized as "No," two as "Yes," three as "Modify," and two as "Unclear." Sample responses appear under the appropriate headings, which follow.

"No" responses

- I would say no. Because I do not think the implementation of the standards had reached those students. The implementation of the standards did not start until those students were in the 9th grade. Most of the students are not ready. The class of 2006 should be ready. They were in middle school when we started to focus on the standards.
- It is 2 years too soon for the Class of 2004. The Class of 2004 was not exposed to the standards.

"Yes" responses

- The state should hold to 2004. Schools don't need more time because what the principal has seen of the test it is an 8th grade test. The principal's biggest complaint is that we don't hold students to a high enough standard. The principal thinks CAHSEE will be dummied down by easing off on cut scores or making easier questions.

"Modify" responses

- Students identified in special ed or EL should take a modified form of assessment.
- We like concept of an exit exam, but would like it handled differently for EL and special ed.

"Unclear" responses

- CAHSEE as a threat will only affect a small number of students. You need to help these students plan the future rather than just saying what the future will be.
- CAHSEE content is basic enough that most students should pass.

Analysis of English-Language Arts (ELA) and Math Teacher Interviews

Eighty-six high school math teachers, 35 middle-grade feeder school math teachers, 86 high school ELA teachers, and 36 middle-grade feeder school ELA teachers were interviewed and entered into the database.

Standards-Based Instruction

We asked teachers a series of questions designed to probe their use of standards-based instruction (SBI). We present the results of our analysis in the following sections.

When did this course begin using SBI?

High schools

There was a surprising range of answers to this question, and answers at each end of the range proved difficult to analyze with accuracy. Several experienced teachers, for example, stated that they had always used SBI throughout their careers, some of which began as long as 30 years ago. These teachers seemed to want to emphasize that "good teaching" did not just begin with California's establishment of content standards. Most teacher explained that they had always used a standard, established curriculum guide, and many math teacher emphasized that the content of math has not really changed over the years, and they have always been teaching the "standard" topics. We present a sample of the experienced teachers' comments.

- Teachers have been teaching what is in the standards for years. (ELA)
- We used the Proficiency levels in 1980s, which were standards-based. We have had people since 1970 who knew about standards-based instruction. (ELA)
- Technically, the English Department began using SBI when the standards were printed a few years ago, but the teacher thinks he's been doing it all along for his 20 years. (ELA)
- The teacher has always used standards-based instruction. (math)
- I've been using SBI since I started teaching in 1986. (math)
- The teacher has been using CPM for 10 years, and since it was made by California teachers for high schools it is SBI. (math)
- All during the teacher's career—30 years—has been using SBI. It's the same material that has always been taught. (math)

Since our focus is on the Class of 2004, the question becomes were the teachers using SBI for these students. For high school teachers to have used SBI for the Class of 2004, the 9th grade teachers would have had to start during the 2000-2001 school year. Teachers' responses were grouped by school to obtain a school response. Responses were coded into three categories—started before the Class of 2004, probably started with the Class of 2004, and started after the Class of 2004.

English-Language Arts. Sixty-two ELA teachers at 37 high schools provided an answer to the question of when they started using SBI in their courses. We coded responses from 14 schools as indicating that high school ELA teachers began using SBI prior to the Class of 2004. Responses at another 12 high schools indicated that ELA teachers appeared to start using SBI with the Class of 2004. Teachers at the remaining 11 schools gave responses that indicated that they started using SBI after the Class of 2004 or were not using SBI.

Mathematics. Sixty-six math teachers at 34 high schools provided an answer to the question of when they started using SBI in their courses. We coded responses from math teachers at 15 high schools as indicating that they began using SBI prior to the Class of 2004. Responses from 13 high schools indicated that the teachers began using SBI with the Class of 2004. Responses from six high schools indicated that they began SBI after students in the Class of 2004 were 9th graders.

Middle-grade feeder schools

Middle-grade feeder school teachers would have had to start using SBI in the 7th grade by school year 1998-1999 to use it with the Class of 2004. We again grouped the teacher responses by school and coded the schools in the same three categories as before.

English-Language Arts. For the ELA teachers, we received responses from 31 teachers from 15 schools. As could be expected, teachers from only 3 of those 15 schools indicated they started using SBI in time for the Class of 2004. We did not code any school as starting prior to the Class of 2004. Thus, responses from 12 of the 15 middle-grade feeder schools indicated that they had started using SBI after the Class of 2004. Most of the responses indicated that the schools had begun implementing SBI sometime within the last 3 to 4 years. Many times that implementation corresponded with the adoption of new textbooks.

Mathematics. Twenty-eight math teachers at 15 middle-grade feeder schools provided responses to when they started using SBI in their courses. Responses from only two middle-grade feeder schools indicated that the teachers had implemented SBI for the Class of 2004. We did not code any middle-grade feeder schools as starting SBI prior to the Class of 2004. Responses from the remaining 12 schools were coded as starting to use SBI since the Class of 2004. Again, most responses indicated that teachers at the school started to use SBI in the last several years.

Implementation rating

We asked math and ELA teachers to rate the implementation of SBI in their course, using a 5-point Likert-type scale. In the scale, a 1 indicated “not at all implemented” and a 5 indicated “completely implemented.”

High schools

When asked to rate the implementation of SBI in their course (or department, if department heads were asked), 72 high school math teachers responded, with an average response of 4.1; and 68 high school ELA teachers responded, with an average of 4.0. Examples of rating comments from high school math and ELA teachers follow.

Math comments

- One teacher explained that the rating for Algebra 1 was a 4, but Algebra 1A (2-year Algebra course) was closer to a 2 because he must go so much slower.
- Another teacher gave a rating of 3 on implementation due to the low level of students as they came into high school.
- Yet another teacher echoed that view in that he was trying to teach students to add and subtract. Additionally, kids rolled into his class all year. He was forced to remediate all year.
- Another teacher who rated implementation at a 3 stated that he did not start with the blueprint, but instead started with the course book and assumed it was aligned with the standards.

ELA comments

- One department chair described implementation in her department as changing over the last three years. During the first year, she said teachers looked at what literature they were teaching and determined what standards could be covered. This later evolved to teachers looking at the standards and trying to select the literature to best cover those standards. After 3 years, everyone in her department is still not to this stage with SBI.
- A teacher who rated implementation at 3 to 4 told us that she is working hard, but that their program still needed work. This department chair added that it would take 1 to 2 years to reach a 5 implementation for most teachers in the department. However, the department chair explained that there were 4 or 5 teachers who would never implement SBI.
- Another department chair described the ELA department as being well into the process. The chair explained that a few years ago, teachers were offered a chance at early retirement ("golden handshake") and quite a few took the district up on it. The chair explained that the end result was that the school has a large number of younger teachers who are well aware of the standards through their teacher education programs.

Middle-grade feeder schools

Averages for middle-grade feeder school teachers were slightly higher, with 31 middle-grade feeder school math teachers responding, with an average of 4.3 (range of 3 to 5). Thirty-three middle-grade feeder school ELA teachers responded, with an average of 4.4 (range of 3 to 5). It is interesting to note that several respondents gave themselves a rating of 4 instead of a 5, saying that there is always room for improvement.

How familiar are teachers with California Content Standards and CAHSEE Blueprints?

High schools.

English-Language Arts. Teachers at 33 of 34 schools told us that they were familiar with the California Content Standards. Teachers at the other school stated that they were in the process of making all of the ELA teachers familiar with the standards. A teacher at this school explained that English teachers were more stubborn than other teachers and liked their

autonomy, adding that teachers are aware of the standards but that it takes time to fully accept the new concept.

Mathematics. Mathematics teachers at all 38 high schools reported being familiar with the California Content Standards.

Middle-grade feeder schools.

English-Language Arts. Teachers at 14 of 15 middle-grade feeder schools reported that they were familiar with the California Content Standards. Teachers at the other middle-grade feeder school reported mixed familiarity with the standards, with two teachers reporting that they were familiar with the standards and one reporting lack of familiarity with the standards. At the teacher level, 29 ELA teachers reported being familiar with the standards and one reported not being familiar with them.

There were fewer comments regarding the blueprints, with only four teachers at the middle-grade feeder school level mentioning them. Results were split, with 2 reporting familiarity with the blueprints and two reporting unfamiliarity with them.

Mathematics. The 19 teachers who responded to this question reported being familiar with the standards; these teachers represent 12 middle-grade feeder schools. There were no teachers who reported being unfamiliar with the standards. There were two comments on the blueprints, with one teacher reporting familiarity with both standards and blueprints and another reporting that only about half of the teachers at that school are familiar with both.

Materials used in class

We asked teachers several questions about the text they were using in class, including text name and publisher, publication date, year of adoption, and alignment to California Content Standards. Our primary goal was to determine how many schools were nearing the end of their textbook cycle and how many had already adopted new books that were aligned to the California Content Standards. An analysis of results by subject and school level follows.

High schools

English-Language Arts. ELA teachers from 38 high schools provided responses that related to textbook adoption or alignment. Of those schools, teachers at 24 schools stated that they had either recently adopted textbooks, were in the textbook adoption process, or were due new textbooks. However, teachers at five out of nine of those schools that are expecting new textbooks next year indicated that budget constraints may affect obtaining those new textbooks. Fifteen teachers stated that their current texts were aligned to the California Content Standards. Teachers at six schools said that although their older textbooks were not listed as being aligned or did not provide the teachers with the standards covered in each unit, teachers were able to use the materials in the textbooks to cover the standards. Teachers at several schools stated that the teachers or district had gone through the textbooks and used the materials in the textbooks in a standards-aligned curriculum. Teachers at five schools stated that their textbooks were not aligned with the California standards.

- They have been using "Elements of Literature" by Holt Reinhardt. This one is not aligned.
- The text was adopted about 4 years ago, and the teacher said that this has been somewhat of a problem since it was adopted just before the emphasis on standards came about.
- Books teach to all the standards but are not specifically standards aligned.

Mathematics. Math teachers in 32 of the 38 high schools reported that their textbooks were published or adopted since 2000. All 32 of those schools also indicated that the textbooks were aligned with California standards. Five of the six schools that reported using older books also indicated that their textbooks covered the California standards. The other school reported that its textbook was close to covering all the California standards. Teachers at one other school that did not indicate when its textbook was adopted stated that the textbook was aligned with the California standards.

- The school uses the Holt Algebra 1 published in 1986. It is standards-based aligned—algebra is algebra.
- The books were adopted before the standards, but the teachers went through and aligned the books to the standards and found that only one major standard was missing. Supplementary texts are used to fill the hole. The texts were adopted 7 years ago.
- It is hard to find a textbook to match California standards because a lot of my students are too far behind. I have to find materials to teach students who need 6th grade-level skills.
- The text is too difficult for the students. The text has exercises to account for different levels of ability but even the lowest level is too difficult.

Middle-grade feeder schools

English-Language Arts. Thirty-one ELA teachers at 14 of the 15 middle-grade feeder schools included responses that could be categorized as either using recently adopted texts, in the textbook adoption process, or using texts that are aligned to California Content Standards. Responses from teachers at seven schools were categorized as a recent adoption (using the text for the first time last year or this year); schools that were piloting texts as part of the adoption process also were included.

Mathematics. Of the 15 middle-grade feeder schools, math teachers at 10 of those schools stated that they had either recently adopted texts or were in the adoption process. Teachers from two schools reported using textbooks from the late 1990s. However, teachers at both of these schools said that the books were either aligned with the California standards or that most of the books were aligned. Teachers at 13 of 15 schools indicated that their textbooks were aligned with the California Content Standards. Teachers at the other two schools did not indicate whether their textbooks were aligned. Teachers at two schools stated that the high schools drove the textbook adoption. One teacher commented that the middle-grade feeder school was using a different Algebra book than its high school. There were comments from two teachers at one school that the textbook they used was too difficult for their students because so many of the students were below level. We also heard comments from middle-grade feeder school teachers that there were too many standards for them to cover, especially with so many of their students being below average.

- There is very little time to bring in outside materials because it is obscene the number of standards we must cover.

How much freedom to use additional materials do teachers have?

We asked teachers if they were free to use additional or supplemental materials of their own choosing in the classroom.

High schools

English-Language Arts. In our interviews with over 70 ELA high school teachers, only five discussed any lack of flexibility in what they could use or teach in their classrooms. Teachers at 30 of the 38 high schools indicated that teachers had the freedom to add supplemental materials to their classes.

