FR-05-43

HumRRO

Human Resources Research Organization

Independent Evaluation of the California High School Exit Examination (CAHSEE): 2005 Evaluation Report—Appendices E Through H

Volume 3

Lauress L. Wise
D. E. (Sunny) Becker
Carolyn DeMeyer Harris
Leslie R. Taylor
Christopher J. Johnstone [National Center for Educational Outcomes]
Nicole A. Miller [National Center for Educational Outcomes]
Sandra J. Thompson [National Center for Educational Outcomes]
Shaobang Sun
Xuejun Shen
Felicia L. Butler
Xiaolei Wang
Lisa E. Koger
Robin Moody
Richard Deatz
Milton Koger
Emily Dickinson
Sally Gensberg [Professional Management and Evaluation Services, Inc.]
Robert A. Hilton
Nelson L. Kelley
Christine Stevens

Prepared for: **California Department of Education**
Sacramento, CA
Contract Number: 00-07

September 30, 2005

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

Volume 3 – Appendices E Through H

Table of Contents

Appendix E: Survey Questionnaire Response Frequencies E-1
District Mathematics Curriculum Head Survey: Frequency Distributions E-24
High School Principal Survey: Frequency Distributions E-53
High School Department Head—ELA, Part 1 Survey: Frequency Distributions E-62
High School Department Head—Mathematics, Part 1 Survey: Frequency Distributions E-95
High School Teacher, Part 2 Survey: Frequency Distributions E-131
Feeder/Middle School Principal Survey: Frequency Distributions E-161
Feeder/Middle School Department Head/Lead Teacher—ELA, Part 1 Survey: Frequency Distributions E-171
Feeder/Middle School Department Head/Lead Teacher—Mathematics, Part 1 Survey: Frequency Distributions E-191
Feeder/Middle School Teacher, Part 2 Survey: Frequency Distributions E-217

Appendix F: Summary of Interview Responses F-1
Demographics F-1
Results F-1
Common Question 1A-1C GMGE, Admin, SP, (EL Question 2A-2C), SP-C F-1
Common Question 2A-2D GMGE, Admin (also 2E), SP, (EL Question 3A-3D) F-11
Common Question 3 GMGE, Admin, SP, (EL Question 4), (SP-C Question 2) F-20
Common Question 4 GMGE, Admin, SP, (EL Question 5), (SP-C Question 3) F-24
Common Question 5A-5C GMGE, (Admin 5), (SP 5A,B), (EL 6A,B), (SP-C 4A,B) F-32
Common Question 6A, B GMGE, (Admin 6A only), (SP 6), (EL 7A, C), (SP-C 5A, C) F-45
Unique Question GMGE 7A-7B F-51
Unique Question Admin 7A, 7B F-52
Unique Question GMGE 8A-8B F-53
Common Question (Admin 8), (SP-C 6) F-55
Common Question (SP 8A, B), (EL 9A, B) F-56
Unique Question EL 8A, 8B F-57
Unique Question Admin 8D-8F F-58
Common Question 9A-9B GMGE, (SP 7), (EL 10) F-59
Common Question (SP 9B), (EL 11B) F-62
Common Question 10A-10C GMGE, (Admin 7C), (SP 9A, C), (11A, C) F-63
Common Question (SP 10A, B), (EL 12A, B) F-72
Unique Question GMGE Q11A and B F-74
Common Question 12A-D, 13A-D GMGE, (Admin 9A-D, 10A-D), (SP 11A-D), (EL13A-13D), (SP-C 7A-D) F-77
Common Question 14A, B GMGE, (Admin 11A, B) F-95
Common Question 15A, B GMGE, (Admin 12A, B), (SP 12A, B), (EL 14A, B), (SP-C 8A, B) F-99
Common Question 16A-C GMGE, (Admin 13A-C) F-107

Table of Contents (Continued)

Common Question 17A-C GMGE, (Admin 14A-C), (SP 13A-C), (EL 15A-C), (SP-C 9A-C) F-112
Common Question 18A, B GMGE, (Admin 15A, B), (SP 13A, B), (EL 16A, B), (SP-C 10A, B) F-122
High School Summaries F-133
School #01 ..... F-134
School #02 ..... F-136
School #03 ..... F-138
School #04 ..... F-141
School #05 ..... F-143
School #06 ..... F-145
School #07 ..... F-147
School #08 ..... F-149
School #09 ..... F-151
School #10 ..... F-154
School #11 ..... F-156
School #12 ..... F-158
School #13 ..... F-160
School #14 ..... F-162
School #15 ..... F-164
School #16 ..... F-167
School #17 ..... F-170
School #18 ..... F-172
School #19 ..... F-175
School #20 ..... F-177
School #21 ..... F-179
School #22 ..... F-181
School #23 ..... F-183
School #24 ..... F-185
School #25 ..... F-187
School #26 ..... F-189
School #27 ..... F-191
School #28 ..... F-193
School #29 ..... F-195
School #30 ..... F-197
School #31 ..... F-199
School #32 ..... F-201
School #33 ..... F-204
School #34 ..... F-206
School #35 ..... F-208
School #36 ..... F-210
School #37 ..... F-213
School #38 ..... F-215
School #39 ..... F-217
School #40 ..... F-219

Table of Contents (Continued)

School #41 ..... F-221
School #42 ..... F-223
School #43 ..... F-225
School #44 ..... F-227
School #45 ..... F-229
School #46 ..... F-231
School #47 ..... F-233

Appendix G: District Executive Summaries G-1
CAHSEE 2005 Instruction Study Executive Summary Guidelines G-1
District Executive Summaries—Content Analysis G-3
Awareness G-3
Curriculum Validity G-4
Instructional Validity G-5
Student Remediation G-8
District Executive Summaries G-11
District Executive Summary #1 ..... G-13
District Executive Summary #2 ..... G-15
District Executive Summary #3 ..... G-17
District Executive Summary #4 ..... G-19
District Executive Summary #5 ..... G-21
District Executive Summary #6 ..... G-23
District Executive Summary #7 ..... G-25
District Executive Summary #8 ..... G-27
District Executive Summary #9 ..... G-29
District Executive Summary #10 ..... G-31
District Executive Summary #11 ..... G-33
District Executive Summary #12 ..... G-35
District Executive Summary #13 ..... G-37
District Executive Summary #14 ..... G-39
District Executive Summary #15 ..... G-41
District Executive Summary #16 ..... G-43
District Executive Summary #17 ..... G-45
District Executive Summary #18 ..... G-47
District Executive Summary #19 ..... G-49
District Executive Summary #20 ..... G-51
District Executive Summary #21 ..... G-53
District Executive Summary #22 ..... G-55
District Executive Summary #23 ..... G-57
District Executive Summary #24 ..... G-59
District Executive Summary #25 ..... G-61
District Executive Summary #26 ..... G-63
District Executive Summary #27 ..... G-65
District Executive Summary #28 ..... G-67
District Executive Summary #29 ..... G-69
District Executive Summary #30 ..... G-71

Table of Contents (Continued)

District Executive Summary #31 ..... G-73
District Executive Summary #32 ..... G-75
District Executive Summary #33 ..... G-77
District Executive Summary #34 ..... G-79
District Executive Summary #35 ..... G-81
District Executive Summary #36 ..... G-83
District Executive Summary #37 ..... G-85
District Executive Summary #38 ..... G-87
District Executive Summary #39 ..... G-89
District Executive Summary #40 ..... G-91
District Executive Summary #41 ..... G-93
District Executive Summary #42 ..... G-95
District Executive Summary #43 ..... G-97
District Executive Summary #44 ..... G-99
District Executive Summary #45 ..... G-101
District Executive Summary #46 ..... G-103
District Executive Summary #47 ..... G-105
District Executive Summary #48 ..... G-107
District Executive Summary #49 ..... G-109
District Executive Summary #50 ..... G-117
District Executive Summary #51 ..... G-119
District Executive Summary #52 ..... G-121
District Executive Summary #53 ..... G-123
District Executive Summary #54 ..... G-125
District Executive Summary #55 ..... G-127
District Executive Summary #56 ..... G-129
District Executive Summary #57 ..... G-131
District Executive Summary #58 ..... G-133
District Executive Summary #59 ..... G-135
District Executive Summary #60 ..... G-137
District Executive Summary #61 ..... G-139
District Executive Summary #62 ..... G-141
District Executive Summary #63 ..... G-143
District Executive Summary #64 ..... G-145
District Executive Summary #65 ..... G-147
District Executive Summary #66 ..... G-149
District Executive Summary #67 ..... G-151
District Executive Summary #68 ..... G-153
District Executive Summary #69 ..... G-155
District Executive Summary #70 ..... G-157
District Executive Summary #71 ..... G-159
District Executive Summary #72 ..... G-161
District Executive Summary #73 ..... G-163
District Executive Summary #74 ..... G-165
District Executive Summary #75 ..... G-167

Table of Contents (Continued)

District Executive Summary #76 ..... G-169
District Executive Summary #77 ..... G-171
District Executive Summary #78 ..... G-173
District Executive Summary #79 ..... G-175
District Executive Summary #80 ..... G-177
District Executive Summary #81 ..... G-179
District Executive Summary #82 ..... G-181
District Executive Summary #83 ..... G-183
District Executive Summary #84 ..... G-185
District Executive Summary #85 ..... G-187
District Executive Summary #86 ..... G-189
District Executive Summary #87 ..... G-191
District Executive Summary #88 ..... G-193
District Executive Summary #89 ..... G-195
District Executive Summary #90 ..... G-197
District Executive Summary #91 ..... G-199
District Executive Summary #92 ..... G-201
District Executive Summary #93 ..... G-203
District Executive Summary #94 ..... G-205
District Executive Summary #95 ..... G-207
District Executive Summary #96 ..... G-209
District Executive Summary #97 ..... G-211
District Executive Summary #98 ..... G-213
District Executive Summary #99 ..... G-215
District Executive Summary #100 ..... G-217
District Executive Summary #101 ..... G-219
District Executive Summary #102 ..... G-221
District Executive Summary #103 ..... G-223
District Executive Summary #104 ..... G-225

Appendix H: Students' Responses on the Student Questionnaire H-1
Question 1 ..... H-1
Question 2 ..... H-4
Question 3 ..... H-7
Question 4 ..... H-10
Question 5 ..... H-13
Question 6 ..... H-16
Question 7 ..... H-19
Question 8 ..... H-22
Question 9 ..... H-25
Question 10 ..... H-28
Question 11 ..... H-31
Question 12 ..... H-34

Table of Contents (Continued)

List of Tables

Table E.1. Proportion of High Schools in Districts That Offer English 9 as Primary or Supplemental Course During Current Academic Year [1] E-1
Table E.2. Proportion of High Schools in Districts That Offer English 10 as Primary or Supplemental Course During Current Academic Year [1] E-1
Table E.3. Proportion of High Schools in Districts That Offer English 11 as Primary or Supplemental Course During Current Academic Year [1] E-1
Table E.4. Proportion of High Schools in Districts That Offer English 12 as Primary or Supplemental Course During Current Academic Year [1] E-2
Table E.5. Proportion of High Schools in Districts That Offer English Literature as Primary or Supplemental Course During Current Academic Year [1] E-2
Table E.6. Proportion of High Schools in Districts That Offer World/Other Literature as Primary or Supplemental Course During Current Academic Year [1] E-3
Table E.7. Proportion of High Schools in Districts That Offer Composition as Primary or Supplemental Course During Current Academic Year [1] E-3
Table E.8. Proportion of High Schools in Districts That Offer Language Structure/Language Arts as Primary or Supplemental Course During Current Academic Year [1] E-4
Table E.9. Proportion of High Schools in Districts That Offer English as a Second Language as Primary or Supplemental Course During Current Academic Year [1] E-4
Table E.10. Proportion of High Schools in Districts That Offer Developmental Reading as Primary or Supplemental Course During Current Academic Year [1] E-5
Table E.11. District ELA Curriculum Head Reported Offering These Other High School ELA Primary or Supplemental Courses [1] E-5
Table E.12. Proportion of Feeder Schools in Districts That Offer English 6 as Primary or Supplemental Course During Current Academic Year [2] E-6
Table E.13. Proportion of Feeder Schools in Districts That Offer English 7 as Primary or Supplemental Course During Current Academic Year [2] E-7
Table E.14. Proportion of Feeder Schools in Districts That Offer English 8 as Primary or Supplemental Course During Current Academic Year [2] E-7
Table E.15. Proportion of Feeder Schools in Districts That Offer English 9 as Primary or Supplemental Course During Current Academic Year [2] E-7
Table E.16. Proportion of Feeder Schools in Districts That Offer English as a Second Language as Primary or Supplemental Course During Current Academic Year [2] E-8
Table E.17. Proportion of Feeder Schools in Districts That Offer Language Structure/Language Arts as Primary or Supplemental Course During Current Academic Year [2] E-8
Table E.18. District ELA Curriculum Head Reported Offering These Other Feeder Middle School ELA Primary or Supplemental Courses [2] E-9
Table E.19. Proportion of High Schools in Districts That Offer Houghton Mifflin Reading: A Legacy of Literacy as an Intervention or Basic Program During Current Academic Year [3] E-9

Table of Contents (Continued)

Table E.20. Proportion of High Schools in Districts That Offer SRA/Open Court Reading as an Intervention or Basic Program During Current Academic Year [3] E-10
Table E.21. Proportion of High Schools in Districts That Offer The Reader's Choice as an Intervention or Basic Program During Current Academic Year [3] E-10
Table E.22. Proportion of High Schools in Districts That Offer Literature and Language as an Intervention or Basic Program During Current Academic Year [3] E-11
Table E.23. Proportion of High Schools in Districts That Offer McDougal Littell Reading & Language Arts Program as an Intervention or Basic Program During Current Academic Year [3] E-11
Table E.24. Proportion of High Schools in Districts That Offer Prentice Hall Literature: Timeless Voices, Timeless Themes as an Intervention or Basic Program During Current Academic Year [3] E-12
Table E.25. Proportion of High Schools in Districts That Offer Language! as an Intervention or Basic Program During Current Academic Year [3] E-12
Table E.26. Proportion of High Schools in Districts That Offer High Point as an Intervention or Basic Program During Current Academic Year [3] E-13
Table E.27. Proportion of High Schools in Districts That Offer High Point for English Learners as an Intervention or Basic Program During Current Academic Year [3] E-13
Table E.28. Proportion of High Schools in Districts That Offer READ 180 as an Intervention or Basic Program During Current Academic Year [3] E-14
Table E.29. Proportion of High Schools in Districts That Offer SRA/Reach Program as an Intervention or Basic Program During Current Academic Year [3] E-14
Table E.30. Proportion of High Schools in Districts That Offer Fast Track Reading Program as an Intervention or Basic Program During Current Academic Year [3] E-14
Table E.31. District ELA Curriculum Head Reported Offering These Other Intervention or Basic Programs [3] E-15
Table E.32. Proportion of Feeder Schools in Districts That Offer Houghton Mifflin Reading: A Legacy of Literacy as an Intervention or Basic Program During Current Academic Year [3] E-15
Table E.33. Proportion of Feeder Schools in Districts That Offer SRA/Open Court Reading as an Intervention or Basic Program During Current Academic Year [3] E-16
Table E.34. Proportion of Feeder Schools in Districts That Offer The Reader's Choice as an Intervention or Basic Program During Current Academic Year [3] E-16
Table E.35. Proportion of Feeder Schools in Districts That Offer Literature and Language as an Intervention or Basic Program During Current Academic Year [3] E-16
Table E.36. Proportion of Feeder Schools in Districts That Offer McDougal Littell Reading & Language Arts Program as an Intervention or Basic Program During Current Academic Year [3] E-17
Table E.37. Proportion of Feeder Schools in Districts That Offer Prentice Hall Literature: Timeless Voices, Timeless Themes as an Intervention or Basic Program During Current Academic Year [3] E-17
Table E.38. Proportion of Feeder Schools in Districts That Offer Language! as an Intervention or Basic Program During Current Academic Year [3] E-18
Table E.39. Proportion of Feeder Schools in Districts That Offer High Point as an Intervention or Basic Program During Current Academic Year [3] E-18

Table of Contents (Continued)

Table E.40. Proportion of Feeder Schools in Districts That Offer High Point for English Learners as an Intervention or Basic Program During Current Academic Year [3] E-19
Table E.41. Proportion of Feeder Schools in Districts That Offer READ 180 as an Intervention or Basic Program During Current Academic Year [3] E-19
Table E.42. Proportion of Feeder Schools in Districts That Offer SRA/Reach Program as an Intervention or Basic Program During Current Academic Year [3] E-20
Table E.43. Proportion of Feeder Schools in Districts That Offer Fast Track Reading Program as an Intervention or Basic Program During Current Academic Year [3] E-20
Table E.44. Proportion of Students Who Did Not Pass ELA Portion of CASHEE by Spring 2004 and Subsequently Enrolled in Remedial Summer Program [4] E-21
Table E.45. Proportion of Students in ELA-Related Summer School Who Passed ELA Portion of CASHEE in July or September 2004 [5] E-21
Table E.46. Percentage of All Students in Grades 6–10 Who Receive ELA Instruction from Teachers With ELA Credential [6] E-22
Table E.47. Percentage of English Learner Students in Grades 6–10 Who Receive ELA Instruction from Teachers With ELA Credential [6] E-22
Table E.48. Percentage of Students Receiving Special Education Services in Grades 6–10 Who Receive ELA Instruction from Teachers With ELA Credential [6] E-23
Table E.49. Percentage of Students With IEPs in Grades 6–10 Who Receive ELA Instruction from Teachers With ELA Credential [6] E-23
Table E.50. Proportion of High Schools in Districts That Offer General Math as Primary or Supplemental Course During Current Academic Year [1] E-24
Table E.51. Proportion of High Schools in Districts That Offer Math A as Primary or Supplemental Course During Current Academic Year [1] E-24
Table E.52. Proportion of High Schools in Districts That Offer Math B as Primary or Supplemental Course During Current Academic Year [1] E-25
Table E.53. Proportion of High Schools in Districts That Offer Pre-Algebra as Primary or Supplemental Course During Current Academic Year [1] E-25
Table E.54. Proportion of High Schools in Districts That Offer Beginning Algebra as Primary or Supplemental Course During Current Academic Year [1] E-26
Table E.55. Proportion of High Schools in Districts That Offer Intermediate Algebra as Primary or Supplemental Course During Current Academic Year [1] E-26
Table E.56. Proportion of High Schools in Districts That Offer Beginning Algebra Part I as Primary or Supplemental Course During Current Academic Year [1] E-27
Table E.57. Proportion of High Schools in Districts That Offer Beginning Algebra Part II as Primary or Supplemental Course During Current Academic Year [1] E-27
Table E.58. Proportion of High Schools in Districts That Offer Integrated Math I as Primary or Supplemental Course During Current Academic Year [1] E-28
Table E.59. Proportion of High Schools in Districts That Offer Integrated Math II as Primary or Supplemental Course During Current Academic Year [1] E-28
Table E.60. Proportion of High Schools in Districts That Offer Consumer Math as Primary or Supplemental Course During Current Academic Year [1] E-29
Table E.61. Proportion of High Schools in Districts That Offer Remedial Math as Primary or Supplemental Course During Current Academic Year [1] E-29

Table of Contents (Continued)

Table E.62. District Math Curriculum Head Reported Offering These Other High School Math Primary or Supplemental Courses [1] E-30
Table E.63. Proportion of Feeder Schools in Districts That Offer General Math as Primary or Supplemental Course During Current Academic Year [2]....E-31
Table E.64. Proportion of Feeder Schools in Districts That Offer Pre-Algebra as Primary or Supplemental Course During Current Academic Year [2]....E-32
Table E.65. Proportion of Feeder Schools in Districts That Offer Beginning Algebra as Primary or Supplemental Course During Current Academic Year [2]....E-32
Table E.66. Proportion of Feeder Schools in Districts That Offer Beginning Algebra Part I as Primary or Supplemental Course During Current Academic Year [2] E-33
Table E.67. Proportion of Feeder Schools in Districts That Offer Beginning Algebra Part II as Primary or Supplemental Course During Current Academic Year [2] E-33
Table E.68. Proportion of Feeder Schools in Districts That Offer Integrated Math I as Primary or Supplemental Course During Current Academic Year [2]....E-34
Table E.69. Proportion of Feeder Schools in Districts That Offer Integrated Math II as Primary or Supplemental Course During Current Academic Year [2]....E-34
Table E.70. Proportion of Feeder Schools in Districts That Offer Math A as Primary or Supplemental Course During Current Academic Year [2] E-35
Table E.71. Proportion of Feeder Schools in Districts That Offer Math B as Primary or Supplemental Course During Current Academic Year [2] E-35
Table E.72. District Math Curriculum Head Reported Offering These Other Feeder Middle School Math Primary or Supplemental Courses [2] E-35
Table E.73. Proportion of High Schools in Districts That Offer Success with Mathcoach Intervention or Basic Program During Current Academic Year [3] E-36
Table E.74. Proportion of High Schools in Districts That Offer Harcourt Math @ 2002 as an Intervention or Basic Program During Current Academic Year [3] E-36
Table E.75. Proportion of High Schools in Districts That Offer Mathematics by Houghton Mifflin as an Intervention or Basic Program During Current Academic Year [3] E-37
Table E.76. Proportion of High Schools in Districts That Offer Concepts and Skills as an Intervention or Basic Program During Current Academic Year [3] E-37
Table E.77. Proportion of High Schools in Districts That Offer Structure and Method as an Intervention or Basic Program During Current Academic Year [3] E-38
Table E.78. Proportion of High Schools in Districts That Offer McGraw-Hill Mathematics as an Intervention or Basic Program During Current Academic Year [3] E-38
Table E.79. Proportion of High Schools in Districts That Offer Prentice Hall Pre-Algebra as an Intervention or Basic Program During Current Academic Year [3]....E-39
Table E.80. Proportion of High Schools in Districts That Offer Prentice Hall Algebra 1 as an Intervention or Basic Program During Current Academic Year [3] E-39
Table E.81. Proportion of High Schools in Districts That Offer Progress in Mathematics as an Intervention or Basic Program During Current Academic Year [3] E-40

Table of Contents (Continued)

Table E.82. Proportion of High Schools in Districts That Offer Saxon Math K–3, An Incremental Development as an Intervention or Basic Program During Current Academic Year [3] E-40
Table E.83. Proportion of High Schools in Districts That Offer Math 54, 65, 76, and 87 as an Intervention or Basic Program During Current Academic Year [3] E-41
Table E.84. Proportion of High Schools in Districts That Offer Scott Foresman CA Mathematics as an Intervention or Basic Program During Current Academic Year [3] E-41
Table E.85. District Math Curriculum Head Reported Offering These Other Intervention or Basic Programs [3] E-41
Table E.86. Percentage of Feeder Schools in Districts That Offer Success with Mathcoach as an Intervention or Basic Program During Current Academic Year [3]....E-43
Table E.87. Percentage of Feeder Schools in Districts That Offer Harcourt Math @ 2002 as an Intervention or Basic Program During Current Academic Year [3] E-43
Table E.88. Percentage of Feeder Schools in Districts That Offer Mathematics by Houghton Mifflin as an Intervention or Basic Program During Current Academic Year [3] E-44
Table E.89. Percentage of Feeder Schools in Districts That Offer Concepts and Skills as an Intervention or Basic Program During Current Academic Year [3] E-44
Table E.90. Percentage of Feeder Schools in Districts That Offer Structure and Method as an Intervention or Basic Program During Current Academic Year [3] E-45
Table E.91. Percentage of Feeder Schools in Districts That Offer McGraw-Hill Mathematics as an Intervention or Basic Program During Current Academic Year [3] E-45
Table E.92. Percentage of Feeder Schools in Districts That Offer Prentice Hall Pre-Algebra as an Intervention or Basic Program During Current Academic Year [3]....E-46
Table E.93. Percentage of Feeder Schools in Districts That Offer Prentice Hall Algebra 1 as an Intervention or Basic Program During Current Academic Year [3]....E-46
Table E.94. Percentage of Feeder Schools in Districts That Offer Progress in Mathematics as an Intervention or Basic Program During Current Academic Year [3] E-47
Table E.95. Percentage of Feeder Schools in Districts That Offer Saxon Math K–3, An Incremental Development as an Intervention or Basic Program During Current Academic Year [3] E-47
Table E.96. Percentage of Feeder Schools in Districts That Offer Math 54, 65, 76, and 87 as an Intervention or Basic Program During Current Academic Year [3] E-48
Table E.97. Percentage of Feeder Schools in Districts That Offer Scott Foresman CA Mathematics as an Intervention or Basic Program During Current Academic Year [3] E-48
Table E.98. Proportion of Students Who Did Not Pass Math Portion of CAHSEE by Spring 2004 and Subsequently Enrolled in Remedial Summer Program [4]....E-49
Table E.99. Proportion of Students in Math-Related Summer School Who Passed Math Portion of CAHSEE in July or September 2004 [5]....E-49
Table E.100. Percentage of All Students in Grades 6–10 Who Receive Math Instruction from Teachers With Math Credential [6]....E-50

Table of Contents (Continued)

Table E.101. Percentage of English Learner Students in Grades 6–10 Who Receive Math Instruction from Teachers With Math Credential [6] E-50
Table E.102. Percentage of Students Receiving Special Education Services in Grades 6–10 Who Receive Math Instruction from Teachers With Math Credential [6] E-51
Table E.103. Percentage of Students With IEPs in Grades 6–10 Who Receive Math Instruction from Teachers With Math Credential [6] E-52
Table E.104. High School Principals Reported Proportion (Projected) of Content Standards in CAHSEE ELA Blueprint Covered in 2004–2005 [1] E-53
Table E.105. High School Principals Reported Proportion of Content Standards in CAHSEE ELA Blueprint Covered in 2003–2004 [1] E-53
Table E.106. High School Principals Reported Proportion of Content Standards in CAHSEE ELA Blueprint Covered in 2002–2003 [1] E-54
Table E.107. High School Principals Reported Proportion of Content Standards in CAHSEE ELA Blueprint Covered Before 2002 [1] E-54
Table E.108. High School Principals Reported Proportion (Projected) of Content Standards in CAHSEE Mathematics Blueprint Covered in 2004–2005 [2] E-55
Table E.109. High School Principals Reported Proportion of Content Standards in CAHSEE Mathematics Blueprint Covered in 2003–2004 [2] E-55
Table E.110. High School Principals Reported Proportion of Content Standards in CAHSEE Mathematics Blueprint Covered in 2002–2003 [2] E-56
Table E.111. High School Principals Reported Proportion of Content Standards in CAHSEE Mathematics Blueprint Covered Before 2002 [2] E-56
Table E.112. Proportion of High School Teachers Who Participated in ELA-Related Professional Development to Teach Content Standards Associated With CAHSEE [3] E-57
Table E.113. Proportion of High School Teachers Who Participated in Math-Related Professional Development to Teach Content Standards Associated With CAHSEE [4] E-57
Table E.114. Percentage of High School Principals Who Reported Using District-Based Tracking System to Monitor and Report Student Proficiency on Content Standards [5] E-57
Table E.115. Percentage of High School Principals Who Reported Using School-Based Tracking System to Monitor and Report Student Proficiency on Content Standards [5] E-58
Table E.116. Percentage of High School Principals Who Reported Using Department-Based (ELA or Math) Tracking System to Monitor and Report Student Proficiency on Content Standards [5] E-58
Table E.117. Percentage of High School Principals Who Reported That Individual Teachers Keep Track of Student Mastery of Content Standards [5] E-58
Table E.118. Percentage of High School Principals Who Reported Using Some Other System to Monitor and Report Student Proficiency on Content Standards [5] E-59
Table E.119. Percentage of High School Principals Who Reported Using No Tracking System to Monitor and Report Student Proficiency on Content Standards [5] E-59

Table of Contents (Continued)

Table E.120. Percentage of High School Principals Who Reported Coordination Between Feeder and High School on Coverage of Content Standards Associated With CAHSEE [6] E-59
Table E.121. Percentage of High School Principals Who Reported Coordination Between Special and General Education on Coverage of Content Standards Associated With CAHSEE [6] E-60
Table E.122. Percentage of High School Principals Who Reported Coordination Between English Language Development and General Education on Coverage of Content Standards Associated With CAHSEE [6] E-60
Table E.123. Percentage of High School Principals Who Reported Coordination Between Alternative (Continuation) and General Education on Coverage of Content Standards Associated With CAHSEE [6] E-60
Table E.124. Percentage of High School Principals Who Reported Regular Articulation Meetings With Feeder Middle Schools [7] E-61
Table E.125. Percentage of High School Principals Who Reported Importance of Regular Articulation Meetings With Feeder Middle Schools in Preparing Students for Success on CAHSEE [8] E-61
Table E.126. Percentage of High School ELA Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year English 9 Offered as Primary or Supplemental Course E-62
Table E.127. Percentage of High School ELA Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year English 10 Offered as Primary or Supplemental Course E-62
Table E.128. Percentage of High School ELA Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year English 11 Offered as Primary or Supplemental Course E-62
Table E.129. Percentage of High School ELA Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year English 12 Offered as Primary or Supplemental Course E-63
Table E.130. Percentage of High School ELA Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year English Literature Offered as Primary or Supplemental Course E-63
Table E.131. Percentage of High School ELA Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year World/Other Literature Offered as Primary or Supplemental Course E-63
Table E.132. Percentage of High School ELA Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year Composition Offered as Primary or Supplemental Course E-64
Table E.133. Percentage of High School ELA Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year Language Structure/Language Arts Offered as Primary or Supplemental Course E-64
Table E.134. Percentage of High School ELA Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year English as a Second Language Offered as Primary or Supplemental Course E-64
Table E.135. Percentage of High School ELA Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year Developmental Reading Offered as Primary or Supplemental Course E-65
Table E.136. High School ELA Curriculum Head Reported Offering These Other ELA Primary or Supplemental Courses E-65

Table of Contents (Continued)

Table E.137. Frequency of Number of Sections of English 9 Offered at High School During Current Academic Year E-66
Table E.138. Frequency of Number of Sections of English 10 Offered During Current Academic Year E-66
Table E.139. Frequency of Number of Sections of English 11 Offered During Current Academic Year E-67
Table E.140. Frequency of Number of Sections of English 12 Offered During Current Academic Year E-67
Table E.141. Frequency of Number of Sections of English Literature Offered During Current Academic Year E-68
Table E.142. Frequency of Number of Sections of World/Other Literature Offered During Current Academic Year E-68
Table E.143. Frequency of Number of Sections of Composition Offered During Current Academic Year E-69
Table E.144. Frequency of Number of Sections of Language Structure/Language Arts Offered During Current Academic Year E-69
Table E.145. Frequency of Number of Sections of English as a Second Language Offered at High School During Current Academic Year E-70
Table E.146. Frequency of Number of Sections of Developmental Reading Offered During Current Academic Year E-70
Table E.147. Percentage of High School ELA Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year Houghton Mifflin Reading: A Legacy of Literacy Offered as an Intervention or Basic Program E-71
Table E.148. Percentage of High School ELA Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year SRA/Open Court Reading Offered as an Intervention or Basic Program E-71
Table E.149. Percentage of High School ELA Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year The Reader's Choice Offered as an Intervention or Basic Program E-71
Table E.150. Percentage of High School ELA Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year Literature and Language Offered as an Intervention or Basic Program E-72
Table E.151. Percentage of High School ELA Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year McDougal Littell Reading & Language Arts Program Offered as an Intervention or Basic Program E-72
Table E.152. Percentage of High School ELA Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year Prentice Hall Literature: Timeless Voices, Timeless Themes Offered as an Intervention or Basic Program E-73
Table E.153. Percentage of High School ELA Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year Language! Offered as an Intervention or Basic Program E-73
Table E.154. Percentage of High School ELA Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year High Point Offered as an Intervention or Basic Program E-73
Table E.155. Percentage of High School ELA Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year High Point for English Learners Offered as an Intervention or Basic Program E-74

Table of Contents (Continued)

Table E.156. Percentage of High School ELA Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year READ 180 Offered as an Intervention or Basic Program E-74
Table E.157. Percentage of High School ELA Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year SRA/Reach Program Offered as an Intervention or Basic Program E-74
Table E.158. Percentage of High School ELA Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year Fast Track Reading Program Offered as an Intervention or Basic Program E-75
Table E.159. High School ELA Curriculum Head Reported Offering These Other ELA Intervention or Basic Programs E-75
Table E.160. Frequency of Number of Sections of Houghton Mifflin Reading: A Legacy of Literacy Offered at High School During Current Academic Year E-76
Table E.161. Frequency of Number of Sections of SRA/Open Court Reading Offered at High School During Current Academic Year E-76
Table E.162. Frequency of Number of Sections of The Reader's Choice Offered at High School During Current Academic Year E-76
Table E.163. Frequency of Number of Sections of Literature and Language Offered at High School During Current Academic Year E-77
Table E.164. Frequency of Number of Sections of McDougal Littell Reading & Language Arts Offered at High School During Current Academic Year E-77
Table E.165. Frequency of Number of Sections of Prentice Hall Literature: Timeless Voices, Timeless Themes Offered at High School During Current Academic Year E-78
Table E.166. Frequency of Number of Sections of Language! Offered at High School During Current Academic Year E-78
Table E.167. Frequency of Number of Sections of High Point Offered at High School During Current Academic Year E-79
Table E.168. Frequency of Number of Sections of High Point for English Learner Offered at High School During Current Academic Year E-79
Table E.169. Frequency of Number of Sections of READ 180 Offered at High School During Current Academic Year E-80
Table E.170. Frequency of Number of Sections of SRA/Reach Program Offered at High School During Current Academic Year E-80
Table E.171. Frequency of Number of Sections of Fast Track Reading Program Offered at High School During Current Academic Year E-81
Table E.172. High School ELA Department Heads Reported Frequency of Full-Time Teachers Working in English Department During Current Academic Year [1] E-81
Table E.173. High School ELA Department Heads Reported Frequency of Teachers in English Department With Bachelor's as Most Advanced Degree [2] E-82
Table E.174. High School ELA Department Heads Reported Frequency of Teachers in English Department With Some Graduate School as Most Advanced Degree [2] ... E-83
Table E.175. High School ELA Department Heads Reported Frequency of Teachers in English Department With Master's as Most Advanced Degree [2] E-84
Table E.176. High School ELA Department Heads Reported Frequency of Teachers in English Department With Doctorate as Most Advanced Degree [2] E-84

Table of Contents (Continued)

Table E.177. High School ELA Department Heads Reported These Other Degrees for Teachers in the English Department E-85
Table E.178. High School ELA Department Heads Reported Proportion of Teachers in English Department Working With an Appropriate ELA Credential [3] E-85
Table E.179. High School ELA Department Heads Reported Proportion of Teachers in English Department Working With an Emergency Credential or Are a District Intern [4] E-85
Table E.180. High School ELA Department Heads Characterization of Experience of Teachers in English Department Who Teach Primary or Supplemental ELA Courses [5] E-86
Table E.181. High School ELA Department Heads Characterization of Experience of Teachers in English Department Who Teach Intervention or Basic ELA Programs [6] E-86
Table E.182. High School ELA Department Heads Reported Distribution of Economically Disadvantaged Students in General Across Sections of Primary or Supplemental ELA Courses [7] E-86
Table E.183. High School ELA Department Heads Reported Distribution of English Learner Students Across Sections of Primary or Supplemental ELA Courses [7] E-87
Table E.184. High School ELA Department Heads Reported Distribution of Remedial Students in General Across Sections of Primary or Supplemental ELA Courses [7] E-87
Table E.185. High School ELA Department Heads Reported Distribution of Students Receiving Special Education Services Across Sections of Primary or Supplemental ELA Courses [7] E-87
Table E.186. High School ELA Department Heads Reported Proportion of Economically Disadvantaged Students in General Who Receive ELA Primary and Supplemental Course Instruction From Teacher With Experience Working With This Subgroup [8] E-88
Table E.187. High School ELA Department Heads Reported Proportion of English Learner Students Who Receive ELA Primary and Supplemental Course Instruction From Teacher With Experience Working With This Subgroup [8]..... E-88
Table E.188. High School ELA Department Heads Reported Proportion of Remedial Students in General Who Receive ELA Primary and Supplemental Course Instruction From Teacher With Experience Working With This Subgroup [8]..... E-89
Table E.189. High School ELA Department Heads Reported Proportion of Students Receiving Special Education Services Who Receive ELA Primary and Supplemental Course Instruction From Teacher With Experience Working With This Subgroup [8] E-89
Table E.190. High School ELA Department Heads Reported Proportion of Economically Disadvantaged Students in General Who Receive ELA Instruction From Teacher Without an Appropriate ELA Credential [9] E-90
Table E.191. High School ELA Department Heads Reported Proportion of English Learner Students in General Who Receive ELA Instruction From Teacher Without an Appropriate ELA Credential [9]..... E-90

Table of Contents (Continued)

Table E.192. High School ELA Department Heads Reported Proportion of Remedial Students in General Who Receive ELA Instruction From Teacher Without an Appropriate ELA Credential [9] E-91
Table E.193. High School ELA Department Heads Reported Proportion of Students Receiving Special Education Services Who Receive ELA Instruction From Teacher Without an Appropriate ELA Credential [9] E-91
Table E.194. High School ELA Department Heads Reported Proportion of Economically Disadvantaged Students in General Who Receive ELA Intervention and Basic Program Instruction From Teacher With Experience Working With This Subgroup [10] E-92
Table E.195. High School ELA Department Heads Reported Proportion of English Learner Students Who Receive ELA Intervention and Basic Program Instruction From Teacher With Experience Working With This Subgroup [10] E-92
Table E.196. High School ELA Department Heads Reported Proportion of Remedial Students in General Who Receive ELA Intervention and Basic Program Instruction From Teacher With Experience Working With This Subgroup [10] E-93
Table E.197. High School ELA Department Heads Reported Proportion of Students Receiving Special Education Services Who Receive ELA Intervention and Basic Program Instruction From Teacher With Experience Working With This Subgroup [10] E-93
Table E.198. High School ELA Department Heads Reported Extent of ELA Teacher Experience in Teaching California Content Standards Associated With the CAHSEE Requirement [11] E-94
Table E.199. High School ELA Department Heads Reported Extent of ELA Course Offerings Being Demanding Courses for Students [12] E-94
Table E.200. Percentage of High School Math Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year General Math Offered as Primary or Supplemental Course E-95
Table E.201. Percentage of High School Math Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year Math A Offered as Primary or Supplemental Course E-95
Table E.202. Percentage of High School Math Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year Math B Offered as Primary or Supplemental Course E-95
Table E.203. Percentage of High School Math Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year Pre-Algebra Offered as Primary or Supplemental Course E-96
Table E.204. Percentage of High School Math Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year Beginning Algebra Offered as Primary or Supplemental Course E-96
Table E.205. Percentage of High School Math Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year Intermediate Algebra Offered as Primary or Supplemental Course E-96
Table E.206. Percentage of High School Math Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year Beginning Algebra Part I Offered as Primary or Supplemental Course E-97
Table E.207. Percentage of High School Math Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year Beginning Algebra Part II Offered as Primary or Supplemental Course E-97

Table of Contents (Continued)

Table E.208. Percentage of High School Math Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year Integrated Math I Offered as Primary or Supplemental Course E-97
Table E.209. Percentage of High School Math Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year Integrated Math II Offered as Primary or Supplemental Course E-98
Table E.210. Percentage of High School Math Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year Consumer Math Offered as Primary or Supplemental Course ... E-98
Table E.211. Percentage of High School Math Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year Remedial Math Offered as Primary or Supplemental Course..... E-98
Table E.212. High School Math Department Head Reported Offering These Other Primary or Supplemental Courses E-99
Table E.213. Frequency of Number of Sections of General Math Offered at High School During Current Academic Year E-100
Table E.214. Frequency of Number of Sections of Math A Offered at High School During Current Academic Year E-101
Table E.215. Frequency of Number of Sections of Math B Offered at High School During Current Academic Year E-101
Table E.216. Frequency of Number of Sections of Pre-Algebra Offered at High School During Current Academic Year E-102
Table E.217. Frequency of Number of Sections of Beginning Algebra Offered at High School During Current Academic Year..... E-102
Table E.218. Frequency of Number of Sections of Intermediate Algebra Offered at High School During Current Academic Year..... E-103
Table E.219. Frequency of Number of Sections of Beginning Algebra Part I Offered at High School During Current Academic Year..... E-103
Table E.220. Frequency of Number of Sections of Beginning Algebra Part II Offered at High School During Current Academic Year..... E-104
Table E.221. Frequency of Number of Sections of Integrated Math I Offered at High School During Current Academic Year E-104
Table E.222. Frequency of Number of Sections of Integrated Math II Offered at High School During Current Academic Year E-105
Table E.223. Frequency of Number of Sections of Consumer Math Offered at High School During Current Academic Year E-105
Table E.224. Frequency of Number of Sections of Remedial Math Offered at High School During Current Academic Year E-106
Table E.225. Percentage of High School Math Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year Success with Mathcoach Offered as an Intervention or Basic Program E-106
Table E.226. Percentage of High School Math Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year Harcourt Math @ 2002 Offered as an Intervention or Basic Program E-106
Table E.227. Percentage of High School Math Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year Mathematics by Houghton Mifflin Offered as an Intervention or Basic Program E-107

Table of Contents (Continued)

Table E.228. Percentage of High School Math Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year Concepts and Skills Offered as an Intervention or Basic Program E-107
Table E.229. Percentage of High School Math Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year Structure and Method Offered as an Intervention or Basic Program E-107
Table E.230. Percentage of High School Math Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year McGraw-Hill Mathematics Offered as an Intervention or Basic Program E-108
Table E.231. Percentage of High School Math Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year Prentice Hall Pre-Algebra Offered as an Intervention or Basic Program E-108
Table E.232. Percentage of High School Math Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year Prentice Hall Algebra 1 Offered as an Intervention or Basic Program E-108
Table E.233. Percentage of High School Math Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year Progress in Mathematics Offered as an Intervention or Basic Program E-109
Table E.234. Percentage of High School Math Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year Saxon Math Offered as an Intervention or Basic Program..... E-109
Table E.235. Percentage of High School Math Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year Math 54, 65, 76, and 87 Offered as an Intervention or Basic Program E-109
Table E.236. Percentage of High School Math Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year Scott Foresman CA Mathematics Offered as an Intervention or Basic Program E-109
Table E.237. High School Math Department Heads Reported Offering These Other Intervention or Basic Programs E-110
Table E.238. Frequency of Number of Sections of Success with Mathcoach Offered at High School During Current Academic Year E-111
Table E.239. Frequency of Number of Sections of Harcourt Math @ 2002 Offered at High School During Current Academic Year E-111
Table E.240. Frequency of Number of Sections of Mathematics by Houghton Mifflin Offered at High School During Current Academic Year E-112
Table E.241. Frequency of Number of Sections of Concepts and Skills Offered at High School During Current Academic Year E-112
Table E.242. Frequency of Number of Sections of Structure and Method Offered at High School During Current Academic Year E-112
Table E.243. Frequency of Number of Sections of McGraw-Hill Mathematics Offered at High School During Current Academic Year E-113
Table E.244. Frequency of Number of Sections of Prentice Hall Pre-Algebra Offered at High School During Current Academic Year E-113
Table E.245. Frequency of Number of Sections of Prentice Hall Algebra 1 Offered at High School During Current Academic Year E-113

Table of Contents (Continued)

Table E.246. Frequency of Number of Sections of Progress in Mathematics Offered at High School During Current Academic Year E-114
Table E.247. Frequency of Number of Sections of Saxon Math Offered at High School During Current Academic Year E-114
Table E.248. Frequency of Number of Sections of Math 54, 65, 76, 87 Offered at High School During Current Academic Year E-114
Table E.249. Frequency of Number of Sections of Scott Foresman CA Mathematics Offered at High School During Current Academic Year E-115
Table E.250. High School Math Department Heads Reported Frequency of Full-Time Teachers Working in Math Department During Current Academic Year [1] E-116
Table E.251. High School Math Department Heads Reported Frequency of Teachers in Math Department With Bachelor's as Most Advanced Degree [2] E-117
Table E.252. High School Math Department Heads Reported Frequency of Teachers in Math Department With Some Graduate School as Most Advanced Degree [2] E-118
Table E.253. High School Math Department Heads Reported Frequency of Teachers in Math Department With Master's as Most Advanced Degree [2] E-119
Table E.254. High School Math Department Heads Reported Frequency of Teachers in Math Department With Doctorate as Most Advanced Degree [2] E-119
Table E.255. High School Math Department Heads Reported These Other Degrees for Teachers in the Math Department E-120
Table E.256. High School Math Department Heads Reported Proportion of Teachers in Math Department Working With an Appropriate Math Credential [3] E-120
Table E.257. High School Math Department Heads Reported Proportion of Teachers in Math Department Working With an Emergency Credential or Are a District Intern [4] E-120
Table E.258. High School Math Department Heads Characterization of Experience of Teachers in Math Department Who Teach Primary or Supplemental Math Courses [5] E-121
Table E.259. High School Math Department Heads Characterization of Experience of Teachers in Math Department Who Teach Intervention or Basic Math Programs [6] E-121
Table E.260. High School Math Department Heads Reported Distribution of Economically Disadvantaged Students in General Across Sections of Primary or Supplemental Math Courses [7] E-121
Table E.261. High School Math Department Heads Reported Distribution of English Learner Students Across Sections of Primary or Supplemental Math Courses [7] E-122
Table E.262. High School Math Department Heads Reported Distribution of Remedial Students in General Across Sections of Primary or Supplemental Math Courses [7] E-122
Table E.263. High School Math Department Heads Reported Distribution of Students Receiving Special Education Services Across Sections of Primary or Supplemental Math Courses [7] E-122

Table of Contents (Continued)

Table E.264. Math Department Heads Reported Proportion of Economically Disadvantaged Students in General Who Receive Math Primary and Supplemental Course Instruction From Teacher With Experience Working With This Subgroup [8] E-123
Table E.265. Math Department Heads Reported Proportion of English Learner Students Who Receive Math Primary and Supplemental Course Instruction From Teacher With Experience Working With This Subgroup [8] E-123
Table E.266. Math Department Heads Reported Proportion of Remedial Students in General Who Receive Math Primary and Supplemental Course Instruction From Teacher With Experience Working With This Subgroup [8] E-124
Table E.267. Math Department Heads Reported Proportion of Students Receiving Special Education Services Who Receive Math Primary and Supplemental Course Instruction From Teacher With Experience Working With This Subgroup [8] E-124
Table E.268. High School Math Department Heads Reported Proportion of Economically Disadvantaged Students in General Who Receive Math Instruction From Teacher Without an Appropriate Math Credential [9] E-125
Table E.269. High School Math Department Heads Reported Proportion of English Learner Students in General Who Receive Math Instruction From Teacher Without an Appropriate Math Credential [9] E-125
Table E.270. High School Math Department Heads Reported Proportion of Remedial Students in General Who Receive Math Instruction From Teacher Without an Appropriate Math Credential [9] E-126
Table E.271. High School Math Department Heads Reported Proportion of Students Receiving Special Education Sevices Who Receive Math Instruction From Teacher Without an Appropriate Math Credential [9] E-126
Table E.272. Math Department Heads Reported Proportion of Economically Disadvantaged Students in General Who Receive Math Intervention and Basic Program Instruction From Teacher With Experience Working With This Subgroup [10] E-127
Table E.273. Math Department Heads Reported Proportion of English Learner Students Who Receive Math Intervention and Basic Program Instruction From Teacher With Experience Working With This Subgroup [10] E-127
Table E.274. Math Department Heads Reported Proportion of Remedial Students in General Who Receive Math Intervention and Basic Program Instruction From Teacher With Experience Working With This Subgroup [10] E-128
Table E.275. Math Department Heads Reported Proportion of Students Receiving Special Education Services Who Receive Math Intervention and Basic Program Instruction From Teacher With Experience Working With This Subgroup [10] E-128
Table E.276. High School Math Department Heads Reported Extent of Math Teacher Experience in Teaching California Content Standards Associated With the CAHSEE Requirement [11] E-129
Table E.277. High School Math Department Heads Reported Extent of Math Course Offerings Being Demanding Courses for Students [12] E-129
Table E.278. High School Teachers Subject Area Associated With Reported Courses or Instructional Programs [2] E-131

Table of Contents (Continued)

Table E.279. Type of Reported High School Courses or Instructional Programs [3] E-131
Table E.280. Type of Reported 'Other' High School Courses or Instructional Programs [3] E-132
Table E.281. Percentage of Reported High School Courses or Instructional Programs Offered Before or After School [4] E-132
Table E.282. Percentage of Reported High School Courses or Instructional Programs Offered as Summer School Course [4] E-132
Table E.283. Percentage of Reported High School Courses or Instructional Programs Offered as Summer School Program [4] E-133
Table E.284. Percentage of Reported High School Courses or Instructional Programs Offered During Normal School Hours [4] E-133
Table E.285. Percentage of Reported High School Courses or Instructional Programs Offered During Intercession Breaks [4] E-133
Table E.286. Frequency of Duration of Reported High School Courses or Instructional Programs [5] E-134
Table E.287. Frequency of Grade Levels of Students Taking Reported High School Courses or Instructional Programs [6] E-134
Table E.288. Frequency of Number of Students Taught Reported High School Courses or Instructional Programs [7] E-135
Table E.289. Proportion of Students Enrolled in Reported High School Courses or Instructional Programs Who Are English Learners [8] E-135
Table E.290. Proportion of Students Enrolled in Reported High School Courses or Instructional Programs Who Are Students Receiving Special Education Services [9] E-136
Table E.291. Proportion of Students Enrolled in Reported High School Courses or Instructional Programs Who Are Economically Disadvantaged [10] E-136
Table E.292. Frequency of Description of Students Enrolled in Reported High School Courses or Instructional Programs [11] E-137
Table E.293. Proportion of Students Enrolled in Reported High School Courses or Instructional Programs Who Achieved At Least Basic Performance on Last Year's STAR CST Test [12] E-137
Table E.294. Percentage of High School Teachers Reporting Low Student Attendance Limits Effectiveness of Reported High School Courses or Instructional Programs [13] E-138
Table E.295. Percentage of High School Teachers Reporting Low Student Motivation Limits Effectiveness of Reported High School Courses or Instructional Programs [13] E-138
Table E.296. Percentage of High School Teachers Reporting Low Student English Proficiency Limits Effectiveness of Reported High School Courses or Instructional Programs [13] E-139
Table E.297. Percentage of High School Teachers Reporting Low Parental Support Limits Effectiveness of Reported High School Courses or Instructional Programs [13] E-139

Table of Contents (Continued)

Table E.298. Percentage of High School Teachers Reporting Lack of Materials/ Resources Limits Effectiveness of Reported High School Courses or Instructional Programs [13] E-140
Table E.299. Percentage of High School Teachers Reporting Limitations in Own Knowledge or Experience Limits Effectiveness of Reported High School Courses or Instructional Programs [13] E-140
Table E.300. Percentage of High School Teachers Reporting Own Difficulty in Engaging Students Limits Effectiveness of Reported High School Courses or Instructional Programs [13] E-141
Table E.301. Percentage of High School Teachers Who Use a Textbook for Reported Courses or Instructional Programs [14] E-141
Table E.302. High School Teachers ELA Textbook Titles [14A] E-141
Table E.303. High School Teachers Math Textbook Titles [14A] E-143
Table E.304. High School Teachers CAHSEE Textbook Titles [14A] E-144
Table E.305. High School Teachers Author/Publisher Names [14A] E-144
Table E.306. Frequency of Year When School Adopted Textbook Used in Reported High School Courses or Instructional Programs [14B] E-146
Table E.307. Proportion of Textbook Used in Reported High School Courses or Instructional Programs [14C] E-146
Table E.308. Percentage of High School Teachers Reporting Frequency of Using Other Texts in Reported High School Courses or Instructional Programs [15] E-147
Table E.309. High School Teachers General Supplemental Materials Titles [15A] E-147
Table E.310. High School ELA Teachers Supplemental Materials Titles for Grammar, Reading, & Writing [15A] E-148
Table E.311. High School ELA Teachers Supplemental Materials Titles for Poetry, Plays, Narratives, and Novels [15A] E-150
Table E.312. High School Math Teachers Supplemental Materials Titles [15A] E-152
Table E.313. Percentage of High School Teachers Reporting Frequency of Using Commercially Prepared Materials (Not Computer-Based) in Reported High School Courses or Instructional Programs [15] E-153
Table E.314. High School Teachers Descriptions of General Commercially Prepared Materials [15A] E-154
Table E.315. High School ELA Teachers Descriptions of Commercially Prepared Materials [15A] E-155
Table E.316. High School Math Teachers Descriptions of Commercially Prepared Materials [15A] E-155
Table E.317 High School Teachers Descriptions of Commercially Prepared Materials—Tests, Assessments, and Standard Review Guides [15A] E-156
Table E.318. Percentage of High School Teachers Reporting Frequency of Using Computer-Based Programs in Reported High School Courses or Instructional Programs [15] E-156
Table E.319. High School Teachers Descriptions of General Computer-Based Materials [15A] E-157
Table E.320. High School ELA Teachers Descriptions of Computer-Based Materials [15A] E-158

Table of Contents (Continued)

Table E.321. High School Math Teachers Descriptions of Computer-Based Materials [15A] E-158
Table E.322. High School Teachers Descriptions of Computer-Based Materials—Tests, Assessments, and Standard Review Guides [15A] E-159
Table E.323. Percentage of High School Teachers Reporting Most Advanced Degree [16] E-159
Table E.324. Percentage of High School Teachers Reporting Years of Experience Teaching Reported Courses or Instructional Programs [18] E-159
Table E.325. Percentage of High School Teachers Reporting Total Years of Teaching Experience [19] E-160
Table E.326. Feeder School Principals Reported Proportion (Projected) of Content Standards in CAHSEE ELA Blueprint Covered in 2004–2005 [1] E-161
Table E.327. Feeder School Principals Reported Proportion of Content Standards in CAHSEE ELA Blueprint Covered in 2003–2004 [1] E-161
Table E.328. Feeder School Principals Reported Proportion of Content Standards in CAHSEE ELA Blueprint Covered in 2002–2003 [1] E-162
Table E.329. Feeder School Principals Reported Proportion of Content Standards in CAHSEE ELA Blueprint Covered Before 2002 [1] E-162
Table E.330. Feeder School Principals Reported Proportion (Projected) of Content Standards in CAHSEE Mathematics Blueprint Covered in 2004–2005 [2] E-163
Table E.331. Feeder School Principals Reported Proportion of Content Standards in CAHSEE Mathematics Blueprint Covered in 2003–2004 [2] E-163
Table E.332. Feeder School Principals Reported Proportion of Content Standards in CAHSEE Mathematics Blueprint Covered in 2002–2003 [2] E-164
Table E.333. Feeder School Principals Reported Proportion of Content Standards in CAHSEE Mathematics Blueprint Covered Before 2002 [2] E-164
Table E.334. Proportion of Feeder School Teachers Who Participated in ELA-Related Professional Development to Teach Content Standards Associated With CAHSEE [4] E-165
Table E.335. Proportion of Feeder School Teachers Who Participated in Math-Related Professional Development to Teach Content Standards Associated With CAHSEE [5] E-165
Table E.336. Percentage of Feeder School Principals Who Reported Using District-Based Tracking System to Monitor and Report Student Proficiency on Content Standards [6] E-165
Table E.337. Percentage of Feeder School Principals Who Reported Using School-Based Tracking System to Monitor and Report Student Proficiency on Content Standards [6] E-166
Table E.338. Percentage of Feeder School Principals Who Reported Using Department-Based (ELA or Math) Tracking System to Monitor and Report Student Proficiency on Content Standards [6] E-166
Table E.339. Percentage of Feeder School Principals Who Reported That Individual Teachers Keep Track of Student Mastery of Content Standards [6] E-166
Table E.340. Percentage of Feeder School Principals Who Reported Using Some Other System to Monitor and Report Student Proficiency on Content Standards [6]. E-166

Table of Contents (Continued)

Table E.341. Percentage of Feeder School Principals Who Reported Using No Tracking System to Monitor and Report Student Proficiency on Content Standards [6] E-167
Table E.342. Percentage of Feeder School Principals Who Reported Coordination Between Feeder and High School on Coverage of Content Standards Associated With CAHSEE [7] E-167
Table E.343. Percentage of Feeder School Principals Who Reported Coordination Between Special and General Education on Coverage of Content Standards Associated With CAHSEE [7] E-167
Table E.344. Percentage of Feeder School Principals Who Reported Coordination Between English Language Development and General Education on Coverage of Content Standards Associated With CAHSEE [7] E-167
Table E.345. Percentage of Feeder School Principals Who Reported Coordination Between Alternative (Continuation) and General Education on Coverage of Content Standards Associated With CAHSEE [7] E-168
Table E.346. Percentage of Feeder School Principals Who Reported Regular Articulation Meetings With Receiving High Schools [8] E-168
Table E.347. Percentage of Feeder School Principals Who Reported Importance of Regular Articulation Meetings With Receiving High Schools in Preparing Students for Success on CAHSEE [9] E-168
Table E.348. Percentage of Feeder School Principals Who Reported Regular Articulation Meetings With Feeder Elementary Schools [10] E-169
Table E.349. Percentage of Feeder School Principals Who Reported Importance of Regular Articulation Meetings With Feeder Elementary Schools in Preparing Students for Success on CAHSEE [11] E-169
Table E.350. Percentage of Feeder School ELA Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year English 6 Offered as Primary or Supplemental Course E-171
Table E.351. Percentage of Feeder School ELA Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year English 7 Offered as Primary or Supplemental Course E-171
Table E.352. Percentage of Feeder School ELA Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year English 8 Offered as Primary or Supplemental Course E-171
Table E.353. Percentage of Feeder School ELA Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year English 9 Offered as Primary or Supplemental Course E-171
Table E.354. Percentage of Feeder School ELA Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year English as a Second Language Offered as Primary or Supplemental Course E-172
Table E.355. Feeder School ELA Curriculum Head Reported Offering These Other ELA Primary or Supplemental Courses E-172
Table E.356. Frequency of Number of Sections of English 6 Offered at Feeder School During Current Academic Year E-172
Table E.357. Frequency of Number of Sections of English 7 Offered at Feeder School During Current Academic Year E-173
Table E.358. Frequency of Number of Sections of English 8 Offered at Feeder School During Current Academic Year E-173

Table of Contents (Continued)

Table E.359. Frequency of Number of Sections of English 9 Offered at Feeder School During Current Academic Year E-173
Table E.360. Frequency of Number of Sections of English as a Second Language Offered at Feeder School During Current Academic Year E-174
Table E.361. Percentage of Feeder School ELA Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year Houghton Mifflin Reading: A Legacy of Literacy Offered as an Intervention or Basic Program E-174
Table E.362. Percentage of Feeder School ELA Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year SRA/Open Court Reading Offered as an Intervention or Basic Program E-174
Table E.363. Percentage of Feeder School ELA Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year The Reader's Choice Offered as an Intervention or Basic Program E-175
Table E.364. Percentage of Feeder School ELA Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year Literature and Language Offered as an Intervention or Basic Program E-175
Table E.365. Percentage of Feeder School ELA Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year McDougal Littell Reading & Language Arts Program Offered as an Intervention or Basic Program E-175
Table E.366. Percentage of Feeder School ELA Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year Prentice Hall Literature: Timeless Voices, Timeless Themes Offered as an Intervention or Basic Program E-176
Table E.367. Percentage of Feeder School ELA Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year Language! Offered as an Intervention or Basic Program E-176
Table E.368. Percentage of Feeder School ELA Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year High Point Offered as an Intervention or Basic Program E-176
Table E.369. Percentage of Feeder School ELA Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year High Point for English Learners Offered as an Intervention or Basic Program E-177
Table E.370. Percentage of Feeder School ELA Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year READ 180 Offered as an Intervention or Basic Program E-177
Table E.371. Percentage of Feeder School ELA Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year SRA/Reach Program Offered as an Intervention or Basic Program E-177
Table E.372. Percentage of Feeder School ELA Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year Fast Track Reading Program Offered as an Intervention or Basic Program E-178
Table E.373. Feeder School ELA Curriculum Head Reported Offering These Other ELA Intervention or Basic Programs E-178
Table E.374. Frequency of Number of Sections of Houghton Mifflin Reading: A Legacy of Literacy Offered at Feeder School During Current Academic Year E-178
Table E.375. Frequency of Number of Sections of SRA/Open Court Reading Offered at Feeder School During Current Academic Year E-178
Table E.376. Frequency of Number of Sections of The Reader's Choice Offered at Feeder School During Current Academic Year E-179

Table of Contents (Continued)

Table E.377. Frequency of Number of Sections of Literature and Language Offered at Feeder School During Current Academic Year E-179
Table E.378. Frequency of Number of Sections of McDougal Littell Reading & Language Arts Offered at Feeder School During Current Academic Year E-179
Table E.379. Frequency of Number of Sections of Prentice Hall Literature: Timeless Voices, Timeless Themes Offered at Feeder School During Current Academic Year E-180
Table E.380. Frequency of Number of Sections of Language! Offered at Feeder School During Current Academic Year E-180
Table E.381. Frequency of Number of Sections of High Point Offered at Feeder School During Current Academic Year E-180
Table E.382. Frequency of Number of Sections of High Point for English Learner Offered at Feeder School During Current Academic Year E-181
Table E.383. Frequency of Number of Sections of READ 180 Offered at Feeder School During Current Academic Year E-181
Table E.384. Frequency of Number of Sections of SRA/Reach Program Offered at Feeder School During Current Academic Year E-181
Table E.385. Frequency of Number of Sections of Fast Track Reading Program Offered at Feeder School During Current Academic Year E-182
Table E.386. Feeder School ELA Department Heads Reported Frequency of Full-Time Teachers Working in English Department During Current Academic Year [1] .. E-182
Table E.387. Feeder School ELA Department Heads Reported Frequency of Teachers in English Department With Bachelor's as Most Advanced Degree [2] E-183
Table E.388. Feeder School ELA Department Heads Reported Frequency of Teachers in English Department With Some Graduate School as Most Advanced Degree [2] E-183
Table E.389. Feeder School ELA Department Heads Reported Frequency of Teachers in English Department With Master's as Most Advanced Degree [2] E-184
Table E.390. Feeder School ELA Department Heads Reported Frequency of Teachers in English Department With Doctorate as Most Advanced Degree [2] E-184
Table E.391. Feeder School ELA Department Heads Reported These Other Degrees for Teachers in the English Department E-184
Table E.392. Feeder School ELA Department Heads Reported Proportion of Teachers in English Department Working With an Appropriate ELA Credential [3] ... E-185
Table E.393. Feeder School ELA Department Heads Reported Proportion of Teachers in English Department Working With an Emergency Credential or Are a District Intern [4] E-185
Table E.394. Feeder School ELA Department Heads Characterization of Experience of Teachers in English Department Who Teach Primary or Supplemental ELA Courses [5] E-185
Table E.395. Feeder School ELA Department Heads Characterization of Experience of Teachers in English Department Who Teach Intervention or Basic ELA Programs [6] E-186

Table of Contents (Continued)

Table E.396. Feeder School ELA Department Heads Reported Distribution of Economically Disadvantaged Students in General Across Sections of Primary or Supplemental ELA Courses [7] E-186
Table E.397. Feeder School ELA Department Heads Reported Distribution of English Learner Students Across Sections of Primary or Supplemental ELA Courses [7] E-186
Table E.398. Feeder School ELA Department Heads Reported Distribution of Remedial Students in General Across Sections of Primary or Supplemental ELA Courses [7] E-187
Table E.399. Feeder School ELA Department Heads Reported Distribution of Students Receiving Special Education Services Across Sections of Primary or Supplemental ELA Courses [7] E-187
Table E.400. Feeder School ELA Department Heads Reported Proportion of Economically Disadvantaged Students in General Who Receive ELA Instruction From Teacher Without an Appropriate ELA Credential [8] E-187
Table E.401. Feeder School ELA Department Heads Reported Proportion of English Learner Students in General Who Receive ELA Instruction From Teacher Without an Appropriate ELA Credential [8] E-188
Table E.402. Feeder School ELA Department Heads Reported Proportion of Remedial Students in General Who Receive ELA Instruction From Teacher Without an Appropriate ELA Credential [8] E-188
Table E.403. Feeder School ELA Department Heads Reported Proportion of Students Receiving Special Education Services Who Receive ELA Instruction From Teacher Without an Appropriate ELA Credential [8] E-188
Table E.404. Feeder School ELA Department Heads Reported Extent of ELA Teacher Experience in Teaching California Content Standards Associated With the CAHSEE Requirement [9] E-189
Table E.405. Feeder School ELA Department Heads Reported Extent of ELA Course Offerings Being Demanding Courses for Students [10] E-189
Table E.406. Percentage of Feeder School Math Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year General Math Offered as Primary or Supplemental Course E-191
Table E.407. Percentage of Feeder School Math Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year Math A Offered as Primary or Supplemental Course E-191
Table E.408. Percentage of Feeder School Math Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year Math B Offered as Primary or Supplemental Course E-191
Table E.409. Percentage of Feeder School Math Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year Pre-Algebra Offered as Primary or Supplemental Course E-192
Table E.410. Percentage of Feeder School Math Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year Beginning Algebra Offered as Primary or Supplemental Course E-192
Table E.411. Percentage of Feeder School Math Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year Intermediate Algebra Offered as Primary or Supplemental Course E-192

Table of Contents (Continued)

Table E.412. Percentage of Feeder School Math Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year Beginning Algebra Part I Offered as Primary or Supplemental Course E-193
Table E.413. Percentage of Feeder School Math Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year Beginning Algebra Part II Offered as Primary or Supplemental Course E-193
Table E.414. Percentage of Feeder School Math Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year Integrated Math I Offered as Primary or Supplemental Course E-193
Table E.415. Percentage of Feeder School Math Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year Integrated Math II Offered as Primary or Supplemental Course E-194
Table E.416. Percentage of Feeder School Math Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year Consumer Math Offered as Primary or Supplemental Course . E-194
Table E.417. Feeder School Math Department Head Reported Offering These Other Primary or Supplemental Courses E-194
Table E.418. Percentage of Feeder School Math Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year Remedial Math Offered as Primary or Supplemental Course ... E-194
Table E.419. Frequency of Number of Sections of General Math Offered at Feeder School During Current Academic Year E-195
Table E.420. Frequency of Number of Sections of Math A Offered at Feeder School During Current Academic Year E-195
Table E.421. Frequency of Number of Sections of Math B Offered at Feeder School During Current Academic Year E-195
Table E.422. Frequency of Number of Sections of Pre-Algebra Offered at Feeder School During Current Academic Year E-196
Table E.423. Frequency of Number of Sections of Beginning Algebra Offered at Feeder School During Current Academic Year E-196
Table E.424. Frequency of Number of Sections of Intermediate Algebra Offered at Feeder School During Current Academic Year E-197
Table E.425. Frequency of Number of Sections of Beginning Algebra Part I Offered at Feeder School During Current Academic Year E-197
Table E.426. Frequency of Number of Sections of Beginning Algebra Part II Offered at Feeder School During Current Academic Year E-197
Table E.427. Frequency of Number of Sections of Integrated Math I Offered at Feeder School During Current Academic Year E-198
Table E.428. Frequency of Number of Sections of Integrated Math II Offered at Feeder School During Current Academic Year E-198
Table E.429. Frequency of Number of Sections of Consumer Math Offered at Feeder School During Current Academic Year E-198
Table E.430. Frequency of Number of Sections of Remedial Math Offered at Feeder School During Current Academic Year E-198
Table E.431. Percentage of Feeder School Math Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year Success with Mathcoach Offered as an Intervention or Basic Program E-199

Table of Contents (Continued)

Table E.432. Percentage of Feeder School Math Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year Harcourt Math @ 2002 Offered as an Intervention or Basic Program E-199
Table E.433. Percentage of Feeder School Math Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year Mathematics by Houghton Mifflin Offered as an Intervention or Basic Program E-199
Table E.434. Percentage of Feeder School Math Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year Concepts and Skills Offered as an Intervention or Basic Program E-200
Table E.435. Percentage of Feeder School Math Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year Structure and Method Offered as an Intervention or Basic Program E-200
Table E.436. Percentage of Feeder School Math Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year McGraw-Hill Mathematics Offered as an Intervention or Basic Program E-200
Table E.437. Percentage of Feeder School Math Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year Prentice Hall Pre-Algebra Offered as an Intervention or Basic Program E-201
Table E.438. Percentage of Feeder School Math Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year Prentice Hall Algebra 1 Offered as an Intervention or Basic Program E-201
Table E.439. Percentage of Feeder School Math Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year Progress in Mathematics Offered as an Intervention or Basic Program E-201
Table E.440. Percentage of Feeder School Math Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year Saxon Math Offered as an Intervention or Basic Program E-202
Table E.441. Percentage of Feeder School Math Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year Math 54, 65, 76, and 87 Offered as an Intervention or Basic Program E-202
Table E.442. Percentage of Feeder School Math Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year Scott Foresman CA Mathematics Offered as an Intervention or Basic Program E-202
Table E.443. Feeder School Math Department Heads Reported Offering These Other Intervention or Basic Programs E-203
Table E.444. Frequency of Number of Sections of Success with Mathcoach Offered at Feeder School During Current Academic Year E-203
Table E.445. Frequency of Number of Sections of Harcourt Math @ 2002 Offered at Feeder School During Current Academic Year E-203
Table E.446. Frequency of Number of Sections of Mathematics by Houghton Mifflin Offered at Feeder School During Current Academic Year E-204
Table E.447. Frequency of Number of Sections of Concepts and Skills Offered at Feeder School During Current Academic Year E-204
Table E.448. Frequency of Number of Sections of Structure and Method Offered at Feeder School During Current Academic Year E-204

Table of Contents (Continued)

Table E.449. Frequency of Number of Sections of McGraw-Hill Mathematics Offered at Feeder School During Current Academic Year E-205
Table E.450. Frequency of Number of Sections of Prentice Hall Pre-Algebra Offered at Feeder School During Current Academic Year E-205
Table E.451. Frequency of Number of Sections of Prentice Hall Algebra 1 Offered at Feeder School During Current Academic Year E-205
Table E.452. Frequency of Number of Sections of Progress in Mathematics Offered at Feeder School During Current Academic Year E-206
Table E.453. Frequency of Number of Sections of Saxon Math Offered at Feeder School During Current Academic Year E-206
Table E.454. Frequency of Number of Sections of Math 54, 65, 76, 87 Offered at Feeder School During Current Academic Year E-206
Table E.455. Frequency of Number of Sections of Scott Foresman CA Mathematics Offered at Feeder School During Current Academic Year E-207
Table E.456. Feeder School Math Department Heads Reported Frequency of Full-Time Teachers Working in Math Department During Current Academic Year [1] E-207
Table E.457. Feeder School Math Department Heads Reported Frequency of Teachers in Math Department With Bachelor's as Most Advanced Degree [2] E-208
Table E.458. Feeder School Math Department Heads Reported Frequency of Teachers in Math Department With Some Graduate School as Most Advanced Degree [2] E-209
Table E.459. Feeder School Math Department Heads Reported Frequency of Teachers in Math Department With Master's as Most Advanced Degree [2] E-209
Table E.460. Feeder School Math Department Heads Reported Frequency of Teachers in Math Department With Doctorate as Most Advanced Degree [2] E-210
Table E.461. Feeder School Math Department Heads Reported Proportion of Teachers in Math Department Working With an Appropriate Math Credential [3] E-210
Table E.462. Feeder School Math Department Heads Reported Proportion of Teachers in Math Department Working With an Emergency Credential or Are a District Intern [4] E-210
Table E.463. Feeder School Math Department Heads Characterization of Experience of Teachers in Math Department Who Teach Primary or Supplemental Math Courses [5] E-211
Table E.464. Feeder School Math Department Heads Characterization of Experience of Teachers in Math Department Who Teach Intervention or Basic Math Programs [6] E-211
Table E.465. Feeder School Math Department Heads Reported Distribution of Economically Disadvantaged Students in General Across Sections of Primary or Supplemental Math Courses [7] E-211
Table E.466. Feeder School Math Department Heads Reported Distribution of English Learner Students Across Sections of Primary or Supplemental Math Courses [7] E-212
Table E.467. Feeder School Math Department Heads Reported Distribution of Remedial Students in General Across Sections of Primary or Supplemental Math Courses [7] E-212

Table of Contents (Continued)

Table E.468. Feeder School Math Department Heads Reported Distribution of Students Receiving Special Education Services Across Sections of Primary or Supplemental Math Courses [7] E-212
Table E.469. Feeder School Math Department Heads Reported Proportion of Economically Disadvantaged Students in General Who Receive Math Instruction From Teacher Without an Appropriate Math Credential [8] E-213
Table E.470. Feeder School Math Department Heads Reported Proportion of English Learner Students in General Who Receive Math Instruction From Teacher Without an Appropriate Math Credential [8] E-213
Table E.471. Feeder School Math Department Heads Reported Proportion of Remedial Students in General Who Receive Math Instruction From Teacher Without an Appropriate Math Credential [8] E-214
Table E.472. Feeder School Math Department Heads Reported Proportion of Students Receiving Special Education Sevices Who Receive Math Instruction From Teacher Without an Appropriate Math Credential [8] E-214
Table E.473. Feeder School Math Department Heads Reported Extent of Math Teacher Experience in Teaching California Content Standards Associated With the CAHSEE Requirement [9] E-215
Table E.474. Feeder School Math Department Heads Reported Extent of Math Course Offerings Being Demanding Courses for Students [10] E-215
Table E.475. Feeder School Teachers Subject Area Associated With Reported Courses or Instructional Programs [2] E-217
Table E.476. Type of Reported Feeder School Courses or Instructional Programs [3] E-217
Table E.477. Type of Reported 'Other' Feeder School Courses or Instructional Programs [3] E-217
Table E.478. Percentage of Reported Feeder School Courses or Instructional Programs Offered Before or After School [4] E-218
Table E.479. Percentage of Reported Feeder School Courses or Instructional Programs Offered as Summer School Course [4] E-218
Table E.480. Percentage of Reported Feeder School Courses or Instructional Programs Offered as Summer School Program [4] E-218
Table E.481. Percentage of Reported Feeder School Courses or Instructional Programs Offered During Normal School Hours [4] E-219
Table E.482. Percentage of Reported Feeder School Courses or Instructional Programs Offered During Intercession Breaks [4] E-219
Table E.483. Frequency of Duration of Reported Feeder School Courses or Instructional Programs [5] E-219
Table E.484. Frequency of Number of Students Taught Reported Feeder School Courses or Instructional Programs [6] E-220
Table E.485. Proportion of Students Enrolled in Reported Feeder School Courses or Instructional Programs Who Are English Learners [7] E-220
Table E.486. Proportion of Students Enrolled in Reported Feeder School Courses or Instructional Programs Who Are Students Receiving Special Education Services [8] E-221

Table of Contents (Continued)

Table E.487. Proportion of Students Enrolled in Reported Feeder School Courses or Instructional Programs Who Are Economically Disadvantaged [9] E-221
Table E.488. Frequency of Description of Students Enrolled in Reported Feeder School Courses or Instructional Programs [10] E-222
Table E.489. Proportion of Students Enrolled in Reported Feeder School Courses or Instructional Programs Who Achieved At Least Basic Performance on Last Year's STAR CST Test [11] E-222
Table E.490. Percentage of Feeder School Teachers Reporting Low Student Attendance Limits Effectiveness of Reported Feeder School Courses or Instructional Programs [12] E-223
Table E.491. Percentage of Feeder School Teachers Reporting Low Student Motivation Limits Effectiveness of Reported Feeder School Courses or Instructional Programs [12] E-223
Table E.492. Percentage of Feeder School Teachers Reporting Low Student English Proficiency Limits Effectiveness of Reported Feeder School Courses or Instructional Programs [12] E-224
Table E.493. Percentage of Feeder School Teachers Reporting Low Parental Support Limits Effectiveness of Reported Feeder School Courses or Instructional Programs [12] E-224
Table E.494. Percentage of Feeder School Teachers Reporting Lack of Materials/ Resources Limits Effectiveness of Reported Feeder School Courses or Instructional Programs [12] E-225
Table E.495. Percentage of Feeder School Teachers Reporting Limitations in Own Knowledge or Experience Limits Effectiveness of Reported Feeder School Courses or Instructional Programs [12] E-225
Table E.496. Percentage of Feeder School Teachers Reporting Own Difficulty in Engaging Students Limits Effectiveness of Reported Feeder School Courses or Instructional Programs [12] E-226
Table E.497. Percentage of Feeder School Teachers Who Use a Textbook for Reported Courses or Instructional Programs [13] E-226
Table E.498. Feeder School Teachers ELA Textbook Titles [13A] E-226
Table E.499. Feeder School Teachers Math Textbook Titles [13A] E-227
Table E.500. Feeder School Teachers Author/Publisher Names [13A] E-227
Table E.501. Frequency of Year When School Adopted Textbook Used in Reported Feeder School Courses or Instructional Programs [13B] E-228
Table E.502. Proportion of Textbook Used in Reported Feeder School Courses or Instructional Programs [13C] E-228
Table E.503. Percentage of Feeder School Teachers Reporting Frequency of Using Other Texts in Reported Feeder School Courses or Instructional Programs [14] E-229
Table E.504. Feeder School Teachers Supplemental Materials Titles [14A] E-229
Table E.505. Percentage of Feeder School Teachers Reporting Frequency of Using Commercially Prepared Materials (Not Computer-Based) in Reported Feeder School Courses or Instructional Programs [14] E-232
Table E.506. Feeder School Teachers Descriptions of General Commercially Prepared Materials [14A] E-233

Table of Contents (Continued)

Table E.507. Feeder School ELA Teachers Descriptions of Commercially Prepared Materials [14A] E-234
Table E.508. Feeder School Math Teachers Descriptions of Commercially Prepared Materials [14A] E-234
Table E.509. Percentage of Feeder School Teachers Reporting Frequency of Using Computer-Based Programs in Reported Feeder School Courses or Instructional Programs [14] E-235
Table E.510. Feeder School Teachers Descriptions of Computer-Based Materials [14A] E-235
Table E.511. Percentage of Feeder School Teachers Reporting Most Advanced Degree [15] E-236
Table E.512. Percentage of Feeder School Teachers Reporting Years of Experience Teaching Reported Courses or Instructional Programs [17] E-237
Table E.513. Percentage of Feeder School Teachers Reporting Total Years of Teaching Experience [18] F-E-237

Table F.1. Number and Type of Site Visit Interviews F-1
Table F.2. (GMGE) Rating of Implementation of Standards-Based Instruction F-2
Table F.3. (GMGE) Broad Differences in the Degree of Implementation of Standards-Based Instruction During a 2-Year Period F-2
Table F.4. (GMGE) Examples of the Increase of Instruction Based on the California Content Standards F-3
Table F.5. (Admin) Ratings of implementation of standards-based instruction F-5
Table F.6. (Admin) Broad Differences in the Degree of Implementation of Standards-Based Instruction during a Two Year Period F-5
Table F.7. (SP) Ratings of implementation of Standards-Based Instruction F-6
Table F.8. (SP) Implementation of standards F-6
Table F.9. (EL) Ratings of Implementation of Standards-Based Instruction F-8
Table F.10. (EL) Implementation of Standards F-9
Table F.11. (SP-C) Rating of Implementation of Standards-Based Instruction F-10
Table F.12. (GMGE) Beliefs About Incoming Student Preparation, Current v. 2 Years Ago F-11
Table F.13. (GMGE) Examples of Better Incoming Student Preparation F-12
Table F.14. (GMGE) Examples of Worse Incoming Student Preparation F-13
Table F.15. (GMGE) Ratings of Incoming Student Preparation, Current v. 2 Years Ago F-14
Table F.16. (Admin) Rating of Preparedness of Incoming Students F-14
Table F.17. (Admin) Examples of Better Preparation F-15
Table F.18. (Admin) Examples of Students Being Less Prepared F-15
Table F.19. (Admin) Ratings of Incoming Student Preparedness F-15
Table F.20. (Admin) Differences in Rating Subpopulations versus General Population F-16
Table F.21. (Admin) Frequency that Subpopulations were Rated as Less Prepared F-16
Table F.22. (SP) Ratings of Incoming Student Preparedness F-16
Table F.23. (SP) Level of Student Preparedness F-16

Table of Contents (Continued)

Table F.24. (SP) Examples of Better Preparedness....F-17
Table F.25. (SP) Examples of Less Preparedness....F-18
Table F.26. (EL) Ratings of Incoming Student Preparedness....F-18
Table F.27. (EL) Level of Student Preparedness....F-19
Table F.28. (EL) Examples of Better Preparedness....F-19
Table F.29. (EL) Examples of Less Preparedness....F-20
Table F.30. (GMGE) California Content Standards and the Written Curriculum....F-21
Table F.31. (Admin) California Content Standards and the Written Curriculum....F-22
Table F.32. (Admin) How Standards Are Incorporated Into Curriculum....F-22
Table F.33. (SP) California Content Standards and the Written Curriculum....F-23
Table F.34. (EL) How Standards are Incorporated into Curriculum....F-23
Table F.35. (SP-C) California Content Standards and the Written Curriculum....F-24
Table F.36. (SP-C) How Standards are Incorporated into Curriculum....F-24
Table F.37. (GMGE) Ensuring the Teaching of California Content Standards....F-25
Table F.38. (Admin) Methods Used to Ensure Teachers are Teaching the California Content Standards....F-27
Table F.39. (SP) Methods for Ensuring CA Standards are Being Taught....F-28
Table F.40. (EL) Methods for Ensuring CA Standards are Being Taught....F-30
Table F.41. (SP-C) Methods to Ensure CA Standards are Being Taught....F-32
Table F.42. (GMGE) What Ensures that Mastery Means the Same Thing to all Teachers?....F-33
Table F.43. (GMGE) Does the Teacher Use an Informal Method to Monitor Student Mastery of Standards?....F-37
Table F.44. (Admin) What Ensures that Mastery Means the Same Thing to all Teachers?....F-39
Table F.45. (SP) What Ensures that Mastery Means the Same Thing to all Teachers?....F-40
Table F.46. (EL) What Ensures that Mastery Means the Same Thing to all Teachers?....F-42
Table F.47. (SP-C) What Ensures that Mastery Means the Same Thing to all Teachers?....F-45
Table F.48. (GMGE) School-Wide Mastery System Description....F-46
Table F.49. (Admin) School-Wide Mastery System Description....F-47
Table F.50. (SP) School-Wide Mastery System Description....F-48
Table F.51. (EL) School-Wide Mastery System Description....F-49
Table F.52. (EL) Informal Methods Used to Monitor Mastery....F-49
Table F.53. (SP-C) Ways to Monitor Individual Student Mastery....F-50
Table F.54. (GMGE) Question 7B Responses by School Level....F-52
Table F.55. (Admin) Changes in Instruction Practice to Meet Individual Student Needs....F-52
Table F.56. (Admin) Changes in Professional Development Opportunities based on Individual Student Needs....F-53
Table F.57. (GMGE) Responses to Distribution of At-Risk or Not Passing Student Populations....F-53

Table of Contents (Continued)