Mathematics. We received responses from over 70 math teachers at 40 high schools. One teacher stated that there was not much flexibility in supplementing materials. Another teacher indicated that the math course was a canned, scripted course. At a third school, a teacher stated that the Essentials class follows standards rigidly and that all first-year Essential teachers and Basic Algebra teachers follow the same lesson plan. Teachers at two high schools talked about a school or district pacing plan and a teacher at another high school stated that all teachers try to teach at the same pace. Teachers at all but one school stated that they use the same basic core textbook. At that school, teachers use two different texts. There were comments that this creates some problems within the department.

Middle-grade feeder schools

English-Language Arts. In the middle-grade feeder school ELA teacher interviews, seven of eight teachers who commented on flexibility indicated that there was some flexibility in teaching the material. This flexibility was sometime in the choice of materials or in the way the material was presented.

- There is definitely flexibility among the teachers in terms of material.
- We have district core novels and a main textbook. Teachers have some variety in the supplemental materials.
- Teachers are able to use whatever text they want.
- Teachers have academic freedom, but the 8th grade teachers coordinate with each other.
- We all use the main textbook. We have very little freedom in choosing text because we have very strict quarterly assessments. Although we have different teaching styles, we try to cover the same kinds of standards cross sections for the quarterly assessments.
- We have the same novels and texts but how to use them is very flexible.

Finally, we found several instances in which teachers in the same course were using different textbooks; teachers described this as problematic.

- All 10th grade teachers use different textbooks; it really bothers this teacher because there is no real planning and a student who moves from one section to another can meet very different materials.

- The teacher uses the Prentice Hall adopted text. The teacher doesn't use CPM because it doesn't seem to offer much for students and he can't see why it's even used. The division in the math department between the two math programs prevents being able to switch students during year. It also creates other problems.
- Many teachers substitute other textbooks when they can for teaching. The chosen text is too large and full of useless information. Students will not carry a large textbook to and from class.
- The size of the book is annoying. A few teachers sneak and use an old Addison-Wesley book.

How prepared are incoming students for the teacher's course?

High schools

We asked high school mathematics and ELA teachers about any changes they have seen in the preparation of students entering their classes since the implementation of standards-based instruction. Thus, depending on the particular course, a teacher might be describing preparation that took place in middle-grade feeder schools or within the high school.

We placed responses into three main categories: better preparation now, little/no change now, worse preparation now. We also found several other categories, such as variance among middle-grade feeder schools, comments about student preparation in general, and preparation depends on student cohort. This question took the form of an open-ended response, with teachers discussing their initial response and often expanding on it. For example, a teacher might state that he or she has seen little change in the quality of student preparation and may also state that student preparation varies among middle-grade feeder schools. Results in Table D.3 show that teachers of both subjects believe students are still not where they should be in terms of readiness for the course, but that they are starting to see improvements in student preparation, followed closely by those who see little or no change in student preparation levels. Only a few teachers stated that the level of student preparation is worse.

Table D.3. Responses about the quality of student preparation by high school subject

	Seeing better prep	Seeing little/no change	Seeing worse prep	Seeing poor prep generally	Feeder school variance	Cohort dependent	New teacher
HS math	16	14	8	20	2	1	7
HS ELA	19	12	3	18	3	2	5

Examples of responses, by category, follow. We have designated whether the comment is from a math or ELA teacher by placing the subject designation in parentheses following the comment.

<u>Seeing poor preparation in general</u>

- Spend way too much time, almost the first quarter, going over material they should know. We should be absolutely further along in all the Algebra classes. (math)
- The teacher thinks students are being passed out of junior high without knowing the skills they need. For example, they can't do multiplication. (math)

- Students are not coming in prepared. Almost all 8th grade grammar standards are not met. Students have a hard time capitalizing names. About 40% of the teacher's time is spent going over things that students should already know. (ELA)
- Students coming in from intermediate school are not as well prepared as he thinks they should be; is having to cover some fundamental topics—too many basics; this is an ongoing thing to work on until the students "get it." (ELA)

Seeing better preparation since the implementation of standards-based instruction

- This is first year he's noticed any difference in student preparation. Students are a little better prepared on fractions. He believes the school will see great changes in a few years—students will be much better prepared. (math)
- We're starting to see a trickle up from the lower grades; more emphasis in math; I used to teach junior high and their elementary teachers didn't teach the math because they didn't like it; we're seeing the emphasis on math; the level is coming up a little. (math)
- Students seem more serious about what they're doing in school than they did 3 years ago; amazingly enough, there is less whining; she thinks "we have their attention." (ELA)
- The teacher believes she is seeing a difference this year in student preparation; all students can read without a struggle and can write a basic essay. She didn't have to review a lot at the beginning of the school year. (ELA)

Seeing little or no change in preparation

- There is no significant difference between this year's juniors and this year's freshmen. (math)
- There is no real difference in the level of preparation of the students coming in now as compared to years past. (math)
- The teacher has not seen any real changes with standards-based instruction. (ELA)
- Most students are well prepared, and there are no changes in level of preparation. Standards-based instruction has not made a difference in the preparation of the students. (ELA)

Seeing worse preparation since the implementation of standards-based instruction

- The teacher thinks the student preparation of this year's class is lower than in the past. (math)
- It's worse in terms of student preparation. (math)
- Students seem to be coming in less prepared rather than more prepared. (ELA)
- I would say that the level of preparation for this course is lower than past experience, but I don't know if that correlates to the standards or to other factors. (ELA)

New teacher comments

- A first-year teacher cannot answer for sure but feels the uniformity of presentation in the department should lead to an improvement in preparation. (math)
- I have not seen any changes in preparation personally because this is my first year. (ELA)

Middle-grade feeder school variance

- Some middle-grade feeder schools do very well in preparing the students; however, the main middle-grade feeder schools are struggling. (math)
- She has taught for three years and noticed that the students' level of preparation depends on where they went to junior high. (ELA)

Cohort variance

- Standards-based instruction does not make as big a difference as the individual group of students coming in. (math)
- Varies from year to year. (ELA)

In addition, we found four comments from ELA teachers describing the progress they make with students in the course of a school year.

- The English Department sees a huge jump in the 9th grade year for its students; they come in with really low ELA scores and in 9th grade this school is able to greatly improve their scores.
- Students are not prepared for 9th grade English when they graduated from 8th grade. Eighty percent of the students are ready for sophomore English at the end of the 9th grade year.

Middle-grade feeder schools

We also asked middle-grade feeder school teachers about the preparation of their incoming students; 22 middle-grade feeder school math and 26 middle-grade feeder school ELA teachers responded. We used the same coding scheme as we did with high school teacher responses, and Table D.4 presents the results. In both subjects, the most frequent response was better preparation, followed by little/no change. We note that in two instances in ELA, teachers gave both a "better preparation" and "little/no change" comment in the same response. Examples of comments are found in the following sections.

Table D.4. Responses about the quality of student preparation by middle-grade feeder school subject

	Seeing better prep	Seeing little/no change	Seeing worse prep	Seeing poor prep generally	Feeder school variance	Cohort dependent	New teacher
FS math	10	6	0	6	0	0	1
FS ELA	13	6	1	4	2	4	3

Better preparation

- 7th graders are showing improvements—they come in better prepared and knowing more than in past. (math)
- It does seem like this year that student skills are somewhat higher than they had been; I would assume the improvement is due to the instruction students are receiving at the elementary level. (ELA)

Little/no change

- I don't think student preparation for this course has changed; I think on the high end of math we're getting much, much better; but the lower end kids are about the same. (math)
- I have not seen incoming students being better prepared. (ELA)

Worse preparation

- These teachers believe that students actually come with lower reading levels now. (ELA)

Poor preparation in general

- All year is spent reviewing. Students cannot get beyond addition, subtraction, multiplication and division. (math)
- We have just recently begun some articulation with our middle-grade feeder schools; we had a 1-day event recently with 5th and 6th grade teachers from five or six different middle-grade feeder schools. I was shocked how little writing they were doing. Some didn't have their students write a one-page paper. There was no communication between grade levels and grade 5 and 6 teachers didn't know there was a 4th grade assessment. (ELA)

Middle-grade feeder school variance

- Students who were here last year are doing better in 8th grade than students who were not here in 7th grade. (ELA)

Cohort dependent

- The best class ever are now 9th graders. Preparation is not consistent due to individual students each year. (ELA)

New teacher

- This is the teacher's first year in 6th grade so she really isn't aware of student preparation from elementary school. (ELA)

How do teachers ensure coverage both across and within grades?

This section addresses how mathematics and ELA teachers use articulation both within the same grade/course and across grades/courses to ensure coverage of standards. Teachers sometimes described these articulation efforts in very general terms, such as when they attended department meetings, and sometimes in more specific terms, such as when they used a benchmark exam or pacing guide (within same grade/course) or met with middle-grade feeder school teachers in their subject (across grades/courses). We used these three categories—general, within, and across—to sort responses. Table D.5 shows that high school math and ELA teachers most frequently mentioned some form of within grade/course articulation. Following this table, we present some comments representative of each category.

High schools

Because these responses were so open ended, it is difficult to assign a traditional "percent responded to this question" category. Instead, we note that of the 86 high school math and 86 high school ELA teachers who were interviewed, there were 67 math teachers and 70 ELA teachers who responded to this question. These responses were not mutually exclusive—teachers could, and often did, provide examples of varying levels of articulation in their responses. Finally, there were a few respondents (three math and four ELA) who taught at schools classified as "other" high schools, which were alternative, continuation, or charter schools. Because of their unique situation, these teachers said they often found it difficult to articulate with middle-grade feeder schools since they were not in a typical feeder pattern.

Table D.5. Type of articulation by subject—high school teacher respondents

Subject area	General articulation	Within grade/course	Across grade/course	Lack of articulation
Math	20	45	26	12
ELA	24	35	25	25

General articulation

- Teachers meet formally once a month and informally every day. (math)
- Coverage across grades is handled by the standards. (math)
- There is a check-off sheet for standards that a teacher developed, and some are using this. (ELA)
- This school has good internal planning and collaboration. (ELA)

Within grade/course

- What our school did was to implement department-wide tests every six weeks (benchmarks). This keeps all teachers on the pace. (math)
- There is a common final that we give. There is a math department curriculum that tells us what topics to cover. It is expected that everyone covers the material, and students are ready for the next trimester. (math)
- The school tried to assign grade-level teachers the same free period in order to have collaboration time—leading to more standardization across all teachers. (ELA)
- Tenth-grade teachers meet every other week, and CAHSEE is big topic. (ELA)

Across grade/course

- We have met with our three middle schools to make sure all are in agreement with how to cover the standards. (math)
- We hold an annual vertical alignment meeting with the middle school. (math)
- Coordination with the 11th grade class; 4 days spent with the middle school English teachers. (ELA)
- The teacher cited the AP Vertical Team as a way of cross-grade training. The vertical team looked at what kids should know going from grade level to grade level. (ELA)

Lack of articulation

- Not all teachers follow the standards as well as others; the department pushes to use the standards, but the school administration, particularly counselors, have not been pushing the importance of this yet. (math)
- In terms of other schools, we really don't do much. Different teachers focus on different areas with different styles. (math)
- Articulation with junior high may not be where it should be. They have no time to meet together and do not know what literature is being taught. Used to be able to meet together, but not now. (ELA)
- We don't do anything to cover standards across grades but that would be an excellent idea. We're not having a lot of communication. I'd love to know what they're doing. (ELA)

Middle-grade feeder schools

We followed a similar analysis procedure with middle-grade feeder school teacher responses to this question, placing responses into general, within grade/course, and across grade/course categories. There were 22 and 29 responses from middle-grade feeder school math and ELA teachers, respectively. Table D.6 shows slight differences between ELA and math, with math responses grouped more tightly among the three categories than are ELA responses. Middle-grade feeder school responses were very similar to high school responses, with general articulation indicating some type of reliance on standards, text, or generic department meeting. Middle-grade feeder school responses also mentioned meeting with same-grade/subject teachers or use of benchmarks or common exams indicating within grade/course articulation, and meeting with teachers in other grades or courses as examples of across grade/course articulation.

Table D.6. Type of articulation by subject—middle-grade feeder school teacher respondents

Subject area	General articulation	Within grade/course	Across grade/course	Lack of articulation
Math	12	10	9	5
ELA	10	20	12	6

How do teachers track mastery of standards, and what do they do for students who fail to master certain standards?