Table F.58. (GMGE) Subpopulations Considered At Risk or Who Have Not Yet Passed CAHSEE....F-54
Table F.59. (SP) Opportunities to Team Teach With GMGE Teachers....F-56
Table F.60. (SP) Frequency of Team Teaching with GMGE Teachers....F-56
Table F.61. (EL) Opportunities to Team Teach with GMGE Teachers....F-57
Table F.62. (EL) Frequency of Team Teaching with GMGE Teachers....F-57
Table F.63. (EL) Do Students Receive Content Instruction in Their Native Language?....F-57
Table F.64. (EL) What Percentage of Instruction Do Students Receive in Their Native Language?....F-58
Table F.65. (Admin) Changes Made to Curriculum Attributable to CAHSEE....F-58
Table F.66. (Admin) Changes to Electives Attributable to CAHSEE....F-58
Table F.67. (Admin) Other Program/Curriculum Changes Attributable to CAHSEE....F-58
Table F.68. (GMGE) Teachers' Reported Frequencies of Meetings with Special Education and EL Teachers....F-59
Table F.69. (SP) Frequency of Collaboration Between SP and GMGE Teachers....F-61
Table F.70. (EL) Frequency of Collaboration Between EL and GMGE Teachers....F-62
Table F.71 (SP) Involvement in GMGE Professional Development....F-62
Table F.72. (GMGE) Teachers' Reported Frequency of Special Education and English Learner Professional Development....F-63
Table F.73. (GMGE) Methods to Ensure Professional Development is Used....F-65
Table F.74. (Admin) Methods to Ensure Professional Development is Used....F-66
Table F.75. (SP) Professional Development Opportunities....F-67
Table F.76. (SP) Methods to Ensure Professional Development is Used....F-68
Table F.77. (SP) Involvement in GMGE Professional Development....F-69
Table F.78. (EL) Professional Development Opportunities....F-69
Table F.79. (EL) Methods to Ensure Professional Development is Used....F-70
Table F.80. (EL) Involvement in GMGE Professional Development....F-71
Table F.81. (SP) Does School Have Programs for SP Parents?....F-72
Table F.82. (SP) Types of Programs for SP Parents....F-72
Table F.83.(EL) Does School Have Programs for EL Parents?....F-73
Table F.84. (EL) Types of Programs for EL Parents....F-73
Table F.85. (EL) Involvement in Parent Programs....F-74
Table F.86. (EL) Type of Support Given for Various Programs....F-74
Table F.87. (GMGE) Is Tailored Instruction Done on a Regular Basis?....F-76
Table F.88. (GMGE) Rating of CAHSEE Support Shown to General Student Population....F-77
Table F.89. (GMGE) Rating of CAHSEE Support Shown to Student Subpopulations....F-77
Table F.90. (GMGE) CAHSEE Support Given to General Populations and Subpopulations....F-79
Table F.91. (GMGE) Teachers' Recommendations to Improve the Level of CAHSEE Support....F-82
Table F.92. (Admin) Ratings of CAHSEE Support....F-84
Table F.93.(Admin) Types of CAHSEE support offered for students....F-85
Table F.94. (Admin) Ratings of CAHSEE Support Two Years Ago....F-85

Table of Contents (Continued)

Table F.95. (Admin) Recommendations for Improving CAHSEE Support F-85
Table F.96. (Admin) Current Ratings for Subpopulation CAHSEE Support.....F-86
Table F.97. (SP) Ratings of CAHSEE Support Shown to SP Students F-86
Table F.98. (SP) Examples of CAHSEE Support F-87
Table F.99. (SP) Recommendations to Improve Level of CAHSEE Support.....F-89
Table F.100. (EL) Ratings of CAHSEE Support Shown to EL Students F-90
Table F.101. (EL) Examples of CAHSEE Support.....F-91
Table F.102. (EL) Recommendations for Improving CAHSEE Support.....F-92
Table F.103. (SP-C) Degree of CAHSEE Support F-94
Table F.104. (SP-C) Type of CAHSEE Support F-94
Table F.105. (SP-C) Teacher Ratings of CAHSEE Support Two Years Ago.....F-94
Table F.106. (GMGE) Reported Changes in Student Motivation or Attitude Attributable to CAHSEE.....F-96
Table F.107. (GMGE) Reported Response to Change in Student Motivation or Attitude Attributable to CAHSEE F-97
Table F.108. Change in Student Motivation or Attitude in High Schools.....F-98
Table F.109. Responses to Reported Change in Motivation and Attitude.....F-99
Table F.110. (GMGE) Change in Motivation or Attitude in Subpopulations Attributable to CAHSEE.....F-99
Table F.111. (GMGE) Response to Change in Student Motivation or Attitude in Subpopulations Attributable to CAHSEE F-100
Table F.112. (Admin) Reported Change in Motivation or Attitude of Subpopulation Attributable to CAHSEE.....F-102
Table F.113. (SP) Change in Student Motivation or Attitude Attributable to CAHSEE ..F-103
Table F.114. (SP) School Response to Change in Student Motivation or Attitude Attributable to CAHSEE.....F-104
Table F.115. (EL) Change in Student Motivation or Attitude Attributable to CAHSEE...F-105
Table F.116. (EL) School Response to Change in Student Motivation or Attitude Attributable to CAHSEE.....F-106
Table F.117. (SP-C) Changes in Student Attitude or Motivation F-106
Table F.118. (GMGE) Teachers' Beliefs that Student Motivation will Change Under CAHSEE.....F-107
Table F.119. (GMGE) Teachers' Anticipated Changes in Student Motivation Under CAHSEE.....F-108
Table F.120. (GMGE) School Response to Anticipated Changes in Attitude or Motivation F-110
Table F.121. (Admin) Anticipated Changes in Student Motivation or Attitude.....F-111
Table F.122. (Admin) Types of Change in Student Motivation.....F-111
Table F.123. (Admin) School Response to Anticipated Changes Under CAHSEE F-112
Table F.124. (GMGE) Teachers' Beliefs About Subpopulation Student Motivation Under CAHSEE.....F-112
Table F.125. (GMGE) Teachers' Anticipated Changes to Subpopulation Student Motivation Under CAHSEE F-113
Table F.126. (GMGE) Potential Actions Schools Might Take in Response to Changes in Subpopulation Student Motivation Under CAHSEE.....F-114

Table of Contents (Continued)

Table F.127. (Admin) Changes in Motivation or Attitude Within Subpopulations F-115
Table F.128. (Admin) Types of Change in Student Motivation or Attitude.....F-115
Table F.129. (Admin) School Response to Anticipated Change in Student Attitude or Motivation Under CAHSEE F-116
Table F.130. (SP) Anticipated Change in Motivation or Attitude Under CAHSEE F-117
Table F.131. (SP) Type of Anticipated Change in Student Motivation or Attitude Under CAHSEE.....F-117
Table F.132. (SP)School Response to Anticipated Change in Student Motivation or Attitude Under CAHSEE.....F-118
Table F.133. (EL) Anticipated Change in Student Motivation or Attitude Under CAHSEE.....F-119
Table F.134. (EL) Type of Anticipated Change in Student Motivation or Attitude Under CAHSEE.....F-119
Table F.135. (EL) School Response to Anticipated Change in Motivation or Attitude Under CAHSEE.....F-121
Table F.136. (SP-C) Anticipated Change in Student Motivation or Attitude Under CAHSEE.....F-121
Table F.137. (SP-C) Type of Anticipated Change in Attitude or Motivation Under CAHSEE.....F-122
Table F.138. (GMGE) Teachers' Beliefs about CAHSEE Accountability F-122
Table F.139. (GMGE) Reasons for Beliefs about CAHSEE Accountability.....F-123
Table F.140. (Admin) Beliefs about CAHSEE Accountability F-125
Table F.141. (Admin) Reasons for Beliefs about CAHSEE Accountability.....F-126
Table F.142. (SP) Beliefs about CAHSEE Accountability.....F-126
Table F.143. (SP) Reasons for Negative Beliefs about CAHSEE Accountability.....F-127
Table F.144. (SP) Reasons for Positive Beliefs about CAHSEE Accountability F-127
Table F.145. (SP) Reasons for Mixed Beliefs about CAHSEE Accountability F-128
Table F.146. (EL) Beliefs about CAHSEE Accountability F-128
Table F.147. (EL) Reasons for Negative Beliefs about CAHSEE Accountability F-129
Table F.148. (EL) Reasons for Positive Beliefs about CAHSEE Accountability.....F-130
Table F.149. (EL) Reasons for Mixed Beliefs about CAHSEE Accountability.....F-130
Table F.150. (SP-C) Beliefs about CAHSEE Accountability.....F-131
Table F.151. (SP-C) Reasons for Beliefs about CAHSEE Accountability F-131

Table H.1. Preparation for the ELA Test Reported by Students in the Classes of 2006 and 2007..... H-2
Table H.2. Preparation for the ELA Test Reported by Repeat Test Takers H-2
Table H.3. Preparation for the Math Test Reported by Students in the Classes of 2006 and 2007..... H-3
Table H.4. Preparation for the Math Test Reported by Repeat Test Takers..... H-3
Table H.5. Importance of the ELA Test as Perceived by Students in the Classes of 2006 and 2007..... H-5
Table H.6. Importance of the ELA Test as Perceived by Repeat Test Takers..... H-5
Table H.7. Importance of the Math Test as Perceived by Students in the Classes of 2006 and 2007..... H-6

Table of Contents (Continued)

Table H.8. Importance of the Math Test as Perceived by Repeat Test Takers H-6
Table H.9. Expectations of High School Graduation Indicated by Students in the Classes of 2006 and 2007 After the ELA Test H-8
Table H.10. Repeat Test Takers' Expectations of High School Graduation After the ELA Test H-8
Table H.11. Expectations of High School Graduation Indicated by Students in the Classes of 2006 and 2007 After the Math Test H-9
Table H.12. Repeat Test Takers' Expectations of High School Graduation After the Math Test H-9
Table H.13. Impact of the ELA Test on High School Graduation Perceived by Students in the Classes of 2006 and 2007 ..... H-11
Table H.14. Impact of the ELA Test on High School Graduation Perceived by Repeat Test Takers H-11
Table H.15. Impact of the Math Test on High School Graduation Perceived by Students in the Classes of 2006 and 2007 ..... H-12
Table H.16. Impact of the Math Test on High School Graduation Perceived by Repeat Test Takers H-12
Table H.17. Post-High-School Plans Reported by Students in the Classes of 2006 and 2007 After the ELA Test H-14
Table H.18. Repeat Test Takers' Post-High-School Plans After the ELA Test H-14
Table H.19. Post-High School Plans Reported by Students in the Classes of 2006 and 2007 After the Math Test H-15
Table H.20. Repeat Test Takers' Post-High-School Plans After the Math Test H-15
Table H.21. Certainty About Post-High School Plans Indicated by Students in the Classes of 2006 and 2007After the ELA Test H-17
Table H.22. Repeat Test Takers' Certainty About Post-High School Plans After the ELA Test H-17
Table H.23. Certainty About Post-High School Plans Indicated by Students in the Classes of 2006 and 2007After the Math Test H-18
Table H.24. Repeat Test Takers' Certainty About Post-High School Plans After the Math Test H-18
Table H.25. Self-Reported Performance on the ELA Test by Students in the Classes of 2006 and 2007 ..... H-20
Table H.26. Self-Reported Performance on the ELA Test by Repeat Test Takers H-20
Table H.27. Self-Reported Performance on the Math Test by Students in the Classes of 2006 and 2007 ..... H-21
Table H.28. Self-Reported Performance on the Math Test by Repeat Test Takers H-21
Table H.29. Reasons For Not Performing Optimally on the ELA Test Indicated by Students in the Classes of 2006 and 2007 ..... H-23
Table H.30. Reasons For Not Performing Optimally on the ELA Test Indicated by Repeat Test Takers H-23
Table H.31. Reasons For Not Performing Optimally on the Math Test Indicated by Students in the Classes of 2006 and 2007 ..... H-24
Table H.32. Reasons For Not Performing Optimally on the Math Test Indicated by Repeat Test Takers H-24

Table of Contents (Continued)

Table H.33. Self-Reported Exposure to Topics on the ELA Test by Students in the Classes of 2006 and 2007 ..... H-26
Table H.34. Self-Reported Exposure to Topics on the ELA Test by Repeat Test Takers H-26
Table H.35. Self-Reported Exposure to Topics on the Math Test by Students in the Classes of 2006 and 2007 ..... H-27
Table H.36. Self-Reported Exposure to Topics on the Math Test by Repeat Test Takers H-27
Table H.37. Familiarity with the Types of Questions on the ELA Test Indicated by Students in the Classes of 2006 and 2007 ..... H-29
Table H.38. Familiarity with the Types of Questions on the ELA Test Indicated by Repeat Test Takers H-29
Table H.39. Familiarity with the Types of Questions on the Math Test Indicated by Students in the Classes of 2006 and 2007 ..... H-30
Table H.40. Familiarity with the Types of Questions on the Math Test Indicated by Repeat Test Takers H-30
Table H.41. Difficulty of the Questions on the ELA Test Perceived by Students in the Classes of 2006 and 2007 ..... H-32
Table H.42. Difficulty of the Questions on the ELA Test Perceived by Repeat Test Takers H-32
Table H.43. Difficulty of the Questions on the Math Test Perceived by Students in the Classes of 2006 and 2007 ..... H-33
Table H.44. Difficulty of the Questions on the Math Test Perceived by Repeat Test Takers H-33
Table H.45. Reasons for Experiencing Difficulty With Topics on the ELA Test Indicated by Students in the Classes of 2006 and 2007 ..... H-35
Table H.46. Reasons for Experiencing Difficulty With Topics on the ELA Test Indicated by Repeat Test Takers H-35
Table H.47. Reasons for Experiencing Difficulty With Topics on the Math Test Indicated by Students in the Classes of 2006 and 2007 ..... H-36
Table H.48. Reasons for Experiencing Difficulty With Topics on the Math Test Indicated by Repeat Test Takers H-36

Appendix E: Survey Questionnaire Response Frequencies

Contains frequency distributions of responses for each of the surveys seen in Appendix B (see Volume 2). The survey item number, if applicable, is shown in brackets following each table title.

Table E.1. Proportion of High Schools in Districts That Offer English 9 as Primary or Supplemental Course During Current Academic Year [1]

ELA-Pri-HS:Comp English-Grade 9 (2101)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	2	1.8	1.8	1.8
	Only a few (less than 25%)	2	1.8	1.8	3.6
	Most (75% - 90%)	2	1.8	1.8	5.4
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	105	94.6	94.6	100.0
	Total	111	100.0	100.0	

Table E.2. Proportion of High Schools in Districts That Offer English 10 as Primary or Supplemental Course During Current Academic Year [1]

ELA-Pri-HS:Comp English-Grade 10 (2101)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	3	2.7	2.8	2.8
	Only a few (less than 25%)	2	1.8	1.8	4.6
	Most (75% - 90%)	2	1.8	1.8	6.4
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	102	91.9	93.6	100.0
	Total	109	98.2	100.0	
Missing	Missing	2	1.8		
Total		111	100.0		

Table E.3. Proportion of High Schools in Districts That Offer English 11 as Primary or Supplemental Course During Current Academic Year [1]

ELA-Pri-HS:Comp English-Grade 11 (2101)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	4	3.6	3.7	3.7
	Only a few (less than 25%)	3	2.7	2.8	6.4
	Some (25% - 74%)	1	.9	.9	7.3
	Most (75% - 90%)	1	.9	.9	8.3
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	100	90.1	91.7	100.0
	Total	109	98.2	100.0	
Missing	Missing	2	1.8		
Total		111	100.0		

Table E.4. Proportion of High Schools in Districts That Offer English 12 as Primary or Supplemental Course During Current Academic Year [1]

ELA-Pri-HS:Comp English-Grade 12 (2101)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	6	5.4	5.6	5.6
	None	2	1.8	1.9	7.4
	Only a few (less than 25%)	3	2.7	2.8	10.2
	Some (25% - 74%)	2	1.8	1.9	12.0
	Most (75% - 90%)	1	.9	.9	13.0
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	94	84.7	87.0	100.0
	Total	108	97.3	100.0	
Missing	Missing	3	2.7		
Total		111	100.0		

Table E.5. Proportion of High Schools in Districts That Offer English Literature as Primary or Supplemental Course During Current Academic Year [1]

ELA-Pri-HS:English Literature (2106)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	14	12.6	15.7	15.7
	None	16	14.4	18.0	33.7
	Only a few (less than 25%)	6	5.4	6.7	40.4
	Some (25% - 74%)	6	5.4	6.7	47.2
	Most (75% - 90%)	5	4.5	5.6	52.8
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	42	37.8	47.2	100.0
	Total	89	80.2	100.0	
Missing	Missing	22	19.8		
Total		111	100.0		

Table E.6. Proportion of High Schools in Districts That Offer World/Other Literature as Primary or Supplemental Course During Current Academic Year [1]

ELA-Pri-HS:World/Other Lit (2107-2109)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	19	17.1	21.8	21.8
	None	18	16.2	20.7	42.5
	Only a few (less than 25%)	9	8.1	10.3	52.9
	Some (25% - 74%)	1	.9	1.1	54.0
	Most (75% - 90%)	6	5.4	6.9	60.9
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	34	30.6	39.1	100.0
	Total	87	78.4	100.0	
Missing	Missing	24	21.6		
Total		111	100.0		

Table E.7. Proportion of High Schools in Districts That Offer Composition as Primary or Supplemental Course During Current Academic Year [1]

ELA-Pri-HS:Composition (2113)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	20	18.0	23.8	23.8
	None	18	16.2	21.4	45.2
	Only a few (less than 25%)	7	6.3	8.3	53.6
	Some (25% - 74%)	8	7.2	9.5	63.1
	Most (75% - 90%)	4	3.6	4.8	67.9
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	27	24.3	32.1	100.0
	Total	84	75.7	100.0	
Missing	Missing	27	24.3		
Total		111	100.0		

Table E.8. Proportion of High Schools in Districts That Offer Language Structure/Language Arts as Primary or Supplemental Course During Current Academic Year [1]

ELA-Pri-HS:Lang Structure/Arts (2116)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	31	27.9	40.3	40.3
	None	27	24.3	35.1	75.3
	Only a few (less than 25%)	3	2.7	3.9	79.2
	Some (25% - 74%)	2	1.8	2.6	81.8
	Most (75% - 90%)	2	1.8	2.6	84.4
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	12	10.8	15.6	100.0
	Total	77	69.4	100.0	
Missing	Missing	34	30.6		
Total		111	100.0		

Table E.9. Proportion of High Schools in Districts That Offer English as a Second Language as Primary or Supplemental Course During Current Academic Year [1]

ELA-Pri-HS:English as a 2nd Lang (2110)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	8	7.2	7.9	7.9
	None	8	7.2	7.9	15.8
	Only a few (less than 25%)	7	6.3	6.9	22.8
	Some (25% - 74%)	6	5.4	5.9	28.7
	Most (75% - 90%)	6	5.4	5.9	34.7
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	66	59.5	65.3	100.0
	Total	101	91.0	100.0	
Missing	Missing	10	9.0		
Total		111	100.0		

Table E.10. Proportion of High Schools in Districts That Offer Developmental Reading as Primary or Supplemental Course During Current Academic Year [1]

ELA-Pri-HS:Developmental Reading (2100)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	12	10.8	12.6	12.6
	None	15	13.5	15.8	28.4
	Only a few (less than 25%)	7	6.3	7.4	35.8
	Some (25% - 74%)	6	5.4	6.3	42.1
	Most (75% - 90%)	6	5.4	6.3	48.4
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	49	44.1	51.6	100.0
	Total	95	85.6	100.0	
Missing	Missing	16	14.4		
Total		111	100.0		

Table E.11. District ELA Curriculum Head Reported Offering These Other High School ELA Primary or Supplemental Courses [1]

Course Title	Frequency	Percentage (n=75)
CAHSEE		
CAHSEE English Language Arts	11	14.67%
Remedial ELA		
Resource Specialist Program	2	2.67%
Remedial English	1	1.33%
Reading Support	1	1.33%
Reading Fundamentals	1	1.33%
Reading	1	1.33%
Intermediate Reading	1	1.33%
ELA		
American Literature	3	4.00%
English Literature	3	4.00%
English	3	4.00%
English 1	2	2.67%
English	2	2.67%
English Review	2	2.67%
English Language & Composition	2	2.67%
Skills for Success	1	1.33%
Literacy Skills	1	1.33%
Pathways	1	1.33%
English Professional	1	1.33%
English Language 1B	1	1.33%
Linguistics	1	1.33%
Ethnic Literature	1	1.33%
Contemporary Issues in Literature	1	1.33%
English Writing Skills	1	1.33%
Creative Composition & Literature	1	1.33%
Applied English	1	1.33%
English 2	1	1.33%

Table E.11. continued

Course Title	Frequency	Percentage (n=75)
English Literature & Composition	1	1.33%
English RDG	1	1.33%
Creative Writing	1	1.33%
Contemporary Cultural Literature & Composition	1	1.33%
English 4	1	1.33%
Learning Center English	1	1.33%
Special Day Class 3000	1	1.33%
Educational Support Specialists Skills for Success	1	1.33%
Advanced ELA		
Advanced Placement English Literature	3	4.00%
Advanced Placement English	2	2.67%
Advance Placement Language & Composition	2	2.67%
Advanced Placement English Composition	2	2.67%
Advanced Placement Literature & Composition	2	2.67%
Advanced Composition	1	1.33%
Advanced Placement English	1	1.33%
Advanced Placement English Language	1	1.33%
Honors English	1	1.33%
ELD		
English Language Development	2	2.67%
English Language Development 5 through 6	1	1.33%
English Language Development 1 through 2	1	1.33%
Transitional English	1	1.33%

Table E.12. Proportion of Feeder Schools in Districts That Offer English 6 as Primary or Supplemental Course During Current Academic Year [2]

ELA-Pri-MS:Comp English-Grade 6 (2101)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	27	24.3	28.7	28.7
	None	4	3.6	4.3	33.0
	Only a few (less than 25%)	5	4.5	5.3	38.3
	Most (75% - 90%)	1	.9	1.1	39.4
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	57	51.4	60.6	100.0
	Total	94	84.7	100.0	
Missing	Missing	17	15.3		
Total		111	100.0		

Table E.13. Proportion of Feeder Schools in Districts That Offer English 7 as Primary or Supplemental Course During Current Academic Year [2]

ELA-Pri-MS:Comp English-Grade 7 (2101)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	13	11.7	13.3	13.3
	Only a few (less than 25%)	1	.9	1.0	14.3
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	84	75.7	85.7	100.0
	Total	98	88.3	100.0	
Missing	Missing	13	11.7		
Total		111	100.0		

Table E.14. Proportion of Feeder Schools in Districts That Offer English 8 as Primary or Supplemental Course During Current Academic Year [2]

ELA-Pri-MS:Comp English-Grade 8 (2101)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	13	11.7	13.3	13.3
	Only a few (less than 25%)	1	.9	1.0	14.3
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	84	75.7	85.7	100.0
	Total	98	88.3	100.0	
Missing	Missing	13	11.7		
Total		111	100.0		

Table E.15. Proportion of Feeder Schools in Districts That Offer English 9 as Primary or Supplemental Course During Current Academic Year [2]

ELA-Pri-MS:Comp English-Grade 9 (2101)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	47	42.3	57.3	57.3
	None	8	7.2	9.8	67.1
	Only a few (less than 25%)	2	1.8	2.4	69.5
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	25	22.5	30.5	100.0
	Total	82	73.9	100.0	
Missing	Missing	29	26.1		
Total		111	100.0		

Table E.16. Proportion of Feeder Schools in Districts That Offer English as a Second Language as Primary or Supplemental Course During Current Academic Year [2]

ELA-Pri-MS:English as a 2nd Lang (2110)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	24	21.6	26.4	26.4
	None	4	3.6	4.4	30.8
	Only a few (less than 25%)	6	5.4	6.6	37.4
	Some (25% - 74%)	4	3.6	4.4	41.8
	Most (75% - 90%)	5	4.5	5.5	47.3
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	48	43.2	52.7	100.0
	Total	91	82.0	100.0	
Missing	Missing	20	18.0		
Total		111	100.0		

Table E.17. Proportion of Feeder Schools in Districts That Offer Language Structure/Language Arts as Primary or Supplemental Course During Current Academic Year [2]

ELA-Pri-MS:Lang Structure/Arts (2116)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	34	30.6	44.7	44.7
	None	17	15.3	22.4	67.1
	Only a few (less than 25%)	5	4.5	6.6	73.7
	Some (25% - 74%)	2	1.8	2.6	76.3
	Most (75% - 90%)	3	2.7	3.9	80.3
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	15	13.5	19.7	100.0
	Total	76	68.5	100.0	
Missing	Missing	35	31.5		
Total		111	100.0		

Table E.18. District ELA Curriculum Head Reported Offering These Other Feeder Middle School ELA Primary or Supplemental Courses [2]

Course Title	Frequency	Percentage (n=17)
Reading	5	29.41%
English Language Development	2	11.76%
Linguistics Remedial Reading	1	5.88%
Journalism	1	5.88%
Linguistics	1	5.88%
Developmental Reading	1	5.88%
Reading Support	1	5.88%
Advanced Composition	1	5.88%
Literature	1	5.88%
English RDG	1	5.88%
Writing	1	5.88%
RSP English	1	5.88%

Table E.19. Proportion of High Schools in Districts That Offer Houghton Mifflin Reading: A Legacy of Literacy as an Intervention or Basic Program During Current Academic Year [3]

ELA-Int-HS:Houghton Mifflin Reading

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	43	38.7	51.2	51.2
	None	36	32.4	42.9	94.0
	Most (75% - 90%)	1	.9	1.2	95.2
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	4	3.6	4.8	100.0
	Total	84	75.7	100.0	
Missing	Missing	27	24.3		
Total		111	100.0		

Table E.20. Proportion of High Schools in Districts That Offer SRA/Open Court Reading as an Intervention or Basic Program During Current Academic Year [3]

ELA-Int-HS:SRA/Open Court Reading

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	41	36.9	50.0	50.0
	None	37	33.3	45.1	95.1
	Only a few (less than 25%)	1	.9	1.2	96.3
	Some (25% - 74%)	1	.9	1.2	97.6
	Most (75% - 90%)	1	.9	1.2	98.8
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	1	.9	1.2	100.0
	Total	82	73.9	100.0	
Missing	Missing	29	26.1		
Total		111	100.0		

Table E.21. Proportion of High Schools in Districts That Offer The Reader's Choice as an Intervention or Basic Program During Current Academic Year [3]

ELA-Int-HS:The Reader's Choice

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	39	35.1	50.0	50.0
	None	36	32.4	46.2	96.2
	Most (75% - 90%)	1	.9	1.3	97.4
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	2	1.8	2.6	100.0
	Total	78	70.3	100.0	
Missing	Missing	33	29.7		
Total		111	100.0		

Table E.22. Proportion of High Schools in Districts That Offer Literature and Language as an Intervention or Basic Program During Current Academic Year [3]

ELA-Int-HS:Literature and Language

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	31	27.9	34.1	34.1
	None	26	23.4	28.6	62.6
	Only a few (less than 25%)	6	5.4	6.6	69.2
	Some (25% - 74%)	1	.9	1.1	70.3
	Most (75% - 90%)	4	3.6	4.4	74.7
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	23	20.7	25.3	100.0
	Total	91	82.0	100.0	
Missing	Missing	20	18.0		
Total		111	100.0		

Table E.23. Proportion of High Schools in Districts That Offer McDougal Littell Reading & Language Arts Program as an Intervention or Basic Program During Current Academic Year [3]

ELA-Int-HS:McDougal Littell Reading

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	32	28.8	41.6	41.6
	None	28	25.2	36.4	77.9
	Only a few (less than 25%)	5	4.5	6.5	84.4
	Most (75% - 90%)	1	.9	1.3	85.7
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	11	9.9	14.3	100.0
	Total	77	69.4	100.0	
Missing	Missing	34	30.6		
Total		111	100.0		

Table E.24. Proportion of High Schools in Districts That Offer Prentice Hall Literature: Timeless Voices, Timeless Themes as an Intervention or Basic Program During Current Academic Year [3]

ELA-Int-HS:Prentice-Hall Literature

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	30	27.0	37.0	37.0
	None	28	25.2	34.6	71.6
	Only a few (less than 25%)	3	2.7	3.7	75.3
	Some (25% - 74%)	3	2.7	3.7	79.0
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	17	15.3	21.0	100.0
	Total	81	73.0	100.0	
Missing	Missing	30	27.0		
Total		111	100.0		

Table E.25. Proportion of High Schools in Districts That Offer Language! as an Intervention or Basic Program During Current Academic Year [3]

ELA-Int-HS:Language! Literacy Intervent

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	27	24.3	32.1	32.1
	None	29	26.1	34.5	66.7
	Only a few (less than 25%)	6	5.4	7.1	73.8
	Some (25% - 74%)	5	4.5	6.0	79.8
	Most (75% - 90%)	1	.9	1.2	81.0
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	16	14.4	19.0	100.0
	Total	84	75.7	100.0	
Missing	Missing	27	24.3		
Total		111	100.0		

Table E.26. Proportion of High Schools in Districts That Offer High Point as an Intervention or Basic Program During Current Academic Year [3]

ELA-Int-HS:High Point (Hampton Brown)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	29	26.1	34.1	34.1
	None	30	27.0	35.3	69.4
	Only a few (less than 25%)	5	4.5	5.9	75.3
	Some (25% - 74%)	4	3.6	4.7	80.0
	Most (75% - 90%)	3	2.7	3.5	83.5
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	14	12.6	16.5	100.0
	Total	85	76.6	100.0	
Missing	Missing	26	23.4		
Total		111	100.0		

Table E.27. Proportion of High Schools in Districts That Offer High Point for English Learners as an Intervention or Basic Program During Current Academic Year [3]

ELA-Int-HS:High Point English Learners

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	15	13.5	15.8	15.8
	None	27	24.3	28.4	44.2
	Only a few (less than 25%)	5	4.5	5.3	49.5
	Some (25% - 74%)	9	8.1	9.5	58.9
	Most (75% - 90%)	4	3.6	4.2	63.2
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	35	31.5	36.8	100.0
	Total	95	85.6	100.0	
Missing	Missing	16	14.4		
Total		111	100.0		

Table E.28. Proportion of High Schools in Districts That Offer READ 180 as an Intervention or Basic Program During Current Academic Year [3]

ELA-Int-HS:READ 180

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	33	29.7	37.5	37.5
	None	29	26.1	33.0	70.5
	Only a few (less than 25%)	7	6.3	8.0	78.4
	Some (25% - 74%)	7	6.3	8.0	86.4
	Most (75% - 90%)	2	1.8	2.3	88.6
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	10	9.0	11.4	100.0
	Total	88	79.3	100.0	
Missing	Missing	23	20.7		
Total		111	100.0		

Table E.29. Proportion of High Schools in Districts That Offer SRA/Reach Program as an Intervention or Basic Program During Current Academic Year [3]

ELA-Int-HS:SRA/Reach Program

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	36	32.4	42.4	42.4
	None	31	27.9	36.5	78.8
	Only a few (less than 25%)	2	1.8	2.4	81.2
	Some (25% - 74%)	6	5.4	7.1	88.2
	Most (75% - 90%)	2	1.8	2.4	90.6
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	8	7.2	9.4	100.0
	Total	85	76.6	100.0	
Missing	Missing	26	23.4		
Total		111	100.0		

Table E.30. Proportion of High Schools in Districts That Offer Fast Track Reading Program as an Intervention or Basic Program During Current Academic Year [3]

ELA-Int-HS:Fast Track Reading Program

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	42	37.8	53.2	53.2
	None	37	33.3	46.8	100.0
	Total	79	71.2	100.0	
Missing	Missing	32	28.8		
Total		111	100.0		

Table E.31. District ELA Curriculum Head Reported Offering These Other Intervention or Basic Programs [3]

Program Title	Frequency	Percentage (n=17)
Elements of Literature	2	11.76%
CAHSEE English	2	11.76%
Wilson Language System	1	5.88%
Shining Star	1	5.88%
English Language Arts	1	5.88%
Reading Plus	1	5.88%
Measuring Up	1	5.88%
New Century	1	5.88%
Readers Handbook	1	5.88%
Writing	1	5.88%
Soar to Success	1	5.88%
Reach	1	5.88%
Special Education Summer Reliability Agreement-	1	5.88%
Corrective Reading, Decoding, & Comprehension		0.00%
Lindamood Bell	1	5.88%
American Literature-American Guidance Service	1	5.88%

Table E.32. Proportion of Feeder Schools in Districts That Offer Houghton Mifflin Reading: A Legacy of Literacy as an Intervention or Basic Program During Current Academic Year [3]

ELA-Int-MS:Houghton Mifflin Reading

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	39	35.1	54.2	54.2
	None	21	18.9	29.2	83.3
	Only a few (less than 25%)	4	3.6	5.6	88.9
	Most (75% - 90%)	1	.9	1.4	90.3
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	7	6.3	9.7	100.0
	Total	72	64.9	100.0	
Missing	Missing	39	35.1		
Total		111	100.0		

Table E.33. Proportion of Feeder Schools in Districts That Offer SRA/Open Court Reading as an Intervention or Basic Program During Current Academic Year [3]

ELA-Int-MS:SRA/Open Court Reading

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	44	39.6	63.8	63.8
	None	21	18.9	30.4	94.2
	Only a few (less than 25%)	2	1.8	2.9	97.1
	Some (25% - 74%)	1	.9	1.4	98.6
	Most (75% - 90%)	1	.9	1.4	100.0
	Total	69	62.2	100.0	
Missing	Missing	42	37.8		
Total		111	100.0		

Table E.34. Proportion of Feeder Schools in Districts That Offer The Reader's Choice as an Intervention or Basic Program During Current Academic Year [3]

ELA-Int-MS:The Reader's Choice

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	44	39.6	62.9	62.9
	None	23	20.7	32.9	95.7
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	3	2.7	4.3	100.0
	Total	70	63.1	100.0	
Missing	Missing	41	36.9		
Total		111	100.0		

Table E.35. Proportion of Feeder Schools in Districts That Offer Literature and Language as an Intervention or Basic Program During Current Academic Year [3]

ELA-Int-MS:Literature and Language

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	35	31.5	46.1	46.1
	None	17	15.3	22.4	68.4
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	24	21.6	31.6	100.0
	Total	76	68.5	100.0	
Missing	Missing	35	31.5		
Total		111	100.0		

Table E.36. Proportion of Feeder Schools in Districts That Offer McDougal Littell Reading & Language Arts Program as an Intervention or Basic Program During Current Academic Year [3]

ELA-Int-MS:McDougal Littell Reading

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	34	30.6	49.3	49.3
	None	16	14.4	23.2	72.5
	Only a few (less than 25%)	3	2.7	4.3	76.8
	Some (25% - 74%)	1	.9	1.4	78.3
	Most (75% - 90%)	2	1.8	2.9	81.2
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	13	11.7	18.8	100.0
	Total	69	62.2	100.0	
Missing	Missing	42	37.8		
Total		111	100.0		

Table E.37. Proportion of Feeder Schools in Districts That Offer Prentice Hall Literature: Timeless Voices, Timeless Themes as an Intervention or Basic Program During Current Academic Year [3]

ELA-Int-MS:Prentice-Hall Literature

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	40	36.0	54.1	54.1
	None	13	11.7	17.6	71.6
	Only a few (less than 25%)	1	.9	1.4	73.0
	Some (25% - 74%)	2	1.8	2.7	75.7
	Most (75% - 90%)	1	.9	1.4	77.0
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	17	15.3	23.0	100.0
	Total	74	66.7	100.0	
Missing	Missing	37	33.3		
Total		111	100.0		

Table E.38. Proportion of Feeder Schools in Districts That Offer Language! as an Intervention or Basic Program During Current Academic Year [3]

ELA-Int-MS:Language! Literacy Intervent

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	34	30.6	45.3	45.3
	None	18	16.2	24.0	69.3
	Only a few (less than 25%)	4	3.6	5.3	74.7
	Some (25% - 74%)	3	2.7	4.0	78.7
	Most (75% - 90%)	1	.9	1.3	80.0
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	15	13.5	20.0	100.0
	Total	75	67.6	100.0	
Missing	Missing	36	32.4		
Total		111	100.0		

Table E.39. Proportion of Feeder Schools in Districts That Offer High Point as an Intervention or Basic Program During Current Academic Year [3]

ELA-Int-MS:High Point (Hampton Brown)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	31	27.9	40.8	40.8
	None	15	13.5	19.7	60.5
	Only a few (less than 25%)	6	5.4	7.9	68.4
	Some (25% - 74%)	6	5.4	7.9	76.3
	Most (75% - 90%)	3	2.7	3.9	80.3
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	15	13.5	19.7	100.0
	Total	76	68.5	100.0	
Missing	Missing	35	31.5		
Total		111	100.0		

Table E.40. Proportion of Feeder Schools in Districts That Offer High Point for English Learners as an Intervention or Basic Program During Current Academic Year [3]

ELA-Int-MS:High Point English Learners

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	23	20.7	28.0	28.0
	None	13	11.7	15.9	43.9
	Only a few (less than 25%)	2	1.8	2.4	46.3
	Some (25% - 74%)	3	2.7	3.7	50.0
	Most (75% - 90%)	6	5.4	7.3	57.3
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	35	31.5	42.7	100.0
	Total	82	73.9	100.0	
Missing	Missing	29	26.1		
Total		111	100.0		

Table E.41. Proportion of Feeder Schools in Districts That Offer READ 180 as an Intervention or Basic Program During Current Academic Year [3]

ELA-Int-MS:READ 180

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	42	37.8	56.0	56.0
	None	20	18.0	26.7	82.7
	Only a few (less than 25%)	4	3.6	5.3	88.0
	Some (25% - 74%)	5	4.5	6.7	94.7
	Most (75% - 90%)	1	.9	1.3	96.0
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	3	2.7	4.0	100.0
	Total	75	67.6	100.0	
Missing	Missing	36	32.4		
Total		111	100.0		

Table E.42. Proportion of Feeder Schools in Districts That Offer SRA/Reach Program as an Intervention or Basic Program During Current Academic Year [3]

ELA-Int-MS:SRA/Reach Program

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	37	33.3	51.4	51.4
	None	17	15.3	23.6	75.0
	Only a few (less than 25%)	3	2.7	4.2	79.2
	Some (25% - 74%)	3	2.7	4.2	83.3
	Most (75% - 90%)	3	2.7	4.2	87.5
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	9	8.1	12.5	100.0
	Total	72	64.9	100.0	
Missing	Missing	39	35.1		
Total		111	100.0		

Table E.43. Proportion of Feeder Schools in Districts That Offer Fast Track Reading Program as an Intervention or Basic Program During Current Academic Year [3]

ELA-Int-MS:Fast Track Reading Program

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	43	38.7	62.3	62.3
	None	20	18.0	29.0	91.3
	Only a few (less than 25%)	2	1.8	2.9	94.2
	Some (25% - 74%)	1	.9	1.4	95.7
	Most (75% - 90%)	1	.9	1.4	97.1
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	2	1.8	2.9	100.0
	Total	69	62.2	100.0	
Missing	Missing	42	37.8		
Total		111	100.0		

Table E.44. Proportion of Students Who Did Not Pass ELA Portion of CASHEE by Spring 2004 and Subsequently Enrolled in Remedial Summer Program [4]

CHDE04:not pass ELA enrolled remedial

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Data not available	13	11.7	11.8	11.8
	No summer school courses	15	13.5	13.6	25.5
	Only a few (less than 25%)	22	19.8	20.0	45.5
	Some (25% - 74%)	41	36.9	37.3	82.7
	Most (75% - 90%)	14	12.6	12.7	95.5
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	5	4.5	4.5	100.0
	Total	110	99.1	100.0	
Missing	Missing	1	.9		
Total		111	100.0		

Table E.45. Proportion of Students in ELA-Related Summer School Who Passed ELA Portion of CASHEE in July or September 2004 [5]

CHDE05:Enrolled summer-passed CAHSEE

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Data not available	25	22.5	23.1	23.1
	Not applicable	36	32.4	33.3	56.5
	Only a few (less than 25%)	13	11.7	12.0	68.5
	Some (25% - 74%)	27	24.3	25.0	93.5
	Most (75% - 90%)	5	4.5	4.6	98.1
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	2	1.8	1.9	100.0
	Total	108	97.3	100.0	
Missing	Missing	3	2.7		
Total		111	100.0		

Table E.46. Percentage of All Students in Grades 6–10 Who Receive ELA Instruction from Teachers With ELA Credential [6]

CHDE06A:All ELA credential

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	2	1.8	1.9	1.9
	1-10%	4	3.6	3.9	5.8
	11-20%	2	1.8	1.9	7.8
	21-30%	1	.9	1.0	8.7
	31-40%	1	.9	1.0	9.7
	41-50%	4	3.6	3.9	13.6
	61-70%	3	2.7	2.9	16.5
	71-80%	8	7.2	7.8	24.3
	81-90%	13	11.7	12.6	36.9
	91-100%	65	58.6	63.1	100.0
	Total	103	92.8	100.0	
Missing	Missing	8	7.2		
Total		111	100.0		

Table E.47. Percentage of English Learner Students in Grades 6–10 Who Receive ELA Instruction from Teachers With ELA Credential [6]

CHDE06B:English learners ELA credential

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	5	4.5	5.1	5.1
	1-10%	4	3.6	4.1	9.2
	11-20%	2	1.8	2.0	11.2
	21-30%	1	.9	1.0	12.2
	31-40%	2	1.8	2.0	14.3
	41-50%	1	.9	1.0	15.3
	61-70%	4	3.6	4.1	19.4
	71-80%	9	8.1	9.2	28.6
	81-90%	19	17.1	19.4	48.0
	91-100%	51	45.9	52.0	100.0
	Total	98	88.3	100.0	
Missing	Missing	13	11.7		
Total		111	100.0		

Table E.48. Percentage of Students Receiving Special Education Services in Grades 6–10 Who Receive ELA Instruction from Teachers With ELA Credential [6]

CHDE06C:Spec Ed ELA credential

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	8	7.2	8.0	8.0
	1-10%	5	4.5	5.0	13.0
	11-20%	3	2.7	3.0	16.0
	21-30%	1	.9	1.0	17.0
	31-40%	1	.9	1.0	18.0
	41-50%	9	8.1	9.0	27.0
	51-60%	8	7.2	8.0	35.0
	61-70%	6	5.4	6.0	41.0
	71-80%	5	4.5	5.0	46.0
	81-90%	18	16.2	18.0	64.0
	91-100%	36	32.4	36.0	100.0
	Total	100	90.1	100.0	
Missing	Missing	11	9.9		
Total		111	100.0		

Table E.49. Percentage of Students With IEPs in Grades 6–10 Who Receive ELA Instruction from Teachers With ELA Credential [6]

CHDE06D:IEPs ELA credential

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	5	4.5	5.0	5.0
	1-10%	4	3.6	4.0	9.0
	11-20%	2	1.8	2.0	11.0
	21-30%	1	.9	1.0	12.0
	31-40%	1	.9	1.0	13.0
	41-50%	9	8.1	9.0	22.0
	51-60%	6	5.4	6.0	28.0
	61-70%	8	7.2	8.0	36.0
	71-80%	9	8.1	9.0	45.0
	81-90%	13	11.7	13.0	58.0
	91-100%	42	37.8	42.0	100.0
	Total	100	90.1	100.0	
Missing	Missing	11	9.9		
Total		111	100.0		