A common thread that ran through our discussions with teachers was the lack of preparation that students had in earlier classes. Teachers routinely reported that they had to spend at least a portion of their instructional time teaching materials that students should already have learned, and this in turn limited the amount of instructional time that teachers had to teach new materials. Therefore, both the coverage and mastery of standards has become an important consideration for teachers.

We found that teachers employ passive as well as active methods to cover standards. For example, some teachers told us that if they are using a textbook that is aligned with the California Content Standards, then they assume that they are covering appropriate standards in their classroom instruction. This is an example of what we call passive coverage.

Other teachers have taken a step beyond just relying on a textbook to cover standards. They have begun using more active methods of ensuring standards coverage. For example, they and their colleagues have aligned, or articulated, their curriculum with the curriculum of adjoining grades or courses to ensure that standards are being covered appropriately and that key topics are neither being omitted nor repeated unnecessarily. Still other teachers create checklists or spreadsheets that allow them to keep track of standards covered during the course of the school year. Some even bring awareness of standards to their students by displaying posters listing the standards in their classrooms and mentioning which standards they will cover in the day's lesson.

These efforts, while laudable, are typically aimed at the class as a whole rather than at individual students, and they are aimed at covering standards rather than mastering them. In some cases, though, teachers do focus on the mastery of standards by individual students rather than the class as a whole. They also devise interventions for students who fail to master the standards. The remainder of this section will highlight some ways that teachers track mastery and develop interventions for students who need help in mastering the standards.

High schools.

English-Language Arts. Teachers described using methods that track the standards they cover to determining the extent to which their students are mastering the standards. Most commonly discussed was some method of checking off standards covered, either through the use of an aligned text, a spreadsheet, or in lesson plans (12 comments), followed by the use of classroom assessments or grades on homework or other assignments to determine mastery (10 comments). Teachers also described the use of pacing guides, benchmark exams, or other common exams to determine mastery of standards (6 comments). Other methods were the use of student-completed checklists (2 comments), standardized test results (3 comments), commercially developed programs that help teachers track standards (1 comment), and department meetings at which individual student mastery of standards is discussed (2 comments).

Mathematics. Math teachers' results were similar to those of ELA teachers, for the most part, with six teachers reporting the use of checking off standards, eight reporting the use of pacing guides, benchmarks, or common exams, eight using class grades, three using standardized tests results, four using commercial programs, one using student-completed checklists, and one using some form of teacher conference or department meeting.

Middle-grade feeder schools.

English-Language Arts. Results for these teachers were similar, with six reporting the use of checklists, five reporting the use of class grades, three using pacing guides, benchmarks, or common exams, one using a commercially prepared program, and one using student-completed checklists.

Mathematics. Math teachers at the middle-grade feeder school level reported the use of pacing guides, benchmarks, or common finals (6 comments), followed by class grades (4 comments), and 2 comments each for teacher checklists, standardized tests, and commercially prepared programs.

Representative comments from both school levels follow. High school comments are designated by an "hs" and subject in parentheses, and middle-grade feeder schools are likewise designated by an "fs" and subject in parentheses.

Checklists

- I have a checklist to monitor if students have mastered the standards before I can move on. (fs ELA)
- He tracks the standards in his lesson plan book. (fs ELA)
- Checking off does not mean that all students have mastered. (fs ELA)

Benchmarks

- District test does provide feedback on whether individual students have mastered a standard but not all teachers use; use pacing guide to track. (hs math)
- We took some of the grammar components and made a grammar scope and sequence; the students were getting comma rules all the way from 7th grade through 11th so we defined mastery or introduction at each point. (fs ELA)

Course grades

- I give a quiz every week on what we covered that week; if scores are below a certain level I repeat. (fs math)
- The teacher does a diagnostic at the beginning and end of each unit to test preparation and mastery. (fs ELA)

Standardized tests

- A standardized test result is the primary way he tracks student mastery of content standards. (hs math)

The following section describes interventions that teachers use to help students master standards. Most commonly mentioned among the teachers we interviewed were the use of some form of tutoring, including summer school, Saturday school, or other programs beyond the regular school day, and retention in grade/retaking the course. Others mentioned were reteaching the materials, individual help, trying different teaching strategies, and placing in other sections of the course (remediation).

High schools.

English-Language Arts. Teachers described placing students in tutoring (3 comments), providing individual help (3 comments), and 1 each for retention, extra practice, and placing in remediation.

Mathematics. Teachers described tutoring (4 comments), retention (3 comments), reteaching and extra practice (2 comments each), and remediation (1 comment).

Middle-grade feeder schools.

English-Language Arts. Teachers described placing students in tutoring (8 comments), retention and trying new teaching strategies (3 comments each), reteaching material (2 comments), and remediation and additional practice (1 comment each).

Mathematics. Teachers described reteaching (4 comments), tutoring (3 comments), and extra practice and individual help (1 comment each). Representative comments from both school levels follow. School level and subject are found in the parentheses, with "hs" indicating high school and "fs" indicating middle-grade feeder school.

Tutoring

- Students with real failures (F in class) are given options; peer tutors, remedial makeup classes, various kinds of support. (fs ELA)
- We have several ways to help students who cannot master some standards at the end of the semester, such as summer school, holiday school, and tutoring. (fs ELA)

Retention

- Retaking the course occurs in if students did not master the standards. (hs math)
- The teacher tells students that she cannot pass them if they do not master the standards. (fs ELA)

Reteach

- If more than 30% of students don't master then we reteach everyone. (fs math)
- If a large number of students fail to master the same standards, the teacher would reteach that standard. (hs math)

Finally, teachers made more general comments regarding the lack of a system to monitor mastery of standards, being caught in a time crunch that does not allow all students to master the standards, and the issue of coverage versus mastery. Table D.7 presents results, and it shows that most responses are found in the "coverage versus mastery" area. Many of these teachers said that there are too many standards for them to cover, much less teach to mastery. Some have begun to divide coverage of standards among several grades, with standards being introduced in one grade, mastered in another grade, and reviewed/reinforced in a third. Representative comments follow the table; school level and subject are designated in parentheses, with "hs" indicating high school and "fs" indicating middle-grade feeder school.

Table D.7. Comments regarding mastery by school type and subject

	No system to monitor standards	Time crunch	Coverage vs. mastery
HS math	6	4	1
HS ELA	8	2	7
FS math	2	1	8
FS ELA	1	2	4

No system to monitor standards

- Do not keep track of individual student mastery of standards. (hs ELA)
- I don't keep track of which standards I have taught and what students have mastered. (fs ELA)

Time crunch

- For those who don't master standards, we just move on. (hs math)
- Students who do not master the standards just move on. (fs ELA)
- If there are three or four students who haven't mastered the standards, can you hold the rest of the class for them? (hs ELA)

Coverage versus mastery

- The standards don't allow you to slow down and teach to mastery. (fs math)
- There is collaboration between grade levels to create a more sensible approach that students can master all the standards by the end of the 8th grade. (fs math)
- …there are so many standards to cover that they can't all be taught to mastery. (hs ELA)

How prepared are students for subsequent courses?

We asked teachers if students would be prepared for the follow-on course or if the next teacher would have to spend time teaching concepts the students should already know. We coded comments about the student preparation of students for the next class as prepared or not prepared. Some teachers tied their responses concerning the readiness of the student for the next class to the grade they received in the class.

High schools.

English-Language Arts. Of the high school ELA teachers, 18 teachers provided comments. Of these, 12 reported that their students would be prepared, three stated they would not be prepared, and three teachers provided a mixed response. For the mixed responses, the teachers indicated that the standards had been covered, but the next teachers would have to do some re-teaching.

- The gap between a realistic level and CAHSEE is large. Our students are low performers because this is a poverty community. It's hard to cover all standards because of students' low skill levels. We do our best to let them learn as much as they can.
- I feel that my students will be prepared to go into the 10th grade. Some will go into college prep and some into academic.
- My students will be very prepared, and I will know by SB assessments. At the end of the year, some students will not be at grade level, though. Some came right out of Bridge 6th or 7th level, but will have made progress of at least 1 ½ years.
- Students leave the course in better shape than they came in, not completely caught up but closer.
- Think students are prepared for next level. They have a good understanding of literature and are able to handle college level classes. They did intense work and have a solid understanding.
- Regarding preparation for 11th grade, those who have done my assignments will be successful. When they are far below that though it is hard to bring them up so much.
- The "best and the brightest" are prepared. Of the "others," less than 50% are prepared. Two-thirds of the students are failing and do not see the relevance of the materials. If the student passes the course, they will be prepared for the next level.

Mathematics. Five high school math teachers responded that their students would not be prepared for the next class. Sixteen teachers stated that their students would be prepared for the next class. There were several teachers who added the caveat that those who passed or those who received a B or C or better would be prepared. There were a couple of teachers who sadly indicated that most of their students would fail their courses, but they would be better prepared to re-take the courses the second time through.

- Last year the final required the students to get 50% correct to pass. We raised the bar to 70% to move on, and 80% of the students made it.
- All the kids I have do not have any idea. I am amazed that some have passed. I have 70% of my students earning a "D" or an "F." Mostly, they have not mastered rather than not have been exposed.
- Yes, they are ready for geometry class when they finish my course. Kids who get As, Bs, and some Cs can handle that. The students with Ds or Fs and some Cs move on to the Geometry Concepts.
- If my students go to the next grade, the teacher still needs to re-teach a lot of basic concepts and skills. We can make sure students are exposed to the standards, but we cannot make sure they can master them.
- Will students be prepared for follow-on classes? Generally, no. I teach low-level classes. I suffer, and I feel such guilt. I get a tremendous amount of pressure to give the students at least a D- so that they are qualified for graduation.
- Yes, most of the students will be in the same course, using the same text, with the same tests and coverage of content. After taking the course this year, they should be better prepared for this course the next time they take it.
- Most students leaving are prepared. There are some who are still working on previous standards. About 75% of those on the college track are ready. Those who get out with a D will have trouble in future classes.
- Students with a C or better go on to the next class. The A and B students are ready. The C students are questionable.
- Students who receive Ds are promoted to the next level but do not know the material.
- Students are pretty well prepared for the next class. I get this from the follow-up instructors.

Middle-grade feeder schools.

English-Language Arts. Six middle-grade feeder school ELA teachers provided a response to this question. Three of those teachers indicated that their students would be prepared and three provided a mixed response.

- The majority of my students are prepared to move on after (this) class. Some students were so far behind when they got here that they could use 3 more years of middle school.
- About 80% of my students are ready for the follow-on course. Those are the students who pay attention and do the work.
- Some kids are prepared for the follow-on class; some are not.
- The students come out of the course with significant gains. Whether they are up to grade level depends on where they started.
- On the 1 to 5 scale, I would give a 4 rating. For the shelter kids, the next teacher will want to know who I am and why I did not teach them anything.

Mathematics. Four middle-grade feeder school math teachers indicated that their students would be prepared for the next course, while three teachers stated that their students would not be prepared.

- I know that our students last year had a high failure rate (40%) in Algebra B (their next course after Algebra A.) We are good at drill. We tend to spoon feed kids with 30 to 40 examples. We have raised the bar since last year. Still, about 40% to 50% will have to take Algebra A in high school.
- We will have covered everything, but mastery is very low.
- I hope my students are really prepared for the next course. My Algebra I students will be fairly well prepared. But, Algebra A students will not be prepared. They are not as disciplined and are young and immature.
- Students leaving here are well prepared for the high school curriculum with the exception of a handful.

Challenges in Implementing SBI

We asked respondents what challenges they faced in implementing standards-based instruction; many provided more general answers to this question, addressing general challenges instead of those related to SBI. Nevertheless, the answers they provided give us insights into what teachers are facing as they prepare students for the CAHSEE.

High schools

Of the 86 high school math and 86 high school ELA teachers, there were 75 math and 70 ELA respondents who answered this question. The most frequent responses for both math and ELA were related to student motivation issues (34 for math, 24 for ELA) and low skills in general (30 for math and 22 for ELA). We suspect that these responses are closely related in a circular relationship—early lack of school success can cause frustration and apathy, which cause students to fall behind even farther and become even less motivated. Other categories with fairly high numbers of responses were apathy toward the CAHSEE (9 for math and 8 for ELA), student subpopulation concerns (6 for math and 14 for ELA), lack of parental support (18 for math and 11 for ELA), and lack of resources (7 for math and 13 for ELA).

Other categories had fewer numbers of responses for both subjects, including logistics (2 for math and 5 for ELA), reaching consensus among teachers (1 for math and 6 for ELA), limited amount of time to teach the number of standards necessary (5 for math and 6 for ELA), and poverty issues (5 for math and 3 for ELA). Representative comments for some of these categories follow.

<u>Student motivation/apathy</u>

- I think with the students they have such a history of failing that they are surprised when they are successful. They just do not expect to get it and have very poor habits. (math)
- How can students be motivated if they do not know the basics? (math)
- Attendance is a challenge—many students miss class on a regular basis. (ELA)
- The biggest challenge is the students who don’t try. (ELA)

Low skills in general

- There are so many gaps in student math skills, so if you're teaching to the standards and they don't meet them then you have to go back and pick them up, but you have to do that at same time you're pushing forward on standards. (math)
- Skill-driven stuff is really hard; they need the background; we review but they still forget it. (math)
- Student skills are very low—cognitive skills are not there, nor is analytical ability; basic comprehension skills and retention/recall are weak. (ELA)

CAHSEE apathy

- Indifference on students' part; don't believe they will be denied a diploma. (math)
- Apathy toward the exam—not taking seriously, thinking they can take it multiple times and haven't seen ramifications of failing. (ELA)

Student subpopulation concerns

- EL students struggle, and teaching needs to learn to address language needs because CAHSEE has language-embedded items. (math)
- There always will be a few students who get left behind—especially the ones who struggle and who get accommodations on other state tests. (ELA)

Lack of parental support

- …educating parents why students should learn. (math)
- …many don't have support at home and many have to help support their families. (ELA)

Resources

- The class size is prohibitive to give individual attention since there are 40 students with one teacher. (math)
- It will be easier to teach the standards when we have enough materials. (ELA)

Amount of time to teach the standards

- …there also are too many math standards—so there is insufficient time to cover the really important ones in a serious manner. (math)
- Time is a challenge because there are so many standards that it becomes a race to be able to say that I covered the standards so it's hard to get to mastery. (ELA)

Middle-grade feeder schools

Twenty-six middle-grade feeder school math and 34 middle-grade feeder school ELA teachers responded to the question of challenges related to the implementation of SBI. Results were similar to those found in the high school analysis, with most responses clustered in the "student motivation" (7 for math and 13 for ELA) and "low skills in general" (7 for math and 10 for ELA) categories. Other frequent responses were "time to teach the standards" (8 for math and 7 for ELA), lack of resources (6 each for math and ELA), student subpopulations (7 for math and 4 for ELA), and parental support (4 for math and 6 for ELA).

Other schools

Three other high school math teachers and four other high school ELA teachers responded to this question; student motivation, student subpopulation concerns, and lack of parental support were most frequently mentioned, with two responses each for student motivation and subpopulation concerns. Lack of parental support had two responses for math and one for ELA.

CAHSEE Opinion

As a final question, interviewers asked teachers for their opinions on whether the Class of 2004 should be required to pass the CAHSEE to get a high school diploma. There were three main themes in responses—whether standards had been covered for the Class of 2004, whether the Class of 2004 should be held accountable for passing the CAHSEE, and whether there should even be a high school exit exam. In all three categories, responses were coded as positive or negative.

Responses were tallied from 67 ELA teachers at 39 high schools, 73 math teachers at 39 high schools, 21 ELA teachers at 11 middle-grade feeder schools, and 24 math teachers at 11 middle-grade feeder schools. Responses are reported by individual teacher and by school.

High schools.

English-Language Arts. Twenty-three teachers discussed coverage of standards for the Class of 2004. Of these 23 teachers, 18 teachers said that standards were covered for the Class of 2004, and five teachers stated that standards had not been covered. At the school level, teachers at 14 schools responded that the standards had been covered, teachers at four schools stated they had not been covered, and teachers at one school were divided in their responses. As can be observed by the numbers, most schools were represented by only a single teacher's response concerning the coverage of standards. The following are some responses to give a flavor of what the teachers told us.

- The Class of 2004 was given the standards, but I do not know if they learned.
- I did not cover the standards as well with the Class of 2004 as I did this year. Next year, we will be doing even better on covering the standards.
- My firm answer is "maybe" for the Class of 2004. I am covering the standards but do not know about others. The next 2 years should be better and more consistent.
- Think the Class of 2004 has received the instruction needed to be ready to pass CAHSEE.

Forty ELA teachers provided responses concerning holding the Class of 2004 accountable for passing the CAHSEE to receive a diploma. Of those 40 teachers, 23 responded that the Class of 2004 should be held accountable and 17 responded that the requirement should be delayed and the Class of 2004 should not be held accountable for passing the CAHSEE. At the school level, the responses were fairly equally split. Teachers at 11 schools responded that the Class of 2004 should be held accountable. Teachers at 11 schools responded that the Class of 2004 should not be held accountable and that the requirement should be delayed. Teachers at four schools were split on their responses.

- More time should be given until the requirement is implemented to allow for teachers to adjust to teaching to standards.
- If the Class of 2004 is not held accountable, it will damage the credibility of the exit exam in the eyes of the students. The exit exam has caused remarkable changes in the students' willingness to work. The classes seem to be getting better every year.
- I believe the state should stand on its requirement. If delayed, it would be a serious mistake—one that reinforces that this is not a serious requirement. Students need to know there is a requirement and that they have a responsibility for their education.
- There will not be a class that is seriously prepared for the CAHSEE for another 6 or 7 years.

Thirty-three teachers provided responses about whether there should be a high school exit exam. Of the 33 teachers, 27 were in favor of having some form of high school exit exam and six were opposed to any kind of high school exit exam.

- I believe the exit exam is an awesome thing.
- Think CAHSEE is good because it gives meaning to graduation.
- We really need the accountability that the CAHSEE requirement will bring. Believe an exit exam is absolutely necessary because it equalizes across the board and keeps schools from passing students on. Believe in accountability. Have seen too many students who have graduated without basic skills.
- Opposed to CAHSEE in general.
- If the diploma is to mean something, the CAHSEE is a fairly decent minimal standard.
- Without the test there will not be a lot of change. Most teachers are like the students. Unless there are consequences and they are held accountable, they will not change.

Mathematics. Thirty teachers expressed an opinion about the coverage of standards for the Class of 2004. Of the 30 teachers, 18 stated that the standards were covered for the Class of 2004 and 12 teachers stated that the standards were not covered. Aggregated by school, there were teachers at 13 schools who indicated that the standards were covered, teachers at eight schools who indicated that the standards were not covered, and teachers at two schools who offered mixed opinions.

- For the Class of 2004, similar standards were covered, but not all students understood them.
- They have been given the opportunity to learn here. They are given chances to do it. If juniors have not passed, they are in courses targeted to help them pass the test. Those who attend regularly and work hard will pass the exam. Still have some good students who are struggling.
- Class of 2004, students have not covered all of the content; they are always behind.

Thirty-eight math teachers at 27 high schools offered opinions about holding the Class of 2004 accountable for passing the CAHSEE. Of those 38 teachers, 26 responded that the Class of 2004 should have to pass the CAHSEE in order to receive a diploma, while 12 thought the requirement should be at least delayed. Aggregating at the school level, math teachers at 17 high schools felt the requirement should stay, teachers at seven high schools thought the requirement should be delayed, and teachers at three high schools provided mixed opinions.

- There will be a lot of students who will fail, but they have got to be accountable. Go and let it be a reality check. Not implementing may be detrimental.
- We should not delay. Students who are working hard to pass need to have that goal in front of them. Students who worked and already passed need to see that what they did has value and does not get blown off. Ditch the whole damn program but do not delay it. I understand the legislature does not want to be bombarded with complaints, but do not delay. Lower the cut score it you have to, but maintain the requirement. Recognize that the Class of 2004 did not have standards-based instruction for their whole schooling and phase in passing score until you reach the desired cut point in several years, but do not pull the rug out from the whole program. CAHSEE has been motivational to students to pass this requirement. Ratchet up the cut score for awhile rather than drop the requirement.
- Class of 2004 should be held accountable for CAHSEE because the junior class has spent the last two years focusing on this test and thought it was going to count. Students have been taking the test repeatedly, taking summer classes to pass, and finally passing. Teachers have spent extra time and resources to prepare them for the test. Delaying would send a message to other classes that the requirement will be removed at the last minute. Start with the first class that has been putting the time in, the Class of 2004.
- Withholding of diplomas should not take place until the students have had a chance to get standards-based instruction from the beginning.
- The Class of 2004 is not prepared. Need to wait 5 to 10 years.

Eighteen math teachers provided responses about whether or not there should be a high school exit exam. Of those 18 teachers, 16 were in favor of having some form of high school exit exam, while two were opposed to any kind of high school exit exam.

- We need a test, but not the test we have. The test should have two components—one that does not use calculators and one that does. For the section that measures higher-order math, the students should be allowed to use calculators.
- An exit exam is fine because students need to know something before they leave.
- Think students should be held accountable for their education and the exit exam is a good way to do that.
- Think the diploma should stand for something. Would like to see more than a single test score used though.
- I do not think anyone ever should have to pass the test to get a diploma.

Middle-grade feeder Schools.

English-Language Arts. We received responses from this question from 21 ELA teachers at 11 middle-grade feeder schools. Responses are reported by individual teacher interviewed. There were no teachers who had a response concerning the coverage of standards for the Class of 2004.

Nine ELA teachers at five middle-grade feeder schools provided a response concerning holding the Class of 2004 accountable for passing the CAHSEE to receive a diploma. Of those nine ELA teachers, four said that the Class of 2004 should have to pass the CAHSEE in

order to receive a diploma. Five teachers thought the requirement of passing the CAHSEE to get a diploma should be at least delayed.

- Class of 2004 should be held responsible for CAHSEE. The students should be responsible. Teachers are taking CAHSEE seriously, but some students have no intention of graduating from high school.
- More time should be given until the requirement is implemented to allow for teachers to adjust to teaching to standards. Class of 2004 is not ready, would be better for 2006 or 2008.
- For the 65 kids I had, yes. But, I had the top kids from my track. For the others, I do not think they should. Because, until they left here, they were not held accountable. We had a no-fail policy here. If these students got 12 fails in 6th grade, they still moved on to 7th grade. The only thing they do not get to do is go through graduation. Our students do not believe us when we tell them. I personally think it should be the first class that they hold accountable in kindergarten.
- Think the 2004 requirement should be waived at this point. It should be delayed until standards-based instruction has been offered from beginning—so, maybe 10 to 12 years.

Seven ELA teachers responded about whether there should be a high school exit exam. Of those seven teachers, five were in favor of having some form of high school exit exam, and two were opposed to any kind of high school exit exam.

- It is grossly unfair to require the exit exam for lower SES. It is punishing to EL groups. Homework should be eliminated, and it would improve students' morale—they have so many things to do at home.
- I like the idea of an exit exam because I like students being held accountable for their learning. There is little motivation when students get to high school. They recognize that they must pass CAHSEE to get a diploma.

Mathematics. We received responses to this question from 24 math teachers at 11 middle-grade feeder schools. Responses are reported by individual teacher interviewed. There were seven teachers who had a response concerning the coverage of standards for the Class of 2004. Of the seven teachers, four responded that the standards were covered for the Class of 2004. There were three3 teachers who responded that the standards were not covered.

- The Class of 2004 was being exposed to similar standards.
- The Class of 2004, in his class, they were using the standards at that time. In other classes, they were not.
- Teachers have not had time to cover the standards adequately.

Eight math teachers at four middle-grade feeder schools provided responses concerning holding the Class of 2004 accountable for the CAHSEE. Of those teachers, two stated that students in the Class of 2004 should have to pass the CAHSEE before receiving a diploma. Six, on the other hand, thought the requirement of passing the CAHSEE to get a diploma should be at least delayed.

- Students should be held accountable and have an exit exam. Some will fail. But, the state needs to stick to the requirement. If students are coming to learn, then let us show it.
- The Class of 2009 should be the first class accountable. Teachers have not had time to cover the standards adequately.
- Still need more time. You should wait until all of the issues are resolved. When asked how long that would be, the teacher replied, "A long time."

There were 18 math teachers who provided responses about whether or not there should be a high school exit exam. Of those 18 teachers, 16 favored having some form of high school exit exam, and two were opposed to any kind of high school exit exam.