District Mathematics Curriculum Head Survey: Frequency Distributions

Table E.50. Proportion of High Schools in Districts That Offer General Math as Primary or Supplemental Course During Current Academic Year [1]

Mth-Pri-HS:General Math (2400)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	23	21.1	27.1	27.1
	None	30	27.5	35.3	62.4
	Only a few (less than 25%)	6	5.5	7.1	69.4
	Some (25% - 74%)	3	2.8	3.5	72.9
	Most (75% - 90%)	3	2.8	3.5	76.5
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	20	18.3	23.5	100.0
	Total	85	78.0	100.0	
Missing	Missing	11	10.1		
	System	13	11.9		
	Total	24	22.0		
Total		109	100.0		

Table E.51. Proportion of High Schools in Districts That Offer Math A as Primary or Supplemental Course During Current Academic Year [1]

Mth-Pri-HS:Math A (2420)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	35	32.1	41.7	41.7
	None	35	32.1	41.7	83.3
	Only a few (less than 25%)	4	3.7	4.8	88.1
	Some (25% - 74%)	2	1.8	2.4	90.5
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	8	7.3	9.5	100.0
	Total	84	77.1	100.0	
Missing	Missing	12	11.0		
	System	13	11.9		
	Total	25	22.9		
Total		109	100.0		

Table E.52. Proportion of High Schools in Districts That Offer Math B as Primary or Supplemental Course During Current Academic Year [1]

Mth-Pri-HS:Math B (2421)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	35	32.1	41.7	41.7
	None	36	33.0	42.9	84.5
	Only a few (less than 25%)	5	4.6	6.0	90.5
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	8	7.3	9.5	100.0
	Total	84	77.1	100.0	
Missing	Missing	12	11.0		
	System	13	11.9		
	Total	25	22.9		
Total		109	100.0		

Table E.53. Proportion of High Schools in Districts That Offer Pre-Algebra as Primary or Supplemental Course During Current Academic Year [1]

Mth-Pri-HS:Pre-Algebra (2424)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	12	11.0	14.0	14.0
	None	13	11.9	15.1	29.1
	Only a few (less than 25%)	9	8.3	10.5	39.5
	Some (25% - 74%)	5	4.6	5.8	45.3
	Most (75% - 90%)	2	1.8	2.3	47.7
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	45	41.3	52.3	100.0
	Total	86	78.9	100.0	
Missing	Missing	10	9.2		
	System	13	11.9		
	Total	23	21.1		
Total		109	100.0		

Table E.54. Proportion of High Schools in Districts That Offer Beginning Algebra as Primary or Supplemental Course During Current Academic Year [1]

Mth-Pri-HS:Beginning Algebra (2403)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	9	8.3	9.5	9.5
	None	9	8.3	9.5	18.9
	Only a few (less than 25%)	2	1.8	2.1	21.1
	Some (25% - 74%)	3	2.8	3.2	24.2
	Most (75% - 90%)	2	1.8	2.1	26.3
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	70	64.2	73.7	100.0
	Total	95	87.2	100.0	
Missing	Missing	1	.9		
	System	13	11.9		
	Total	14	12.8		
Total		109	100.0		

Table E.55. Proportion of High Schools in Districts That Offer Intermediate Algebra as Primary or Supplemental Course During Current Academic Year [1]

Mth-Pri-HS:Intermediate Algebra (2404)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	14	12.8	15.2	15.2
	None	12	11.0	13.0	28.3
	Only a few (less than 25%)	4	3.7	4.3	32.6
	Some (25% - 74%)	1	.9	1.1	33.7
	Most (75% - 90%)	2	1.8	2.2	35.9
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	59	54.1	64.1	100.0
	Total	92	84.4	100.0	
Missing	Missing	4	3.7		
	System	13	11.9		
	Total	17	15.6		
Total		109	100.0		

Table E.56. Proportion of High Schools in Districts That Offer Beginning Algebra Part I as Primary or Supplemental Course During Current Academic Year [1]

Mth-Pri-HS:Beginning Algebra I (2428)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	17	15.6	18.7	18.7
	None	8	7.3	8.8	27.5
	Only a few (less than 25%)	5	4.6	5.5	33.0
	Some (25% - 74%)	4	3.7	4.4	37.4
	Most (75% - 90%)	3	2.8	3.3	40.7
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	54	49.5	59.3	100.0
	Total	91	83.5	100.0	
Missing	Missing	5	4.6		
	System	13	11.9		
	Total	18	16.5		
Total		109	100.0		

Table E.57. Proportion of High Schools in Districts That Offer Beginning Algebra Part II as Primary or Supplemental Course During Current Academic Year [1]

Mth-Pri-HS:Beginning Algebra II (2429)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	18	16.5	19.6	19.6
	None	11	10.1	12.0	31.5
	Only a few (less than 25%)	4	3.7	4.3	35.9
	Some (25% - 74%)	4	3.7	4.3	40.2
	Most (75% - 90%)	2	1.8	2.2	42.4
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	53	48.6	57.6	100.0
	Total	92	84.4	100.0	
Missing	Missing	4	3.7		
	System	13	11.9		
	Total	17	15.6		
Total		109	100.0		

Table E.58. Proportion of High Schools in Districts That Offer Integrated Math I as Primary or Supplemental Course During Current Academic Year [1]

Mth-Pri-HS:Integrated Math I (2425)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	37	33.9	44.0	44.0
	None	39	35.8	46.4	90.5
	Only a few (less than 25%)	3	2.8	3.6	94.0
	Some (25% - 74%)	2	1.8	2.4	96.4
	Most (75% - 90%)	1	.9	1.2	97.6
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	2	1.8	2.4	100.0
	Total	84	77.1	100.0	
Missing	Missing	12	11.0		
	System	13	11.9		
	Total	25	22.9		
Total		109	100.0		

Table E.59. Proportion of High Schools in Districts That Offer Integrated Math II as Primary or Supplemental Course During Current Academic Year [1]

Mth-Pri-HS:Integrated Math II (2426)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	38	34.9	45.2	45.2
	None	39	35.8	46.4	91.7
	Only a few (less than 25%)	2	1.8	2.4	94.0
	Some (25% - 74%)	3	2.8	3.6	97.6
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	2	1.8	2.4	100.0
	Total	84	77.1	100.0	
Missing	Missing	12	11.0		
	System	13	11.9		
	Total	25	22.9		
Total		109	100.0		

Table E.60. Proportion of High Schools in Districts That Offer Consumer Math as Primary or Supplemental Course During Current Academic Year [1]

Mth-Pri-HS:Consumer Math (2401)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	.00	27	24.8	32.1	32.1
	None	24	22.0	28.6	60.7
	Only a few (less than 25%)	7	6.4	8.3	69.0
	Some (25% - 74%)	6	5.5	7.1	76.2
	Most (75% - 90%)	3	2.8	3.6	79.8
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	17	15.6	20.2	100.0
	Total	84	77.1	100.0	
Missing	Missing	12	11.0		
	System	13	11.9		
	Total	25	22.9		
Total		109	100.0		

Table E.61. Proportion of High Schools in Districts That Offer Remedial Math as Primary or Supplemental Course During Current Academic Year [1]

Mth-Pri-HS:Remedial Math (2402)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	.00	24	22.0	27.6	27.6
	None	27	24.8	31.0	58.6
	Only a few (less than 25%)	3	2.8	3.4	62.1
	Some (25% - 74%)	5	4.6	5.7	67.8
	Most (75% - 90%)	1	.9	1.1	69.0
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	27	24.8	31.0	100.0
	Total	87	79.8	100.0	
Missing	Missing	9	8.3		
	System	13	11.9		
	Total	22	20.2		
Total		109	100.0		

Table E.62. District Math Curriculum Head Reported Offering These Other High School Math Primary or Supplemental Courses [1]

Course Title	Frequency	Percentage (n=84)
CAHSEE		
CAHSEE Preparation	5	6.17%
Conquering the CAHSEE Math Teachers Press	2	2.47%
CAHSEE Math Remediation	1	1.23%
CAHSEE Math from Country Office of Education	1	1.23%
CAHSEE Study Guides	1	1.23%
Algebra		
American Guidance Service Algebra	5	6.17%
American Guidance Service PreAlgebra	4	4.94%
Algebra 1 Glencoe	2	2.47%
Keys to Algebra	2	2.47%
Algebra 1 Pacemaker	2	2.47%
Algebra 1 McDougal Littell	2	2.47%
PreAlgebra McDougal Littell	1	1.23%
Algebra 1A McDougal Littell	1	1.23%
PreAlgebra Glencoe	1	1.23%
Algebra 2 Glencoe	1	1.23%
Pre Algebra Pacemaker	1	1.23%
PreAlgebra A Transition to Algebra Merrill	1	1.23%
Algebra 1 Rescue Sopris West	1	1.23%
Computer Algebra	1	1.23%
College Preparatory Math & Algebra	1	1.23%
Algebra Carnegie Tutor	1	1.23%
District Written Curriculum	1	1.23%
Getting Ready for Algebra County Office of Education	1	1.23%
You can be Algebra Ready Sopris West	1	1.23%
Accelerated Math	1	1.23%
Teacher Created Materials	1	1.23%
Kaplan Success	1	1.23%
California Standards Algebra Coach	1	1.23%
PreAlgebra Globe Fearon	1	1.23%
Algebra Globe Fearon	1	1.23%
Algebra Applications & Connections Merrill	1	1.23%
Below Algebra		
Riverdeep Math	3	3.70%
Geometry Glencoe	2	2.47%
Discovering Geometry Key Curriculum Press	2	2.47%
Harcourt Math 5th Grade	1	1.23%
Harcourt Math 6th Grade	1	1.23%
Larson Computer Math	1	1.23%
Math Tutorial Class	1	1.23%
Connecting Math Concepts	1	1.23%
Math Review	1	1.23%
California Standards Math Coach	1	1.23%
Math Support	1	1.23%
Integration, Applications, Connections Glencoe	1	1.23%
General Math DC Heath & Company	1	1.23%
Glencoe General Math	1	1.23%

Table E.62. continued

Course Title	Frequency	Percentage (n=84)
American Guidance Service Basic Math	1	1.23%
American Guidance Service Math All Levels	1	1.23%
Transitional Math Level 2 & 3 Sopris West	1	1.23%
Mathematics Course 2 Prentice Hall	1	1.23%
California Math Review	2	2.47%
Meeting the California Challenge Globe Fearon	1	1.23%
American Guidance Service Geometry	1	1.23%
Integrated Math 1 & 2 McDougal Littell	1	1.23%
Special Education Math	1	1.23%
Other Courses		
Skill Intervention Kit Prentice Hall	2	2.47%
McDougal Littell Course 1-6	1	1.23%
Kaplan Advantage	1	1.23%
Princeton Review	1	1.23%
McDougal Littell Course 2	1	1.23%

Table E.63. Proportion of Feeder Schools in Districts That Offer General Math as Primary or Supplemental Course During Current Academic Year [2]

Mth-Pri-MS:General Math (2400)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	18	16.5	21.7	21.7
	None	9	8.3	10.8	32.5
	Only a few (less than 25%)	4	3.7	4.8	37.3
	Some (25% - 74%)	2	1.8	2.4	39.8
	Most (75% - 90%)	1	.9	1.2	41.0
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	49	45.0	59.0	100.0
	Total	83	76.1	100.0	
Missing	Missing	13	11.9		
	System	13	11.9		
	Total	26	23.9		
Total		109	100.0		

Table E.64. Proportion of Feeder Schools in Districts That Offer Pre-Algebra as Primary or Supplemental Course During Current Academic Year [2]

Mth-Pri-MS:Pre-Algebra (2424)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	13	11.9	14.6	14.6
	None	1	.9	1.1	15.7
	Only a few (less than 25%)	1	.9	1.1	16.9
	Some (25% - 74%)	3	2.8	3.4	20.2
	Most (75% - 90%)	1	.9	1.1	21.3
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	70	64.2	78.7	100.0
	Total	89	81.7	100.0	
Missing	Missing	7	6.4		
	System	13	11.9		
	Total	20	18.3		
Total		109	100.0		

Table E.65. Proportion of Feeder Schools in Districts That Offer Beginning Algebra as Primary or Supplemental Course During Current Academic Year [2]

Mth-Pri-MS:Beginning Algebra (2403)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	16	14.7	18.4	18.4
	None	7	6.4	8.0	26.4
	Only a few (less than 25%)	2	1.8	2.3	28.7
	Some (25% - 74%)	2	1.8	2.3	31.0
	Most (75% - 90%)	1	.9	1.1	32.2
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	59	54.1	67.8	100.0
	Total	87	79.8	100.0	
Missing	Missing	9	8.3		
	System	13	11.9		
	Total	22	20.2		
Total		109	100.0		

Table E.66. Proportion of Feeder Schools in Districts That Offer Beginning Algebra Part I as Primary or Supplemental Course During Current Academic Year [2]

Mth-Pri-MS:Beginning Algebra I (2428)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	25	22.9	30.5	30.5
	None	11	10.1	13.4	43.9
	Only a few (less than 25%)	2	1.8	2.4	46.3
	Some (25% - 74%)	2	1.8	2.4	48.8
	Most (75% - 90%)	1	.9	1.2	50.0
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	41	37.6	50.0	100.0
	Total	82	75.2	100.0	
Missing	Missing	14	12.8		
	System	13	11.9		
	Total	27	24.8		
Total		109	100.0		

Table E.67. Proportion of Feeder Schools in Districts That Offer Beginning Algebra Part II as Primary or Supplemental Course During Current Academic Year [2]

Mth-Pri-MS:Beginning Algebra II (2429)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	34	31.2	43.0	43.0
	None	23	21.1	29.1	72.2
	Only a few (less than 25%)	2	1.8	2.5	74.7
	Most (75% - 90%)	1	.9	1.3	75.9
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	19	17.4	24.1	100.0
	Total	79	72.5	100.0	
Missing	Missing	17	15.6		
	System	13	11.9		
	Total	30	27.5		
Total		109	100.0		

Table E.68. Proportion of Feeder Schools in Districts That Offer Integrated Math I as Primary or Supplemental Course During Current Academic Year [2]

Mth-Pri-MS:Integrated Math I (2425)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	47	43.1	61.0	61.0
	None	28	25.7	36.4	97.4
	Some (25% - 74%)	1	.9	1.3	98.7
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	1	.9	1.3	100.0
	Total	77	70.6	100.0	
Missing	Missing	19	17.4		
	System	13	11.9		
	Total	32	29.4		
Total		109	100.0		

Table E.69. Proportion of Feeder Schools in Districts That Offer Integrated Math II as Primary or Supplemental Course During Current Academic Year [2]

Mth-Pri-MS:Integrated Math II (2426)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	.00	47	43.1	62.7	62.7
	None	28	25.7	37.3	100.0
	Total	75	68.8	100.0	
Missing	Missing	21	19.3		
	System	13	11.9		
	Total	34	31.2		
Total		109	100.0		

Table E.70. Proportion of Feeder Schools in Districts That Offer Math A as Primary or Supplemental Course During Current Academic Year [2]

Mth-Pri-MS:Math A (2420)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	.00	43	39.4	56.6	56.6
	None	28	25.7	36.8	93.4
	Only a few (less than 25%)	1	.9	1.3	94.7
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	4	3.7	5.3	100.0
	Total	76	69.7	100.0	
Missing	Missing	20	18.3		
	System	13	11.9		
	Total	33	30.3		
Total		109	100.0		

Table E.71. Proportion of Feeder Schools in Districts That Offer Math B as Primary or Supplemental Course During Current Academic Year [2]

Mth-Pri-MS:Math B (2421)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	.00	45	41.3	59.2	59.2
	None	28	25.7	36.8	96.1
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	3	2.8	3.9	100.0
	Total	76	69.7	100.0	
Missing	Missing	20	18.3		
	System	13	11.9		
	Total	33	30.3		
Total		109	100.0		

Table E.72. District Math Curriculum Head Reported Offering These Other Feeder Middle School Math Primary or Supplemental Courses [2]

Course Title	Frequency	Percentage (n=19)
General Math	4	21.05%
Geometry	4	21.05%
Math Support	2	10.53%
Algebra 1	2	10.53%
Accelerated Math	1	5.26%
Math Lab Intervention	1	5.26%
Math 6	1	5.26%
English Language Development Algebra 1 Support	1	5.26%
Plato	1	5.26%
Kaplan Advantage	1	5.26%
Math Lab	1	5.26%

Table E.73. Proportion of High Schools in Districts That Offer Success with Mathcoach Intervention or Basic Program During Current Academic Year [3]

Mth-Int-HS:Success with Mathcoach

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	50	45.9	61.7	61.7
	None	31	28.4	38.3	100.0
	Total	81	74.3	100.0	
Missing	Missing	15	13.8		
	System	13	11.9		
	Total	28	25.7		
Total		109	100.0		

Table E.74. Proportion of High Schools in Districts That Offer Harcourt Math @ 2002 as an Intervention or Basic Program During Current Academic Year [3]

Mth-Int-HS:Harcourt Math 2002(w/Spanish)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	50	45.9	60.2	60.2
	None	32	29.4	38.6	98.8
	Some (25% - 74%)	1	.9	1.2	100.0
	Total	83	76.1	100.0	
Missing	Missing	13	11.9		
	System	13	11.9		
	Total	26	23.9		
Total		109	100.0		

Table E.75. Proportion of High Schools in Districts That Offer Mathematics by Houghton Mifflin as an Intervention or Basic Program During Current Academic Year [3]

Mth-Int-HS:Mathematics by Houghton Miff.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	49	45.0	59.0	59.0
	None	30	27.5	36.1	95.2
	Only a few (less than 25%)	2	1.8	2.4	97.6
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	2	1.8	2.4	100.0
	Total	83	76.1	100.0	
Missing	Missing	13	11.9		
	System	13	11.9		
	Total	26	23.9		
Total		109	100.0		

Table E.76. Proportion of High Schools in Districts That Offer Concepts and Skills as an Intervention or Basic Program During Current Academic Year [3]

Mth-Int-HS:Concepts and Skills

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	37	33.9	45.1	45.1
	None	24	22.0	29.3	74.4
	Only a few (less than 25%)	2	1.8	2.4	76.8
	Some (25% - 74%)	2	1.8	2.4	79.3
	Most (75% - 90%)	2	1.8	2.4	81.7
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	15	13.8	18.3	100.0
	Total	82	75.2	100.0	
Missing	Missing	14	12.8		
	System	13	11.9		
	Total	27	24.8		
Total		109	100.0		

Table E.77. Proportion of High Schools in Districts That Offer Structure and Method as an Intervention or Basic Program During Current Academic Year [3]

Mth-Int-HS:Structure and Method

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	42	38.5	50.0	50.0
	None	25	22.9	29.8	79.8
	Only a few (less than 25%)	3	2.8	3.6	83.3
	Some (25% - 74%)	3	2.8	3.6	86.9
	Most (75% - 90%)	1	.9	1.2	88.1
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	10	9.2	11.9	100.0
	Total	84	77.1	100.0	
Missing	Missing	12	11.0		
	System	13	11.9		
	Total	25	22.9		
Total		109	100.0		

Table E.78. Proportion of High Schools in Districts That Offer McGraw-Hill Mathematics as an Intervention or Basic Program During Current Academic Year [3]

Mth-Int-HS:McGraw-Hill Mathematics

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	49	45.0	59.0	59.0
	None	33	30.3	39.8	98.8
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	1	.9	1.2	100.0
	Total	83	76.1	100.0	
Missing	Missing	13	11.9		
	System	13	11.9		
	Total	26	23.9		
Total		109	100.0		

Table E.79. Proportion of High Schools in Districts That Offer Prentice Hall Pre-Algebra as an Intervention or Basic Program During Current Academic Year [3]

Mth-Int-HS:Prentice Hall Pre-Algebra

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	34	31.2	40.0	40.0
	None	26	23.9	30.6	70.6
	Only a few (less than 25%)	4	3.7	4.7	75.3
	Some (25% - 74%)	6	5.5	7.1	82.4
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	15	13.8	17.6	100.0
	Total	85	78.0	100.0	
Missing	Missing	11	10.1		
	System	13	11.9		
	Total	24	22.0		
Total		109	100.0		

Table E.80. Proportion of High Schools in Districts That Offer Prentice Hall Algebra 1 as an Intervention or Basic Program During Current Academic Year [3]

Mth-Int-HS:Prentice Hall Algebra 1

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	33	30.3	38.8	38.8
	None	25	22.9	29.4	68.2
	Only a few (less than 25%)	3	2.8	3.5	71.8
	Some (25% - 74%)	6	5.5	7.1	78.8
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	18	16.5	21.2	100.0
	Total	85	78.0	100.0	
Missing	Missing	11	10.1		
	System	13	11.9		
	Total	24	22.0		
Total		109	100.0		

Table E.81. Proportion of High Schools in Districts That Offer Progress in Mathematics as an Intervention or Basic Program During Current Academic Year [3]

Mth-Int-HS:Progress in Mathematics

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	48	44.0	58.5	58.5
	None	33	30.3	40.2	98.8
	Only a few (less than 25%)	1	.9	1.2	100.0
	Total	82	75.2	100.0	
Missing	Missing	14	12.8		
	System	13	11.9		
	Total	27	24.8		
Total		109	100.0		

Table E.82. Proportion of High Schools in Districts That Offer Saxon Math K–3, An Incremental Development as an Intervention or Basic Program During Current Academic Year [3]

Mth-Int-HS:Saxon Math K-3

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	46	42.2	57.5	57.5
	None	33	30.3	41.3	98.8
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	1	.9	1.3	100.0
	Total	80	73.4	100.0	
Missing	Missing	16	14.7		
	System	13	11.9		
	Total	29	26.6		
Total		109	100.0		

Table E.83. Proportion of High Schools in Districts That Offer Math 54, 65, 76, and 87 as an Intervention or Basic Program During Current Academic Year [3]

Mth-Int-HS:Math 54, 65, 76, and 87

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	46	42.2	59.0	59.0
	None	31	28.4	39.7	98.7
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	1	.9	1.3	100.0
	Total	78	71.6	100.0	
Missing	Missing	18	16.5		
	System	13	11.9		
	Total	31	28.4		
Total		109	100.0		

Table E.84. Proportion of High Schools in Districts That Offer Scott Foresman CA Mathematics as an Intervention or Basic Program During Current Academic Year [3]

Mth-Int-HS:Scott Foresman CA Mathematics

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	42	38.5	52.5	52.5
	None	32	29.4	40.0	92.5
	Only a few (less than 25%)	4	3.7	5.0	97.5
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	2	1.8	2.5	100.0
	Total	80	73.4	100.0	
Missing	Missing	16	14.7		
	System	13	11.9		
	Total	29	26.6		
Total		109	100.0		

Table E.85. District Math Curriculum Head Reported Offering These Other Intervention or Basic Programs [3]

Program Title	Frequency	Percentage (n=81)
CAHSEE Courses		
CAHSEE Preparation	5	6.17%
Conquering the CAHSEE Math Teachers Press	2	2.47%
CAHSEE Math Remediation	1	1.23%
CAHSEE Math from Country Office of Education	1	1.23%
CAHSEE Study Guides	1	1.23%
Algebra		
American Guidance Service Algebra	5	6.17%
American Guidance Service PreAlgebra	4	4.94%
Algebra 1 Glencoe	2	2.47%
Keys to Algebra	2	2.47%
Algebra 1 Pacemaker	2	2.47%

Table E.85. continued

Program Title	Frequency	Percentage (n=81)
Algebra 1 McDougal Littell	2	2.47%
PreAlgebra McDougal Littell	1	1.23%
Algebra 1A McDougal Littell	1	1.23%
PreAlgebra Glencoe	1	1.23%
Algebra 2 Glencoe	1	1.23%
Pre Algebra Pacemaker	1	1.23%
PreAlgebra A Transition to Algebra Merrill	1	1.23%
Algebra 1 Rescue Sopris West	1	1.23%
Computer Algebra	1	1.23%
College Preparatory Math & Algebra	1	1.23%
Algebra Carnegie Tutor	1	1.23%
District Written Curriculum	1	1.23%
Getting Ready for Algebra County Office of Education	1	1.23%
You can be Algebra Ready Sopris West	1	1.23%
Accelerated Math	1	1.23%
Teacher Created Materials	1	1.23%
Kaplan Success	1	1.23%
California Standards Algebra Coach	1	1.23%
PreAlgebra Globe Fearon	1	1.23%
Algebra Globe Fearon	1	1.23%
Algebra Applications & Connections Merrill	1	1.23%
Below Algebra		
Riverdeep Math	3	3.70%
Geometry Glencoe	2	2.47%
Discovering Geometry Key Curriculum Press	2	2.47%
Harcourt Math 5th Grade	1	1.23%
Harcourt Math 6th Grade	1	1.23%
Larson Computer Math	1	1.23%
Math Tutorial Class	1	1.23%
Connecting Math Concepts	1	1.23%
Math Review	1	1.23%
California Standards Math Coach	1	1.23%
Math Support	1	1.23%
Integration, Applications, Connections Glencoe	1	1.23%
General Math DC Heath & Company	1	1.23%
Glencoe General Math	1	1.23%
American Guidance Service Basic Math	1	1.23%
American Guidance Service Math All Levels	1	1.23%
Transitional Math Level 2 & 3 Sopris West	1	1.23%
Mathematics Course 2 Prentice Hall	1	1.23%
California Math Review	2	2.47%
Meeting the California Challenge Globe Fearon	1	1.23%
American Guidance Service Geometry	1	1.23%
Integrated Math 1 & 2 McDougal Littell	1	1.23%
Special Education Math	1	1.23%
Other Courses		
Skill Intervention Kit Prentice Hall	2	2.47%
McDougal Littell Course 1-6	1	1.23%
Kaplan Advantage	1	1.23%
Princeton Review	1	1.23%
McDougal Littell Course 2	1	1.23%

Table E.86. Percentage of Feeder Schools in Districts That Offer Success with Mathcoach as an Intervention or Basic Program During Current Academic Year [3]

Mth-Int-MS:Success with Mathcoach

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	53	48.6	68.8	68.8
	None	23	21.1	29.9	98.7
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	1	.9	1.3	100.0
	Total	77	70.6	100.0	
Missing	Missing	19	17.4		
	System	13	11.9		
	Total	32	29.4		
Total		109	100.0		

Table E.87. Percentage of Feeder Schools in Districts That Offer Harcourt Math @ 2002 as an Intervention or Basic Program During Current Academic Year [3]

Mth-Int-MS:Harcourt Math 2002(w/Spanish)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	50	45.9	64.9	64.9
	None	22	20.2	28.6	93.5
	Only a few (less than 25%)	2	1.8	2.6	96.1
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	3	2.8	3.9	100.0
	Total	77	70.6	100.0	
Missing	Missing	19	17.4		
	System	13	11.9		
	Total	32	29.4		
Total		109	100.0		

Table E.88. Percentage of Feeder Schools in Districts That Offer Mathematics by Houghton Mifflin as an Intervention or Basic Program During Current Academic Year [3]

Mth-Int-MS:Mathematics by Houghton Miff.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	48	44.0	62.3	62.3
	None	22	20.2	28.6	90.9
	Only a few (less than 25%)	2	1.8	2.6	93.5
	Some (25% - 74%)	1	.9	1.3	94.8
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	4	3.7	5.2	100.0
	Total	77	70.6	100.0	
Missing	Missing	19	17.4		
	System	13	11.9		
	Total	32	29.4		
Total		109	100.0		

Table E.89. Percentage of Feeder Schools in Districts That Offer Concepts and Skills as an Intervention or Basic Program During Current Academic Year [3]

Mth-Int-MS:Concepts and Skills

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	32	29.4	41.6	41.6
	None	13	11.9	16.9	58.4
	Only a few (less than 25%)	3	2.8	3.9	62.3
	Some (25% - 74%)	1	.9	1.3	63.6
	Most (75% - 90%)	2	1.8	2.6	66.2
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	26	23.9	33.8	100.0
	Total	77	70.6	100.0	
Missing	Missing	19	17.4		
	System	13	11.9		
	Total	32	29.4		
Total		109	100.0		

Table E.90. Percentage of Feeder Schools in Districts That Offer Structure and Method as an Intervention or Basic Program During Current Academic Year [3]

Mth-Int-MS:Structure and Method

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	46	42.2	59.7	59.7
	None	18	16.5	23.4	83.1
	Only a few (less than 25%)	3	2.8	3.9	87.0
	Some (25% - 74%)	1	.9	1.3	88.3
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	9	8.3	11.7	100.0
	Total	77	70.6	100.0	
Missing	Missing	19	17.4		
	System	13	11.9		
	Total	32	29.4		
Total		109	100.0		

Table E.91. Percentage of Feeder Schools in Districts That Offer McGraw-Hill Mathematics as an Intervention or Basic Program During Current Academic Year [3]

Mth-Int-MS:McGraw-Hill Mathematics

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	53	48.6	68.8	68.8
	None	21	19.3	27.3	96.1
	Only a few (less than 25%)	1	.9	1.3	97.4
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	2	1.8	2.6	100.0
	Total	77	70.6	100.0	
Missing	Missing	19	17.4		
	System	13	11.9		
	Total	32	29.4		
Total		109	100.0		

Table E.92. Percentage of Feeder Schools in Districts That Offer Prentice Hall Pre-Algebra as an Intervention or Basic Program During Current Academic Year [3]

Mth-Int-MS:Prentice Hall Pre-Algebra

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	36	33.0	45.0	45.0
	None	12	11.0	15.0	60.0
	Only a few (less than 25%)	2	1.8	2.5	62.5
	Some (25% - 74%)	1	.9	1.3	63.8
	Most (75% - 90%)	1	.9	1.3	65.0
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	28	25.7	35.0	100.0
	Total	80	73.4	100.0	
Missing	Missing	16	14.7		
	System	13	11.9		
	Total	29	26.6		
Total		109	100.0		

Table E.93. Percentage of Feeder Schools in Districts That Offer Prentice Hall Algebra 1 as an Intervention or Basic Program During Current Academic Year [3]

Mth-Int-MS:Prentice Hall Algebra 1

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	37	33.9	46.3	46.3
	None	11	10.1	13.8	60.0
	Only a few (less than 25%)	3	2.8	3.8	63.8
	Some (25% - 74%)	4	3.7	5.0	68.8
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	25	22.9	31.3	100.0
	Total	80	73.4	100.0	
Missing	Missing	16	14.7		
	System	13	11.9		
	Total	29	26.6		
Total		109	100.0		

Table E.94. Percentage of Feeder Schools in Districts That Offer Progress in Mathematics as an Intervention or Basic Program During Current Academic Year [3]

Mth-Int-MS:Progress in Mathematics

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	51	46.8	69.9	69.9
	None	22	20.2	30.1	100.0
	Total	73	67.0	100.0	
Missing	Missing	23	21.1		
	System	13	11.9		
	Total	36	33.0		
Total		109	100.0		

Table E.95. Percentage of Feeder Schools in Districts That Offer Saxon Math K–3, An Incremental Development as an Intervention or Basic Program During Current Academic Year [3]

Mth-Int-MS:Saxon Math K-3

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	49	45.0	67.1	67.1
	None	23	21.1	31.5	98.6
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	1	.9	1.4	100.0
	Total	73	67.0	100.0	
Missing	Missing	23	21.1		
	System	13	11.9		
	Total	36	33.0		
Total		109	100.0		

Table E.96. Percentage of Feeder Schools in Districts That Offer Math 54, 65, 76, and 87 as an Intervention or Basic Program During Current Academic Year [3]

Mth-Int-MS:Math 54, 65, 76, and 87

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	49	45.0	68.1	68.1
	None	21	19.3	29.2	97.2
	Some (25% - 74%)	1	.9	1.4	98.6
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	1	.9	1.4	100.0
	Total	72	66.1	100.0	
Missing	Missing	24	22.0		
	System	13	11.9		
	Total	37	33.9		
Total		109	100.0		

Table E.97. Percentage of Feeder Schools in Districts That Offer Scott Foresman CA Mathematics as an Intervention or Basic Program During Current Academic Year [3]

Mth-Int-MS:Scott Foresman CA Mathematics

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	45	41.3	60.0	60.0
	None	18	16.5	24.0	84.0
	Only a few (less than 25%)	2	1.8	2.7	86.7
	Some (25% - 74%)	3	2.8	4.0	90.7
	Most (75% - 90%)	1	.9	1.3	92.0
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	6	5.5	8.0	100.0
	Total	75	68.8	100.0	
Missing	Missing	21	19.3		
	System	13	11.9		
	Total	34	31.2		
Total		109	100.0		

Table E.98. Proportion of Students Who Did Not Pass Math Portion of CAHSEE by Spring 2004 and Subsequently Enrolled in Remedial Summer Program [4]

CHDM04:not pass Math enrolled remedial

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Data not available	14	12.8	14.7	14.7
	No summer school courses	17	15.6	17.9	32.6
	Only a few (less than 25%)	26	23.9	27.4	60.0
	Some (25% - 74%)	30	27.5	31.6	91.6
	Most (75% - 90%)	5	4.6	5.3	96.8
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	3	2.8	3.2	100.0
	Total	95	87.2	100.0	
Missing	Missing	1	.9		
	System	13	11.9		
	Total	14	12.8		
Total		109	100.0		

Table E.99. Proportion of Students in Math-Related Summer School Who Passed Math Portion of CAHSEE in July or September 2004 [5]

CHDM05:Enrolled summer-passed CAHSEE

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Data not available	20	18.3	21.3	21.3
	Not applicable	35	32.1	37.2	58.5
	Only a few (less than 25%)	10	9.2	10.6	69.1
	Some (25% - 74%)	24	22.0	25.5	94.7
	Most (75% - 90%)	3	2.8	3.2	97.9
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	2	1.8	2.1	100.0
	Total	94	86.2	100.0	
Missing	Missing	2	1.8		
	System	13	11.9		
	Total	15	13.8		
Total		109	100.0		

Table E.100. Percentage of All Students in Grades 6–10 Who Receive Math Instruction from Teachers With Math Credential [6]

CHDM06A:All Math credential

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	1	.9	1.1	1.1
	1-10%	6	5.5	6.8	8.0
	11-20%	2	1.8	2.3	10.2
	41-50%	3	2.8	3.4	13.6
	51-60%	4	3.7	4.5	18.2
	61-70%	2	1.8	2.3	20.5
	71-80%	9	8.3	10.2	30.7
	81-90%	15	13.8	17.0	47.7
	91-100%	46	42.2	52.3	100.0
	Total	88	80.7	100.0	
Missing	Missing	8	7.3		
	System	13	11.9		
	Total	21	19.3		
Total		109	100.0		

Table E.101. Percentage of English Learner Students in Grades 6–10 Who Receive Math Instruction from Teachers With Math Credential [6]

CHDM06B:English learners ELA credential

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	3	2.8	3.4	3.4
	1-10%	5	4.6	5.7	9.2
	11-20%	3	2.8	3.4	12.6
	21-30%	1	.9	1.1	13.8
	31-40%	1	.9	1.1	14.9
	41-50%	2	1.8	2.3	17.2
	51-60%	3	2.8	3.4	20.7
	61-70%	2	1.8	2.3	23.0
	71-80%	10	9.2	11.5	34.5
	81-90%	19	17.4	21.8	56.3
	91-100%	38	34.9	43.7	100.0
	Total	87	79.8	100.0	
Missing	Missing	9	8.3		
	System	13	11.9		
	Total	22	20.2		
Total		109	100.0		

Table E.102. Percentage of Students Receiving Special Education Services in Grades 6–10 Who Receive Math Instruction from Teachers With Math Credential [6]

CHDM06C:Spec Ed ELA credential

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	9	8.3	10.3	10.3
	1-10%	10	9.2	11.5	21.8
	11-20%	5	4.6	5.7	27.6
	21-30%	2	1.8	2.3	29.9
	31-40%	1	.9	1.1	31.0
	41-50%	5	4.6	5.7	36.8
	51-60%	3	2.8	3.4	40.2
	61-70%	9	8.3	10.3	50.6
	71-80%	3	2.8	3.4	54.0
	81-90%	15	13.8	17.2	71.3
	91-100%	25	22.9	28.7	100.0
	Total	87	79.8	100.0	
Missing	Missing	9	8.3		
	System	13	11.9		
	Total	22	20.2		
Total		109	100.0		

Table E.103. Percentage of Students With IEPs in Grades 6–10 Who Receive Math Instruction from Teachers With Math Credential [6]

CHDM06D:IEPs ELA credential

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	5	4.6	5.7	5.7
	1-10%	8	7.3	9.2	14.9
	11-20%	4	3.7	4.6	19.5
	21-30%	1	.9	1.1	20.7
	31-40%	1	.9	1.1	21.8
	41-50%	5	4.6	5.7	27.6
	51-60%	6	5.5	6.9	34.5
	61-70%	10	9.2	11.5	46.0
	71-80%	4	3.7	4.6	50.6
	81-90%	11	10.1	12.6	63.2
	91-100%	32	29.4	36.8	100.0
	Total	87	79.8	100.0	
Missing	Missing	9	8.3		
	System	13	11.9		
	Total	22	20.2		
Total		109	100.0		

High School Principal Survey: Frequency Distributions

Table E.104. High School Principals Reported Proportion (Projected) of Content Standards in CAHSEE ELA Blueprint Covered in 2004–2005 [1]

HSP01A:ELA standards 2004-2005

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Little Covered (less than 40%)	1	.5	.5	.5
	Partially Covered (40% - 60%)	11	5.1	5.1	5.6
	Mostly Covered (61% - 95%)	101	47.0	47.2	52.8
	Completely Covered (96% - 100%)	101	47.0	47.2	100.0
	Total	214	99.5	100.0	
Missing	Missing	1	.5		
Total		215	100.0		

Table E.105. High School Principals Reported Proportion of Content Standards in CAHSEE ELA Blueprint Covered in 2003–2004 [1]

HSP01B:ELA standards 2003-2004

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Do Not Know	9	4.2	4.3	4.3
	Little Covered (less than 40%)	2	.9	.9	5.2
	Partially Covered (40% - 60%)	32	14.9	15.2	20.4
	Mostly Covered (61% - 95%)	110	51.2	52.1	72.5
	Completely Covered (96% - 100%)	58	27.0	27.5	100.0
	Total	211	98.1	100.0	
Missing	Missing	4	1.9		
Total		215	100.0		

Table E.106. High School Principals Reported Proportion of Content Standards in CAHSEE ELA Blueprint Covered in 2002–2003 [1]

HSP01C:ELA standards 2002-2003

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Do Not Know	18	8.4	8.5	8.5
	Little Covered (less than 40%)	15	7.0	7.1	15.6
	Partially Covered (40% - 60%)	69	32.1	32.7	48.3
	Mostly Covered (61% - 95%)	76	35.3	36.0	84.4
	Completely Covered (96% - 100%)	33	15.3	15.6	100.0
	Total	211	98.1	100.0	
Missing	Missing	4	1.9		
Total		215	100.0		

Table E.107. High School Principals Reported Proportion of Content Standards in CAHSEE ELA Blueprint Covered Before 2002 [1]

HSP01D:ELA standards Before 2002

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Do Not Know	52	24.2	24.9	24.9
	Little Covered (less than 40%)	37	17.2	17.7	42.6
	Partially Covered (40% - 60%)	64	29.8	30.6	73.2
	Mostly Covered (61% - 95%)	41	19.1	19.6	92.8
	Completely Covered (96% - 100%)	15	7.0	7.2	100.0
	Total	209	97.2	100.0	
Missing	Missing	6	2.8		
Total		215	100.0		

Table E.108. High School Principals Reported Proportion (Projected) of Content Standards in CAHSEE Mathematics Blueprint Covered in 2004–2005 [2]

HSP02A:Math standards 2004-2005

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Do Not Know	1	.5	.5	.5
	Little Covered (less than 40%)	1	.5	.5	.9
	Partially Covered (40% - 60%)	15	7.0	7.0	8.0
	Mostly Covered (61% - 95%)	91	42.3	42.7	50.7
	Completely Covered (96% - 100%)	105	48.8	49.3	100.0
	Total	213	99.1	100.0	
Missing	Missing	2	.9		
Total		215	100.0		

Table E.109. High School Principals Reported Proportion of Content Standards in CAHSEE Mathematics Blueprint Covered in 2003–2004 [2]

HSP02B:Math standards 2003-2004

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Do Not Know	11	5.1	5.2	5.2
	Little Covered (less than 40%)	7	3.3	3.3	8.5
	Partially Covered (40% - 60%)	27	12.6	12.8	21.3
	Mostly Covered (61% - 95%)	111	51.6	52.6	73.9
	Completely Covered (96% - 100%)	55	25.6	26.1	100.0
	Total	211	98.1	100.0	
Missing	Missing	4	1.9		
Total		215	100.0		

Table E.110. High School Principals Reported Proportion of Content Standards in CAHSEE Mathematics Blueprint Covered in 2002–2003 [2]

HSP02C:Math standards 2002-2003

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Do Not Know	18	8.4	8.6	8.6
	Little Covered (less than 40%)	16	7.4	7.6	16.2
	Partially Covered (40% - 60%)	62	28.8	29.5	45.7
	Mostly Covered (61% - 95%)	82	38.1	39.0	84.8
	Completely Covered (96% - 100%)	32	14.9	15.2	100.0
	Total	210	97.7	100.0	
Missing	Missing	5	2.3		
Total		215	100.0		

Table E.111. High School Principals Reported Proportion of Content Standards in CAHSEE Mathematics Blueprint Covered Before 2002 [2]

HSP02D:Math standards Before 2002

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Do Not Know	51	23.7	24.4	24.4
	Little Covered (less than 40%)	32	14.9	15.3	39.7
	Partially Covered (40% - 60%)	62	28.8	29.7	69.4
	Mostly Covered (61% - 95%)	50	23.3	23.9	93.3
	Completely Covered (96% - 100%)	14	6.5	6.7	100.0
	Total	209	97.2	100.0	
Missing	Missing	6	2.8		
Total		215	100.0		

Table E.112. Proportion of High School Teachers Who Participated in ELA-Related Professional Development to Teach Content Standards Associated With CAHSEE [3]

HSP03:ELA professional development

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not applicable	4	1.9	1.9	1.9
	Only a few (less than 25%)	20	9.3	9.3	11.2
	Some (25% to 74%)	61	28.4	28.4	39.5
	Most (75% to 90%)	64	29.8	29.8	69.3
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	66	30.7	30.7	100.0
	Total	215	100.0	100.0	