- An exit exam is a good thing. But students should not be penalized for not passing.
- I am 100% for teachers and students being held accountable.
- CAHSEE is an incentive to work harder. I like CAHSEE.
- CAHSEE is not a positive thing for the students. Getting the students to buy into the test is difficult, because many teachers do not even buy into it. It is a waste of time. CAHSEE will be a problem for 50% of the students to get a diploma.

Analysis of CAHSEE Remediation Teacher Interviews

Twenty-one interviews were coded as CAHSEE remediation teacher interviews. All were coded at the high school level.

Increasing Alignment to California Content Standards

Is course/program using SBI?

Eighteen of 21 CAHSEE remediation teacher respondents reported the use of the California standards in their program. Those few that did not refer specifically to the use of standards often spoke of using CAHSEE released items or CAHSEE blueprints as a means of targeting the needs of their students. Several stated that they used a standards-aligned text that helped them stay focused on standards-based instruction. The following comments provide good representation of teachers' input.

- The district team, teachers from all the schools, focused on getting familiar with the standards. They used the standards including the exit exam blueprint and mapped them to a course, sequenced the lessons, and produced a daily calendar for what content is covered and tested. This teacher took the course design and embellished it by formalizing his lesson plans to relate directly to specific standards.
- I take it straight off the exit exam. I work on the test blueprint outline.
- The teacher lets the book keep track of the standards since it is aligned to the content standards.

Five of 21 CAHSEE remediation teacher respondents offered an implementation level for standards-based instruction within their course, on a 1 to 5 scale (5 being full implementation). Their average score was 4.6.

Texts/materials used and aligned with standards

CAHSEE remediation teachers mentioned several different texts that were used for their remediation courses, many of which were specifically aligned to the California standards. In addition to texts, many cited other resources used, such as CAHSEE practice tests, CAHSEE released items, workbooks, computer tutorials, and test-taking strategies. The following is a list of textbooks used:

- The pullout course used the Mathematics Workbook for the CAHSEE.
- Math Matters!, 2nd edition, Lynch, Olmstead, DeForest-Deavis, 2001.
- California Mathematics Review Content Standards 6-Algebra 1, American Book, Inc., 2002, softbound
- California Standards book, Accelerated Math
- Meeting the California Challenge: Instruction and Practice for High School Students on the Math Content Standards, Globe Fearon, Pierson Learning Group
- Mathematics Workbook, California High School Exit Exam Mathematics Study Guide Coordination Group Publications
- Taking the Terror out of Testing: High School Exit Exam Resource Book

Copies/use of California Content Standards

Seventeen of 21 CAHSEE remediation teacher respondents indicated that they were familiar with the California Content Standards and/or the CAHSEE blueprints. However, the level of familiarity varied. Some teachers stated that they had copies of the standards--others mentioned using the standards in curriculum development, and others just stated that they and other teachers were familiar or very familiar with the California standards. The following comments provide some examples of teacher familiarity with and use of the standards.

- The teacher has copies of the standards.
- The teacher had not seen the blueprints but would use them for a remediation class.
- We develop courses with CAHSEE, California standards, and blueprints for ELA/Math.
- The district person used the blueprint to discuss standards at the district meeting.
- Teacher is very familiar with the standards. Served on a committee to develop lesson plans for each algebra standard. All math instruction is geared to standards.
- I have the CD for CAHSEE and make transparencies from it.
- Teachers are very familiar with standards. Good awareness for summer course. He pulled CAHSEE web questions and shared with students so they were very aware too.

Prediction/statement regarding 2004 requirement

CAHSEE remediation teacher respondents seemed fairly evenly split on the accountability issues. Though the consensus seemed to be that accountability in itself is a good thing, some thought the class of 2004 was ready; others didn't; and still others were somewhere in between.

- By junior year, the students here should be able to pass the test. The standards were taught at this school for the class of 2004.
- He would like the date to remain firm, because if it changes, then the message is that we aren't serious.
- Should the class of 2004 be held accountable on the CAHSEE? I would say no; I do not think we are ready.
- The class of 2004 is not yet prepared for the exam. The class of 2004 probably needs more time because this requirement was not expected of them.
- On the one hand, we should hold kids accountable so they won't lose faith, but there will be more success on the CAHSEE the longer you put it off.

A few CAHSEE remediation teacher respondents offered a prediction of when they thought students would be ready to be held accountable to the CAHSEE.

- Now that we have standards-based instruction, I would delay CAHSEE for a year or two.
- In 6 years, if students work, they can pass the CAHSEE.

Remediation Program Targeting the CAHSEE

Course/program description

Fifteen of 21 CAHSEE remediation teachers referred to their CAHSEE remediation program as a "course," though it was not always clear if the course was held during regular school hours or after school. Some schools had a 7th "after school" period during which they may have chosen to offer remediation. Two programs were held on Saturday, while another was described as a pull-out program held during students' elective or gym period. Below are some comments describing how some programs/courses are organized.

- Students must take the course during their junior year if they have failed the CAHSEE.
- The class was a 2-hour intercession course conducted from 1pm to 3pm Monday through Friday. There were two teachers teaching 80 students in the cafeteria. This was the only class conducted during those hours in the cafeteria.
- This course is held after school so it doesn't interfere with the other classes scheduled.
- Class is held on Monday, Wednesday, Thursday and Saturday for 8 weeks.
- They are doing this on a pull out basis—gym or elective.

Programs ranged from 14 to 170 students being served. However, not all respondents had a complete count of students in the programs. In some situations, teachers only had a count of the number of students in their section of a remedial course.

Elective

Twelve of 21 programs were characterized as taken for credit toward graduation, the majority being taken for elective credit. One teacher's course could be taken for math or elective credit, depending on the student's needs for graduation. One offered no credit for student participation. One respondent didn't know what credit, if any, was offered for the program.

How students are placed in remediation

Fifteen of 21 programs were identified as required, with students typically being placed by counselors after failing the CAHSEE. Two CAHSEE remediation teachers indicated that parents were given the option to refuse the course but were strongly advised to let their child participate. One program was initially held on a voluntary basis but later was required after a lack of student participation. Below are some responses regarding student placement in CAHSEE remediation programs.

- If students fail the exit exam once or more, they will be placed in the remediation class.
- The students who have not passed the exam must take the remediation course but do not have to continue.
- Students must take the remediation course during their junior year if they have failed the CAHSEE.
- Students are identified by counselors.

- Students are told they could take the remediation course, and they were strongly recommended to take it, but parents could say no.
- The pull-out program was voluntary and participation eventually dropped off.

One of the three voluntary programs indicated that half of students in need of assistance were not getting it.

Demographic cross-sectional participation

Six of 21 CAHSEE remediation teacher respondents made mention of subpopulations (ranging from gender, ethnicity, and socioeconomic groupings to special education students) that were disproportionately represented in their CAHSEE remediation course/program. Below is a list of comments from CAHSEE remediation teachers whose classes were overrepresented by certain subgroups:

- There are mainly white students at this school. However, there are a disproportionate number of minorities in this class; about two-thirds of the class are minority.
- The class is mostly female. There is a noticeable absence of Armenians.
- Students taking this class are predominantly male.
- It seems that these are the students who are lower SES than the total school population.
- There are no Asians in the class though there are many at the school.
- I don't think it was a conscious decision to exclude special education students from remediation.

Nine of 21 respondents indicated that their course/program served a cross section of their school's population. The following comments are representative of the range of responses from CAHSEE remediation teachers serving a cross section of their school's population.

- Students from all subpopulations are included—from special education to students taking Algebra 1.
- No distinguishable differences between class make-up and student population were observed.

How many times can students take remediation?

Ten of 21 CAHSEE remediation teachers stated that the remediation course could be taken more than once. One specified that students can only receive credit for one time taking of the course. Three schools had not yet created a re-take policy. One teacher indicated that a course could be taken only once. Below are some comments regarding the number of times a student is able to take a CAHSEE remediation course.

- I do not think there is a limit on the number of times the student can take the course. If they do not get credit for subsequent takings, this could create a problem with credits for graduation.
- The course can only be taken once for credit.
- The course can only be taken one time.

How course/program was developed

The next set of questions was directed at how the program/course had been developed. Three primary types of curriculum development emerged: teacher level, school level and district level. Below each type of curriculum development are individual responses regarding how a particular program was developed.

Teacher-level

- The teacher attended a conference on the CAHSEE and has a copy of "The CAHSEE Mathematics Project for the State." He then tried to analyze common themes among the sample test items. These are the standards he "hammers."
- She developed curriculum based on book topics.

School-level

- It was designed as a remediation class by the school to increase the grade level of students in mathematics.
- The teachers met and brainstormed what we knew. We met and wrote up the course and syllabus.

District-level

- This was a district level course development effort by selected teachers from various schools.
- There was a committee at the district level that was formed to review the standards and CAHSEE blueprint and to put together a pacing chart.
- The curriculum was developed by a district-level person to be offered at two high schools.

System to monitor subsequent CAHSEE performance

Though not all courses had begun the evaluation process, several had used or planned on using student performance on the CAHSEE, or on CAHSEE released items, as a means of measuring program effectiveness. The following responses provide examples of evaluation methods used by CAHSEE remediation teachers:

- There are plans to look at CAHSEE scores following student enrollment in this course.
- Records have not been kept on student performance after the course.
- Seventy-five percent of summer students passed the math test.
- Passing CAHSEE is the ultimate evaluation.
- Sixty percent of students taking this course are passing the CAHSEE on their second try.
- We will accumulate data for comparing the performance on CAHSEE between students who took the remediation course and students who did not.
- The course will involve a pre- and post-test based on the released items.

Other evaluation was ongoing throughout the course, including in-class testing, pre-and post-tests, individualized assignments and keeping student work on file. Below are examples of during-class evaluation used by CAHSEE remediation teachers.

- We can track students' performance and progress with different ways, including weekly tests and individualized assignments.
- We administer an 80-item diagnostic test at the start; students determine their status related to the standards. We give it again at the end to show progress.
- The program includes an assessment component with pre-post tests for each strand.
- They keep all their work in files.

Analysis of Special Education Teacher Interviews

Seventy-two interviews were coded as special education teacher interviews. Of these, 52 were coded as high schools (2 were alternative schools and 20 as feeder schools).

Increasing Alignment to California Content Standards

Use of standards in IEP and 504 plans

High schools

Thirty-six of 52 high school special education teacher respondents indicated that their department used the standards in developing students' Individualized Education Plans (IEPs). In one school, standards were not specifically used to determine IEPs, but were used to develop curriculum. Two noted that their department had just begun to use the standards to develop IEPs within the past year one of which stated that the school was not yet using the standards completely. Some references were made to the use of standards in writing goals and objectives for each student. Others noted that the standards were used but were modified to meet students' specific needs. This often translated into the use of lower grade level standards. The following provides examples of the use of standards in developing IEPs.

- The California standards are used to develop IEPs. Goals are established for each standard in order for students to best meet the standard.
- They are not specifically using the standards to determine IEPs. They look first to the special needs of the individual to determine the IEP, then use the standards to develop curriculum.
- IEPs are written from the California Content Standards and they adjust the level of the standards to meet student needs.
- All goals and objectives were written to be aligned with California Content Standards. They are aligned to the student's grade level content standards rather than at grade level standards.
- The goals and objectives of the IEPs are supposed to be based on the standards. I have to go back to the IEP and find where the student is. I find a standard that fits their level of achievement. I may have to go down to the 5th grade level to find a standard that is at their level.

Middle-grade feeder schools

Nine of 20 middle-grade feeder school special education teachers stated that they used the California standards in developing their students' IEPs. Seven other teacher stated that they use the standards, but noted that the standards they use are usually below the students' grade levels. Two teachers made no mention of the IEPs specifically, but stated that they use the standards. Finally, two teachers stated that they focused on students' individual needs rather than the standards when developing IEPs. A few related comments are provided here.

- Goals and benchmarks have to be written to the content standards.
- The standards are written into the IEPs, but they are the standards for where the student is performing, not necessarily grade level.
- The content standards really don't come into play on IEPs; the focus is on the students' needs.

How many special education students were mainstreamed/exposed to standards?

High schools

High schools seemed to be making a concerted effort to expose their special education students to the California Content Standards. This usually involved "mainstreaming" special education students into general education courses, where they could be exposed to the same standards as the rest of their grade-level cohort. Often, as suggested in the previous section on IEPs, special education students were exposed to lower grade-level standards in accordance with their individual needs.

In several schools, all Resource (RSP) students, typically less severely challenged than Special Day students, were mainstreamed in at least one subject area. In most situations, Special Day (SDC) students were at least mainstreamed in electives, such as physical education. For schools that did not mainstream all their RSP students, data are provided below. Also provided are data for those schools that did mainstream their SDC students in math or English/language arts (ELA). Overall, larger proportions of RSP students were mainstreamed in math and English/language arts. It is important to note that numbers are not necessarily an accurate count of the school's entire mainstreamed special education population. Some respondents offered their best guess while others provided numbers based on their particular classes.

RSP:

- 85% in math; 100% in ELA
- 32% in math; 16% in ELA
- 85% in math and ELA
- 30% in math and ELA
- 85-90% in math and ELA
- 50% in math; 25% in ELA
- 20% in math; 30% in ELA
- 40% in math; unknown in ELA
- 75% in math; 70-75% in ELA
- 6% in math and ELA
- 60% in math; 80% in ELA
- 50% in math; 5-10% in ELA

SDC:

- unknown in math; 25% in ELA
- 0% in math; 10-15% in ELA
- 2% in math; 5-10% in ELA
- 3-4% in math and ELA
- 5-10% in math; unknown in ELA
- 20% in math and ELA

The consensus was that all RSP students and some SDC students would be exposed to at least some of the content standards. Sixteen of 52 special education teachers stated that RSP students would be exposed to all standards, 10 of which also stated that all special education students, including SDC, would be exposed to all content. Nineteen of 50 indicated that RSP students would be exposed to some of the standards. What was not always so clear was the grade-level at which the standards were being covered. Typically, teachers noted that upper level math content would not be met. One teacher maintained that most special education students would not be exposed to any of the content standards. Within these general responses, there were a few clarifications, some of which are listed below.

- The students are exposed to all standards; the opportunity is there.
- Getting to geometry and some algebra will be difficult.

- The students will be exposed, but perhaps not all at the level of the CAHSEE expectations.
- A lot of students won't have the opportunity of being exposed to a lot of the standards when they take CAHSEE the first time.
- SDC students will never be exposed to algebra content or higher level thinking because they can't read at a high enough level ,and they can't retain information consistently or long enough for testing.

Middle-grade feeder schools

Nine of 20 middle-grade feeder school special education teachers stated that some proportion of their students (RSP and/or SDC) was mainstreamed. Generally, more RSP students than SDC were mainstreamed, and RSP students were more likely to be mainstreamed in math and English. SDC students were often only mainstreamed in elective courses. Seven teachers stated that all of their RSP students were mainstreamed. Finally, one teacher stated that all special education students were mainstreamed; another stated that no SDC students were mainstreamed, and two respondents failed to provide information about mainstreaming at their school.

Nine of the 20 middle-grade feeder school special education teachers stated that their students would be exposed to some portion of the California Content Standards. Similarly to high school teacher respondents, concerns were raised by some over higher-level math standards. Four respondents stated that students would be exposed to all of the content standards. Finally, four made no references to exposure, two stated that exposure depended on the student, and one stated that special education students would be exposed to none of the content standards.

Department system to monitor coverage and mastery of standards

High schools

Teachers mentioned a variety of tools used to track coverage and student mastery of the standards, including portfolios, pre-and post-tests, practice CAHSEE test items, benchmarks, IEPs, observations, grades, progress reports, interim assessments, in-class test scores, standardized test scores, and student work samples. The following are just a few examples of how coverage and student mastery of the standards was tracked by special education teachers.

- They have established benchmarks for the goals that are set. There are usually two to three benchmarks per month that are covered to reach a main goal.
- We track mastery based on goals and objectives that are tested annually, to see if students reach those goals. It's done on an annual goal basis, but they can be tested and tracked throughout that period to determine mastery (based on student work, testing, and teacher observations).
- I give standardized tests, two forms: Brigance, but can't get standardized scores, and the Woodcock Johnson III, which is used nationally and locally.

Though many teachers agreed that most special education students would be exposed to at least some of the required content, mastery of the content was viewed quite differently. Teachers generally agreed that special education students would not master

the content necessary for passing the CAHSEE. Several indicated that math standards were the biggest obstacle to overcome. One comment indicated that mastery is possible with the appropriate accommodations. The following provide examples from the range of responses about student mastery of the content standards.

- I imagine that some of these students won't have mastered math by the time they take CAHSEE for the first time, geometry especially.
- Generally speaking, only 50 to 60% of the standards can be mastered when they take the CAHSEE for the first time.
- As far as mastering the content to which they have been exposed, the areas of math will be a problem.
- We can still cover all CAHSEE standards at a reduced speed with special day students. They would be able to show mastery if they were allowed alternative modes.
- The mastery of content by SDC students relates to long- and short-term memory; so a student may have mastery one day but not the next- it's a moving target.

Middle-grade feeder schools

Four of 20 middle-grade feeder school special education teachers used students' IEPs to track mastery of the standards. Three others stated that tracking was not done. Other means of tracking mastery included:

- Progress reports
- Accelerated Math reports
- District trimester exams
- Grades
- Reading inventories
- Standardized tests (STAR, Brigance)
- In-class testing
- Portfolios
- Observation

All middle-grade feeder school special education teachers agreed that most of the special education students would not master all of the content necessary to pass the CAHSEE. Eight of 20 stated that their students would have trouble mastering all of the math standards, especially algebra and word problems. Others mentioned subjects such as writing, spelling and vocabulary that would prove to be a roadblock.

Text/materials used and aligned with standards

High schools

Several high school special education teachers mentioned the materials they used in their courses. For the most part, special education ELA classes used the same materials as general education classes, but often with supplements and accommodations. Here are some typical responses indicating the use of general education texts with accommodations.

- Special education has the adaptive version of the Prentice Hall literature series and has adapted novels, which just go at a slower pace.
- We use the same text as general education but adapted to be more readable, for example, simplified Tom Sawyer.

A few special education math teachers mentioned specific texts/programs used in their courses some of which were standards aligned and used in the general education

program as well. Both alternative schools stated they use standards in courses, but they did not mention if the textbooks used were aligned to the standards. The list is as follows.

- Accelerated Math
- Algebra 8th Grade California TE, McDougal and Littell
- Saxon Math Program
- Cornerstone Math and Boxers Math
- Strategic Math (competency based)
- Prentice Hall general education math textbooks
- Plato Program
- The Fearon books
- Focus on Achievement

Middle-grade feeder schools.

Middle-grade feeder school special education teachers also mentioned the use of general education textbooks in their special education classes. Some comments regarding the use of general education texts with accommodations are presented below.

- They use the regular curriculum books, but can take time where needed for certain concepts, controlling the pace and depth of the topic.
- Students use regular education materials and RSP teacher support with other supplemental materials aligned to the standards.

Texts and other supplemental materials used by special education teachers are listed here:

- Key Curriculum Press Materials
- Project Read
- Spectrum Math
- Schaeffer Method
- Elements of Literature
- Rewards, 2000
- Writing and Grammar--Prentice-Hall
- Phono-Graphix Word Work
- Prentice-Hall Mathematics Computational Practice Skills

Content not exposed to students

High schools

High school special education teachers generally agreed that at least a portion of their students would not be exposed to some of the content standards. Responses ranged from general statements about a lack of exposure, to mention of the CAHSEE standards in particular, to specific subject areas that would be difficult to cover. Some of the subject areas mentioned seemed to be out of the scope of the CAHSEE. Both respondents of the alternative schools stated that their students should be exposed to all of the content standards. A variety of responses are listed below.

- Special education students will not be exposed to upper math like pre-algebra, algebra and geometry.
- …may not get to persuasive essays.
- Special education students will be exposed, but perhaps not at the level of CAHSEE's expectations.

- There is quite a bit of content that special education students won't be exposed to prior to taking the CAHSEE. They haven't graphed linear equations, polynomials and trinomials, or slopes.
- Writing and spelling are weaknesses.
- Special education students won't be exposed to science, math, vocabulary and sentence diagramming.

Middle-grade feeder schools

Thirteen middle-grade feeder school special education teachers stated that their students would be exposed to some, if not all, of the content standards. Areas of concern included upper level math; teachers were often concerned that the extra time needed to instruct special education students would impede their ability to cover all the standards. The following quote is representative of such concerns.

- Math is the problem. It takes much longer to teach and learn a single topic in special education. He can't stay as long as needed and other topics get dropped.

Particular content will not have mastered

High schools

As exposure to the standards was often difficult to achieve, most teachers admitted that mastery of some content would not be possible for many of their students. Again, most made general statements regarding their students' inability to master all of the California standards. Others mentioned specific subject areas that would be difficult to master, and others spoke of mastery of lower level standards, or of mastery with accommodations. Among the specific subject areas mentioned were reading and writing comprehension, algebra, trigonometry and vocabulary. Some responses to questions about content that would not be mastered are provided below:

- Pretty high percent of special education students cannot master a lot of content standards when they take CAHSEE.
- Mastery may be possible at a second or third grade level.
- Students would be able to show mastery if they were allowed alternative modes.
- He doesn't see where much else can be done to help the kids master the content; the ability is just not there. (alternative school respondent)

Middle-grade feeder schools

Middle-grade feeder school special education teachers mentioned the following areas of concern in which student mastery of the standards might not be achieved.

- Writing
- Spelling
- Math (especially Algebra)
- Social Studies
- Science
- Vocabulary
- Comprehension
- Word Problems
- Multi-Step Problems

Copies/use of California Content Standards

High schools

Seventeen of 52 special education teachers indicated that they were very familiar with the California Content Standards, while 21 characterized themselves as familiar with the standards, four as pretty familiar and two as not familiar. Nine special education teachers stated that they had copies of the standards, while 21 indicated that they put the standards to use. Use of the standards ranged from posting the standards in the classroom, to basing IEPs on the standards and aligning coursework with the standards. Three teachers mentioned staff development or workshops that they'd attended that addressed the standards. One respondent was on the district's CAHSEE board. Some interesting comments about the use of the California Content Standards are listed below.

- Each teacher has a state standards notebook that is geared to all standardized tests students might take (including AP). The notebook shows standards covered, sample items, and performance data from past tests.
- All the lesson plans are obtained from general education courses that are standards aligned and use a checklist to monitor the standards being covered.

Four teachers expressed familiarity with the standards but qualified their statements by saying that the standards were "largely irrelevant" for their special education students. These teachers noted that special education students typically functioned at lower grade levels, and it was the teacher's responsibility to put the individual student's needs first.

- Teachers have found they have to go down to lower grade levels in terms of the standards.

Middle-grade feeder schools

Eighteen of 20 middle-grade feeder school special education teachers were "familiar" with or "aware" of the standards. Three respondents stated that they had copies of the standards, and four added that they used the standards regularly. Two respondents stated that they were not really familiar with the standards.

How many special education students have passed/will pass the CAHSEE?

High schools

Thirteen of 52 high school special education teachers indicated that none of their students had passed both portions of the CAHSEE. Of students that had passed at least one section of the exam, more students had more success in ELA than in math. Many of these teachers did not necessarily have the numbers in front of them, and some may have simply been guessing. A few relevant responses are provided here.

- No special education students have passed the math portion of the CAHSEE.
- Seventy percent of special education students have taken the CAHSEE at least once and none of those students have passed yet.
- Probably 5% or less has passed both parts.
- I've had nine students take the CAHSEE and one passed both sections. Five of the others passed ELA and one passed math.
- One student passed the English portion of the exam. (alternative school respondent)

Some teachers were able to make predictions in terms of how many of their students they expected would eventually pass the CAHSEE. These predictions varied, with some anticipating nearly complete success, others complete failure, and still others somewhere in the middle-grade feeder. It was common that more students had passed or were expected to pass the ELA portion of the CAHSEE. Two respondents noted that if special education students were allowed accommodations, more would pass the CAHSEE. Representative comments are provided below.

- There may not even be 1% of special education students that will pass the CAHSEE.
- Eventually over 90% of special day and over 90% of resource kids will pass.
- About 75% should be able to pass the test with accommodations, and about 50% will be able to pass both sections of the test.
- Without modifications, none of this year's kids will pass. By just allowing the use of a calculator, which is what everyone does in real life, perhaps 9 or 10 would pass.
- Three students need to pass both tests. She expects only two to have problems. (alternative school respondent)

Department provides extra support to help pass

High schools

Special education teachers mentioned several types of assistance offered to their students in preparation for the CAHSEE; examples are listed here.