Table E.113. Proportion of High School Teachers Who Participated in Math-Related Professional Development to Teach Content Standards Associated With CAHSEE [4]

HSP04:Math professional development

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not applicable	3	1.4	1.4	1.4
	Only a few (less than 25%)	33	15.3	15.4	16.8
	Some (25% to 74%)	56	26.0	26.2	43.0
	Most (75% to 90%)	53	24.7	24.8	67.8
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	69	32.1	32.2	100.0
	Total	214	99.5	100.0	
Missing	-9	1	.5		
Total		215	100.0		

Table E.114. Percentage of High School Principals Who Reported Using District-Based Tracking System to Monitor and Report Student Proficiency on Content Standards [5]

HSP05A:District-based tracking system

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not marked	49	22.8	23.0	23.0
	Marked	164	76.3	77.0	100.0
	Total	213	99.1	100.0	
Missing	Missing	2	.9		
Total		215	100.0		

Table E.115. Percentage of High School Principals Who Reported Using School-Based Tracking System to Monitor and Report Student Proficiency on Content Standards [5]

HSP05B:School-based tracking system

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not marked	96	44.7	45.1	45.1
	Marked	117	54.4	54.9	100.0
	Total	213	99.1	100.0	
Missing	Missing	2	.9		
Total		215	100.0		

Table E.116. Percentage of High School Principals Who Reported Using Department-Based (ELA or Math) Tracking System to Monitor and Report Student Proficiency on Content Standards [5]

HSP05C:Department-based tracking system

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not marked	109	50.7	51.2	51.2
	Marked	104	48.4	48.8	100.0
	Total	213	99.1	100.0	
Missing	Missing	2	.9		
Total		215	100.0		

Table E.117. Percentage of High School Principals Who Reported That Individual Teachers Keep Track of Student Mastery of Content Standards [5]

HSP05D:Individual teachers keep track

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not marked	105	48.8	49.3	49.3
	Marked	108	50.2	50.7	100.0
	Total	213	99.1	100.0	
Missing	Missing	2	.9		
Total		215	100.0		

Table E.118. Percentage of High School Principals Who Reported Using Some Other System to Monitor and Report Student Proficiency on Content Standards [5]

HSP05E:Other (describe below)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not marked	202	94.0	94.8	94.8
	Marked	11	5.1	5.2	100.0
	Total	213	99.1	100.0	
Missing	Missing	2	.9		
Total		215	100.0		

Table E.119. Percentage of High School Principals Who Reported Using No Tracking System to Monitor and Report Student Proficiency on Content Standards [5]

HSP05F:None

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not marked	208	96.7	97.7	97.7
	Marked	5	2.3	2.3	100.0
	Total	213	99.1	100.0	
Missing	Missing	2	.9		
Total		215	100.0		

Table E.120. Percentage of High School Principals Who Reported Coordination Between Feeder and High School on Coverage of Content Standards Associated With CAHSEE [6]

HSP06A:Middle School/High School

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not developed	42	19.5	20.2	20.2
	Partially developed	122	56.7	58.7	78.8
	Fully developed	44	20.5	21.2	100.0
	Total	208	96.7	100.0	
Missing	Missing	7	3.3		
Total		215	100.0		

Table E.121. Percentage of High School Principals Who Reported Coordination Between Special and General Education on Coverage of Content Standards Associated With CAHSEE [6]

HSP06B:Spec Ed/Gen Ed

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not developed	15	7.0	7.3	7.3
	Partially developed	118	54.9	57.3	64.6
	Fully developed	73	34.0	35.4	100.0
	Total	206	95.8	100.0	
Missing	Missing	9	4.2		
Total		215	100.0		

Table E.122. Percentage of High School Principals Who Reported Coordination Between English Language Development and General Education on Coverage of Content Standards Associated With CAHSEE [6]

HSP06C:English Lang Dev/Gen Education

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not developed	12	5.6	5.8	5.8
	Partially developed	109	50.7	52.7	58.5
	Fully developed	86	40.0	41.5	100.0
	Total	207	96.3	100.0	
Missing	Missing	8	3.7		
Total		215	100.0		

Table E.123. Percentage of High School Principals Who Reported Coordination Between Alternative (Continuation) and General Education on Coverage of Content Standards Associated With CAHSEE [6]

HSP06D:Alternative/Gen Education

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not developed	51	23.7	26.7	26.7
	Partially developed	107	49.8	56.0	82.7
	Fully developed	33	15.3	17.3	100.0
	Total	191	88.8	100.0	
Missing	Missing	24	11.2		
Total		215	100.0		

Table E.124. Percentage of High School Principals Who Reported Regular Articulation Meetings With Feeder Middle Schools [7]

HSP07:Regular Articulation meetings

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Does not apply	8	3.7	3.7	3.7
	No	86	40.0	40.2	43.9
	Yes, with some of them	61	28.4	28.5	72.4
	Yes, with all of them	59	27.4	27.6	100.0
	Total	214	99.5	100.0	
Missing	Missing	1	.5		
Total		215	100.0		

Table E.125. Percentage of High School Principals Who Reported Importance of Regular Articulation Meetings With Feeder Middle Schools in Preparing Students for Success on CAHSEE [8]

HSP08:Importance of regular articulation

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very unimportant	2	.9	1.0	1.0
	Unimportant	4	1.9	2.0	2.9
	Neither	16	7.4	7.8	10.7
	Important	85	39.5	41.5	52.2
	Very important	98	45.6	47.8	100.0
	Total	205	95.3	100.0	
Missing	Missing	10	4.7		
Total		215	100.0		

High School Department Head—ELA, Part 1 Survey: Frequency Distributions

Table E.126. Percentage of High School ELA Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year English 9 Offered as Primary or Supplemental Course

ELA-Pri-Yr:Comp English-Grade 9 (2101)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Before 2002	179	90.4	97.8	97.8
	2002 - 03	2	1.0	1.1	98.9
	2003 - 04	1	.5	.5	99.5
	2004 - 05	1	.5	.5	100.0
	Total	183	92.4	100.0	
Missing	Missing	15	7.6		
Total		198	100.0		

Table E.127. Percentage of High School ELA Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year English 10 Offered as Primary or Supplemental Course

ELA-Pri-Yr:Comp English-Grade 10 (2101)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Before 2002	181	91.4	97.8	97.8
	2002 - 03	2	1.0	1.1	98.9
	2003 - 04	1	.5	.5	99.5
	2004 - 05	1	.5	.5	100.0
	Total	185	93.4	100.0	
Missing	Missing	13	6.6		
Total		198	100.0		

Table E.128. Percentage of High School ELA Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year English 11 Offered as Primary or Supplemental Course

ELA-Pri-Yr:Comp English-Grade 11 (2101)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Before 2002	175	88.4	97.2	97.2
	2002 - 03	1	.5	.6	97.8
	2003 - 04	2	1.0	1.1	98.9
	2004 - 05	2	1.0	1.1	100.0
	Total	180	90.9	100.0	
Missing	Missing	18	9.1		
Total		198	100.0		

Table E.129. Percentage of High School ELA Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year English 12 Offered as Primary or Supplemental Course

ELA-Pri-Yr:Comp English-Grade 12 (2101)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Before 2002	163	82.3	97.6	97.6
	2002 - 03	1	.5	.6	98.2
	2003 - 04	1	.5	.6	98.8
	2004 - 05	2	1.0	1.2	100.0
	Total	167	84.3	100.0	
Missing	Missing	31	15.7		
Total		198	100.0		

Table E.130. Percentage of High School ELA Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year English Literature Offered as Primary or Supplemental Course

ELA-Pri-Yr:English Literature (2106)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Before 2002	71	35.9	95.9	95.9
	2004 - 05	3	1.5	4.1	100.0
	Total	74	37.4	100.0	
Missing	Missing	124	62.6		
Total		198	100.0		

Table E.131. Percentage of High School ELA Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year World/Other Literature Offered as Primary or Supplemental Course

ELA-Pri-Yr:World/Other Lit (2107-2109)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Before 2002	65	32.8	94.2	94.2
	2002 - 03	1	.5	1.4	95.7
	2003 - 04	1	.5	1.4	97.1
	2004 - 05	2	1.0	2.9	100.0
	Total	69	34.8	100.0	
Missing	Missing	129	65.2		
Total		198	100.0		

Table E.132. Percentage of High School ELA Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year Composition Offered as Primary or Supplemental Course

ELA-Pri-Yr:Composition (2113)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Before 2002	43	21.7	91.5	91.5
	2003 - 04	1	.5	2.1	93.6
	2004 - 05	3	1.5	6.4	100.0
	Total	47	23.7	100.0	
Missing	Missing	151	76.3		
Total		198	100.0		

Table E.133. Percentage of High School ELA Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year Language Structure/Language Arts Offered as Primary or Supplemental Course

ELA-Pri-Yr:Lang Structure/Arts (2116)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Before 2002	20	10.1	90.9	90.9
	2002 - 03	1	.5	4.5	95.5
	2004 - 05	1	.5	4.5	100.0
	Total	22	11.1	100.0	
Missing	Missing	176	88.9		
Total		198	100.0		

Table E.134. Percentage of High School ELA Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year English as a Second Language Offered as Primary or Supplemental Course

ELA-Pri-Yr:English as a 2nd Lang (2110)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Before 2002	139	70.2	95.2	95.2
	2002 - 03	3	1.5	2.1	97.3
	2003 - 04	2	1.0	1.4	98.6
	2004 - 05	2	1.0	1.4	100.0
	Total	146	73.7	100.0	
Missing	Missing	52	26.3		
Total		198	100.0		

Table E.135. Percentage of High School ELA Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year Developmental Reading Offered as Primary or Supplemental Course

ELA-Pri-Yr:Developmental Reading (2100)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Before 2002	76	38.4	71.7	71.7
	2002 - 03	15	7.6	14.2	85.8
	2003 - 04	8	4.0	7.5	93.4
	2004 - 05	7	3.5	6.6	100.0
	Total	106	53.5	100.0	
Missing	Missing	92	46.5		
Total		198	100.0		

Table E.136. High School ELA Curriculum Head Reported Offering These Other ELA Primary or Supplemental Courses

Course Title	Frequency	Percentage (n=60)
Journalism	6	10.00%
CAHSEE Exit Exam English & Literacy	5	8.33%
Advanced Placement English	5	8.33%
Advanced Placement Literature & Composition	4	6.67%
Advanced Placement Language & Composition	3	5.00%
American Literature	3	5.00%
English College Preparatory	3	5.00%
Speech	3	5.00%
Academy English	2	3.33%
Read 180	2	3.33%
English	2	3.33%
English 9PR	1	1.67%
Essentials of English	1	1.67%
Transitional English	1	1.67%
Intervention English	1	1.67%
English Literature	1	1.67%
Rhetoric & Writing	1	1.67%
2115 Forensics	1	1.67%
Poetry	1	1.67%
Honors English	1	1.67%
Science Fiction	1	1.67%
English Language Arts	1	1.67%
American Cultures	1	1.67%
Times Writing	1	1.67%
Writers Seminar	1	1.67%
English Second Language	1	1.67%
Language	1	1.67%
Voices of Modern Cultures	1	1.67%
Humanities	1	1.67%
Speech & Debate	1	1.67%
Shakespeare	1	1.67%
Reach RS3	1	1.67%
Bible Literature Accelerated	1	1.67%

Table E.137. Frequency of Number of Sections of English 9 Offered at High School During Current Academic Year

ELA-Pri-Sec:Comp English-Grade 9 (2101)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	7	3.5	4.0	4.0
	2	2	1.0	1.2	5.2
	3	3	1.5	1.7	6.9
	4	2	1.0	1.2	8.1
	5	3	1.5	1.7	9.8
	6	1	.5	.6	10.4
	7	1	.5	.6	11.0
	8	2	1.0	1.2	12.1
	9 or more	152	76.8	87.9	100.0
	Total	173	87.4	100.0	
Missing	Missing	25	12.6		
Total		198	100.0		

Table E.138. Frequency of Number of Sections of English 10 Offered During Current Academic Year

ELA-Pri-Sec:Comp English-Grade 10 (2101)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	6	3.0	3.4	3.4
	2	4	2.0	2.3	5.7
	3	2	1.0	1.1	6.9
	4	2	1.0	1.1	8.0
	5	3	1.5	1.7	9.8
	6	1	.5	.6	10.3
	7	4	2.0	2.3	12.6
	8	7	3.5	4.0	16.7
	9 or more	145	73.2	83.3	100.0
	Total	174	87.9	100.0	
Missing	Missing	24	12.1		
Total		198	100.0		

Table E.139. Frequency of Number of Sections of English 11 Offered During Current Academic Year

ELA-Pri-Sec:Comp English-Grade 11 (2101)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	8	4.0	4.7	4.7
	1	1	.5	.6	5.3
	2	5	2.5	2.9	8.2
	3	1	.5	.6	8.8
	4	2	1.0	1.2	9.9
	5	6	3.0	3.5	13.5
	6	2	1.0	1.2	14.6
	7	7	3.5	4.1	18.7
	8	12	6.1	7.0	25.7
	9 or more	127	64.1	74.3	100.0
	Total	171	86.4	100.0	
Missing	Missing	27	13.6		
Total		198	100.0		

Table E.140. Frequency of Number of Sections of English 12 Offered During Current Academic Year

ELA-Pri-Sec:Comp English-Grade 12 (2101)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	14	7.1	8.7	8.7
	1	1	.5	.6	9.3
	2	7	3.5	4.3	13.7
	3	3	1.5	1.9	15.5
	4	3	1.5	1.9	17.4
	5	4	2.0	2.5	19.9
	6	13	6.6	8.1	28.0
	7	9	4.5	5.6	33.5
	8	6	3.0	3.7	37.3
	9 or more	101	51.0	62.7	100.0
	Total	161	81.3	100.0	
Missing	Missing	37	18.7		
Total		198	100.0		

Table E.141. Frequency of Number of Sections of English Literature Offered During Current Academic Year

ELA-Pri-Sec:English Literature (2106)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	52	26.3	48.1	48.1
	1	4	2.0	3.7	51.9
	2	13	6.6	12.0	63.9
	3	4	2.0	3.7	67.6
	4	9	4.5	8.3	75.9
	5	1	.5	.9	76.9
	6	2	1.0	1.9	78.7
	7	2	1.0	1.9	80.6
	8	2	1.0	1.9	82.4
	9 or more	19	9.6	17.6	100.0
	Total	108	54.5	100.0	
Missing	Missing	90	45.5		
Total		198	100.0		

Table E.142. Frequency of Number of Sections of World/Other Literature Offered During Current Academic Year

ELA-Pri-Sec:World/Other Lit (2107-2109)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	54	27.3	51.4	51.4
	1	9	4.5	8.6	60.0
	2	6	3.0	5.7	65.7
	3	2	1.0	1.9	67.6
	4	2	1.0	1.9	69.5
	6	1	.5	1.0	70.5
	7	2	1.0	1.9	72.4
	9 or more	29	14.6	27.6	100.0
	Total	105	53.0	100.0	
Missing	Missing	93	47.0		
Total		198	100.0		

Table E.143. Frequency of Number of Sections of Composition Offered During Current Academic Year

ELA-Pri-Sec:Composition (2113)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	57	28.8	60.6	60.6
	1	5	2.5	5.3	66.0
	2	4	2.0	4.3	70.2
	3	6	3.0	6.4	76.6
	4	3	1.5	3.2	79.8
	5	2	1.0	2.1	81.9
	6	1	.5	1.1	83.0
	8	1	.5	1.1	84.0
	9 or more	15	7.6	16.0	100.0
	Total	94	47.5	100.0	
Missing	Missing	104	52.5		
Total		198	100.0		

Table E.144. Frequency of Number of Sections of Language Structure/Language Arts Offered During Current Academic Year

ELA-Pri-Sec:Lang Structure/Arts (2116)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	68	34.3	85.0	85.0
	1	2	1.0	2.5	87.5
	2	1	.5	1.3	88.8
	4	2	1.0	2.5	91.3
	5	1	.5	1.3	92.5
	6	1	.5	1.3	93.8
	8	1	.5	1.3	95.0
	9 or more	4	2.0	5.0	100.0
	Total	80	40.4	100.0	
Missing	Missing	118	59.6		
Total		198	100.0		

Table E.145. Frequency of Number of Sections of English as a Second Language Offered at High School During Current Academic Year

ELA-Pri-Sec:English as a 2nd Lang (2110)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	19	9.6	14.1	14.1
	1	4	2.0	3.0	17.0
	2	14	7.1	10.4	27.4
	3	15	7.6	11.1	38.5
	4	14	7.1	10.4	48.9
	5	18	9.1	13.3	62.2
	6	6	3.0	4.4	66.7
	7	4	2.0	3.0	69.6
	8	4	2.0	3.0	72.6
	9 or more	37	18.7	27.4	100.0
	Total	135	68.2	100.0	
Missing	Missing	63	31.8		
Total		198	100.0		

Table E.146. Frequency of Number of Sections of Developmental Reading Offered During Current Academic Year

ELA-Pri-Sec:Developmental Reading (2100)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	31	15.7	26.7	26.7
	1	6	3.0	5.2	31.9
	2	8	4.0	6.9	38.8
	3	12	6.1	10.3	49.1
	4	8	4.0	6.9	56.0
	5	12	6.1	10.3	66.4
	6	8	4.0	6.9	73.3
	7	7	3.5	6.0	79.3
	8	4	2.0	3.4	82.8
	9 or more	20	10.1	17.2	100.0
	Total	116	58.6	100.0	
Missing	Missing	82	41.4		
Total		198	100.0		

Table E.147. Percentage of High School ELA Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year Houghton Mifflin Reading: A Legacy of Literacy Offered as an Intervention or Basic Program

ELA-Int-Yr:Houghton Mifflin Reading

		Frequency	Percent
Missing	Missing	198	100.0

Note. No one listed this as an intervention or basic program.

Table E.148. Percentage of High School ELA Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year SRA/Open Court Reading Offered as an Intervention or Basic Program

ELA-Int-Yr:SRA/Open Court Reading

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Before 2002	1	.5	33.3	33.3
	2004 - 05	2	1.0	66.7	100.0
	Total	3	1.5	100.0	
Missing	Missing	195	98.5		
Total		198	100.0		

Table E.149. Percentage of High School ELA Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year The Reader's Choice Offered as an Intervention or Basic Program

ELA-Int-Yr:The Reader's Choice

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	2002 - 03	3	1.5	75.0	75.0
	2003 - 04	1	.5	25.0	100.0
	Total	4	2.0	100.0	
Missing	Missing	194	98.0		
Total		198	100.0		

Table E.150. Percentage of High School ELA Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year Literature and Language Offered as an Intervention or Basic Program

ELA-Int-Yr:Literature and Language

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Before 2002	17	8.6	38.6	38.6
	2002 - 03	8	4.0	18.2	56.8
	2003 - 04	9	4.5	20.5	77.3
	2004 - 05	10	5.1	22.7	100.0
	Total	44	22.2	100.0	
Missing	Missing	154	77.8		
Total		198	100.0		

Table E.151. Percentage of High School ELA Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year McDougal Littell Reading & Language Arts Program Offered as an Intervention or Basic Program

ELA-Int-Yr:McDougal Littell Reading

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Before 2002	27	13.6	60.0	60.0
	2002 - 03	3	1.5	6.7	66.7
	2003 - 04	8	4.0	17.8	84.4
	2004 - 05	7	3.5	15.6	100.0
	Total	45	22.7	100.0	
Missing	Missing	153	77.3		
Total		198	100.0		

Table E.152. Percentage of High School ELA Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year Prentice Hall Literature: Timeless Voices, Timeless Themes Offered as an Intervention or Basic Program

ELA-Int-Yr:Prentice-Hall Literature

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Before 2002	17	8.6	54.8	54.8
	2002 - 03	6	3.0	19.4	74.2
	2003 - 04	4	2.0	12.9	87.1
	2004 - 05	4	2.0	12.9	100.0
	Total	31	15.7	100.0	
Missing	Missing	167	84.3		
Total		198	100.0		

Table E.153. Percentage of High School ELA Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year Language! Offered as an Intervention or Basic Program

ELA-Int-Yr:Language! Literacy Intervent

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Before 2002	22	11.1	53.7	53.7
	2002 - 03	13	6.6	31.7	85.4
	2003 - 04	5	2.5	12.2	97.6
	2004 - 05	1	.5	2.4	100.0
	Total	41	20.7	100.0	
Missing	Missing	157	79.3		
Total		198	100.0		

Table E.154. Percentage of High School ELA Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year High Point Offered as an Intervention or Basic Program

ELA-Int-Yr:High Point (Hampton Brown)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Before 2002	6	3.0	20.7	20.7
	2002 - 03	6	3.0	20.7	41.4
	2003 - 04	13	6.6	44.8	86.2
	2004 - 05	4	2.0	13.8	100.0
	Total	29	14.6	100.0	
Missing	Missing	169	85.4		
Total		198	100.0		

Table E.155. Percentage of High School ELA Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year High Point for English Learners Offered as an Intervention or Basic Program

ELA-Int-Yr:High Point English Learners

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Before 2002	10	5.1	22.2	22.2
	2002 - 03	13	6.6	28.9	51.1
	2003 - 04	14	7.1	31.1	82.2
	2004 - 05	8	4.0	17.8	100.0
	Total	45	22.7	100.0	
Missing	Missing	153	77.3		
Total		198	100.0		

Table E.156. Percentage of High School ELA Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year READ 180 Offered as an Intervention or Basic Program

ELA-Int-Yr:READ 180

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Before 2002	7	3.5	25.9	25.9
	2002 - 03	3	1.5	11.1	37.0
	2003 - 04	8	4.0	29.6	66.7
	2004 - 05	9	4.5	33.3	100.0
	Total	27	13.6	100.0	
Missing	Missing	171	86.4		
Total		198	100.0		

Table E.157. Percentage of High School ELA Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year SRA/Reach Program Offered as an Intervention or Basic Program

ELA-Int-Yr:SRA/Reach Program

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Before 2002	9	4.5	47.4	47.4
	2002 - 03	2	1.0	10.5	57.9
	2003 - 04	5	2.5	26.3	84.2
	2004 - 05	3	1.5	15.8	100.0
	Total	19	9.6	100.0	
Missing	Missing	179	90.4		
Total		198	100.0		

Table E.158. Percentage of High School ELA Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year Fast Track Reading Program Offered as an Intervention or Basic Program

ELA-Int-Yr:Fast Track Reading Program

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Before 2002	3	1.5	75.0	75.0
	2004 - 05	1	.5	25.0	100.0
	Total	4	2.0	100.0	
Missing	Missing	194	98.0		
Total		198	100.0		

Table E.159. High School ELA Curriculum Head Reported Offering These Other ELA Intervention or Basic Programs

Program Title	Frequency	Percentage (n=27)
CAHSEE	4	14.81%
Language Arts Support	2	7.41%
English	1	3.70%
Elements of Literature	1	3.70%
Ramp up to Advance Literature	1	3.70%
Power Reading	1	3.70%
Study Skills 3000	1	3.70%
California Based Educational Data	1	3.70%
Language Topics	1	3.70%
Studio	1	3.70%
Literacy 9	1	3.70%
Strategic Literacy	1	3.70%
Advance to Literacy	1	3.70%
Academic Literacy	1	3.70%
English Literacy	1	3.70%
English Language Development Literacy	1	3.70%
Shining Star	1	3.70%
Comprehensive English Writers	1	3.70%
Sophomore Academic Support	1	3.70%
Competence in Academics	1	3.70%
Holt, Rinehart, Winston	1	3.70%
Vocabulary Workshop	1	3.70%
PM Language Arts	1	3.70%

Table E.160. Frequency of Number of Sections of Houghton Mifflin Reading: A Legacy of Literacy Offered at High School During Current Academic Year

ELA-Int-Sec:Houghton Mifflin Reading

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	59	29.8	98.3	98.3
	2	1	.5	1.7	100.0
	Total	60	30.3	100.0	
Missing	Missing	138	69.7		
Total		198	100.0		

Table E.161. Frequency of Number of Sections of SRA/Open Court Reading Offered at High School During Current Academic Year

ELA-Int-Sec:SRA/Open Court Reading

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	57	28.8	98.3	98.3
	2	1	.5	1.7	100.0
	Total	58	29.3	100.0	
Missing	Missing	140	70.7		
Total		198	100.0		

Table E.162. Frequency of Number of Sections of The Reader's Choice Offered at High School During Current Academic Year

ELA-Int-Sec:The Reader's Choice

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	55	27.8	94.8	94.8
	9 or more	3	1.5	5.2	100.0
	Total	58	29.3	100.0	
Missing	Missing	140	70.7		
Total		198	100.0		

Table E.163. Frequency of Number of Sections of Literature and Language Offered at High School During Current Academic Year

ELA-Int-Sec:Literature and Language

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	48	24.2	56.5	56.5
	5	3	1.5	3.5	60.0
	8	1	.5	1.2	61.2
	9 or more	33	16.7	38.8	100.0
	Total	85	42.9	100.0	
Missing	Missing	113	57.1		
Total		198	100.0		

Table E.164. Frequency of Number of Sections of McDougal Littell Reading & Language Arts Offered at High School During Current Academic Year

ELA-Int-Sec:McDougal Littell Reading

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	49	24.7	59.0	59.0
	2	1	.5	1.2	60.2
	4	1	.5	1.2	61.4
	9 or more	32	16.2	38.6	100.0
	Total	83	41.9	100.0	
Missing	Missing	115	58.1		
Total		198	100.0		

Table E.165. Frequency of Number of Sections of Prentice Hall Literature: Timeless Voices, Timeless Themes Offered at High School During Current Academic Year

ELA-Int-Sec:Prentice-Hall Literature

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	50	25.3	65.8	65.8
	2	1	.5	1.3	67.1
	3	1	.5	1.3	68.4
	4	1	.5	1.3	69.7
	6	2	1.0	2.6	72.4
	9 or more	21	10.6	27.6	100.0
	Total	76	38.4	100.0	
Missing	Missing	122	61.6		
Total		198	100.0		

Table E.166. Frequency of Number of Sections of Language! Offered at High School During Current Academic Year

ELA-Int-Sec:Language! Literacy Intervent

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	43	21.7	55.8	55.8
	1	4	2.0	5.2	61.0
	2	2	1.0	2.6	63.6
	3	4	2.0	5.2	68.8
	4	6	3.0	7.8	76.6
	5	2	1.0	2.6	79.2
	6	5	2.5	6.5	85.7
	8	1	.5	1.3	87.0
	9 or more	10	5.1	13.0	100.0
	Total	77	38.9	100.0	
Missing	Missing	121	61.1		
Total		198	100.0		

Table E.167. Frequency of Number of Sections of High Point Offered at High School During Current Academic Year

ELA-Int-Sec:High Point (Hampton Brown)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	49	24.7	70.0	70.0
	1	2	1.0	2.9	72.9
	2	6	3.0	8.6	81.4
	3	3	1.5	4.3	85.7
	4	4	2.0	5.7	91.4
	6	2	1.0	2.9	94.3
	8	1	.5	1.4	95.7
	9 or more	3	1.5	4.3	100.0
	Total	70	35.4	100.0	
Missing	Missing	128	64.6		
Total		198	100.0		

Table E.168. Frequency of Number of Sections of High Point for English Learner Offered at High School During Current Academic Year

ELA-Int-Sec:High Point English Learners

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	44	22.2	53.0	53.0
	1	5	2.5	6.0	59.0
	2	6	3.0	7.2	66.3
	3	3	1.5	3.6	69.9
	4	3	1.5	3.6	73.5
	5	4	2.0	4.8	78.3
	6	5	2.5	6.0	84.3
	8	1	.5	1.2	85.5
	9 or more	12	6.1	14.5	100.0
	Total	83	41.9	100.0	
Missing	Missing	115	58.1		
Total		198	100.0		

Table E.169. Frequency of Number of Sections of READ 180 Offered at High School During Current Academic Year

ELA-Int-Sec:READ 180

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	52	26.3	74.3	74.3
	1	1	.5	1.4	75.7
	2	3	1.5	4.3	80.0
	3	2	1.0	2.9	82.9
	4	1	.5	1.4	84.3
	5	3	1.5	4.3	88.6
	6	1	.5	1.4	90.0
	7	1	.5	1.4	91.4
	8	1	.5	1.4	92.9
	9 or more	5	2.5	7.1	100.0
	Total	70	35.4	100.0	
Missing	Missing	128	64.6		
Total		198	100.0		

Table E.170. Frequency of Number of Sections of SRA/Reach Program Offered at High School During Current Academic Year

ELA-Int-Sec:SRA/Reach Program

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	51	25.8	73.9	73.9
	1	3	1.5	4.3	78.3
	2	2	1.0	2.9	81.2
	3	2	1.0	2.9	84.1
	4	1	.5	1.4	85.5
	5	1	.5	1.4	87.0
	6	2	1.0	2.9	89.9
	7	2	1.0	2.9	92.8
	9 or more	5	2.5	7.2	100.0
	Total	69	34.8	100.0	
Missing	Missing	129	65.2		
Total		198	100.0		

Table E.171. Frequency of Number of Sections of Fast Track Reading Program Offered at High School During Current Academic Year

ELA-Int-Sec:Fast Track Reading Program

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	55	27.8	96.5	96.5
	1	1	.5	1.8	98.2
	3	1	.5	1.8	100.0
	Total	57	28.8	100.0	
Missing	Missing	141	71.2		
Total		198	100.0		

Table E.172. High School ELA Department Heads Reported Frequency of Full-Time Teachers Working in English Department During Current Academic Year [1]

DHHE01:# full-time ELA teachers

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	2	1.0	1.0	1.0
	2	2	1.0	1.0	2.1
	3	2	1.0	1.0	3.1
	4	3	1.5	1.5	4.6
	5	3	1.5	1.5	6.2
	7	3	1.5	1.5	7.7
	8	5	2.5	2.6	10.3
	9	6	3.0	3.1	13.3
	10	8	4.0	4.1	17.4
	11	9	4.5	4.6	22.1
	12	7	3.5	3.6	25.6
	13	13	6.6	6.7	32.3
	14	12	6.1	6.2	38.5
	15	11	5.6	5.6	44.1
	16 or more	109	55.1	55.9	100.0
	Total	195	98.5	100.0	
Missing	System	3	1.5		
Total		198	100.0		

Table E.173. High School ELA Department Heads Reported Frequency of Teachers in English Department With Bachelor's as Most Advanced Degree [2]

DHHE02A:Bachelor degree

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	11	5.6	7.1	7.1
	1	6	3.0	3.9	11.0
	2	6	3.0	3.9	14.8
	3	6	3.0	3.9	18.7
	4	9	4.5	5.8	24.5
	5	6	3.0	3.9	28.4
	6	2	1.0	1.3	29.7
	7	7	3.5	4.5	34.2
	8	6	3.0	3.9	38.1
	9	6	3.0	3.9	41.9
	10	9	4.5	5.8	47.7
	11	2	1.0	1.3	49.0
	12	5	2.5	3.2	52.3
	13	4	2.0	2.6	54.8
	14	3	1.5	1.9	56.8
	15 or more	67	33.8	43.2	100.0
	Total	155	78.3	100.0	
Missing	System	43	21.7		
Total		198	100.0		

Table E.174. High School ELA Department Heads Reported Frequency of Teachers in English Department With Some Graduate School as Most Advanced Degree [2]

DHHE02B:Some graduate school

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	2	1.0	1.2	1.2
	1	6	3.0	3.6	4.8
	2	10	5.1	6.0	10.8
	3	12	6.1	7.2	18.1
	4	10	5.1	6.0	24.1
	5	10	5.1	6.0	30.1
	6	9	4.5	5.4	35.5
	7	8	4.0	4.8	40.4
	8	9	4.5	5.4	45.8
	9	11	5.6	6.6	52.4
	10	9	4.5	5.4	57.8
	11	4	2.0	2.4	60.2
	12	4	2.0	2.4	62.7
	13	6	3.0	3.6	66.3
	14	5	2.5	3.0	69.3
	15 or more	51	25.8	30.7	100.0
	Total	166	83.8	100.0	
Missing	System	32	16.2		
Total		198	100.0		

Table E.175. High School ELA Department Heads Reported Frequency of Teachers in English Department With Master's as Most Advanced Degree [2]

DHHE02C:Masters degree

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	3	1.5	1.7	1.7
	1	12	6.1	6.8	8.5
	2	14	7.1	7.9	16.4
	3	17	8.6	9.6	26.0
	4	21	10.6	11.9	37.9
	5	18	9.1	10.2	48.0
	6	17	8.6	9.6	57.6
	7	14	7.1	7.9	65.5
	8	12	6.1	6.8	72.3
	9	5	2.5	2.8	75.1
	10	11	5.6	6.2	81.4
	11	4	2.0	2.3	83.6
	12	7	3.5	4.0	87.6
	13	4	2.0	2.3	89.8
	14	2	1.0	1.1	91.0
	15 or more	16	8.1	9.0	100.0
	Total	177	89.4	100.0	
Missing	System	21	10.6		
Total		198	100.0		

Table E.176. High School ELA Department Heads Reported Frequency of Teachers in English Department With Doctorate as Most Advanced Degree [2]

DHHE02D:Doctoral degree

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	87	43.9	68.5	68.5
	1	30	15.2	23.6	92.1
	2	8	4.0	6.3	98.4
	3	2	1.0	1.6	100.0
	Total	127	64.1	100.0	
Missing	System	71	35.9		
Total		198	100.0		

Table E.177. High School ELA Department Heads Reported These Other Degrees for Teachers in the English Department

Other Degrees	Frequency	Percentage (n=6)
National Board Certification	2	33.33%
Juris Doctorate	2	33.33%
Masters In Philosophy	1	16.67%
Two different BA's in Two Subjects	1	16.67%

Table E.178. High School ELA Department Heads Reported Proportion of Teachers in English Department Working With an Appropriate ELA Credential [3]

DHHE03:Percent with ELA credential

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	None	1	.5	.5	.5
	Only a few (less than 25%)	7	3.5	3.7	4.3
	Some (25% - 74%)	15	7.6	8.0	12.3
	Most (75% - 90%)	23	11.6	12.3	24.6
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	141	71.2	75.4	100.0
	Total	187	94.4	100.0	
Missing	Missing	11	5.6		
Total		198	100.0		

Table E.179. High School ELA Department Heads Reported Proportion of Teachers in English Department Working With an Emergency Credential or Are a District Intern [4]

DHHE04:% emergency credential or intern

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	None	115	58.1	61.5	61.5
	Only a few (less than 25%)	64	32.3	34.2	95.7
	Some (25% - 74%)	4	2.0	2.1	97.9
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	4	2.0	2.1	100.0
	Total	187	94.4	100.0	
Missing	Missing	11	5.6		
Total		198	100.0		

Table E.180. High School ELA Department Heads Characterization of Experience of Teachers in English Department Who Teach Primary or Supplemental ELA Courses [5]

DHHE05:Experience-Primary teachers

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Few have 5 or more years	11	5.6	5.8	5.8
	About half have 5 or more years	39	19.7	20.4	26.2
	Most have 5 or more years	141	71.2	73.8	100.0
	Total	191	96.5	100.0	
Missing	Missing	7	3.5		
Total		198	100.0		

Table E.181. High School ELA Department Heads Characterization of Experience of Teachers in English Department Who Teach Intervention or Basic ELA Programs [6]

DHHE06:Experience-Intervention teachers

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Few have 5 or more years	26	13.1	14.5	14.5
	About half have 5 or more years	38	19.2	21.2	35.8
	Most have 5 or more years	115	58.1	64.2	100.0
	Total	179	90.4	100.0	
Missing	Missing	19	9.6		
Total		198	100.0		

Table E.182. High School ELA Department Heads Reported Distribution of Economically Disadvantaged Students in General Across Sections of Primary or Supplemental ELA Courses [7]

DHHE07A:Economically disadvantaged

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Clustered in one or a few sections	14	7.1	7.7	7.7
	Across most or all sections	167	84.3	92.3	100.0
	Total	181	91.4	100.0	
Missing	Missing	17	8.6		
Total		198	100.0		

Table E.183. High School ELA Department Heads Reported Distribution of English Learner Students Across Sections of Primary or Supplemental ELA Courses [7]

DHHE07B:English learners

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Clustered in one or a few sections	102	51.5	56.4	56.4
	Across most or all sections	79	39.9	43.6	100.0
	Total	181	91.4	100.0	
Missing	Missing	17	8.6		
Total		198	100.0		

Table E.184. High School ELA Department Heads Reported Distribution of Remedial Students in General Across Sections of Primary or Supplemental ELA Courses [7]

DHHE07C:Remedial students in general

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Clustered in one or a few sections	46	23.2	24.9	24.9
	Across most or all sections	139	70.2	75.1	100.0
	Total	185	93.4	100.0	
Missing	Missing	13	6.6		
Total		198	100.0		

Table E.185. High School ELA Department Heads Reported Distribution of Students Receiving Special Education Services Across Sections of Primary or Supplemental ELA Courses [7]

DHHE07D:Receive special ed services

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Clustered in one or a few sections	74	37.4	41.6	41.6
	Across most or all sections	104	52.5	58.4	100.0
	Total	178	89.9	100.0	
Missing	Missing	20	10.1		
Total		198	100.0		

Table E.186. High School ELA Department Heads Reported Proportion of Economically Disadvantaged Students in General Who Receive ELA Primary and Supplemental Course Instruction From Teacher With Experience Working With This Subgroup [8]

DHHE08A:Pri Exp-Economic disadvantaged

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	None	2	1.0	1.1	1.1
	Only a few (less than 25%)	4	2.0	2.2	3.3
	Some (25% - 74%)	25	12.6	13.6	16.8
	Most (75% - 90%)	58	29.3	31.5	48.4
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	95	48.0	51.6	100.0
	Total	184	92.9	100.0	
Missing	Missing	14	7.1		
Total		198	100.0		

Table E.187. High School ELA Department Heads Reported Proportion of English Learner Students Who Receive ELA Primary and Supplemental Course Instruction From Teacher With Experience Working With This Subgroup [8]

DHHE08B:Pri Exp-English learners

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	None	3	1.5	1.6	1.6
	Only a few (less than 25%)	9	4.5	4.8	6.4
	Some (25% - 74%)	22	11.1	11.7	18.1
	Most (75% - 90%)	42	21.2	22.3	40.4
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	112	56.6	59.6	100.0
	Total	188	94.9	100.0	
Missing	Missing	10	5.1		
Total		198	100.0		

Table E.188. High School ELA Department Heads Reported Proportion of Remedial Students in General Who Receive ELA Primary and Supplemental Course Instruction From Teacher With Experience Working With This Subgroup [8]

DHHE08C:Pri Exp-Remedial students

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Only a few (less than 25%)	5	2.5	2.7	2.7
	Some (25% - 74%)	26	13.1	14.0	16.7
	Most (75% - 90%)	62	31.3	33.3	50.0
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	93	47.0	50.0	100.0
	Total	186	93.9	100.0	
Missing	Missing	12	6.1		
Total		198	100.0		

Table E.189. High School ELA Department Heads Reported Proportion of Students Receiving Special Education Services Who Receive ELA Primary and Supplemental Course Instruction From Teacher With Experience Working With This Subgroup [8]

DHHE08D:Pri Exp-Special Ed services

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	None	2	1.0	1.1	1.1
	Only a few (less than 25%)	8	4.0	4.3	5.4
	Some (25% - 74%)	23	11.6	12.5	17.9
	Most (75% - 90%)	44	22.2	23.9	41.8
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	107	54.0	58.2	100.0
	Total	184	92.9	100.0	
Missing	Missing	14	7.1		
Total		198	100.0		

Table E.190. High School ELA Department Heads Reported Proportion of Economically Disadvantaged Students in General Who Receive ELA Instruction From Teacher Without an Appropriate ELA Credential [9]

DHHE09A:No Cred-Economic disadvantaged

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	None	122	61.6	65.9	65.9
	Only a few (less than 25%)	41	20.7	22.2	88.1
	Some (25% - 74%)	9	4.5	4.9	93.0
	Most (75% - 90%)	3	1.5	1.6	94.6
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	10	5.1	5.4	100.0
	Total	185	93.4	100.0	
Missing	Missing	13	6.6		
Total		198	100.0		

Table E.191. High School ELA Department Heads Reported Proportion of English Learner Students in General Who Receive ELA Instruction From Teacher Without an Appropriate ELA Credential [9]

DHHE09B:No Cred-English learners

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	None	132	66.7	70.6	70.6
	Only a few (less than 25%)	34	17.2	18.2	88.8
	Some (25% - 74%)	9	4.5	4.8	93.6
	Most (75% - 90%)	2	1.0	1.1	94.7
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	10	5.1	5.3	100.0
	Total	187	94.4	100.0	
Missing	Missing	11	5.6		
Total		198	100.0		

Table E.192. High School ELA Department Heads Reported Proportion of Remedial Students in General Who Receive ELA Instruction From Teacher Without an Appropriate ELA Credential [9]

DHHE09C:No Cred-Remedial students

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	None	122	61.6	65.9	65.9
	Only a few (less than 25%)	42	21.2	22.7	88.6
	Some (25% - 74%)	8	4.0	4.3	93.0
	Most (75% - 90%)	3	1.5	1.6	94.6
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	10	5.1	5.4	100.0
	Total	185	93.4	100.0	
Missing	Missing	13	6.6		
Total		198	100.0		

Table E.193. High School ELA Department Heads Reported Proportion of Students Receiving Special Education Services Who Receive ELA Instruction From Teacher Without an Appropriate ELA Credential [9]

DHHE09D:No Cred-Special Ed services

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	None	123	62.1	66.8	66.8
	Only a few (less than 25%)	40	20.2	21.7	88.6
	Some (25% - 74%)	10	5.1	5.4	94.0
	Most (75% - 90%)	3	1.5	1.6	95.7
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	8	4.0	4.3	100.0
	Total	184	92.9	100.0	
Missing	Missing	14	7.1		
Total		198	100.0		

Table E.194. High School ELA Department Heads Reported Proportion of Economically Disadvantaged Students in General Who Receive ELA Intervention and Basic Program Instruction From Teacher With Experience Working With This Subgroup [10]