- Practice tests
- Remedial classes
- Test-taking strategies
- Study skills classes
- Lunchtime tutoring
- Summer school
- After-school tutoring
- Tutors
- Saturday school
- Pull-out tutoring
- Note-taking strategies
- Computer based instruction
- Targeted review periods

In addition to special assistance offered prior to taking the CAHSEE, many special education teachers emphasized the importance of allowing accommodations for special education students during testing, or the need for differential standards for special education students. Some examples of these responses are provided below.

- There need to be differential standards for the truly handicapped kids.
- Maybe there should be a changed cut score to begin with, or have a different score for special education students.
- We need many accommodations to help them.
- The teacher would like to see a multiple diploma situation similar to the New York Regents Diploma for those who pass the state's test. There are also vocational diplomas or certificates in a specific area.
- It would be important to allow students to use calculators if it is in their IEP.
- There should be a modified version for anyone with an IEP. Test whether kids can analyze and get the main points at a lower level. This would be fairer than modifications with materials that are beyond their reading level.

- The test could be broken down into sections rather than just English or Mathematics so that students could pass fractions, for example, and not have to take it again.
- They should give students more choices for the writing samples. Resource students need to have a choice of topics. Some topics are not within their experience.

Prediction/statement regarding 2004 requirement

High schools

Sixteen of 52 high school special education teachers stated explicitly that the class of 2004 was not ready to be held accountable to the CAHSEE. Most recommended that the exam be postponed for at least another year. The two alternative school teachers stated that accommodations or alternative diplomas should be made available to special education students. Some of their responses are provided below.

- The class of 2004 should not be held accountable.
- The class of 2004 just isn't ready.
- There should be a delay in the CAHSEE requirement for all students.
- The class of 2004 could use more time.
- At least two more years would help in preparing students.

Several common reasons for this were expressed, including a lack of student preparedness and a lack of time to implement the standards properly. Examples of typical responses are listed here.

- The lead time wasn't sufficient to prepare students for the standards on the test.
- The class of 2004 wasn't prepared from the start of their education.
- Students had not been held to the standards in earlier years and were socially promoted and now in mid-stream are being told differently.
- The teachers or students have not had enough years of regrouping their strategies and concentrating on what is expected.

Some teachers suggested what they thought would be an adequate amount of time for students to be successfully caught up; examples are presented here.

- Put it off until 2008.
- The state should delay maybe 2 more years because it has just been sprung on us.
- The students that were in first grade when the standards were implemented are the ones that should be held accountable.
- The class of 2006 has had more time and should be the first class to be responsible for CAHSEE.

Among teachers who thought that the class of 2004 was ready for accountability, common reasons were that the current juniors had been adequately prepared, or that postponement would result in a loss of credibility, as shown by the following comments.

- The standards were covered for the class of 2004.
- Don't delay. When you back off it looks bad. When students don't have to do it, they won't take it seriously.

Middle-grade feeder schools

Middle-grade feeder school special education teachers who spoke about the CAHSEE and its impact on both the class of 2004 and their own students offered a variety of responses. Eight teachers focused their comments on the need for accommodations or alternative diplomas for special education students. Three stated that the class of 2004 was not ready to be held accountable. Three made predictions about their own students, two stating that most of their students would be able to pass the CAHSEE, and the third stating that most students would go on to fail the exit exam. Some representative comments are provided below.

- From a special education point of view, the teacher is very concerned about a mandated exit exam, particularly with not allowing accommodations.
- They probably should not hold the class of 2004 accountable on the CAHSEE. But in upcoming years, the students will be better prepared for the CAHSEE.
- The teacher thinks the school's RSP and SDC students will not be able to pass the CAHSEE when they get to high school. Students will have a better chance if CAHSEE allows accommodations, and students get a valid score.

Analysis of English Learner (EL) Teacher Interviews

Fifty-five interviews were coded as English Language Learner teacher interviews. Forty-two of the 55 were coded at the high school level (2 were alternative schools) and 13 at the middle-grade feeder school level.

Increasing Alignment to California Content Standards

How to integrate standards into EL curriculum

High schools

High school English Learner (EL) teachers indicated a variety of ways in which the California standards were integrated into the EL curriculum. Several mentioned the use of textbooks and other materials as a guide in using the standards. As these texts usually listed the standards associated with each chapter, teachers were able to remain focused on the standards simply through the use of a standards-aligned text. The majority of responses indicated in non-specific terms that the standards were used, stating that the curriculum was standards-aligned, or that the standards were incorporated into instruction. One alternative school teacher worked as part of a committee to align the curriculum with the California standards. A few of the more interesting responses are included below.

- The teacher uses quarterly writing rubrics based on CAHSEE rubrics.
- She was involved in groups that looked at regular standards and adapted them to levels that were doable for EL students. They worked from the California Content Standards and adapted them to create the EL standards so they are very close.
- The district deals with teacher consults and committees to map EL standards to California standards, and they are uniformly implemented across the district. Teachers are recording within courses what standards have been covered, and they are running end-of-unit tests to monitor progress.

Middle-grade feeder schools

Eleven of 13 middle-grade feeder school EL teachers stated that they used the California standards in their instruction. The standards were integrated into curriculum in a variety of ways, of few of which are listed below.

- We integrate the standards in all kinds of ways: decoding strategies, phonics programs, reading strategies, writing strategies, and WRITE program workshops. Kids have to keep a portfolio. They prepare a research report that requires that they discuss how they met each of the standards.
- The textbooks are standards aligned.
- The entire school is behind the effort by encouraging things like listing the standards on the boards in the classrooms and pointing them out to the students when they are being covered.

EL student population

High schools

Of the 32 high schools at which EL teachers were interviewed, 13 had an EL population of 10% or less. Four had between 11-20% EL students, 7 between 21-30% and 8 between 31-50%. It was interesting that one alternative school reported an EL population of only 1%.

Most of the respondents did not have their school's numbers broken out by level. In more than one case, schools were only able to work with a portion of the school's EL population, and sometimes with only those students at the lowest levels of English proficiency. A few comments about the numbers of EL students at a given level are presented below.

- The EL teacher can only work with approximately 20 students. There is only one period of EL per day offered to the most recent immigrants.
- Of the schools 240 EL students, only 40 receive services. Twenty-five of these students are level 1 and 15 are level 2.
- One-third of the student population is EL, but only 150-200 students are in the EL program.
- Fifty EL1 students, 60 EL2 students and 120 EL3 students.
- About 650 students are at level 1 or 2; about 150 are at levels 3 and 4.

Middle-grade feeder schools

Of the 10 middle-grade feeder schools at which EL teachers were interviewed, three had an EL population of 10% or less. Four has between 11-20% EL students, two between 31-50% EL students, and one had more than 50% EL students.

Again, middle-grade feeder school teachers didn't always have access to the distribution of EL students across the levels. Three respondents spoke of fairly evenly distributed student populations, while another noted that her school's EL population was made up of intermediate students. Some relevant comments are listed below.

- Our newcomer count is pretty low. Most kids are in the intermediate range.
- The lowest level has 20 students…the mid level has 18 students…the highest level has 20 students.

How many regular standards are covered?

High schools

Seven of the 26 EL teachers who responded to this question were able to give an estimate of their ability to cover the California Content Standards with their EL students. They stated that their EL courses covered the same standards as their general education counterparts. Five of the 26 stated that EL standards were the focus at the lower EL levels, with a movement to the regular standards in higher level EL courses. Two of these respondents noted that they make every effort to move their students into the higher EL levels as quickly as possible to assure they are exposed to the California standards. Other respondents mentioned various proportions of the standards that they thought they would be able to cover with their students. The following comments provide a good representation of the range of responses to this question about content coverage.

- Since she has grades 9 and 10 and standards are for 9th and 10th grade, she is planning to cover the same content during the year.
- They use the EL standards for levels 1 and 2. Levels 3 and 4 are standards based using the regular standards.
- EL1: 20%, EL2: 40%, EL3: 0%, EL4: 80% and EL5: 100%.
- The classes are ability grouped so there may be freshman and seniors in the same class. This causes some problems when addressing the California standards.

Middle-grade feeder schools

Four of the 13 middle-grade feeder school EL teachers were able to make an estimate of their ability to cover all of the necessary standards in their courses. The responses were varied from less than half to all of the content standards being covered. The four responses are listed here.

- We could cover maybe 30 to 40% well.
- EL teachers try to cover the same content standards but not at the same level.
- we cover probably 80%.
- I am able to teach the whole curriculum by the end of the school year.

Text/materials used and aligned with standards

High schools

Fourteen of 42 high school EL teachers mentioned using the High Point Series, published by Hampton-Brown. This textbook series was described by some as a "state adopted" book. One additional teacher mentioned that her school was looking at adopting High Point. Most teachers used a combination of textbooks, as well as supplemental materials. One alternative school teacher stated that she did not use a specific text at all. Fifteen of the 42 teachers stated that the materials they used were aligned with the California standards. A list of the texts mentioned appears below; texts mentioned by those who stated that they used standards-aligned material appear in italics.

- Practical English
- *English, Yes*
- *Connect with English*
- *High Point*
- *Making Connections*
- Voices in Literature
- *Intercom 2000*
- *Side by Side*
- *English-At Your Command*
- Themes for Today
- Voices in Literature
- Making Connections and English Across the Curriculum
- Writing to Express, Writing to Persuade
- Grammar Skills for Writers
- *Vistas*
- Introduction to Academic Writing
- Literature for Life
- World of Vocabulary

In addition to textbooks, most EL teachers used some other form of supplemental materials. Listed below are the supplemental materials mentioned by the teachers.

- Verb lists
- Sight word lists
- "Caught Reading"
- Pictures
- Worksheets
- "Pacemaker Classics"

- General Ed texts
- Current events
- Books on tape
- CAHSEE released test items
- Novels/plays/poems

One teacher noted that it was often difficult to match language-appropriate materials to a student's grade level.

- As many students have limited English language abilities, language-appropriate materials are often at a low academic level.

Middle-grade feeder schools

Seven of 13 middle-grade feeder school teachers mentioned use the High Point series published by Hampton Brown. Four teachers indicated that they used texts and other materials that were aligned to the standards. A list of the texts mentioned appears below.

- Timeless Voices, Timeless Themes
- Practice and Learn
- Decoding Strategies
- Writing for a Reason
- Voices and Literature
- Making Connections
- Accelerated Reader
- Language of Literature

Copies/use of California Content Standards

High schools

Eleven of 42 high school EL teachers stated they had copies of the California standards. Thirty-eight either said that they were familiar with the standards or mentioned that they used the standards in their instruction. Four teachers characterized themselves as aware of the standards. Six teachers mentioned standards-related professional development in which they had taken part. Two teachers indicated that they had worked as part of a committee to adapt the regular standards to the EL ability levels. Below are a few comments that represent the range of responses.

- She implements the standards in her course.
- EL teachers got together to look at the standards. The teachers use the standards but modified them slightly to meet the goals of each EL level. EL teachers have copies of the standards and use them "like a Bible."
- Teacher is aware of CAHSEE and tries to cover materials that will be needed for CAHSEE.
- Teachers are familiar and have copies in notebooks that they received two years ago. The notebook includes standards across the curriculum. They have received staff development on the various components included in the notebook.

Middle-grade feeder schools

Eleven of 13 middle-grade feeder school EL teachers stated that they used the standards in their instruction. However, not all middle-grade feeder school EL teachers were familiar with the CAHSEE blueprints. Some of their comments on using the standards are provided below.

- All of the areas of the standards are included in our curriculum outline, point by point. The curriculum guideline provides course guidelines and sequences of instruction.
- Instruction tracks standards closely but only covers about half of the EL standards.
- I'm not familiar with the CAHSEE standards, but I'm familiar with the EL standards.

Prediction/statement regarding 2004 exit exam requirement

High schools

Thirty-five high school EL teachers indicated that at least some portion of the class of 2004 had already passed or would be able to pass the CAHSEE. The following are a few comments made by teachers who were able to estimate the number of students who had passed/would pass the CAHSEE.

- I think the juniors are fine and have already passed it.
- Of her 60 students, she hopes all will take math in March, and she thinks 30 to 40% will pass.
- Thinks Class of 2004 students will all pass except EL special education students.
- The 2004 requirement will not present a roadblock for her students.