DHHE10A:Int Exp-Economic disadvantaged

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	None	14	7.1	8.0	8.0
	Only a few (less than 25%)	6	3.0	3.4	11.5
	Some (25% - 74%)	19	9.6	10.9	22.4
	Most (75% - 90%)	40	20.2	23.0	45.4
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	95	48.0	54.6	100.0
	Total	174	87.9	100.0	
Missing	Missing	24	12.1		
Total		198	100.0		

Table E.195. High School ELA Department Heads Reported Proportion of English Learner Students Who Receive ELA Intervention and Basic Program Instruction From Teacher With Experience Working With This Subgroup [10]

DHHE10B:Int Exp-English learners

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	None	12	6.1	6.9	6.9
	Only a few (less than 25%)	8	4.0	4.6	11.5
	Some (25% - 74%)	15	7.6	8.6	20.1
	Most (75% - 90%)	38	19.2	21.8	42.0
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	101	51.0	58.0	100.0
	Total	174	87.9	100.0	
Missing	Missing	24	12.1		
Total		198	100.0		

Table E.196. High School ELA Department Heads Reported Proportion of Remedial Students in General Who Receive ELA Intervention and Basic Program Instruction From Teacher With Experience Working With This Subgroup [10]

DHHE10C:Int Exp-Remedial students

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	None	12	6.1	6.9	6.9
	Only a few (less than 25%)	5	2.5	2.9	9.8
	Some (25% - 74%)	20	10.1	11.6	21.4
	Most (75% - 90%)	39	19.7	22.5	43.9
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	97	49.0	56.1	100.0
	Total	173	87.4	100.0	
Missing	Missing	25	12.6		
Total		198	100.0		

Table E.197. High School ELA Department Heads Reported Proportion of Students Receiving Special Education Services Who Receive ELA Intervention and Basic Program Instruction From Teacher With Experience Working With This Subgroup [10]

DHHE10D:Int Exp-Special Ed services

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	None	13	6.6	7.6	7.6
	Only a few (less than 25%)	7	3.5	4.1	11.6
	Some (25% - 74%)	18	9.1	10.5	22.1
	Most (75% - 90%)	31	15.7	18.0	40.1
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	103	52.0	59.9	100.0
	Total	172	86.9	100.0	
Missing	Missing	26	13.1		
Total		198	100.0		

Table E.198. High School ELA Department Heads Reported Extent of ELA Teacher Experience in Teaching California Content Standards Associated With the CAHSEE Requirement [11]

DHHE11:Exp California Content Standards

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Slight extent	3	1.5	1.5	1.5
	Moderate extent	30	15.2	15.5	17.0
	Great extent	72	36.4	37.1	54.1
	Very great extent	89	44.9	45.9	100.0
	Total	194	98.0	100.0	
Missing	Missing	4	2.0		
Total		198	100.0		

Table E.199. High School ELA Department Heads Reported Extent of ELA Course Offerings Being Demanding Courses for Students [12]

DHHE12:ELA courses demanding

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not at all	1	.5	.5	.5
	Slight extent	3	1.5	1.6	2.1
	Moderate extent	49	24.7	25.5	27.6
	Great extent	86	43.4	44.8	72.4
	Very great extent	53	26.8	27.6	100.0
	Total	192	97.0	100.0	
Missing	Missing	6	3.0		
Total		198	100.0		

High School Department Head—Mathematics, Part 1 Survey: Frequency Distributions

Table E.200. Percentage of High School Math Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year General Math Offered as Primary or Supplemental Course

Mth-Pri-Yr:General Math (2400)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Before 2002	43	21.1	97.7	97.7
	2002 - 03	1	.5	2.3	100.0
	Total	44	21.6	100.0	
Missing	Missing	160	78.4		
Total		204	100.0		

Table E.201. Percentage of High School Math Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year Math A Offered as Primary or Supplemental Course

Mth-Pri-Yr:Math A (2420)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Before 2002	30	14.7	100.0	100.0
Missing	Missing	174	85.3		
Total		204	100.0		

Table E.202. Percentage of High School Math Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year Math B Offered as Primary or Supplemental Course

Mth-Pri-Yr:Math B (2421)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Before 2002	24	11.8	100.0	100.0
Missing	Missing	180	88.2		
Total		204	100.0		

Table E.203. Percentage of High School Math Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year Pre-Algebra Offered as Primary or Supplemental Course

Mth-Pri-Yr:Pre-Algebra (2424)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Before 2002	71	34.8	83.5	83.5
	2002 - 03	8	3.9	9.4	92.9
	2003 - 04	1	.5	1.2	94.1
	2004 - 05	5	2.5	5.9	100.0
	Total	85	41.7	100.0	
Missing	Missing	119	58.3		
Total		204	100.0		

Table E.204. Percentage of High School Math Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year Beginning Algebra Offered as Primary or Supplemental Course

Mth-Pri-Yr:Beginning Algebra (2403)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Before 2002	145	71.1	92.9	92.9
	2002 - 03	6	2.9	3.8	96.8
	2003 - 04	3	1.5	1.9	98.7
	2004 - 05	2	1.0	1.3	100.0
	Total	156	76.5	100.0	
Missing	Missing	48	23.5		
Total		204	100.0		

Table E.205. Percentage of High School Math Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year Intermediate Algebra Offered as Primary or Supplemental Course

Mth-Pri-Yr:Intermediate Algebra (2404)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Before 2002	103	50.5	93.6	93.6
	2002 - 03	4	2.0	3.6	97.3
	2003 - 04	3	1.5	2.7	100.0
	Total	110	53.9	100.0	
Missing	Missing	94	46.1		
Total		204	100.0		

Table E.206. Percentage of High School Math Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year Beginning Algebra Part I Offered as Primary or Supplemental Course

Mth-Pri-Yr:Beginning Algebra I (2428)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Before 2002	93	45.6	82.3	82.3
	2002 - 03	13	6.4	11.5	93.8
	2003 - 04	4	2.0	3.5	97.3
	2004 - 05	3	1.5	2.7	100.0
	Total	113	55.4	100.0	
Missing	Missing	91	44.6		
Total		204	100.0		

Table E.207. Percentage of High School Math Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year Beginning Algebra Part II Offered as Primary or Supplemental Course

Mth-Pri-Yr:Beginning Algebra II (2429)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Before 2002	94	46.1	81.0	81.0
	2002 - 03	12	5.9	10.3	91.4
	2003 - 04	5	2.5	4.3	95.7
	2004 - 05	5	2.5	4.3	100.0
	Total	116	56.9	100.0	
Missing	Missing	88	43.1		
Total		204	100.0		

Table E.208. Percentage of High School Math Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year Integrated Math I Offered as Primary or Supplemental Course

Mth-Pri-Yr:Integrated Math I (2425)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Before 2002	20	9.8	87.0	87.0
	2002 - 03	1	.5	4.3	91.3
	2003 - 04	1	.5	4.3	95.7
	2004 - 05	1	.5	4.3	100.0
	Total	23	11.3	100.0	
Missing	Missing	181	88.7		
Total		204	100.0		

Table E.209. Percentage of High School Math Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year Integrated Math II Offered as Primary or Supplemental Course

Mth-Pri-Yr:Integrated Math II (2426)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Before 2002	18	8.8	94.7	94.7
	2002 - 03	1	.5	5.3	100.0
	Total	19	9.3	100.0	
Missing	Missing	185	90.7		
Total		204	100.0		

Table E.210. Percentage of High School Math Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year Consumer Math Offered as Primary or Supplemental Course

Mth-Pri-Yr:Consumer Math (2401)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Before 2002	37	18.1	86.0	86.0
	2003 - 04	1	.5	2.3	88.4
	2004 - 05	5	2.5	11.6	100.0
	Total	43	21.1	100.0	
Missing	Missing	161	78.9		
Total		204	100.0		

Table E.211. Percentage of High School Math Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year Remedial Math Offered as Primary or Supplemental Course

Mth-Pri-Yr:Remedial Math (2402)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Before 2002	24	11.8	51.1	51.1
	2002 - 03	9	4.4	19.1	70.2
	2003 - 04	7	3.4	14.9	85.1
	2004 - 05	7	3.4	14.9	100.0
	Total	47	23.0	100.0	
Missing	Missing	157	77.0		
Total		204	100.0		

Table E.212. High School Math Department Head Reported Offering These Other Primary or Supplemental Courses

Course Title	Frequency	Percentage (n=120)
CAHSEE		
CAHSEE Math	11	9.17%
CAHSEE Review	1	0.83%
CAHSEE Algebra Support	1	0.83%
CAHSEE Geometry Support	1	0.83%
Math Challenge Passing CAHSEE	1	0.83%
Below Algebra	2	1.67%
Math Analysis	2	1.67%
Math Tutorial	2	1.67%
Special Day Math 3000	1	0.83%
Business Math	1	0.83%
Intermediate Math	1	0.83%
Integrated Math	1	0.83%
Math Lab	1	0.83%
Math Essentials	1	0.83%
Success in Math	1	0.83%
Math 12th Grade	1	0.83%
Real Life Math	1	0.83%
Special Education Math	1	0.83%
Math Explorations	1	0.83%
Math	1	0.83%
Essentials in Math	1	0.83%
Elementary Math	1	0.83%
Intervention Math	1	0.83%
Math Endeavors	1	0.83%
Math Path	1	0.83%
Math Analysis		
Algebra	6	5.00%
Algebra 1	3	2.50%
Algebra 2	2	1.67%
Algebra & Geometry	2	1.67%
Basic Algebra	2	1.67%
Intermediate Algebra	1	0.83%
Special Education PreAlgebra	1	0.83%
Resource Specialist Program Algebra	1	0.83%
Algebra Special Education	1	0.83%
Algebra with Trigonometry	1	0.83%
Algebra 1 SDAIE	1	0.83%
Algebra Fundamentals	1	0.83%
Algebra 3	1	0.83%
Foundations of Algebra & Geometry	1	0.83%
Foundations of Algebra	1	0.83%
Applied Algebra	1	0.83%
Sheltered Algebra	1	0.83%
Algebra Support		
Above Algebra	18	15.00%
Geometry	6	5.00%
Probability & Statistics	5	4.17%

Table E.212. continued

Course Title	Frequency	Percentage (n=120)
Calculus	4	3.33%
PreCalculus	3	2.50%
Calculus A & B	3	2.50%
Advanced Placement Calculus	3	2.50%
Advance Placement Calculus A & B	2	1.67%
Trigonometry	1	0.83%
Business Calculations	1	0.83%
Calculus B & C	1	0.83%
Geometry Essentials	1	0.83%
Solid Geometry	1	0.83%
Geometry Part 2		
Other Courses	2	1.67%
Success Lab	1	0.83%
Opportunity	1	0.83%
Resource Specialist Program Special Day	1	0.83%
Resource 3001	1	0.83%
Resource Special Education	1	0.83%

Table E.213. Frequency of Number of Sections of General Math Offered at High School During Current Academic Year

Mth-Pri-Sec:General Math (2400)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	106	52.0	82.8	82.8
	1	3	1.5	2.3	85.2
	2	4	2.0	3.1	88.3
	3	5	2.5	3.9	92.2
	4	3	1.5	2.3	94.5
	5	2	1.0	1.6	96.1
	6	1	.5	.8	96.9
	7	2	1.0	1.6	98.4
	9 or more	2	1.0	1.6	100.0
	Total	128	62.7	100.0	
Missing	Missing	76	37.3		
Total		204	100.0		

Table E.214. Frequency of Number of Sections of Math A Offered at High School During Current Academic Year

Mth-Pri-Sec:Math A (2420)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	109	53.4	94.0	94.0
	1	2	1.0	1.7	95.7
	2	1	.5	.9	96.6
	4	1	.5	.9	97.4
	6	1	.5	.9	98.3
	9 or more	2	1.0	1.7	100.0
	Total	116	56.9	100.0	
Missing	Missing	88	43.1		
Total		204	100.0		

Table E.215. Frequency of Number of Sections of Math B Offered at High School During Current Academic Year

Mth-Pri-Sec:Math B (2421)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	107	52.5	93.9	93.9
	1	1	.5	.9	94.7
	2	3	1.5	2.6	97.4
	3	1	.5	.9	98.2
	4	1	.5	.9	99.1
	9 or more	1	.5	.9	100.0
	Total	114	55.9	100.0	
Missing	Missing	90	44.1		
Total		204	100.0		

Table E.216. Frequency of Number of Sections of Pre-Algebra Offered at High School During Current Academic Year

Mth-Pri-Sec:Pre-Algebra (2424)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	78	38.2	56.1	56.1
	1	6	2.9	4.3	60.4
	2	6	2.9	4.3	64.7
	3	7	3.4	5.0	69.8
	4	5	2.5	3.6	73.4
	5	4	2.0	2.9	76.3
	6	3	1.5	2.2	78.4
	7	6	2.9	4.3	82.7
	8	6	2.9	4.3	87.1
	9 or more	18	8.8	12.9	100.0
	Total	139	68.1	100.0	
Missing	Missing	65	31.9		
Total		204	100.0		

Table E.217. Frequency of Number of Sections of Beginning Algebra Offered at High School During Current Academic Year

Mth-Pri-Sec:Beginning Algebra (2403)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	23	11.3	13.8	13.8
	1	3	1.5	1.8	15.6
	2	5	2.5	3.0	18.6
	3	6	2.9	3.6	22.2
	4	8	3.9	4.8	26.9
	5	4	2.0	2.4	29.3
	6	7	3.4	4.2	33.5
	7	13	6.4	7.8	41.3
	8	6	2.9	3.6	44.9
	9 or more	92	45.1	55.1	100.0
	Total	167	81.9	100.0	
Missing	Missing	37	18.1		
Total		204	100.0		

Table E.218. Frequency of Number of Sections of Intermediate Algebra Offered at High School During Current Academic Year

Mth-Pri-Sec:Intermediate Algebra (2404)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	38	18.6	26.6	26.6
	1	1	.5	.7	27.3
	2	5	2.5	3.5	30.8
	3	2	1.0	1.4	32.2
	4	5	2.5	3.5	35.7
	5	6	2.9	4.2	39.9
	6	10	4.9	7.0	46.9
	7	15	7.4	10.5	57.3
	8	9	4.4	6.3	63.6
	9 or more	52	25.5	36.4	100.0
	Total	143	70.1	100.0	
Missing	Missing	61	29.9		
Total		204	100.0		

Table E.219. Frequency of Number of Sections of Beginning Algebra Part I Offered at High School During Current Academic Year

Mth-Pri-Sec:Beginning Algebra I (2428)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	53	26.0	35.8	35.8
	1	2	1.0	1.4	37.2
	2	5	2.5	3.4	40.5
	3	4	2.0	2.7	43.2
	4	10	4.9	6.8	50.0
	5	5	2.5	3.4	53.4
	6	7	3.4	4.7	58.1
	7	4	2.0	2.7	60.8
	8	5	2.5	3.4	64.2
	9 or more	53	26.0	35.8	100.0
	Total	148	72.5	100.0	
Missing	Missing	56	27.5		
Total		204	100.0		

Table E.220. Frequency of Number of Sections of Beginning Algebra Part II Offered at High School During Current Academic Year

Mth-Pri-Sec:Beginning Algebra II (2429)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	48	23.5	32.2	32.2
	1	6	2.9	4.0	36.2
	2	7	3.4	4.7	40.9
	3	8	3.9	5.4	46.3
	4	9	4.4	6.0	52.3
	5	6	2.9	4.0	56.4
	6	10	4.9	6.7	63.1
	7	11	5.4	7.4	70.5
	8	3	1.5	2.0	72.5
	9 or more	41	20.1	27.5	100.0
	Total	149	73.0	100.0	
Missing	Missing	55	27.0		
Total		204	100.0		

Table E.221. Frequency of Number of Sections of Integrated Math I Offered at High School During Current Academic Year

Mth-Pri-Sec:Integrated Math I (2425)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	93	45.6	88.6	88.6
	1	1	.5	1.0	89.5
	2	3	1.5	2.9	92.4
	3	2	1.0	1.9	94.3
	4	1	.5	1.0	95.2
	5	2	1.0	1.9	97.1
	9 or more	3	1.5	2.9	100.0
	Total	105	51.5	100.0	
Missing	Missing	99	48.5		
Total		204	100.0		

Table E.222. Frequency of Number of Sections of Integrated Math II Offered at High School During Current Academic Year

Mth-Pri-Sec:Integrated Math II (2426)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	95	46.6	91.3	91.3
	1	1	.5	1.0	92.3
	2	1	.5	1.0	93.3
	3	2	1.0	1.9	95.2
	4	1	.5	1.0	96.2
	8	1	.5	1.0	97.1
	9 or more	3	1.5	2.9	100.0
	Total	104	51.0	100.0	
Missing	Missing	100	49.0		
Total		204	100.0		

Table E.223. Frequency of Number of Sections of Consumer Math Offered at High School During Current Academic Year

Mth-Pri-Sec:Consumer Math (2401)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	90	44.1	77.6	77.6
	1	5	2.5	4.3	81.9
	2	7	3.4	6.0	87.9
	3	7	3.4	6.0	94.0
	4	1	.5	.9	94.8
	5	2	1.0	1.7	96.6
	6	2	1.0	1.7	98.3
	9 or more	2	1.0	1.7	100.0
	Total	116	56.9	100.0	
Missing	Missing	88	43.1		
Total		204	100.0		

Table E.224. Frequency of Number of Sections of Remedial Math Offered at High School During Current Academic Year

Mth-Pri-Sec:Remedial Math (2402)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	84	41.2	71.2	71.2
	1	5	2.5	4.2	75.4
	2	7	3.4	5.9	81.4
	3	9	4.4	7.6	89.0
	4	5	2.5	4.2	93.2
	6	1	.5	.8	94.1
	7	1	.5	.8	94.9
	9 or more	6	2.9	5.1	100.0
	Total	118	57.8	100.0	
Missing	Missing	86	42.2		
Total		204	100.0		

Table E.225. Percentage of High School Math Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year Success with Mathcoach Offered as an Intervention or Basic Program

Mth-Int-Yr:Success with Mathcoach

		Frequency	Percent
Missing	Missing	204	100.0

Note. No one listed this as an intervention or basic program.

Table E.226. Percentage of High School Math Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year Harcourt Math @ 2002 Offered as an Intervention or Basic Program

Mth-Int-Yr:Harcourt Math 2002(w/Spanish)

		Frequency	Percent
Missing	Missing	204	100.0

Note. No one listed this as an intervention or basic program.

Table E.227. Percentage of High School Math Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year Mathematics by Houghton Mifflin Offered as an Intervention or Basic Program

Mth-Int-Yr:Mathematics by Houghton Miff.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Before 2002	5	2.5	83.3	83.3
	2002 - 03	1	.5	16.7	100.0
	Total	6	2.9	100.0	
Missing	Missing	198	97.1		
Total		204	100.0		

Table E.228. Percentage of High School Math Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year Concepts and Skills Offered as an Intervention or Basic Program

Mth-Int-Yr:Concepts and Skills

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Before 2002	24	11.8	58.5	58.5
	2002 - 03	12	5.9	29.3	87.8
	2003 - 04	4	2.0	9.8	97.6
	2004 - 05	1	.5	2.4	100.0
	Total	41	20.1	100.0	
Missing	Missing	163	79.9		
Total		204	100.0		

Table E.229. Percentage of High School Math Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year Structure and Method Offered as an Intervention or Basic Program

Mth-Int-Yr:Structure and Method

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Before 2002	18	8.8	78.3	78.3
	2002 - 03	1	.5	4.3	82.6
	2003 - 04	3	1.5	13.0	95.7
	2004 - 05	1	.5	4.3	100.0
	Total	23	11.3	100.0	
Missing	Missing	181	88.7		
Total		204	100.0		

Table E.230. Percentage of High School Math Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year McGraw-Hill Mathematics Offered as an Intervention or Basic Program

Mth-Int-Yr:McGraw-Hill Mathematics

		Frequency	Percent
Missing	Missing	204	100.0

Note. No one listed this as an intervention or basic program.

Table E.231. Percentage of High School Math Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year Prentice Hall Pre-Algebra Offered as an Intervention or Basic Program

Mth-Int-Yr:Prentice Hall Pre-Algebra

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Before 2002	4	2.0	36.4	36.4
	2002 - 03	6	2.9	54.5	90.9
	2003 - 04	1	.5	9.1	100.0
	Total	11	5.4	100.0	
Missing	Missing	193	94.6		
Total		204	100.0		

Table E.232. Percentage of High School Math Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year Prentice Hall Algebra 1 Offered as an Intervention or Basic Program

Mth-Int-Yr:Prentice Hall Algebra 1

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Before 2002	21	10.3	61.8	61.8
	2002 - 03	8	3.9	23.5	85.3
	2003 - 04	2	1.0	5.9	91.2
	2004 - 05	3	1.5	8.8	100.0
	Total	34	16.7	100.0	
Missing	Missing	170	83.3		
Total		204	100.0		

Table E.233. Percentage of High School Math Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year Progress in Mathematics Offered as an Intervention or Basic Program

Mth-Int-Yr:Progress in Mathematics

		Frequency	Percent
Missing	Missing	204	100.0

Note. No one listed this as an intervention or basic program.

Table E.234. Percentage of High School Math Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year Saxon Math Offered as an Intervention or Basic Program

Mth-Int-Yr:Saxon Math K-3

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Before 2002	1	.5	50.0	50.0
	2002 - 03	1	.5	50.0	100.0
	Total	2	1.0	100.0	
Missing	Missing	202	99.0		
Total		204	100.0		

Table E.235. Percentage of High School Math Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year Math 54, 65, 76, and 87 Offered as an Intervention or Basic Program

Mth-Int-Yr:Math 54, 65, 76, and 87

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Before 2002	2	1.0	50.0	50.0
	2002 - 03	1	.5	25.0	75.0
	2004 - 05	1	.5	25.0	100.0
	Total	4	2.0	100.0	
Missing	Missing	200	98.0		
Total		204	100.0		

Table E.236. Percentage of High School Math Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year Scott Foresman CA Mathematics Offered as an Intervention or Basic Program

Mth-Int-Yr:Scott Foresman CA Mathematics

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Before 2002	1	.5	100.0	100.0
Missing	Missing	203	99.5		
Total		204	100.0		

Table E.237. High School Math Department Heads Reported Offering These Other Intervention or Basic Programs

Program Title	Frequency	Percentage (n=110)
CAHSEE		
CAHSEE PREP	12	10.91%
CAHSEE Tutorial	2	1.82%
CAHSEE Intervention	2	1.82%
Meeting the California Challenge	1	0.91%
Below Algebra		
Basic Math	8	7.27%
Interactive Math	6	5.45%
Math Review	5	4.55%
Math Intervention	4	3.64%
Math Tutorial	5	4.55%
Advanced Math	1	0.91%
Remedial Support Math	1	0.91%
Supplemental Math	1	0.91%
Accelerated Math	1	0.91%
Goals	1	0.91%
Math Council	1	0.91%
Accelerated Math	1	0.91%
PM Math	1	0.91%
Advisory Remedial Math	1	0.91%
Math Technology	1	0.91%
Algebra		
Algebra 1	29	26.36%
Algebra	4	3.64%
Pre Algebra	6	5.45%
Algebra 2	1	0.91%
Algebra Essentials	1	0.91%
Algebra Exploration Block	1	0.91%
Algebra & Geometry Fundamentals	1	0.91%
Above Algebra		
Geometry	1	0.91%
Other Course		
College Prep Math	8	7.27%
Keep Youth doing something Program	1	0.91%
Plato	1	0.91%
Nova Net	1	0.91%

Table E.238. Frequency of Number of Sections of Success with Mathcoach Offered at High School During Current Academic Year

DHHMIS03

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	95	46.6	96.9	96.9
	2	1	.5	1.0	98.0
	9 or more	2	1.0	2.0	100.0
	Total	98	48.0	100.0	
Missing	Missing	106	52.0		
Total		204	100.0		

Table E.239. Frequency of Number of Sections of Harcourt Math @ 2002 Offered at High School During Current Academic Year

DHHMIS04

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	77	37.7	68.8	68.8
	1	1	.5	.9	69.6
	2	6	2.9	5.4	75.0
	3	2	1.0	1.8	76.8
	4	1	.5	.9	77.7
	5	1	.5	.9	78.6
	6	2	1.0	1.8	80.4
	7	1	.5	.9	81.3
	9 or more	21	10.3	18.8	100.0
	Total	112	54.9	100.0	
Missing	Missing	92	45.1		
Total		204	100.0		

Table E.240. Frequency of Number of Sections of Mathematics by Houghton Mifflin Offered at High School During Current Academic Year

DHHMIS05

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	85	41.7	81.0	81.0
	2	1	.5	1.0	81.9
	6	2	1.0	1.9	83.8
	7	2	1.0	1.9	85.7
	8	1	.5	1.0	86.7
	9 or more	14	6.9	13.3	100.0
	Total	105	51.5	100.0	
Missing	Missing	99	48.5		
Total		204	100.0		

Table E.241. Frequency of Number of Sections of Concepts and Skills Offered at High School During Current Academic Year

DHHMIS06

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	94	46.1	100.0	100.0
Missing	Missing	110	53.9		
Total		204	100.0		

Table E.242. Frequency of Number of Sections of Structure and Method Offered at High School During Current Academic Year

DHHMIS07

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	87	42.6	92.6	92.6
	3	2	1.0	2.1	94.7
	6	1	.5	1.1	95.7
	8	1	.5	1.1	96.8
	9 or more	3	1.5	3.2	100.0
	Total	94	46.1	100.0	
Missing	Missing	110	53.9		
Total		204	100.0		

Table E.243. Frequency of Number of Sections of McGraw-Hill Mathematics Offered at High School During Current Academic Year

DHHMIS08

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	77	37.7	73.3	73.3
	2	1	.5	1.0	74.3
	3	1	.5	1.0	75.2
	4	1	.5	1.0	76.2
	7	1	.5	1.0	77.1
	8	1	.5	1.0	78.1
	9 or more	23	11.3	21.9	100.0
	Total	105	51.5	100.0	
Missing	Missing	99	48.5		
Total		204	100.0		

Table E.244. Frequency of Number of Sections of Prentice Hall Pre-Algebra Offered at High School During Current Academic Year

DHHMIS09

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	93	45.6	100.0	100.0
Missing	Missing	111	54.4		
Total		204	100.0		

Table E.245. Frequency of Number of Sections of Prentice Hall Algebra 1 Offered at High School During Current Academic Year

DHHMIS10

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	93	45.6	100.0	100.0
Missing	Missing	111	54.4		
Total		204	100.0		

Table E.246. Frequency of Number of Sections of Progress in Mathematics Offered at High School During Current Academic Year

DHHMIS11

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	93	45.6	96.9	96.9
	2	2	1.0	2.1	99.0
	9 or more	1	.5	1.0	100.0
	Total	96	47.1	100.0	
Missing	Missing	108	52.9		
Total		204	100.0		

Table E.247. Frequency of Number of Sections of Saxon Math Offered at High School During Current Academic Year

DHHMIS12

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	N/A	94	46.1	98.9	98.9
	9 or more	1	.5	1.1	100.0
	Total	95	46.6	100.0	
Missing	Missing	109	53.4		
Total		204	100.0		

Table E.248. Frequency of Number of Sections of Math 54, 65, 76, 87 Offered at High School During Current Academic Year

DHHMIS13

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	10	4.9	15.6	15.6
	2	12	5.9	18.8	34.4
	3	7	3.4	10.9	45.3
	4	5	2.5	7.8	53.1
	5	3	1.5	4.7	57.8
	6	5	2.5	7.8	65.6
	7	3	1.5	4.7	70.3
	8	3	1.5	4.7	75.0
	9 or more	16	7.8	25.0	100.0
	Total	64	31.4	100.0	
Missing	Missing	140	68.6		
Total		204	100.0		

Table E.249. Frequency of Number of Sections of Scott Foresman CA Mathematics Offered at High School During Current Academic Year

DHHMIS14

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	3	1.5	11.5	11.5
	2	7	3.4	26.9	38.5
	3	3	1.5	11.5	50.0
	4	3	1.5	11.5	61.5
	5	1	.5	3.8	65.4
	7	2	1.0	7.7	73.1
	8	1	.5	3.8	76.9
	9 or more	6	2.9	23.1	100.0
	Total	26	12.7	100.0	
Missing	Missing	178	87.3		
Total		204	100.0		

Table E.250. High School Math Department Heads Reported Frequency of Full-Time Teachers Working in Math Department During Current Academic Year [1]

DHHM01

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	2	1.0	1.0	1.0
	2	4	2.0	2.0	3.0
	3	5	2.5	2.5	5.4
	4	2	1.0	1.0	6.4
	5	5	2.5	2.5	8.9
	6	2	1.0	1.0	9.9
	7	2	1.0	1.0	10.8
	8	5	2.5	2.5	13.3
	9	12	5.9	5.9	19.2
	10	18	8.8	8.9	28.1
	11	12	5.9	5.9	34.0
	12	21	10.3	10.3	44.3
	13	16	7.8	7.9	52.2
	14	17	8.3	8.4	60.6
	15	14	6.9	6.9	67.5
	16 or more	66	32.4	32.5	100.0
	Total	203	99.5	100.0	
Missing	System	1	.5		
Total		204	100.0		

Table E.251. High School Math Department Heads Reported Frequency of Teachers in Math Department With Bachelor's as Most Advanced Degree [2]

DHHM02A

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	10	4.9	6.9	6.9
	1	9	4.4	6.2	13.1
	2	8	3.9	5.5	18.6
	3	17	8.3	11.7	30.3
	4	10	4.9	6.9	37.2
	5	6	2.9	4.1	41.4
	6	9	4.4	6.2	47.6
	7	8	3.9	5.5	53.1
	8	5	2.5	3.4	56.6
	9	3	1.5	2.1	58.6
	10	12	5.9	8.3	66.9
	11	9	4.4	6.2	73.1
	12	9	4.4	6.2	79.3
	13	2	1.0	1.4	80.7
	14	4	2.0	2.8	83.4
	15 or more	24	11.8	16.6	100.0
	Total	145	71.1	100.0	
Missing	System	59	28.9		
Total		204	100.0		

Table E.252. High School Math Department Heads Reported Frequency of Teachers in Math Department With Some Graduate School as Most Advanced Degree [2]

DHHM02B

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	7	3.4	4.2	4.2
	1	9	4.4	5.4	9.6
	2	17	8.3	10.2	19.8
	3	11	5.4	6.6	26.3
	4	14	6.9	8.4	34.7
	5	15	7.4	9.0	43.7
	6	14	6.9	8.4	52.1
	7	5	2.5	3.0	55.1
	8	11	5.4	6.6	61.7
	9	14	6.9	8.4	70.1
	10	15	7.4	9.0	79.0
	11	2	1.0	1.2	80.2
	12	6	2.9	3.6	83.8
	13	3	1.5	1.8	85.6
	14	8	3.9	4.8	90.4
	15 or more	16	7.8	9.6	100.0
	Total	167	81.9	100.0	
Missing	System	37	18.1		
Total		204	100.0		

Table E.253. High School Math Department Heads Reported Frequency of Teachers in Math Department With Master's as Most Advanced Degree [2]

DHHM02C

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	4	2.0	2.1	2.1
	1	21	10.3	11.2	13.4
	2	27	13.2	14.4	27.8
	3	19	9.3	10.2	38.0
	4	25	12.3	13.4	51.3
	5	18	8.8	9.6	61.0
	6	18	8.8	9.6	70.6
	7	12	5.9	6.4	77.0
	8	13	6.4	7.0	84.0
	9	10	4.9	5.3	89.3
	10	8	3.9	4.3	93.6
	11	5	2.5	2.7	96.3
	12	2	1.0	1.1	97.3
	13	1	.5	.5	97.9
	14	1	.5	.5	98.4
	15 or more	3	1.5	1.6	100.0
	Total	187	91.7	100.0	
Missing	System	17	8.3		
Total		204	100.0		

Table E.254. High School Math Department Heads Reported Frequency of Teachers in Math Department With Doctorate as Most Advanced Degree [2]

DHHM02D

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	94	46.1	74.6	74.6
	1	27	13.2	21.4	96.0
	2	4	2.0	3.2	99.2
	3	1	.5	.8	100.0
	Total	126	61.8	100.0	
Missing	System	78	38.2		
Total		204	100.0		

Table E.255. High School Math Department Heads Reported These Other Degrees for Teachers in the Math Department

Other Degree	Frequency	Percentage (n=4)
National Board Certification	2	50.00%
Long Term Substitute	1	25.00%
Teaching Credentials	1	25.00%

Table E.256. High School Math Department Heads Reported Proportion of Teachers in Math Department Working With an Appropriate Math Credential [3]

DHHM03

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	None	1	.5	.5	.5
	Only a few (less than 25%)	3	1.5	1.5	2.0
	Some (25% - 74%)	12	5.9	5.9	7.9
	Most (75% - 90%)	40	19.6	19.8	27.7
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	146	71.6	72.3	100.0
	Total	202	99.0	100.0	
Missing	Missing	2	1.0		
Total		204	100.0		

Table E.257. High School Math Department Heads Reported Proportion of Teachers in Math Department Working With an Emergency Credential or Are a District Intern [4]

DHHM04

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	None	94	46.1	47.2	47.2
	Only a few (less than 25%)	90	44.1	45.2	92.5
	Some (25% - 74%)	15	7.4	7.5	100.0
	Total	199	97.5	100.0	
Missing	Missing	5	2.5		
Total		204	100.0		

Table E.258. High School Math Department Heads Characterization of Experience of Teachers in Math Department Who Teach Primary or Supplemental Math Courses [5]

DHHM05

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Few have 5 or more years	9	4.4	4.5	4.5
	About half have 5 or more years	45	22.1	22.3	26.7
	Most have 5 or more years	148	72.5	73.3	100.0
	Total	202	99.0	100.0	
Missing	Missing	2	1.0		
Total		204	100.0		

Table E.259. High School Math Department Heads Characterization of Experience of Teachers in Math Department Who Teach Intervention or Basic Math Programs [6]

DHHM06

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Few have 5 or more years	21	10.3	11.4	11.4
	About half have 5 or more years	44	21.6	23.8	35.1
	Most have 5 or more years	120	58.8	64.9	100.0
	Total	185	90.7	100.0	
Missing	Missing	19	9.3		
Total		204	100.0		

Table E.260. High School Math Department Heads Reported Distribution of Economically Disadvantaged Students in General Across Sections of Primary or Supplemental Math Courses [7]

DHHM07A

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Clustered in one or a few sections	21	10.3	10.7	10.7
	Across most or all sections	175	85.8	89.3	100.0
	Total	196	96.1	100.0	
Missing	Missing	8	3.9		
Total		204	100.0		

Table E.261. High School Math Department Heads Reported Distribution of English Learner Students Across Sections of Primary or Supplemental Math Courses [7]

DHHM07B

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Clustered in one or a few sections	89	43.6	46.6	46.6
	Across most or all sections	102	50.0	53.4	100.0
	Total	191	93.6	100.0	
Missing	Missing	13	6.4		
Total		204	100.0		

Table E.262. High School Math Department Heads Reported Distribution of Remedial Students in General Across Sections of Primary or Supplemental Math Courses [7]

DHHM07C

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Clustered in one or a few sections	46	22.5	23.8	23.8
	Across most or all sections	147	72.1	76.2	100.0
	Total	193	94.6	100.0	
Missing	Missing	11	5.4		
Total		204	100.0		

Table E.263. High School Math Department Heads Reported Distribution of Students Receiving Special Education Services Across Sections of Primary or Supplemental Math Courses [7]

DHHM07D

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Clustered in one or a few sections	95	46.6	49.5	49.5
	Across most or all sections	97	47.5	50.5	100.0
	Total	192	94.1	100.0	
Missing	Missing	12	5.9		
Total		204	100.0		

Table E.264. Math Department Heads Reported Proportion of Economically Disadvantaged Students in General Who Receive Math Primary and Supplemental Course Instruction From Teacher With Experience Working With This Subgroup [8]

DHHM08A

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	None	4	2.0	2.1	2.1
	Only a few (less than 25%)	11	5.4	5.7	7.7
	Some (25% - 74%)	38	18.6	19.6	27.3
	Most (75% - 90%)	54	26.5	27.8	55.2
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	87	42.6	44.8	100.0
	Total	194	95.1	100.0	
Missing	Missing	10	4.9		
Total		204	100.0		

Table E.265. Math Department Heads Reported Proportion of English Learner Students Who Receive Math Primary and Supplemental Course Instruction From Teacher With Experience Working With This Subgroup [8]

DHHM08B

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	None	2	1.0	1.0	1.0
	Only a few (less than 25%)	12	5.9	6.2	7.3
	Some (25% - 74%)	34	16.7	17.6	24.9
	Most (75% - 90%)	51	25.0	26.4	51.3
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	94	46.1	48.7	100.0
	Total	193	94.6	100.0	
Missing	Missing	11	5.4		
Total		204	100.0		

Table E.266. Math Department Heads Reported Proportion of Remedial Students in General Who Receive Math Primary and Supplemental Course Instruction From Teacher With Experience Working With This Subgroup [8]

DHHM08C

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	None	2	1.0	1.0	1.0
	Only a few (less than 25%)	13	6.4	6.7	7.7
	Some (25% - 74%)	34	16.7	17.5	25.3
	Most (75% - 90%)	58	28.4	29.9	55.2
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	87	42.6	44.8	100.0
	Total	194	95.1	100.0	
Missing	Missing	10	4.9		
Total		204	100.0		

Table E.267. Math Department Heads Reported Proportion of Students Receiving Special Education Services Who Receive Math Primary and Supplemental Course Instruction From Teacher With Experience Working With This Subgroup [8]

DHHM08D

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	None	3	1.5	1.6	1.6
	Only a few (less than 25%)	22	10.8	11.4	13.0
	Some (25% - 74%)	31	15.2	16.1	29.0
	Most (75% - 90%)	55	27.0	28.5	57.5
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	82	40.2	42.5	100.0
	Total	193	94.6	100.0	
Missing	Missing	11	5.4		
Total		204	100.0		

Table E.268. High School Math Department Heads Reported Proportion of Economically Disadvantaged Students in General Who Receive Math Instruction From Teacher Without an Appropriate Math Credential [9]

DHHM09A

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	None	116	56.9	58.6	58.6
	Only a few (less than 25%)	69	33.8	34.8	93.4
	Some (25% - 74%)	8	3.9	4.0	97.5
	Most (75% - 90%)	2	1.0	1.0	98.5
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	3	1.5	1.5	100.0
	Total	198	97.1	100.0	
Missing	Missing	6	2.9		
Total		204	100.0		

Table E.269. High School Math Department Heads Reported Proportion of English Learner Students in General Who Receive Math Instruction From Teacher Without an Appropriate Math Credential [9]

DHHM09B

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	None	127	62.3	64.1	64.1
	Only a few (less than 25%)	59	28.9	29.8	93.9
	Some (25% - 74%)	6	2.9	3.0	97.0
	Most (75% - 90%)	3	1.5	1.5	98.5
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	3	1.5	1.5	100.0
	Total	198	97.1	100.0	
Missing	Missing	6	2.9		
Total		204	100.0		

Table E.270. High School Math Department Heads Reported Proportion of Remedial Students in General Who Receive Math Instruction From Teacher Without an Appropriate Math Credential [9]

DHHM09C

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	None	118	57.8	59.6	59.6
	Only a few (less than 25%)	66	32.4	33.3	92.9
	Some (25% - 74%)	7	3.4	3.5	96.5
	Most (75% - 90%)	3	1.5	1.5	98.0
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	4	2.0	2.0	100.0
	Total	198	97.1	100.0	
Missing	Missing	6	2.9		
Total		204	100.0		

Table E.271. High School Math Department Heads Reported Proportion of Students Receiving Special Education Sevices Who Receive Math Instruction From Teacher Without an Appropriate Math Credential [9]

DHHM09D

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	None	112	54.9	56.0	56.0
	Only a few (less than 25%)	69	33.8	34.5	90.5
	Some (25% - 74%)	12	5.9	6.0	96.5
	Most (75% - 90%)	4	2.0	2.0	98.5
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	3	1.5	1.5	100.0
	Total	200	98.0	100.0	
Missing	Missing	4	2.0		
Total		204	100.0		

Table E.272. Math Department Heads Reported Proportion of Economically Disadvantaged Students in General Who Receive Math Intervention and Basic Program Instruction From Teacher With Experience Working With This Subgroup [10]

DHHM10A

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	None	15	7.4	8.5	8.5
	Only a few (less than 25%)	15	7.4	8.5	17.0
	Some (25% - 74%)	27	13.2	15.3	32.4
	Most (75% - 90%)	48	23.5	27.3	59.7
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	71	34.8	40.3	100.0
	Total	176	86.3	100.0	
Missing	Missing	28	13.7		
Total		204	100.0		

Table E.273. Math Department Heads Reported Proportion of English Learner Students Who Receive Math Intervention and Basic Program Instruction From Teacher With Experience Working With This Subgroup [10]

DHHM10B

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	None	13	6.4	7.4	7.4
	Only a few (less than 25%)	14	6.9	8.0	15.4
	Some (25% - 74%)	24	11.8	13.7	29.1
	Most (75% - 90%)	46	22.5	26.3	55.4
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	78	38.2	44.6	100.0
	Total	175	85.8	100.0	
Missing	Missing	29	14.2		
Total		204	100.0		

Table E.274. Math Department Heads Reported Proportion of Remedial Students in General Who Receive Math Intervention and Basic Program Instruction From Teacher With Experience Working With This Subgroup [10]

DHHM10C

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	None	14	6.9	8.0	8.0
	Only a few (less than 25%)	15	7.4	8.5	16.5
	Some (25% - 74%)	25	12.3	14.2	30.7
	Most (75% - 90%)	52	25.5	29.5	60.2
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	70	34.3	39.8	100.0
	Total	176	86.3	100.0	
Missing	Missing	28	13.7		
Total		204	100.0		

Table E.275. Math Department Heads Reported Proportion of Students Receiving Special Education Services Who Receive Math Intervention and Basic Program Instruction From Teacher With Experience Working With This Subgroup [10]

DHHM10D

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	None	15	7.4	8.6	8.6
	Only a few (less than 25%)	18	8.8	10.3	18.9
	Some (25% - 74%)	25	12.3	14.3	33.1
	Most (75% - 90%)	41	20.1	23.4	56.6
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	76	37.3	43.4	100.0
	Total	175	85.8	100.0	
Missing	Missing	29	14.2		
Total		204	100.0		