For the majority of high school EL teachers, CAHSEE accountability wasn't so much a class of 2004 issue as it was an EL-level issue. Twenty of 42 EL teachers noted that students who had been in the program since their 9th grade year would have a greater chance of passing the CAHSEE. These students would have had the time to advance to the higher EL levels—levels at which they would be more exposed to the California standards prior to taking the CAHSEE. Students who entered the school in higher grade levels, but at lower levels of English language proficiency, would not have as much time to prepare for the CAHSEE. Below are comments that address this issue.

- For EL 9th and 10th, they likely can pass if they start here as freshman (80%). Level 3 and 4, if they took it seriously, perhaps 50% could pass.
- The intermediate and advanced ELD will probably be okay. The beginning level will not pass.
- If a student comes to this school as a 9th grader, some of these students who progress through EL1 and EL2 and get into EL3 and EL4 may be able to pass.

Not all teachers were positive about any proportion of their students in the Class of 2004 passing the CAHSEE. The following comments illustrate how some of these teachers feel about EL student success on the CAHSEE and when to hold students accountable.

- None of the current juniors would pass the CAHSEE.
- I think the expectations are unrealistic.
- The Class of 2004 is not ready and will probably not pass, but she thinks the CAHSEE should be implemented now anyway. The 2005 and 2006 classes will be able to pass the CAHSEE.

- I don't know what will happen to students if the Class of 2004 is responsible for the CAHSEE. Many will not succeed.

Middle-grade feeder schools

Middle-grade feeder school EL teachers were fairly evenly split in terms of their predictions about the 2004 CAHSEE requirement. Four stated that their current students would probably not be able to pass the CAHSEE; three stated that their students should have no problems passing, and three stated that student success would depend on their current EL level and their ability to advance through the EL program before taking the CAHSEE. The comments below are representative of the range of responses.

- Her prediction is that the majority of her students will not pass the CAHSEE when they get to 10th grade based on where they are right now.
- She is confident that the majority of her students will pass it.
- If students are a strong level 2 in 8th grade, they should be able to pass the CAHSEE by the end of high school. If students are low 2 or 1, it is less likely they will pass, but it depends on their educational background and support at high school.

Targeted Programs for English Learners

How does teacher design test prep activities?

High schools

High school teachers mentioned several types of preparatory activities that were used in readying students for the CAHSEE, ranging from special programs to specific test-preparation activities. Some responses are listed below.

- An after-school program is in place for students with limited abilities.
- They use the Jean Schaeffer method.
- The teacher uses "Test Best" which is CAT9 aligned.
- The school has a summer program for reading and writing.
- Tutors explicitly help students prepare to pass the CAHSEE. For example, one item was looking at a telephone page and answering questions. The students wonder why they need to do this because they'd just go on the Internet or call 411 for help. The tutor is helping them to understand why it is important to know how to do things "the test way."

Some teachers mentioned using pre-packaged test preparation materials; others used released test items; and still others drew from a variety of sources to prepare students in specific areas, such as vocabulary. Activities were created/assembled by a single teacher, created/assembled at the school or department level, or distributed by the district. The following responses illustrate the variety of ways that test preparation activities were developed.

- She knows the topics on the exam, and she covers them in class prior to the exam.
- The teacher uses word lists provided by the English Department, sample CAHSEE items, and skeletons for essay writing.
- The district provides the Kaplan test preparation series for use in the classes.

- Departments are working with the blueprint. We are using "Word of the Day" in the district to carry across the curriculum.
- Aside from working on comprehension and increasing vocabulary and grammar skills in general, she does not specifically prepare students for the CAHSEE.

Middle-grade feeder schools

Though three middle-grade feeder school teachers stated that they were not familiar with the CAHSEE, several others were aware of its importance and had begun preparing their students for the test. Most of the preparatory activities mentioned were focused on test taking strategies and familiarizing students with the testing scenario, as these comments illustrate.

- She uses a book called Scoring High for reading and language. Many students have never had a standardized test and this really helps them understand the style of testing.
- The kids do STAR testing and the district conducts tests three times a year in core subjects.
- He starts them with the writing prompt (persuasion, literature) so they get used to seeing that every trimester.

Analysis of Special Program Teacher Interviews

Forty-two interviews were coded as special program teacher interviews. Of these, 37 were coded at the high school level (3 were from one alternative school) and 5 at the middle-grade feeder school level.

Increasing Alignment to California Content Standards

Is course/program using SBI?

High schools

Twenty of 37 high school special program teachers stated that they used the California standards within their program. The following comments provide good representation of teacher input.

- The program attempts to integrate the students' learning styles with the content standards.
- Initially, the course was more national standards, but they have been modified for the CAHSEE standards.
- Rating implementation on standards-based instruction: 3 on content, but 5 on feeling successful.
- One problem is that the program is not aligned with the California Content Standards.

Middle-grade feeder schools

Three of five middle-grade feeder school special program teachers stated that they used the California standards within their program. The remaining two teachers, however, did not mention the standards. Comments about the use of standards are provided below.

- We use the California Content Standards for reading, writing, and social studies. It is driven by the California Content Standards.
- The California Content Standards were used in developing the standards.
- The California standards are used for all English classes. Although this class is more skills based, we do use the standards.

Challenges in implementing program

High schools

High school special program teachers indicated a number of challenges faced by their program. Responses generally fell into student-level and school-level challenges, and are listed below:.

Student-level

- Getting students to understand their capabilities
- Parental support
- Transportation
- Absenteeism
- Drug use
- Low self-esteem
- Truancy
- Motivation
- Behavior problems

School-level

- Articulation between elementary, middle-grade feeder and high schools
- Students phased out of EL program too quickly
- Funding
- Lack of time to prepare students
- Staffing (not enough tutors)
- Large class sizes
- Inability to reach all students in need
- Lack of student preparation upon entering high school

Middle-grade feeder schools

Middle-grade feeder school respondents largely cited student level factors, most of which were mirrored in the high school responses, that presented challenges for their programs. In addition to the above-listed student level challenges, parental education and participation were also mentioned.

Texts/materials used and aligned with standards

High schools

Most high school special program teachers used a variety of textbooks and other materials.

Some texts mentioned

- Literature, Adapted Readers Companion, 2002, Prentice Hall
- High Point, Hampton Brown
- Algebra 1, 1997, Larsen
- Meeting California Challenges, 2002, Globe Fearon
- Key to Algebra, 1992, Key Press
- Literature of Life, 1998, South-West
- The Language of Literature, McDougal Littell
- Bridges to Literature, McDougal Littell

Other materials

- Language! by Sopras West
- America's Choice materials
- Boxer Math
- Jane Schaeffer writing method
- Newspaper/magazine articles
- Math Blaster
- Workbooks
- Computer programs
- Books on tape
- Accelerated Math
- CPM
- Scholastic Read 180
- Kaplan softbound text
- Smartel

Though most teachers did not make statements as to whether these texts and other materials were aligned to the California standards, several did reiterate the point that they put the standards to use in their programs, as these statements illustrate.

- Boxer can tell you all of the state standards, and it tells you what units cover those standards.
- They use a real variety of materials, but look at the standards to show mastery.
- She uses practice tests linked to the CAHSEE standards developed by William K. Bradford Publishing Company.
- The standards are written on the board.

Middle-grade feeder schools

Two of the five middle-grade feeder school special program teachers stated that the texts used in their programs were aligned to the standards. Of the remaining three, one used content reading articles; another used a program called Literacy for Success; and the third used a Holt text.

What proportion are likely to pass the CAHSEE?

High schools

Ten respondents made general comments about the difficulty that they expected students to have with the exam. Thirteen were able to give proportions, five of which stated that less than one quarter would pass, four others estimating about one half, and four estimating 75 to 90%. Two stated that students would pass depending on their levels of participation or ability level. The following comments provide a good representation of teachers' comments.

- It will be very difficult for the students in this program to pass the CAHSEE.
- Students have little chance of reaching CAHSEE level competence.
- Twenty-five percent of the students have the potential to pass due to maturing.
- Probably 50% of my students can pass the CAHSEE.
- If current students remain in the program for the whole year and a half, the coordinator hopes that approximately 80% will pass.
- In total, 90% will pass the exam.
- Those students coming to their school at an earlier age have a greater potential to pass, simply by being in the system longer. (alternative school)

Prediction/statement regarding 2004 exit exam requirement

Fourteen special program teachers expressed their opinion regarding holding the class of 2004 accountable to the CAHSEE. Five expressed that accountability should be delayed while nine thought that the 2004 date should be maintained. A few representative comments are provided below.

- The Class of 2008 would be more appropriate for accountability.
- The state needs to allow more time for a cycle of results of class-size reduction.
- The exit exam should perhaps go ahead and keep on schedule with some conditions.
- They should definitely follow through with the 2004 date.
- The Class of 2004 should be held responsible for CAHSEE as a graduation requirement.

Special Programs Targeting Remediation

Course/program description

High school

Depending on whether the program was structured as a single course, a before- or after-school program, or multiple courses, program length tended to vary. Twenty-three programs were structured as a single course that met during the school day; one course met during a seventh after-school period. Eight other programs were conducted before or after regular school hours. Five programs were organized as "schools within schools"—with multiple courses and/or multiple years. Some examples of program descriptions appear below.

- Advanced Linguistics is a scheduled full year class for low performing readers.
- The class meets as a regular class on a block schedule for two hours.
- The tutoring program is a 4-week program and students can enroll for before or after school.
- Students may be in the program during one, two or three class periods.

Programs that were organized as a single course tended to last one semester or one school year. Before/after school programs varied between a few weeks and an entire school year. Multiple course programs might last a year or more. Some responses are provided here.

- This is an entire semester course.
- There are several sections of Language Skills. The program lasts the entire year.
- Students attend 4 days a week for 1 hour and 15 minutes. They are supposed to remain for the entire year.
- The Language! Program takes 2-3 years to complete.

Program sizes range anywhere from 10 to 300 student participants. Schools serving a larger population of students might have several sections of an intervention course, each serving 20 or more students. Programs that were organized as a course were typically taken for elective credit.

Middle-grade feeder schools

Three of the five middle-grade feeder school special program teacher respondents described their programs as a course, meeting for one period per day or as a two-period block. The two other special programs were organized more as a school within a school program, with students meeting several periods each day. Middle-grade feeder school programs served between 16 and 100 students. Three of the five programs served around 40 students.

How students are placed in remediation

High schools

Twenty-two high school special program teachers mentioned that student performance on standardized and other tests (SAT9, CATS6, Myers Briggs, Bader Reading and Language Inventory) was used to target students for special programs. Additional methods of targeting are listed below.

- Grades
- Attendance records

- Behavior
- Teacher/counselor referrals
- Parent/student requests
- Administrative decisions

Sixteen teachers identified their programs as required for students, while 12 stated that student participation was voluntary. Some representative comments are listed below.

- It is really required since students are just placed there.
- The program is required if they meet the screening criteria.
- The after-school tutoring is optional.
- It is voluntary; you can't require enrollment.

Middle-grade feeder schools

All five of the middle-grade feeder school special program teachers stated that standardized tests were used to target students for their program. In addition to standardized test scores, the following were used as a means of targeting students for service: grade point average, teacher/counselor recommendation, reading difficulties, and academic history.

Demographic cross-sectional participation

High schools

Twelve high school special program teachers stated that their program served a group that was representative of their school's general population, while seven said that their programs served primarily Hispanics or English Learners (EL). One stated that his program was mostly lower performing students; another program served predominantly males, and three alternative school teachers reported they had a large special education population.

- They have a range of students: special education, EL and native English speakers.
- No noticeable difference between class make-up and overall student population.
- In each classroom, there is a wide variety of students. However, within the program as a whole, there is a large population of transient Hispanics.
- A cross section should come, but Latinos seem to come more than African Americans.

Middle-grade feeder schools

One middle-grade feeder school special program was described as "ethnically represented" and "economically represented." Three teachers described their programs as largely for Hispanic students, and one noted that her program included special education students.

Method to measure program's success

High schools

Teachers were asked if the school had been able to measure the programs' success. Six high school special program teachers indicated that no evaluation had been conducted, usually because their programs were so new. Evaluation tools that were being used by some schools are listed below.

- Student growth charts
- Pre-and post-tests
- In-class tests
- Standardized tests
- Student self-assessments
- Parent surveys
- Observation
- In-class assignments
- Grades
- Student feedback
- CASAS exam (Comprehensive Adult Student Assessment System)

Middle-grade feeder schools

Two of the five middle-grade feeder school special programs used pre and post-tests as tools for program evaluation. Two programs did not have an evaluation component in place yet. Finally, one program was described as using “a lot of qualitative testing in reading.”