Table E.276. High School Math Department Heads Reported Extent of Math Teacher Experience in Teaching California Content Standards Associated With the CAHSEE Requirement [11]

DHHM11

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Slight extent	2	1.0	1.0	1.0
	Moderate extent	27	13.2	13.6	14.6
	Great extent	74	36.3	37.2	51.8
	Very great extent	96	47.1	48.2	100.0
	Total	199	97.5	100.0	
Missing	Missing	5	2.5		
Total		204	100.0		

Table E.277. High School Math Department Heads Reported Extent of Math Course Offerings Being Demanding Courses for Students [12]

DHHM12

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Slight extent	2	1.0	1.0	1.0
	Moderate extent	37	18.1	18.4	19.4
	Great extent	107	52.5	53.2	72.6
	Very great extent	55	27.0	27.4	100.0
	Total	201	98.5	100.0	
Missing	Missing	3	1.5		
Total		204	100.0		

High School Teacher, Part 2 Survey: Frequency Distributions

Table E.278. High School Teachers Subject Area Associated With Reported Courses or Instructional Programs [2]

HST02:Subject area

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	English-Language Arts	1188	50.1	51.3	51.3
	Mathematics	1129	47.7	48.7	100.0
	Total	2317	97.8	100.0	
Missing	Missing	52	2.2		
Total		2369	100.0		

Table E.279. Type of Reported High School Courses or Instructional Programs [3]

HST03:Type course/instructional program

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Primary course open to all students	1556	65.8	66.9	66.9
	Required alternative to primary course	337	14.2	14.5	81.4
	Required supplemental remediation	197	8.3	8.5	89.9
	Elective course open to all students	41	1.7	1.8	91.7
	Elective course targeted to remediation	134	5.7	5.8	97.4
	Other (specify below)	60	2.5	2.6	100.0
	Total	2325	98.3	100.0	
Missing	Missing	40	1.7		
Total		2365	100.0		

Table E.280. Type of Reported 'Other' High School Courses or Instructional Programs [3]

Other Course or Instructional Program	Frequency	Percentage (n=76)
Special Education	20	26.32%
Primary Course	13	17.11%
Elective Course	11	14.47%
Tutorial	6	7.89%
Freshman Required	5	6.58%
Senior Required	1	1.32%
Algebra I	4	5.26%
Resource Program	3	3.95%
English	2	2.63%
English Learner	2	2.63%
Pre-requisites Have or Have Not Met	2	2.63%
No Pre-requisites	1	1.32%
Advance Course	1	1.32%
Sheltered Class	1	1.32%
Assigned By Middle School	1	1.32%
Middle School	1	1.32%
AVID	1	1.32%
ELD Students	1	1.32%

Table E.281. Percentage of Reported High School Courses or Instructional Programs Offered Before or After School [4]

HST04A:Offer Before/After school course

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not marked	2273	95.9	96.1	96.1
	Marked	92	3.9	3.9	100.0
	Total	2365	99.8	100.0	
Missing	Missing	4	.2		
Total		2369	100.0		

Table E.282. Percentage of Reported High School Courses or Instructional Programs Offered as Summer School Course [4]

HST04B:Offer Summer school course

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not marked	1995	84.2	84.4	84.4
	Marked	370	15.6	15.6	100.0
	Total	2365	99.8	100.0	
Missing	Missing	4	.2		
Total		2369	100.0		

Table E.283. Percentage of Reported High School Courses or Instructional Programs Offered as Summer School Program [4]

HST04C:Offer Summer program

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not marked	2303	97.2	97.4	97.4
	Marked	62	2.6	2.6	100.0
	Total	2365	99.8	100.0	
Missing	Missing	4	.2		
Total		2369	100.0		

Table E.284. Percentage of Reported High School Courses or Instructional Programs Offered During Normal School Hours [4]

HST04D:Offer During normal school hours

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not marked	50	2.1	2.1	2.1
	Marked	2315	97.7	97.9	100.0
	Total	2365	99.8	100.0	
Missing	Missing	4	.2		
Total		2369	100.0		

Table E.285. Percentage of Reported High School Courses or Instructional Programs Offered During Intercession Breaks [4]

HST04E:Offer Intercession breaks

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not marked	2350	99.2	99.4	99.4
	Marked	15	.6	.6	100.0
	Total	2365	99.8	100.0	
Missing	Missing	4	.2		
Total		2369	100.0		

Table E.286. Frequency of Duration of Reported High School Courses or Instructional Programs [5]

HST05:Duration of course/program

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Few weeks	32	1.4	1.4	1.4
	Quarter	28	1.2	1.2	2.5
	Trimester	5	.2	.2	2.8
	Semester	288	12.2	12.2	15.0
	Full school year	2002	84.5	85.0	100.0
	Total	2355	99.4	100.0	
Missing	Missing	14	.6		
Total		2369	100.0		

Table E.287. Frequency of Grade Levels of Students Taking Reported High School Courses or Instructional Programs [6]

HST06:Grade level(s) majority students

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	9th	662	27.9	28.2	28.2
	9th and 10th	536	22.6	22.9	51.1
	10th	451	19.0	19.2	70.3
	10th and 11th	263	11.1	11.2	81.6
	11th	158	6.7	6.7	88.3
	11th and 12th	108	4.6	4.6	92.9
	12th	83	3.5	3.5	96.5
	Other (specify)	83	3.5	3.5	100.0
	Total	2344	98.9	100.0	
Missing	Missing	25	1.1		
Total		2369	100.0		

Table E.288. Frequency of Number of Students Taught Reported High School Courses or Instructional Programs [7]

HST07:Number of students in this course

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	10 or fewer	48	2.0	2.0	2.0
	11 - 30	405	17.1	17.2	19.2
	31 - 60	635	26.8	26.9	46.1
	61 -100	588	24.8	24.9	71.1
	More than 100	682	28.8	28.9	100.0
	Total	2358	99.5	100.0	
Missing	Missing	11	.5		
Total		2369	100.0		

Table E.289. Proportion of Students Enrolled in Reported High School Courses or Instructional Programs Who Are English Learners [8]

HST08:Proportion English learners

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not sure	137	5.8	5.9	5.9
	Only a few (less than 25%)	1206	51.0	51.5	57.4
	Some (25% - 74%)	573	24.2	24.5	81.8
	Most (75% - 90%)	160	6.8	6.8	88.7
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	265	11.2	11.3	100.0
	Total	2341	99.0	100.0	
Missing	Missing	24	1.0		
Total		2365	100.0		

Table E.290. Proportion of Students Enrolled in Reported High School Courses or Instructional Programs Who Are Students Receiving Special Education Services [9]

HST09:Proportion special education

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not sure	264	11.1	11.3	11.3
	Only a few (less than 25%)	1677	70.8	71.5	82.7
	Some (25% - 74%)	310	13.1	13.2	96.0
	Most (75% - 90%)	17	.7	.7	96.7
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	78	3.3	3.3	100.0
	Total	2346	99.0	100.0	
Missing	Missing	23	1.0		
Total		2369	100.0		

Table E.291. Proportion of Students Enrolled in Reported High School Courses or Instructional Programs Who Are Economically Disadvantaged [10]

HST10:Proportion "at-risk"

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not sure	591	25.0	25.2	25.2
	Only a few (less than 25%)	467	19.7	19.9	45.1
	Some (25% - 74%)	635	26.8	27.1	72.2
	Most (75% - 90%)	395	16.7	16.9	89.1
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	256	10.8	10.9	100.0
	Total	2344	99.1	100.0	
Missing	Missing	21	.9		
Total		2365	100.0		

Table E.292. Frequency of Description of Students Enrolled in Reported High School Courses or Instructional Programs [11]

HST11:Students prepared for course

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Most students without prerequisite skills	784	33.2	33.3	33.3
	Some students without prerequisite skills	1221	51.6	51.9	85.3
	Almost all well prepared	346	14.6	14.7	100.0
	Total	2351	99.4	100.0	
Missing	Missing	14	.6		
Total		2365	100.0		

Table E.293. Proportion of Students Enrolled in Reported High School Courses or Instructional Programs Who Achieved At Least Basic Performance on Last Year's STAR CST Test [12]

HST12:% achieved basic performance

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not sure	879	37.1	38.1	38.1
	Only a few (less than 25%)	518	21.9	22.4	60.5
	Some (25% - 74%)	585	24.7	25.3	85.8
	Most (75% - 90%)	209	8.8	9.1	94.9
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	118	5.0	5.1	100.0
	Total	2309	97.5	100.0	
Missing	Missing	60	2.5		
Total		2369	100.0		

Table E.294. Percentage of High School Teachers Reporting Low Student Attendance Limits Effectiveness of Reported High School Courses or Instructional Programs [13]

HST13A:Low student attendance

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not at all	327	13.8	14.3	14.3
	Slight extent	678	28.7	29.6	43.9
	Moderate extent	549	23.2	24.0	67.9
	Great extent	374	15.8	16.3	84.2
	Very great extent	362	15.3	15.8	100.0
	Total	2290	96.8	100.0	
Missing	Missing	75	3.2		
Total		2365	100.0		

Table E.295. Percentage of High School Teachers Reporting Low Student Motivation Limits Effectiveness of Reported High School Courses or Instructional Programs [13]

HST13B:Low student motivation

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not at all	100	4.2	4.3	4.3
	Slight extent	334	14.1	14.3	18.6
	Moderate extent	565	23.9	24.3	42.9
	Great extent	632	26.7	27.1	70.0
	Very great extent	698	29.5	30.0	100.0
	Total	2329	98.5	100.0	
Missing	Missing	36	1.5		
Total		2365	100.0		

Table E.296. Percentage of High School Teachers Reporting Low Student English Proficiency Limits Effectiveness of Reported High School Courses or Instructional Programs [13]

HST13C:Low English proficiency

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not at all	452	19.1	19.7	19.7
	Slight extent	936	39.6	40.8	60.5
	Moderate extant	535	22.6	23.3	83.9
	Great extent	215	9.1	9.4	93.2
	Very great extent	155	6.6	6.8	100.0
	Total	2293	97.0	100.0	
Missing	Missing	72	3.0		
Total		2365	100.0		

Table E.297. Percentage of High School Teachers Reporting Low Parental Support Limits Effectiveness of Reported High School Courses or Instructional Programs [13]

HST13D:Low parental support

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not at all	199	8.4	8.7	8.7
	Slight extent	595	25.2	26.1	34.8
	Moderate extent	699	29.6	30.7	65.5
	Great extent	463	19.6	20.3	85.8
	Very great extent	323	13.7	14.2	100.0
	Total	2279	96.4	100.0	
Missing	Missing	86	3.6		
Total		2365	100.0		

Table E.298. Percentage of High School Teachers Reporting Lack of Materials/ Resources Limits Effectiveness of Reported High School Courses or Instructional Programs [13]

HST13E:Lack of materials/resources

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not at all	1056	44.7	47.2	47.2
	Slight extent	687	29.0	30.7	78.0
	Moderate extent	277	11.7	12.4	90.4
	Great extent	138	5.8	6.2	96.6
	Very great extent	77	3.3	3.4	100.0
	Total	2235	94.5	100.0	
Missing	Missing	130	5.5		
Total		2365	100.0		

Table E.299. Percentage of High School Teachers Reporting Limitations in Own Knowledge or Experience Limits Effectiveness of Reported High School Courses or Instructional Programs [13]

HST13F:Own knowledge/experience limits

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not at all	1588	67.1	69.9	69.9
	Slight extent	529	22.4	23.3	93.2
	Moderate extent	95	4.0	4.2	97.4
	Great extent	36	1.5	1.6	99.0
	Very great extent	23	1.0	1.0	100.0
	Total	2271	96.0	100.0	
Missing	Missing	94	4.0		
Total		2365	100.0		

Table E.300. Percentage of High School Teachers Reporting Own Difficulty in Engaging Students Limits Effectiveness of Reported High School Courses or Instructional Programs [13]

HST13G:Difficulty engaging students

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not at all	934	39.5	41.0	41.0
	Slight extent	953	40.3	41.8	82.8
	Moderate extent	294	12.4	12.9	95.7
	Great extent	76	3.2	3.3	99.1
	Very great extent	21	.9	.9	100.0
	Total	2278	96.3	100.0	
Missing	Missing	87	3.7		
Total		2365	100.0		

Table E.301. Percentage of High School Teachers Who Use a Textbook for Reported Courses or Instructional Programs [14]

HST14:Use textbook for course/program?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	326	13.8	13.8	13.8
	Yes	2037	86.0	86.2	100.0
	Total	2363	99.7	100.0	
Missing	Missing	6	.3		
Total		2369	100.0		

Table E.302. High School Teachers ELA Textbook Titles [14A]

Textbook Title	Frequency	Percentage (n=1.012)
Literature and Language Arts	265	26.19%
The Language of Literature	168	16.60%
Elements of Literature	77	7.61%
Literature	56	5.53%
Timeless Voices Times Themes	52	5.14%
The Language of Literature	42	4.15%
Novels & Plays	40	3.95%
High Point to Success in Language, Literature, & Content	35	3.46%
English Language Arts & Literature	20	1.98%
Language	20	1.98%
Literature Gold California Edition	11	1.09%
Literature Platinum	11	1.09%
Corrective Reading	9	0.89%
Language Network	6	0.59%
Readers Handbook	6	0.59%

Table E.302. continued

Textbook Title	Frequency	Percentage (n=1.012)
Literature the Readers Choice	5	0.49%
Language & Literature	4	0.40%
Interactive Reader	4	0.40%
Anthology	4	0.40%
Bridges to Literature	4	0.40%
California Reader Review	3	0.30%
California Writer Review	3	0.30%
California Grammar Review	3	0.30%
The Interactive Reader	3	0.30%
Focus on Grammar Intermediate	3	0.30%
Read 180	3	0.30%
Handbook	2	0.20%
Decoding Strategies	2	0.20%
Writing and Grammar	2	0.20%
Exploring Life Through Literature	2	0.20%
The Norton Reader	2	0.20%
Traditions in Literature	2	0.20%
Farewell to Manzanar	2	0.20%
Literature Cooper	1	0.10%
Mastering the English Language Arts Standards	1	0.10%
Pathways to the Present	1	0.10%
Language Readers Beginning Level 1 & 2	1	0.10%
The Language of Learning	1	0.10%
Writers Institute	1	0.10%
Wilson Reading System	1	0.10%
Reading Language Arts Program	1	0.10%
Language Instructional Guide	1	0.10%
Dynamics of Life	1	0.10%
Reading for Writers	1	0.10%
Evergreen a Guide to Writing	1	0.10%
Macbeth	1	0.10%
The Night	1	0.10%
Maus 1	1	0.10%
Lord of The Files	1	0.10%
A Separate Peace	1	0.10%
To Kill A Mockingbird	1	0.10%
Much To Do About Nothing	1	0.10%

Table E.303. High School Teachers Math Textbook Titles [14A]

Textbook Title	Frequency	Percentage (n=893)
Below Algebra		
California Mathematics Review Content Standards	19	2.13%
College Prep Mathematics	18	2.02%
Mathematics Skills & Connections	12	1.34%
Mathematics	6	0.67%
Mathematics Concepts and Skills	6	0.67%
Interactive Math	3	0.34%
Mathematics Structure and Method	2	0.22%
Math with Business Applications	2	0.22%
Essentials of Mathematics	1	0.11%
Advanced Mathematical Concepts	1	0.11%
Moving with Math	1	0.11%
Algebra		
Algebra 1	321	35.95%
Algebra	88	9.85%
Algebra 2	41	4.59%
Algebra 1 Concepts & Skills	38	4.26%
PreAlgebra California Edition	33	3.70%
Algebra Structure & Method	27	3.02%
Algebra 1 California Edition	20	2.24%
Algebra Tools for a Changing World	15	1.68%
Algebra Concepts & Applications	15	1.68%
Algebra 2 with Trigonometry	12	1.34%
Algebra 1 Applications & Connections	9	1.01%
Algebra 1 Explorations & Applications	9	1.01%
Algebra 1 Interactive	8	0.90%
Discovering Algebra-Investigative Approach	8	0.90%
Foundations for Algebra	8	0.90%
Algebra 1 Concepts & Applications	8	0.90%
Algebra 1 Explorations & Applications Graphs	6	0.67%
Algebra 1, Integration, Application, Connections	6	0.67%
Algebra 1 An Integrated Approach	5	0.56%
Algebra 1 & 2	5	0.56%
Peacemaker Algebra	5	0.56%
Basic Algebra	4	0.45%
Focus on Algebra	4	0.45%
Intermediate Algebra	3	0.34%
Intro to Algebra 1	2	0.22%
Algebra 1 Cognitive Tutor	2	0.22%
Intro to Algebra 2	2	0.22%
PreAlgebra Tools for a Changing World	1	0.11%
Algebra 2 An Integrated Approach	1	0.11%
Passports to Algebra & Geometry	2	0.22%
Beyond Algebra		
Geometry	75	8.40%
Discovering Geometry An Investigative Approach	8	0.90%
Geometry Concepts & Skills	8	0.90%
Geometry Integration Application & Connections	5	0.56%
PreAlgebra-A Transition to Algebra & Geometry	4	0.45%
Geometry Explorations & Applications	4	0.45%
PreCalculus	3	0.34%
Calculus	3	0.34%
Geometry Tools for a Changing World	2	0.22%
Geometry & Math Analysis	1	0.11%
Trigonometry	1	0.11%

Table E.304. High School Teachers CAHSEE Textbook Titles [14A]

Textbook Title	Frequency	Percentage (n=74)
CAHSEE for Math	25	33.78%
College Prep Math & Algebra	21	28.38%
CAHSEE Success in Math	6	8.11%
Meeting the California Challenge	5	6.76%
Measuring Up	3	4.05%
Moving with Math Conquering the CAHSEE	3	4.05%
CAHSEE for English	2	2.70%
Preparing for the CAHSEE	2	2.70%
CAHSEE Success in ELA	2	2.70%
Kaplan	2	2.70%
CAHSEE English & Math	1	1.35%
Mastering the California Standards	1	1.35%
CAHSEE Review	1	1.35%

Table E.305. High School Teachers Author/Publisher Names [14A]

Textbook Title	Frequency	Percentage (n=1,750)
McDougal Littell	541	30.91%
Holt, Rinehart, Winston	277	15.83%
Prentice Hall	249	14.23%
Glencoe & McGraw-Hill	166	9.49%
Larson, Boswell, Stiff, Kanold	84	4.80%
Holt	35	2.00%
Hampton Brown	29	1.66%
Smith, Charles, Dossey, Bittinger	25	1.43%
College Preparatory Math	22	1.26%
Globe Fearon	21	1.20%
Sopris West	18	1.03%
American Book Company	18	1.03%
Science Research Association	17	0.97%
Addison Wesley	17	0.97%
Sallee, Kysh, Kasimatis, Hoey	17	0.97%
Key Curriculum Press	15	0.86%
Merrill	14	0.80%
Houghton Mifflin	14	0.80%
Dolciani	13	0.74%
Heath	12	0.69%
Scott Foresman & Company	10	0.57%
Brown, Dolciani, & Sorgenfrey	9	0.51%
Harcourt Bruce & Company	8	0.46%
Devin Pintozzi & Dr. Frank Pintozzi	8	0.46%
Thomson Heinle	7	0.40%
South West Educational Publishing	6	0.34%
Michael Serra	5	0.29%
Longman	5	0.29%
American Guidance Service	5	0.29%
Math Teachers Press	5	0.29%
California Department of Education	4	0.23%

Table E.305. continued

Textbook Title	Frequency	Percentage (n=1,750)
Jane Fell Green	4	0.23%
Beers & Odell	4	0.23%
Pearson Learning Group	4	0.23%
Kaplan	4	0.23%
Heinle & Heinle	3	0.17%
Thompson Publishing	3	0.17%
David Danson, Marcha Landace, Leah McCraken, & Linda Thompson	3	0.17%
Kaminshke Murdock	2	0.11%
Miller & Levine	2	0.11%
Spielvogel	2	0.11%
Russell Jacob	2	0.11%
Norton & Company	2	0.11%
Stephen Hearne Grossen	2	0.11%
Jurgensen, Brown, 7 Jurgens	2	0.11%
MaryLou McClosk & Lydia Stack	2	0.11%
Bellman, Bragg, Chapin, Gardella, Hall, Handlin, Mantre	2	0.11%
Great Source Education Group	2	0.11%
Foster, Ruth, & Winters	1	0.06%
Christina Lacie	1	0.06%
Stewart	1	0.06%
Demana	1	0.06%
Moise & Downs	1	0.06%
Cohen	1	0.06%
Engelmann, Osborn, Hanner	1	0.06%
Fendel, Resek, Alpen, Franc	1	0.06%
Research & Education Association	1	0.06%
Lange, Rousos, Mason	1	0.06%
William S. Hadley	1	0.06%
D. Lowry, E. Ockerga, W. Rucker	1	0.06%
Siegfried Haenisch	1	0.06%
Kate Kinsells	1	0.06%
Steven S. Zumdahl	1	0.06%
McCuen & Winkler	1	0.06%
Wiesel	1	0.06%
Steinbeck	1	0.06%
Peterson & Brereton	1	0.06%
Miriam Leiva & Richard Brown	1	0.06%
Rosenberg	1	0.06%
Wilson Training Cord	1	0.06%
McFarland	1	0.06%
People Publishing Group	1	0.06%
Gerard, Jones, Foster HBI Publications	1	0.06%
Coordination Group Publishing	1	0.06%
Scholastic	1	0.06%
Amsco	1	0.06%
Carnegie Learning, Inc	1	0.06%

Table E.306. Frequency of Year When School Adopted Textbook Used in Reported High School Courses or Instructional Programs [14B]

HST14B:When did school adopt textbook

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not applicable	428	18.1	19.0	19.0
	Before 2002	880	37.1	39.0	57.9
	2002 - 2003	341	14.4	15.1	73.0
	2003 - 2004	331	14.0	14.7	87.7
	2004 - 2005	278	11.7	12.3	100.0
	Total	2258	95.3	100.0	
Missing	Missing	111	4.7		
Total		2369	100.0		

Table E.307. Proportion of Textbook Used in Reported High School Courses or Instructional Programs [14C]

HST14C:How much of textbook do you use?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Too many variables to categorize	63	2.7	2.7	2.7
	Not applicable	342	14.5	14.5	17.2
	Some (less than 40%)	341	14.4	14.5	31.7
	About half (40% - 60%)	436	18.4	18.5	50.2
	Most (61% - 95%)	815	34.5	34.6	84.9
	All (96% - 100%)	356	15.1	15.1	100.0
	Total	2353	99.5	100.0	
Missing	Missing	12	.5		
Total		2365	100.0		

Table E.308. Percentage of High School Teachers Reporting Frequency of Using Other Texts in Reported High School Courses or Instructional Programs [15]

HST15A:Use Other text(s)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Less than 1 x per month or never	795	33.6	36.5	36.5
	1 x per month	332	14.0	15.2	51.7
	1 x per week	328	13.8	15.1	66.8
	2 - 3x per week	425	17.9	19.5	86.3
	Daily	299	12.6	13.7	100.0
	Total	2179	92.0	100.0	
Missing	Missing	190	8.0		
Total		2369	100.0		

Table E.309. High School Teachers General Supplemental Materials Titles [15A]

Title	Frequency	Percentage (n=360)
Testing		
CAHSEE Review	25	6.94%
Meeting the California Challenge	23	6.39%
Standard Review Guides & Test Materials	15	4.17%
CAHSEE Education Math	11	3.06%
Measuring Up to California Standards	9	2.50%
CAHSEE Education English	9	2.50%
Kaplan	3	0.83%
Preparing for the CAHSEE	2	0.56%
Roadmap to the California Exit Exam	2	0.56%
California Standards Assessment Workbook	1	0.28%
Standards Plus	1	0.28%
California Standards Concepts	1	0.28%
CAHSEE Success	1	0.28%
Conquering the CAHSEE	1	0.28%
Passing The CAHSEE Mathematics	1	0.28%
Scholastic Aptitude Test	1	0.28%
Princeton Review	1	0.28%
College Board	1	0.28%
Newspapers, Magazines, & Newsletters		
Newspapers, Magazines, & Newsletters	40	11.11%
Teen Week Magazine	5	1.39%
Los Angeles Times	4	1.11%
Scholastic Scope Magazine	2	0.56%
Scope and Action Teen Magazine	2	0.56%
New York Times	1	0.28%
General Knowledge & Reference Materials		
Text Supplementary Materials	54	15.00%
Not applicable	48	13.33%
Reference Materials	26	7.22%
Holt Handbook	13	3.61%

Table E.309. continued

Title	Frequency	Percentage (n=360)
Worksheets & Workbooks	11	3.06%
Vocabulary Materials	6	1.67%
Focus on Achievement Lessons	4	1.11%
Teacher Created Materials	4	1.11%
Readers Handbook	3	0.83%
Old Text Materials	3	0.83%
Special Ed Materials	3	0.83%
Music CDs	2	0.56%
Pathwise Instructional Strategies for Student Achievement	2	0.56%
Dictionary	2	0.56%
Source Book	2	0.56%
Strategic Teaching & Learning	2	0.56%
Library Materials	2	0.56%
Cartoon Mnemonics	1	0.28%
Selection Support Skills Development Workbook	1	0.28%
Making Connections	1	0.28%
College Board Materials	1	0.28%
Skills Sharpeners	1	0.28%
Regents Illustrated Classic	1	0.28%
Cliff Notes	1	0.28%
Practice Masters	1	0.28%
Advance Placement Workbook	1	0.28%
The Transitions Curriculum	1	0.28%
Heath Biology	1	0.28%

Table E.310. High School ELA Teachers Supplemental Materials Titles for Grammar, Reading, & Writing [15A]

Title	Frequency	Percentage (n=452)
Grammar, Reading, & Writing	105	23.23%
Holt Handbook	15	3.32%
Interactive Reader	13	2.88%
Writers Inc.	11	2.43%
B A Better Reader	8	1.77%
Writing & Grammar Communication in Action	7	1.55%
Writers Craft	7	1.55%
California Reading Review	5	1.11%
World of Vocabulary	5	1.11%
Accelerated Reader	5	1.11%
Grammar & Composition	4	0.88%
Warriner's Grammar	3	0.66%
Reading Drills	3	0.66%
California Writing Review	3	0.66%
California Grammar & Usage	3	0.66%
Readers Handbook	2	0.44%
Reading Power	2	0.44%
Roots	2	0.44%
Heritage Series	2	0.44%
English Learners Version	2	0.44%
Write to Succeed	2	0.44%

Table E.310. continued

Title	Frequency	Percentage (n=452)
Elements of Writing Language of Skills	2	0.44%
Academic Writing	2	0.44%
Scholastic Read 180 Software	2	0.44%
Read Naturally	1	0.22%
Fundamentals of English	1	0.22%
Jamestown Critical Reading	1	0.22%
Grammar Usage & Mechanics	1	0.22%
Side by Side Series	1	0.22%
Painless Grammar	1	0.22%
Steps in Composition	1	0.22%
Rewards Plus	1	0.22%
English Skills	1	0.22%
Workshops	1	0.22%
Skills for School Success	1	0.22%
Teacher Curriculum Materials	1	0.22%
Studio Curriculum Materials	1	0.22%
Multi Cultural Reading	1	0.22%
America's Choice Materials	1	0.22%
Writing Practically	1	0.22%
Short Story Reader	1	0.22%
Building English Skills	1	0.22%
Idiots Guide to Etiquette	1	0.22%
Daily Oral Language	1	0.22%
Weaving it Together	1	0.22%
Thoughts & Notions	1	0.22%
English, Yes	1	0.22%
Grammar In Context	1	0.22%
English At Your Command	1	0.22%
Project Write	1	0.22%
Write Well	1	0.22%
The Three Genres	1	0.22%
Lets Write	1	0.22%
Grammar Grabbers	1	0.22%
Building Reading Comprehension	1	0.22%
Real Life Writing	1	0.22%
Universal Access Interactive Reading	1	0.22%
Daybook of Critical Reading 7 Writing	1	0.22%
All Write	1	0.22%
Word Skills Vocabulary Book	1	0.22%
Basic English Pacemaker	1	0.22%
Reading Strategies	1	0.22%
Writing & Grammar Strategies	1	0.22%
California Language Arts Review	1	0.22%
Literature		
Literature & Grammar	130	28.76%
Literature & Language Arts	11	2.43%
Language Network	10	2.21%
Elements of Literature	8	1.77%
The Language of Literature	8	1.77%
Literature Anthologies	5	1.11%

Table E.310. continued

Title	Frequency	Percentage (n=452)
Literature	4	0.88%
Voices in Literature	4	0.88%
Language Network	3	0.66%
Daulieres Greek Myths	2	0.44%
Norton Anthology of Essays	2	0.44%
English in Literature	2	0.44%
Literature Handbook	2	0.44%
Literature & Language Arts Program Workbook	1	0.22%
World Literature	1	0.22%
American Literature	1	0.22%
McMillan Literature Series	1	0.22%
Bridges to Literature	1	0.22%
Greek Literature	1	0.22%

Table E.311. High School ELA Teachers Supplemental Materials Titles for Poetry, Plays, Narratives, and Novels [15A]

Title	Frequency	Percentage (n=1,185)
To Kill a Mocking Bird	105	8.86%
Of Mice & Men	100	8.44%
Lord of the Flies	96	8.10%
Night	66	5.57%
Romeo & Juliet	50	4.22%
The Great Gatsby	50	4.22%
Adventures of Huckleberry Finn and Tom Sawyer	49	4.14%
Fahrenheit 451	40	3.38%
Animal Farm	40	3.38%
The Catcher in the Rye	37	3.12%
House on Mango Street	35	2.95%
Bless Me Ultima	27	2.28%
Scarlet Letter	26	2.19%
The Crucible	24	2.03%
All Quiet on the Western Front	24	2.03%
MacBeth	23	1.94%
Novel	18	1.52%
The Joyluck Club	18	1.52%
Julius Caesar	17	1.43%
Things Fall Apart	15	1.27%
Othello	15	1.27%
A Raisin in the Sun	15	1.27%
The Pearl	14	1.18%
Antigone	11	0.93%
Midsummer Nights Dream	11	0.93%
The Grapes of Wrath	11	0.93%
A Separate Peace	10	0.84%
The Odyssey	10	0.84%
Black Boy	9	0.76%
Hamlet	9	0.76%
Oedipus The King	9	0.76%
The Bean Trees	9	0.76%

Table E.311. continued

Title	Frequency	Percentage (n=1,185)
Hamilton's Mythology	8	0.68%
A Separate Peace	8	0.68%
The Outsiders	7	0.59%
The Old Man and the Sea	7	0.59%
Death of a Salesman	7	0.59%
The Pigman	6	0.51%
A Tale of Two Cities	6	0.51%
Enders Game	6	0.51%
Holes	6	0.51%
Beowulf	6	0.51%
Like Water for Chocolate	6	0.51%
I Know Why the Caged Bird Sings	5	0.42%
Farewell to Manzanar	5	0.42%
Twelve Angry Men	5	0.42%
Great Expectations	5	0.42%
The Taming of The Shrew	5	0.42%
The Giver	4	0.34%
Short Stories	4	0.34%
Short Stories	4	0.34%
Poems	4	0.34%
Twelfth Night	4	0.34%
Native Son	4	0.34%
Essays	3	0.25%
Our Town	3	0.25%
Cannery Row	3	0.25%
Plays	3	0.25%
The Stranger	3	0.25%
A Lesson Before Dying	3	0.25%
Les Miserable	3	0.25%
Shakespeare	2	0.17%
Westside Story	2	0.17%
Catch 22	2	0.17%
Chicken Soup for the Teenage Soul	2	0.17%
Much Ado About Nothing	2	0.17%
Dr Jekyll & Mr. Hyde	2	0.17%
King Lear	2	0.17%
Real Life Heroes	2	0.17%
Norton Anthology of Poetry	1	0.08%
Edgar Allen Poe	1	0.08%
Twelve Angry Men	1	0.08%
Poems Pat Mora	1	0.08%
Heart of Darkness	1	0.08%
Piano Lesson	1	0.08%
Autobiography	1	0.08%
Shane Jack Schaefer	1	0.08%
Irene Goodnight	1	0.08%
Gods	1	0.08%
Kindred	1	0.08%
The Evil	1	0.08%
The Miracle Worker	1	0.08%

Table E.311. continued

Title	Frequency	Percentage (n=1,185)
Bridge to Terabithia	1	0.08%
Fring History	1	0.08%
Barrio Boy	1	0.08%
Tale of Tow Cites	1	0.08%
The Chosen	1	0.08%
The Humane Comedy	1	0.08%
The Canterbury Tales	1	0.08%
Anthem	1	0.08%
Orations	1	0.08%
Ethan Frome	1	0.08%
The Boys Life	1	0.08%
Rhyme of the Ancient Mariner	1	0.08%
The Merchant of Venice	1	0.08%
American Street Anthology	1	0.08%
Speak	1	0.08%
Living Up the Street	1	0.08%
Steinbeck	1	0.08%
Fast Food Nation	1	0.08%
The Underdogs	1	0.08%
Great American Stories	1	0.08%

Table E.312. High School Math Teachers Supplemental Materials Titles [15A]

Title	Frequency	Percentage (n=413)
Below Algebra		
Math Materials	63	15.25%
California Math Review	20	4.84%
College Prep Math	17	4.12%
PreAlgebra Materials	10	2.42%
Math with Pizzazz	3	0.73%
Mathematics Study Guide	3	0.73%
PaceMaker Basic Math	2	0.48%
Basic First Math	1	0.24%
Heath Math	1	0.24%
Steps to Mathematics	1	0.24%
Moving with Math	1	0.24%
Math Steps	1	0.24%
Math Matters	1	0.24%
Investigating Math	1	0.24%
Practical Mathematics	1	0.24%
PreAlgebra with Pizzazz	1	0.24%
PreAlgebra An Integrated Transition to Algebra & Geometry	1	0.24%
Algebra		
Algebra Materials	136	32.93%
Algebra 1	29	7.02%
Algebra 1 Structure Method	19	4.60%
Algebra with Pizzazz	16	3.87%
Algebra Workbook	6	1.45%
Algebra1 Concepts & Skill	5	1.21%
Algebra Tools for A Changing World	5	1.21%

Table E.312. continued

Title	Frequency	Percentage (n=413)
Algebra 1 Applications & Connections	2	0.48%
Algebra 1 Integrated Approach	2	0.48%
Developing Skills in Algebra 1	2	0.48%
Beginning Algebra with Applications	1	0.24%
Algebra & PreAlgebra	1	0.24%
Algebra 1 California Edition	1	0.24%
Algebra & Trigonometry Structure & Method	1	0.24%
Algebra 2	1	0.24%
Algebra Number Power	1	0.24%
Math Activity Book Algebra & PreAlgebra	1	0.24%
Beyond Algebra		
Geometry Related Materials	43	10.41%
Discovering Geometry	5	1.21%
Geometry Concepts & Applications	3	0.73%
Geometry An Integrated Approach	2	0.48%
Geometry Workbook	1	0.24%
Geometry and Algebra	1	0.24%
Geometers Sketchpad Software	1	0.24%

Table E.313. Percentage of High School Teachers Reporting Frequency of Using Commercially Prepared Materials (Not Computer-Based) in Reported High School Courses or Instructional Programs [15]

HST15B:Use Commercial material(s)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Less than 1 x per month or never	728	30.7	33.5	33.5
	1 x per month	390	16.5	18.0	51.5
	1 x per week	475	20.1	21.9	73.3
	2 - 3x per week	383	16.2	17.6	91.0
	Daily	196	8.3	9.0	100.0
	Total	2172	91.7	100.0	
Missing	Missing	197	8.3		
Total		2369	100.0		

Table E.314. High School Teachers Descriptions of General Commercially Prepared Materials [15A]

Title	Frequency	Percentage (n=573)
General Materials		
Workbooks & Worksheets	187	32.64%
Teacher created materials	16	2.79%
Practice Problems	12	2.09%
Graphic Organizer & Lesson Plans	10	1.75%
Overhead Notes & Transparencies	8	1.40%
Cooperative Activities	8	1.40%
Special Education Materials	8	1.40%
Internet/ Online Resources	7	1.22%
District Created Materials	6	1.05%
Class Projects	5	0.87%
Test & Quizzes	5	0.87%
Text Resource Book	4	0.70%
Study Guides	4	0.70%
Pathwise Materials	2	0.35%
Cliff Notes	2	0.35%
Homework	2	0.35%
Department Created Materials	2	0.35%
Skills for School Success	1	0.17%
Audio Materials	1	0.17%
Rewards Plus	1	0.17%
Focus On Achievements	1	0.17%
Newspapers, Magazines, Newsletters	47	8.20%
Scholastic Action Magazine	9	1.57%
Los Angeles Times	5	0.87%
New York Times	3	0.52%
Teen Week	3	0.52%
UpFront Magazine	2	0.35%
General Knowledge & Reference Materials	59	10.30%
Not Applicable	53	9.25%
Audio Materials	26	4.54%
Games and Puzzles	25	4.36%
District Related Materials	12	2.09%
VHS Taps & Videos	9	1.57%
Electronic Materials	9	1.57%
Overhead Projector	6	1.05%
Advance Placement Prep Materials	6	1.05%
Music CDs	4	0.70%
Punchline	2	0.35%
Channel 1	1	0.17%

Table E.315. High School ELA Teachers Descriptions of Commercially Prepared Materials [15A]

Title	Frequency	Percentage (n=248)
Grammar, Reading, & Writing	153	61.69%
Jane Schaffer Writing Studio Curriculum Materials	11	4.44%
Writers Inc.	9	3.63%
Worksheets & Workbooks	9	3.63%
Daily Oral Language, Vocabulary, & Spelling Skills Builders	8	3.23%
Roots & Dissection	8	3.23%
Interactive Reader	7	2.82%
Reading Comprehension	6	2.42%
Grammar Handbook	5	2.02%
Read Naturally	4	1.61%
Handbook	4	1.61%
Language Network	4	1.61%
Read 180	3	1.21%
Accelerated Reader	3	1.21%
Corrective Reading Skill Application	2	0.81%
Auto Books	2	0.81%
Write Traits Rubrics	2	0.81%
ELD Study Guide Series	2	0.81%
Set Up to Writing Program	2	0.81%
Reading Drills	2	0.81%
SRA Reading Lab	2	0.81%

Table E.316. High School Math Teachers Descriptions of Commercially Prepared Materials [15A]

Title	Frequency	Percentage (n=283)
Algebra Related Materials	88	31.10%
Algebra With Pizzazz	81	28.62%
Math Materials	54	19.08%
Geometry Related Materials	13	4.59%
PreAlgebra with Pizzazz	10	3.53%
Punchline Bridge to Algebra	9	3.18%
Math with Pizzazz	8	2.83%
Developing Skills in Algebra 1	5	1.77%
College Prep Math	4	1.41%
Geometers Sketchpad Workbook	3	1.06%
Real World Math	3	1.06%
Remedial Worksheets	3	1.06%
Geometry with Pizzazz	2	0.71%

Table E.317 High School Teachers Descriptions of Commercially Prepared Materials—Tests, Assessments, and Standard Review Guides [15A]

Title	Frequency	Percentage (n=166)
Standards Review Guides & Test Materials	53	31.93%
CAHSEE Review Materials	37	22.29%
CAHSEE Released Test Questions & Practice Tests	9	5.42%
Meeting the California Challenge	9	5.42%
Preparing for the CAHSEE	8	4.82%
CAHSEE Education in Math	7	4.22%
SAT Preparatory Materials	7	4.22%
Kaplan Preparatory Materials	6	3.61%
Preparing for the CAHSEE ELA	5	3.01%
Assessments	5	3.01%
California Content Standards Review	4	2.41%
CAHSEE Education ELA	3	1.81%
Standardized Test Practice Workbooks	3	1.81%
Measuring Up	3	1.81%
California Standards Manager	2	1.20%
Roadmap CAHSEE Math	2	1.20%
Passing the CAHSEE in English	2	1.20%
Stands Plus	1	0.60%

Table E.318. Percentage of High School Teachers Reporting Frequency of Using Computer-Based Programs in Reported High School Courses or Instructional Programs [15]

HST15C:Use Computer-based program(s)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Less than 1 x per month or never	1264	53.4	59.4	59.4
	1 x per month	377	15.9	17.7	77.1
	1 x per week	272	11.5	12.8	89.9
	2 - 3x per week	115	4.9	5.4	95.3
	Daily	101	4.3	4.7	100.0
	Total	2129	89.9	100.0	
Missing	Missing	240	10.1		
Total		2369	100.0		

Table E.319. High School Teachers Descriptions of General Computer-Based Materials [15A]

Title	Frequency	Percentage (n=506)
Not Applicable	108	21.34%
Internet	87	17.19%
Technology	60	11.86%
Test Generator	41	8.10%
Computer Programs	27	5.34%
Research	25	4.94%
Worksheet Builder/Generator	23	4.55%
Green Globs Graphing Software	17	3.36%
PLATO	13	2.57%
Textbook Supplemental Programs	12	2.37%
WebQuests	11	2.17%
Edusoft Resources	9	1.78%
Lesson Plans	8	1.58%
Skillsbank	7	1.38%
Games	6	1.19%
ExamViewPro	5	0.99%
Riverdeep	4	0.79%
Electric Library	4	0.79%
Easy Grade Pro	4	0.79%
Edcaide	3	0.59%
Extra Practice	3	0.59%
Electronic Teacher Classroom	3	0.59%
Worksheets & Lessons	3	0.59%
Grade Quick	3	0.59%
Perfect Copy	3	0.59%
Quia.com	3	0.59%
CQ Researcher	3	0.59%
College.com	3	0.59%
Larson Learning	2	0.40%
Online Lesson Planner	2	0.40%
Test & Quizzes	2	0.40%
Turnitincom	2	0.40%

Table E.320. High School ELA Teachers Descriptions of Computer-Based Materials [15A]

Title	Frequency	Percentage (n=247)
Microsoft Word (Excel & PowerPoint)	98	39.68%
Accelerated Reader	43	17.41%
Grammar, Reading, Writing	34	13.77%
Read 180 Software	15	6.07%
Word Processing	12	4.86%
ACCESS ELA	12	4.86%
Learning 100 Reading Comprehension Program	11	4.45%
STAR Reader Computer Test	5	2.02%
Novels	4	1.62%
Photoshop	4	1.62%
New Century Reading	4	1.62%
Skills Tutor	3	1.21%
My Access Vantage Writing Program	2	0.81%
My Access Vantage Writing Program	2	0.81%

Table E.321. High School Math Teachers Descriptions of Computer-Based Materials [15A]

Title	Frequency	Percentage (n=166)
Math	56	33.73%
Accelerated Math	31	18.67%
Geometer Sketchpad	18	10.84%
Boxer Math	9	5.42%
Algebra Computer Programs	6	3.61%
Math Lab	5	3.01%
Larson's Excel at Algebra Software	5	3.01%
Math Blaster	4	2.41%
Math.com	3	1.81%
Riverdeep	3	1.81%
Interactive Math	3	1.81%
AAAMath.com	3	1.81%
Math Games	2	1.20%
Math Test Generator	2	1.20%
Math Worksheet Builder/Generator	2	1.20%
Equation Graphic	2	1.20%
The House That Math Built	2	1.20%
HotMath.com	2	1.20%
Algebra in Motion	2	1.20%
Graphing Software	2	1.20%
A Plus Math	1	0.60%
Texas Instrument Calculators	1	0.60%
Real World Math	1	0.60%
Quarter Mile Math	1	0.60%

Table E.322. High School Teachers Descriptions of Computer-Based Materials—Tests, Assessments, and Standard Review Guides [15A]

Title	Frequency	Percentage (n=78)
Testing, Assessments, & Reporting	36	46.15%
Teacher Created Materials	20	25.64%
CAHSEE Preparatory	10	12.82%
Text CD Rom Materials	9	11.54%
CAHSEE Online Test Preparation	1	1.28%
CAHSEE Workbook	1	1.28%
Department Created	1	1.28%

Table E.323. Percentage of High School Teachers Reporting Most Advanced Degree [16]

HST16:What is your most advanced degree?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Bachelors	447	18.9	19.1	19.1
	Some graduate school	789	33.3	33.8	52.9
	Masters	1020	43.1	43.6	96.5
	Doctoral	35	1.5	1.5	98.0
	Other	45	1.9	1.9	100.0
	8.00	1	.0	.0	100.0
	Total	2337	98.6	100.0	
Missing	Missing	32	1.4		
Total		2369	100.0		

Table E.324. Percentage of High School Teachers Reporting Years of Experience Teaching Reported Courses or Instructional Programs [18]

HST18:Years teaching this course/program

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 year or less	415	17.5	17.8	17.8
	2 - 3 years	494	20.9	21.2	39.0
	4 - 5 years	364	15.4	15.6	54.7
	6 - 10 years	473	20.0	20.3	75.0
	11 - 20 years	361	15.2	15.5	90.5
	More than 20 years	222	9.4	9.5	100.0
	Total	2329	98.3	100.0	
Missing	Missing	40	1.7		
Total		2369	100.0		

Table E.325. Percentage of High School Teachers Reporting Total Years of Teaching Experience [19]

HST19:Years teaching experience

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 year or less	125	5.3	5.4	5.4
	2 - 3 years	282	11.9	12.1	17.5
	4 - 5 years	283	11.9	12.2	29.7
	6 - 10 years	560	23.6	24.1	53.8
	11 - 20 years	599	25.3	25.8	79.5
	More than 20 years	476	20.1	20.5	100.0
	Total	2325	98.1	100.0	
Missing	Missing	44	1.9		
Total		2369	100.0		

Feeder/Middle School Principal Survey: Frequency Distributions

Table E.326. Feeder School Principals Reported Proportion (Projected) of Content Standards in CAHSEE ELA Blueprint Covered in 2004–2005 [1]

MSP01A:ELA standards 2004-2005

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Do Not Know	2	5.6	5.7	5.7
	Partially Covered (40% - 60%)	4	11.1	11.4	17.1
	Mostly Covered (61% - 95%)	17	47.2	48.6	65.7
	Completely Covered (96% - 100%)	12	33.3	34.3	100.0
	Total	35	97.2	100.0	
Missing	Missing	1	2.8		
Total		36	100.0		

Table E.327. Feeder School Principals Reported Proportion of Content Standards in CAHSEE ELA Blueprint Covered in 2003–2004 [1]

MSP01B:ELA standards 2003-2004

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Do Not Know	4	11.1	11.4	11.4
	Little Covered (less than 40%)	2	5.6	5.7	17.1
	Partially Covered (40% - 60%)	6	16.7	17.1	34.3
	Mostly Covered (61% - 95%)	14	38.9	40.0	74.3
	Completely Covered (96% - 100%)	9	25.0	25.7	100.0
	Total	35	97.2	100.0	
Missing	Missing	1	2.8		
Total		36	100.0		

Table E.328. Feeder School Principals Reported Proportion of Content Standards in CAHSEE ELA Blueprint Covered in 2002–2003 [1]

MSP01C:ELA standards 2002-2003

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Do Not Know	9	25.0	25.7	25.7
	Little Covered (less than 40%)	7	19.4	20.0	45.7
	Partially Covered (40% - 60%)	7	19.4	20.0	65.7
	Mostly Covered (61% - 95%)	9	25.0	25.7	91.4
	Completely Covered (96% - 100%)	3	8.3	8.6	100.0
	Total	35	97.2	100.0	
Missing	Missing	1	2.8		
Total		36	100.0		

Table E.329. Feeder School Principals Reported Proportion of Content Standards in CAHSEE ELA Blueprint Covered Before 2002 [1]

MSP01D:ELA standards Before 2002

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Do Not Know	15	41.7	42.9	42.9
	Little Covered (less than 40%)	6	16.7	17.1	60.0
	Partially Covered (40% - 60%)	5	13.9	14.3	74.3
	Mostly Covered (61% - 95%)	8	22.2	22.9	97.1
	Completely Covered (96% - 100%)	1	2.8	2.9	100.0
	Total	35	97.2	100.0	
Missing	Missing	1	2.8		
Total		36	100.0		

Table E.330. Feeder School Principals Reported Proportion (Projected) of Content Standards in CAHSEE Mathematics Blueprint Covered in 2004–2005 [2]

MSP02A:Math standards 2004-2005

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Do Not Know	2	5.6	6.1	6.1
	Partially Covered (40% - 60%)	2	5.6	6.1	12.1
	Mostly Covered (61% - 95%)	19	52.8	57.6	69.7
	Completely Covered (96% - 100%)	10	27.8	30.3	100.0
	Total	33	91.7	100.0	
Missing	Missing	3	8.3		
Total		36	100.0		

Table E.331. Feeder School Principals Reported Proportion of Content Standards in CAHSEE Mathematics Blueprint Covered in 2003–2004 [2]

MSP02B:Math standards 2003-2004

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Do Not Know	3	8.3	9.1	9.1
	Little Covered (less than 40%)	2	5.6	6.1	15.2
	Partially Covered (40% - 60%)	5	13.9	15.2	30.3
	Mostly Covered (61% - 95%)	15	41.7	45.5	75.8
	Completely Covered (96% - 100%)	8	22.2	24.2	100.0
	Total	33	91.7	100.0	
Missing	Missing	3	8.3		
Total		36	100.0		

Table E.332. Feeder School Principals Reported Proportion of Content Standards in CAHSEE Mathematics Blueprint Covered in 2002–2003 [2]

MSP02C:Math standards 2002-2003

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Do Not Know	9	25.0	27.3	27.3
	Little Covered (less than 40%)	6	16.7	18.2	45.5
	Partially Covered (40% - 60%)	6	16.7	18.2	63.6
	Mostly Covered (61% - 95%)	10	27.8	30.3	93.9
	Completely Covered (96% - 100%)	2	5.6	6.1	100.0
	Total	33	91.7	100.0	
Missing	Missing	3	8.3		
Total		36	100.0		

Table E.333. Feeder School Principals Reported Proportion of Content Standards in CAHSEE Mathematics Blueprint Covered Before 2002 [2]

MSP02D:Math standards Before 2002

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Do Not Know	13	36.1	40.6	40.6
	Little Covered (less than 40%)	6	16.7	18.8	59.4
	Partially Covered (40% - 60%)	3	8.3	9.4	68.8
	Mostly Covered (61% - 95%)	9	25.0	28.1	96.9
	Completely Covered (96% - 100%)	1	2.8	3.1	100.0
	Total	32	88.9	100.0	
Missing	Missing	4	11.1		
Total		36	100.0		

Table E.334. Proportion of Feeder School Teachers Who Participated in ELA-Related Professional Development to Teach Content Standards Associated With CAHSEE [4]

MSP04:ELA professional development

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not applicable	4	11.1	11.1	11.1
	Only a few (less than 25%)	2	5.6	5.6	16.7
	Some (25% to 74%)	4	11.1	11.1	27.8
	Most (75% to 90%)	10	27.8	27.8	55.6
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	16	44.4	44.4	100.0
	Total	36	100.0	100.0	

Table E.335. Proportion of Feeder School Teachers Who Participated in Math-Related Professional Development to Teach Content Standards Associated With CAHSEE [5]

MSP05:Math professional development

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not applicable	4	11.1	11.1	11.1
	Only a few (less than 25%)	2	5.6	5.6	16.7
	Some (25% to 74%)	7	19.4	19.4	36.1
	Most (75% to 90%)	6	16.7	16.7	52.8
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	17	47.2	47.2	100.0
	Total	36	100.0	100.0	

Table E.336. Percentage of Feeder School Principals Who Reported Using District-Based Tracking System to Monitor and Report Student Proficiency on Content Standards [6]

MSP06A:District-based tracking system

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Marked	29	80.6	100.0	100.0
Missing	Missing	7	19.4		
Total		36	100.0		

Table E.337. Percentage of Feeder School Principals Who Reported Using School-Based Tracking System to Monitor and Report Student Proficiency on Content Standards [6]

MSP06B:School-based tracking system

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Marked	20	55.6	100.0	100.0
Missing	Missing	16	44.4		
Total		36	100.0		

Table E.338. Percentage of Feeder School Principals Who Reported Using Department-Based (ELA or Math) Tracking System to Monitor and Report Student Proficiency on Content Standards [6]

MSP06C:Department-based tracking system

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Marked	19	52.8	100.0	100.0
Missing	Missing	17	47.2		
Total		36	100.0		

Table E.339. Percentage of Feeder School Principals Who Reported That Individual Teachers Keep Track of Student Mastery of Content Standards [6]

MSP06D:Individual teachers keep track

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Marked	23	63.9	100.0	100.0
Missing	Missing	13	36.1		
Total		36	100.0		

Table E.340. Percentage of Feeder School Principals Who Reported Using Some Other System to Monitor and Report Student Proficiency on Content Standards [6]

MSP06E:Other (describe below)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not marked	35	97.2	97.2	97.2
	Marked	1	2.8	2.8	100.0
	Total	36	100.0	100.0	

Table E.341. Percentage of Feeder School Principals Who Reported Using No Tracking System to Monitor and Report Student Proficiency on Content Standards [6]

MSP65F:None

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not marked	36	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table E.342. Percentage of Feeder School Principals Who Reported Coordination Between Feeder and High School on Coverage of Content Standards Associated With CAHSEE [7]

MSP07A:Middle School/High School

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not developed	10	27.8	27.8	27.8
	Partially developed	14	38.9	38.9	66.7
	Fully developed	12	33.3	33.3	100.0
	Total	36	100.0	100.0	

Table E.343. Percentage of Feeder School Principals Who Reported Coordination Between Special and General Education on Coverage of Content Standards Associated With CAHSEE [7]

MSP07B:Spec Ed/Gen Ed

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not developed	5	13.9	13.9	13.9
	Partially developed	21	58.3	58.3	72.2
	Fully developed	10	27.8	27.8	100.0
	Total	36	100.0	100.0	

Table E.344. Percentage of Feeder School Principals Who Reported Coordination Between English Language Development and General Education on Coverage of Content Standards Associated With CAHSEE [7]

MSP07C:English Lang Dev/Gen Education

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not developed	5	13.9	13.9	13.9
	Partially developed	18	50.0	50.0	63.9
	Fully developed	13	36.1	36.1	100.0
	Total	36	100.0	100.0	

Table E.345. Percentage of Feeder School Principals Who Reported Coordination Between Alternative (Continuation) and General Education on Coverage of Content Standards Associated With CAHSEE [7]

MSP07D:Alternative/Gen Education

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not developed	17	47.2	65.4	65.4
	Partially developed	6	16.7	23.1	88.5
	Fully developed	3	8.3	11.5	100.0
	Total	26	72.2	100.0	
Missing	Missing	10	27.8		
Total		36	100.0		

Table E.346. Percentage of Feeder School Principals Who Reported Regular Articulation Meetings With Receiving High Schools [8]

MSP08:Regular Articulation meetings

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	16	44.4	45.7	45.7
	Yes, with some of them	7	19.4	20.0	65.7
	Yes, with all of them	12	33.3	34.3	100.0
	Total	35	97.2	100.0	
Missing	Missing	1	2.8		
Total		36	100.0		

Table E.347. Percentage of Feeder School Principals Who Reported Importance of Regular Articulation Meetings With Receiving High Schools in Preparing Students for Success on CAHSEE [9]

MSP09:Importance of regular articulation

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Unimportant	3	8.3	8.6	8.6
	Neither	4	11.1	11.4	20.0
	Important	16	44.4	45.7	65.7
	Very important	12	33.3	34.3	100.0
	Total	35	97.2	100.0	
Missing	Missing	1	2.8		
Total		36	100.0		

Table E.348. Percentage of Feeder School Principals Who Reported Regular Articulation Meetings With Feeder Elementary Schools [10]

MSP10:Reg meetings with feeder Elem

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Does not apply	1	2.8	2.9	2.9
	No	18	50.0	51.4	54.3
	Yes, with some of them	5	13.9	14.3	68.6
	Yes, with all of them	11	30.6	31.4	100.0
	Total	35	97.2	100.0	
Missing	Missing	1	2.8		
Total		36	100.0		

Table E.349. Percentage of Feeder School Principals Who Reported Importance of Regular Articulation Meetings With Feeder Elementary Schools in Preparing Students for Success on CAHSEE [11]

MSP11:Imp Reg meetings with feeder Elem

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Unimportant	1	2.8	2.9	2.9
	Neither	6	16.7	17.1	20.0
	Important	15	41.7	42.9	62.9
	Very important	13	36.1	37.1	100.0
	Total	35	97.2	100.0	
Missing	Missing	1	2.8		
Total		36	100.0		

Feeder/Middle School Department Head/Lead Teacher—ELA, Part 1 Survey: Frequency Distributions

Table E.350. Percentage of Feeder School ELA Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year English 6 Offered as Primary or Supplemental Course

ELA-Pri-Yr:Comp English-Grade 6 (2101)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Missing	12	37.5	37.5	37.5
	Before 2002	19	59.4	59.4	96.9
	2003 - 04	1	3.1	3.1	100.0
	Total	32	100.0	100.0	

Table E.351. Percentage of Feeder School ELA Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year English 7 Offered as Primary or Supplemental Course

ELA-Pri-Yr:Comp English-Grade 7 (2101)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Missing	4	12.5	12.5	12.5
	Before 2002	27	84.4	84.4	96.9
	2003 - 04	1	3.1	3.1	100.0
	Total	32	100.0	100.0	

Table E.352. Percentage of Feeder School ELA Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year English 8 Offered as Primary or Supplemental Course

ELA-Pri-Yr:Comp English-Grade 8 (2101)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Missing	4	12.5	12.5	12.5
	Before 2002	27	84.4	84.4	96.9
	2003 - 04	1	3.1	3.1	100.0
	Total	32	100.0	100.0	

Table E.353. Percentage of Feeder School ELA Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year English 9 Offered as Primary or Supplemental Course

ELA-Pri-Yr:Comp English-Grade 9 (2101)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Missing	32	100.0	100.0	100.0

Note. No one listed this as a primary or supplemental course.

Table E.354. Percentage of Feeder School ELA Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year English as a Second Language Offered as Primary or Supplemental Course

ELA-Pri-Yr:English as a 2nd Lang (2110)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Missing	11	34.4	34.4	34.4
	Before 2002	20	62.5	62.5	96.9
	2004 - 05	1	3.1	3.1	100.0
	Total	32	100.0	100.0	

Table E.355. Feeder School ELA Curriculum Head Reported Offering These Other ELA Primary or Supplemental Courses

Course Title	Frequency	Percentage (n=6)
Literacy	1	16.67%
English Language Development	1	16.67%
High Point for English Language	1	16.67%
Care Language Arts and Reading	1	16.67%
Reading	1	16.67%
Language	1	16.67%

Table E.356. Frequency of Number of Sections of English 6 Offered at Feeder School During Current Academic Year

ELA-Pri-Sec:Comp English-Grade 6 (2101)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Missing	12	37.5	37.5	37.5
	N/A	4	12.5	12.5	50.0
	1	1	3.1	3.1	53.1
	6	1	3.1	3.1	56.3
	9 or more	14	43.8	43.8	100.0
	Total	32	100.0	100.0	

Table E.357. Frequency of Number of Sections of English 7 Offered at Feeder School During Current Academic Year

ELA-Pri-Sec:Comp English-Grade 7 (2101)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Missing	8	25.0	25.0	25.0
	1	1	3.1	3.1	28.1
	2	1	3.1	3.1	31.3
	7	1	3.1	3.1	34.4
	9 or more	21	65.6	65.6	100.0
	Total	32	100.0	100.0	

Table E.358. Frequency of Number of Sections of English 8 Offered at Feeder School During Current Academic Year

ELA-Pri-Sec:Comp English-Grade 8 (2101)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Missing	8	25.0	25.0	25.0
	1	1	3.1	3.1	28.1
	2	1	3.1	3.1	31.3
	8	3	9.4	9.4	40.6
	9 or more	19	59.4	59.4	100.0
	Total	32	100.0	100.0	

Table E.359. Frequency of Number of Sections of English 9 Offered at Feeder School During Current Academic Year

ELA-Pri-Sec:Comp English-Grade 9 (2101)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Missing	21	65.6	65.6	65.6
	N/A	11	34.4	34.4	100.0
	Total	32	100.0	100.0	

Table E.360. Frequency of Number of Sections of English as a Second Language Offered at Feeder School During Current Academic Year

ELA-Pri-Sec:English as a 2nd Lang (2110)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Missing	11	34.4	34.4	34.4
	N/A	3	9.4	9.4	43.8
	1	3	9.4	9.4	53.1
	2	2	6.3	6.3	59.4
	3	3	9.4	9.4	68.8
	4	1	3.1	3.1	71.9
	5	4	12.5	12.5	84.4
	6	2	6.3	6.3	90.6
	8	1	3.1	3.1	93.8
	9 or more	2	6.3	6.3	100.0
	Total	32	100.0	100.0	

Table E.361. Percentage of Feeder School ELA Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year Houghton Mifflin Reading: A Legacy of Literacy Offered as an Intervention or Basic Program

ELA-Int-Yr:Houghton Mifflin Reading

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Missing	29	90.6	90.6	90.6
	Before 2002	2	6.3	6.3	96.9
	2004 - 05	1	3.1	3.1	100.0
	Total	32	100.0	100.0	

Table E.362. Percentage of Feeder School ELA Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year SRA/Open Court Reading Offered as an Intervention or Basic Program

ELA-Int-Yr:SRA/Open Court Reading

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Missing	30	93.8	93.8	93.8
	Before 2002	2	6.3	6.3	100.0
	Total	32	100.0	100.0	

Table E.363. Percentage of Feeder School ELA Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year The Reader's Choice Offered as an Intervention or Basic Program

ELA-Int-Yr:The Reader's Choice

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Missing	31	96.9	96.9	96.9
	Before 2002	1	3.1	3.1	100.0
	Total	32	100.0	100.0	

Table E.364. Percentage of Feeder School ELA Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year Literature and Language Offered as an Intervention or Basic Program

ELA-Int-Yr:Literature and Language

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Missing	24	75.0	75.0	75.0
	Before 2002	4	12.5	12.5	87.5
	2002 - 03	2	6.3	6.3	93.8
	2003 - 04	2	6.3	6.3	100.0
	Total	32	100.0	100.0	

Table E.365. Percentage of Feeder School ELA Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year McDougal Littell Reading & Language Arts Program Offered as an Intervention or Basic Program

ELA-Int-Yr:McDougal Littell Reading

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Missing	23	71.9	71.9	71.9
	Before 2002	3	9.4	9.4	81.3
	2002 - 03	3	9.4	9.4	90.6
	2003 - 04	3	9.4	9.4	100.0
	Total	32	100.0	100.0	

Table E.366. Percentage of Feeder School ELA Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year Prentice Hall Literature: Timeless Voices, Timeless Themes Offered as an Intervention or Basic Program

ELA-Int-Yr:Prentice-Hall Literature

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Missing	21	65.6	65.6	65.6
	Before 2002	2	6.3	6.3	71.9
	2002 - 03	6	18.8	18.8	90.6
	2003 - 04	3	9.4	9.4	100.0
	Total	32	100.0	100.0	

Table E.367. Percentage of Feeder School ELA Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year Language! Offered as an Intervention or Basic Program

ELA-Int-Yr:Language! Literacy Intervent

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Missing	20	62.5	62.5	62.5
	Before 2002	3	9.4	9.4	71.9
	2002 - 03	7	21.9	21.9	93.8
	2003 - 04	2	6.3	6.3	100.0
	Total	32	100.0	100.0	

Table E.368. Percentage of Feeder School ELA Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year High Point Offered as an Intervention or Basic Program

ELA-Int-Yr:High Point (Hampton Brown)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Missing	23	71.9	71.9	71.9
	Before 2002	1	3.1	3.1	75.0
	2002 - 03	3	9.4	9.4	84.4
	2003 - 04	2	6.3	6.3	90.6
	2004 - 05	3	9.4	9.4	100.0
	Total	32	100.0	100.0	

Table E.369. Percentage of Feeder School ELA Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year High Point for English Learners Offered as an Intervention or Basic Program

ELA-Int-Yr:High Point English Learners

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Missing	17	53.1	53.1	53.1
	Before 2002	1	3.1	3.1	56.3
	2002 - 03	6	18.8	18.8	75.0
	2003 - 04	4	12.5	12.5	87.5
	2004 - 05	4	12.5	12.5	100.0
	Total	32	100.0	100.0	

Table E.370. Percentage of Feeder School ELA Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year READ 180 Offered as an Intervention or Basic Program

ELA-Int-Yr:READ 180

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Missing	28	87.5	87.5	87.5
	Before 2002	1	3.1	3.1	90.6
	2002 - 03	2	6.3	6.3	96.9
	2003 - 04	1	3.1	3.1	100.0
	Total	32	100.0	100.0	

Table E.371. Percentage of Feeder School ELA Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year SRA/Reach Program Offered as an Intervention or Basic Program

ELA-Int-Yr:SRA/Reach Program

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Missing	27	84.4	84.4	84.4
	Before 2002	3	9.4	9.4	93.8
	2002 - 03	2	6.3	6.3	100.0
	Total	32	100.0	100.0	

Table E.372. Percentage of Feeder School ELA Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year Fast Track Reading Program Offered as an Intervention or Basic Program

ELA-Int-Yr:Fast Track Reading Program

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Missing	32	100.0	100.0	100.0

Note. No one listed this as an intervention or basic program.

Table E.373. Feeder School ELA Curriculum Head Reported Offering These Other ELA Intervention or Basic Programs

Program Title	Frequency	Percentage (n=6)
Voyager	1	16.67%
DRW	1	16.67%
Corrective Reading	1	16.67%
Prentice Hall Literature	1	16.67%
Studio	1	16.67%
Ramp Up	1	16.67%

Table E.374. Frequency of Number of Sections of Houghton Mifflin Reading: A Legacy of Literacy Offered at Feeder School During Current Academic Year

ELA-Int-Sec:Houghton Mifflin Reading

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Missing	18	56.3	56.3	56.3
	N/A	12	37.5	37.5	93.8
	6	1	3.1	3.1	96.9
	9 or more	1	3.1	3.1	100.0
	Total	32	100.0	100.0	

Table E.375. Frequency of Number of Sections of SRA/Open Court Reading Offered at Feeder School During Current Academic Year

ELA-Int-Sec:SRA/Open Court Reading

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Missing	21	65.6	65.6	65.6
	N/A	11	34.4	34.4	100.0
	Total	32	100.0	100.0	

Table E.376. Frequency of Number of Sections of The Reader's Choice Offered at Feeder School During Current Academic Year

ELA-Int-Sec:The Reader's Choice

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Missing	21	65.6	65.6	65.6
	N/A	11	34.4	34.4	100.0
	Total	32	100.0	100.0	

Table E.377. Frequency of Number of Sections of Literature and Language Offered at Feeder School During Current Academic Year

ELA-Int-Sec:Literature and Language

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Missing	17	53.1	53.1	53.1
	N/A	7	21.9	21.9	75.0
	4	2	6.3	6.3	81.3
	7	1	3.1	3.1	84.4
	9 or more	5	15.6	15.6	100.0
	Total	32	100.0	100.0	

Table E.378. Frequency of Number of Sections of McDougal Littell Reading & Language Arts Offered at Feeder School During Current Academic Year

ELA-Int-Sec:McDougal Littell Reading

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Missing	15	46.9	46.9	46.9
	N/A	8	25.0	25.0	71.9
	3	1	3.1	3.1	75.0
	9 or more	8	25.0	25.0	100.0
	Total	32	100.0	100.0	

Table E.379. Frequency of Number of Sections of Prentice Hall Literature: Timeless Voices, Timeless Themes Offered at Feeder School During Current Academic Year

ELA-Int-Sec:Prentice-Hall Literature

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Missing	16	50.0	50.0	50.0
	N/A	7	21.9	21.9	71.9
	5	1	3.1	3.1	75.0
	9 or more	8	25.0	25.0	100.0
	Total	32	100.0	100.0	

Table E.380. Frequency of Number of Sections of Language! Offered at Feeder School During Current Academic Year

ELA-Int-Sec:Language! Literacy Intervent

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Missing	18	56.3	56.3	56.3
	N/A	6	18.8	18.8	75.0
	2	2	6.3	6.3	81.3
	4	1	3.1	3.1	84.4
	6	1	3.1	3.1	87.5
	7	1	3.1	3.1	90.6
	9 or more	3	9.4	9.4	100.0
	Total	32	100.0	100.0	

Table E.381. Frequency of Number of Sections of High Point Offered at Feeder School During Current Academic Year

ELA-Int-Sec:High Point (Hampton Brown)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Missing	19	59.4	59.4	59.4
	N/A	7	21.9	21.9	81.3
	1	1	3.1	3.1	84.4
	4	1	3.1	3.1	87.5
	5	1	3.1	3.1	90.6
	6	1	3.1	3.1	93.8
	7	1	3.1	3.1	96.9
	9 or more	1	3.1	3.1	100.0
	Total	32	100.0	100.0	

Table E.382. Frequency of Number of Sections of High Point for English Learner Offered at Feeder School During Current Academic Year

ELA-Int-Sec:High Point English Learners

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Missing	17	53.1	53.1	53.1
	N/A	3	9.4	9.4	62.5
	1	2	6.3	6.3	68.8
	2	2	6.3	6.3	75.0
	3	2	6.3	6.3	81.3
	4	2	6.3	6.3	87.5
	5	1	3.1	3.1	90.6
	8	1	3.1	3.1	93.8
	9 or more	2	6.3	6.3	100.0
	Total	32	100.0	100.0	

Table E.383. Frequency of Number of Sections of READ 180 Offered at Feeder School During Current Academic Year

ELA-Int-Sec:READ 180

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Missing	18	56.3	56.3	56.3
	N/A	9	28.1	28.1	84.4
	2	2	6.3	6.3	90.6
	3	1	3.1	3.1	93.8
	5	1	3.1	3.1	96.9
	9 or more	1	3.1	3.1	100.0
	Total	32	100.0	100.0	

Table E.384. Frequency of Number of Sections of SRA/Reach Program Offered at Feeder School During Current Academic Year

ELA-Int-Sec:SRA/Reach Program

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Missing	22	68.8	68.8	68.8
	N/A	8	25.0	25.0	93.8
	2	1	3.1	3.1	96.9
	4	1	3.1	3.1	100.0
	Total	32	100.0	100.0	

Table E.385. Frequency of Number of Sections of Fast Track Reading Program Offered at Feeder School During Current Academic Year

ELA-Int-Sec:Fast Track Reading Program

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Missing	21	65.6	65.6	65.6
	N/A	11	34.4	34.4	100.0
	Total	32	100.0	100.0	

Table E.386. Feeder School ELA Department Heads Reported Frequency of Full-Time Teachers Working in English Department During Current Academic Year [1]

DHME01:# full-time ELA teachers

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	1	3.1	3.1	3.1
	4	1	3.1	3.1	6.3
	5	2	6.3	6.3	12.5
	6	2	6.3	6.3	18.8
	8	4	12.5	12.5	31.3
	10	4	12.5	12.5	43.8
	11	1	3.1	3.1	46.9
	12	2	6.3	6.3	53.1
	13	1	3.1	3.1	56.3
	14	1	3.1	3.1	59.4
	16 or more	13	40.6	40.6	100.0
	Total	32	100.0	100.0	

Table E.387. Feeder School ELA Department Heads Reported Frequency of Teachers in English Department With Bachelor's as Most Advanced Degree [2]

DHME02A:Bachelor degree

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	1	3.1	4.3	4.3
	1	2	6.3	8.7	13.0
	2	2	6.3	8.7	21.7
	3	1	3.1	4.3	26.1
	4	2	6.3	8.7	34.8
	5	3	9.4	13.0	47.8
	6	2	6.3	8.7	56.5
	7	1	3.1	4.3	60.9
	8	1	3.1	4.3	65.2
	15 or more	8	25.0	34.8	100.0
	Total	23	71.9	100.0	
Missing	System	9	28.1		
Total		32	100.0		

Table E.388. Feeder School ELA Department Heads Reported Frequency of Teachers in English Department With Some Graduate School as Most Advanced Degree [2]

DHME02B:Some graduate school

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	1	3.1	3.8	3.8
	1	3	9.4	11.5	15.4
	2	1	3.1	3.8	19.2
	3	1	3.1	3.8	23.1
	4	1	3.1	3.8	26.9
	5	4	12.5	15.4	42.3
	6	2	6.3	7.7	50.0
	7	3	9.4	11.5	61.5
	8	1	3.1	3.8	65.4
	9	1	3.1	3.8	69.2
	10	2	6.3	7.7	76.9
	15 or more	6	18.8	23.1	100.0
	Total	26	81.3	100.0	
Missing	System	6	18.8		
Total		32	100.0		

Table E.389. Feeder School ELA Department Heads Reported Frequency of Teachers in English Department With Master's as Most Advanced Degree [2]

DHME02C:Masters degree

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	4	12.5	13.3	13.3
	1	1	3.1	3.3	16.7
	2	4	12.5	13.3	30.0
	3	3	9.4	10.0	40.0
	4	1	3.1	3.3	43.3
	5	2	6.3	6.7	50.0
	6	6	18.8	20.0	70.0
	7	4	12.5	13.3	83.3
	8	1	3.1	3.3	86.7
	10	1	3.1	3.3	90.0
	12	2	6.3	6.7	96.7
	15 or more	1	3.1	3.3	100.0
	Total	30	93.8	100.0	
Missing	System	2	6.3		
Total		32	100.0		

Table E.390. Feeder School ELA Department Heads Reported Frequency of Teachers in English Department With Doctorate as Most Advanced Degree [2]

DHME02D:Doctoral degree

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	17	53.1	85.0	85.0
	1	2	6.3	10.0	95.0
	2	1	3.1	5.0	100.0
	Total	20	62.5	100.0	
Missing	System	12	37.5		
Total		32	100.0		

Table E.391. Feeder School ELA Department Heads Reported These Other Degrees for Teachers in the English Department

Other Degrees	Frequency	Percentage (n=1)
Multiple Subject Credential	1	100%

Table E.392. Feeder School ELA Department Heads Reported Proportion of Teachers in English Department Working With an Appropriate ELA Credential [3]

DHME03:Percent with ELA credential

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Missing	2	6.3	6.3	6.3
	Only a few (less than 25%)	3	9.4	9.4	15.6
	Some (25% - 74%)	4	12.5	12.5	28.1
	Most (75% - 90%)	3	9.4	9.4	37.5
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	20	62.5	62.5	100.0
	Total	32	100.0	100.0	

Table E.393. Feeder School ELA Department Heads Reported Proportion of Teachers in English Department Working With an Emergency Credential or Are a District Intern [4]

DHME04:% emergency credential or intern

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Missing	2	6.3	6.3	6.3
	None	16	50.0	50.0	56.3
	Only a few (less than 25%)	10	31.3	31.3	87.5
	Some (25% - 74%)	4	12.5	12.5	100.0
	Total	32	100.0	100.0	

Table E.394. Feeder School ELA Department Heads Characterization of Experience of Teachers in English Department Who Teach Primary or Supplemental ELA Courses [5]

DHME05:Experience-Primary teachers

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Missing	1	3.1	3.1	3.1
	Few have 5 or more years	3	9.4	9.4	12.5
	About half have 5 or more years	9	28.1	28.1	40.6
	Most have 5 or more years	19	59.4	59.4	100.0
	Total	32	100.0	100.0	

Table E.395. Feeder School ELA Department Heads Characterization of Experience of Teachers in English Department Who Teach Intervention or Basic ELA Programs [6]

DHME06:Experience-Intervention teachers

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Missing	1	3.1	3.1	3.1
	Few have 5 or more years	6	18.8	18.8	21.9
	About half have 5 or more years	8	25.0	25.0	46.9
	Most have 5 or more years	17	53.1	53.1	100.0
	Total	32	100.0	100.0	

Table E.396. Feeder School ELA Department Heads Reported Distribution of Economically Disadvantaged Students in General Across Sections of Primary or Supplemental ELA Courses [7]

DHME07A:Economically disadvantaged

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Missing	4	12.5	12.5	12.5
	Clustered in one or a few sections	8	25.0	25.0	37.5
	Across most or all sections	20	62.5	62.5	100.0
	Total	32	100.0	100.0	

Table E.397. Feeder School ELA Department Heads Reported Distribution of English Learner Students Across Sections of Primary or Supplemental ELA Courses [7]

DHME07B:English learners

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Missing	4	12.5	12.5	12.5
	Clustered in one or a few sections	18	56.3	56.3	68.8
	Across most or all sections	10	31.3	31.3	100.0
	Total	32	100.0	100.0	

Table E.398. Feeder School ELA Department Heads Reported Distribution of Remedial Students in General Across Sections of Primary or Supplemental ELA Courses [7]

DHME07C:Remedial students in general

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Missing	4	12.5	12.5	12.5
	Clustered in one or a few sections	8	25.0	25.0	37.5
	Across most or all sections	20	62.5	62.5	100.0
	Total	32	100.0	100.0	

Table E.399. Feeder School ELA Department Heads Reported Distribution of Students Receiving Special Education Services Across Sections of Primary or Supplemental ELA Courses [7]

DHME07D:Receive special ed services

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Missing	5	15.6	15.6	15.6
	Clustered in one or a few sections	20	62.5	62.5	78.1
	Across most or all sections	7	21.9	21.9	100.0
	Total	32	100.0	100.0	

Table E.400. Feeder School ELA Department Heads Reported Proportion of Economically Disadvantaged Students in General Who Receive ELA Instruction From Teacher Without an Appropriate ELA Credential [8]

DHME08A:Pri Exp-Economic disadvantaged

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Missing	3	9.4	9.4	9.4
	None	18	56.3	56.3	65.6
	Only a few (less than 25%)	5	15.6	15.6	81.3
	Some (25% - 74%)	5	15.6	15.6	96.9
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	1	3.1	3.1	100.0
	Total	32	100.0	100.0	

Table E.401. Feeder School ELA Department Heads Reported Proportion of English Learner Students in General Who Receive ELA Instruction From Teacher Without an Appropriate ELA Credential [8]

DHME08B:Pri Exp-English learners

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Missing	3	9.4	9.4	9.4
	None	17	53.1	53.1	62.5
	Only a few (less than 25%)	5	15.6	15.6	78.1
	Some (25% - 74%)	5	15.6	15.6	93.8
	Most (75% - 90%)	1	3.1	3.1	96.9
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	1	3.1	3.1	100.0
	Total	32	100.0	100.0	

Table E.402. Feeder School ELA Department Heads Reported Proportion of Remedial Students in General Who Receive ELA Instruction From Teacher Without an Appropriate ELA Credential [8]

DHME08C:Pri Exp-Remedial students

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Missing	3	9.4	9.4	9.4
	None	19	59.4	59.4	68.8
	Only a few (less than 25%)	4	12.5	12.5	81.3
	Some (25% - 74%)	5	15.6	15.6	96.9
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	1	3.1	3.1	100.0
	Total	32	100.0	100.0	

Table E.403. Feeder School ELA Department Heads Reported Proportion of Students Receiving Special Education Services Who Receive ELA Instruction From Teacher Without an Appropriate ELA Credential [8]

DHME08D:Pri Exp-Special Ed services

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Missing	4	12.5	12.5	12.5
	None	19	59.4	59.4	71.9
	Only a few (less than 25%)	4	12.5	12.5	84.4
	Some (25% - 74%)	2	6.3	6.3	90.6
	Most (75% - 90%)	2	6.3	6.3	96.9
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	1	3.1	3.1	100.0
	Total	32	100.0	100.0	

Table E.404. Feeder School ELA Department Heads Reported Extent of ELA Teacher Experience in Teaching California Content Standards Associated With the CAHSEE Requirement [9]

DHME09:Exp California Content Standards

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Missing	1	3.1	3.1	3.1
	Slight extent	2	6.3	6.3	9.4
	Moderate extent	1	3.1	3.1	12.5
	Great extent	17	53.1	53.1	65.6
	Very great extent	11	34.4	34.4	100.0
	Total	32	100.0	100.0	

Table E.405. Feeder School ELA Department Heads Reported Extent of ELA Course Offerings Being Demanding Courses for Students [10]

DHME10:ELA courses demanding

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Missing	1	3.1	3.1	3.1
	Moderate extent	9	28.1	28.1	31.3
	Great extent	14	43.8	43.8	75.0
	Very great extent	8	25.0	25.0	100.0
	Total	32	100.0	100.0	

Feeder/Middle School Department Head/Lead Teacher—Mathematics, Part 1 Survey: Frequency Distributions

Table E.406. Percentage of Feeder School Math Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year General Math Offered as Primary or Supplemental Course

Mth-Pri-Yr:General Math (2400)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Missing	15	41.7	41.7	41.7
	Before 2002	15	41.7	41.7	83.3
	2002 - 03	1	2.8	2.8	86.1
	2003 - 04	2	5.6	5.6	91.7
	2004 - 05	3	8.3	8.3	100.0
	Total	36	100.0	100.0	

Table E.407. Percentage of Feeder School Math Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year Math A Offered as Primary or Supplemental Course

Mth-Pri-Yr:Math A (2420)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Missing	32	88.9	88.9	88.9
	Before 2002	3	8.3	8.3	97.2
	2003 - 04	1	2.8	2.8	100.0
	Total	36	100.0	100.0	

Table E.408. Percentage of Feeder School Math Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year Math B Offered as Primary or Supplemental Course

Mth-Pri-Yr:Math B (2421)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Missing	32	88.9	88.9	88.9
	Before 2002	3	8.3	8.3	97.2
	2003 - 04	1	2.8	2.8	100.0
	Total	36	100.0	100.0	

Table E.409. Percentage of Feeder School Math Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year Pre-Algebra Offered as Primary or Supplemental Course

Mth-Pri-Yr:Pre-Algebra (2424)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Missing	8	22.2	22.2	22.2
	Before 2002	21	58.3	58.3	80.6
	2002 - 03	4	11.1	11.1	91.7
	2003 - 04	2	5.6	5.6	97.2
	2004 - 05	1	2.8	2.8	100.0
	Total	36	100.0	100.0	

Table E.410. Percentage of Feeder School Math Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year Beginning Algebra Offered as Primary or Supplemental Course

Mth-Pri-Yr:Beginning Algebra (2403)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Missing	10	27.8	27.8	27.8
	Before 2002	21	58.3	58.3	86.1
	2002 - 03	3	8.3	8.3	94.4
	2004 - 05	2	5.6	5.6	100.0
	Total	36	100.0	100.0	

Table E.411. Percentage of Feeder School Math Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year Intermediate Algebra Offered as Primary or Supplemental Course

Mth-Pri-Yr:Intermediate Algebra (2404)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Missing	34	94.4	94.4	94.4
	Before 2002	2	5.6	5.6	100.0
	Total	36	100.0	100.0	

Table E.412. Percentage of Feeder School Math Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year Beginning Algebra Part I Offered as Primary or Supplemental Course

Mth-Pri-Yr:Beginning Algebra I (2428)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Missing	18	50.0	50.0	50.0
	Before 2002	12	33.3	33.3	83.3
	2002 - 03	5	13.9	13.9	97.2
	2003 - 04	1	2.8	2.8	100.0
	Total	36	100.0	100.0	

Table E.413. Percentage of Feeder School Math Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year Beginning Algebra Part II Offered as Primary or Supplemental Course

Mth-Pri-Yr:Beginning Algebra II (2429)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Missing	28	77.8	77.8	77.8
	Before 2002	6	16.7	16.7	94.4
	2002 - 03	2	5.6	5.6	100.0
	Total	36	100.0	100.0	

Table E.414. Percentage of Feeder School Math Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year Integrated Math I Offered as Primary or Supplemental Course

Mth-Pri-Yr:Integrated Math I (2425)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Missing	34	94.4	94.4	94.4
	Before 2002	2	5.6	5.6	100.0
	Total	36	100.0	100.0	

Table E.415. Percentage of Feeder School Math Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year Integrated Math II Offered as Primary or Supplemental Course

Mth-Pri-Yr:Integrated Math II (2426)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Missing	35	97.2	97.2	97.2
	Before 2002	1	2.8	2.8	100.0
	Total	36	100.0	100.0	

Table E.416. Percentage of Feeder School Math Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year Consumer Math Offered as Primary or Supplemental Course

Mth-Pri-Yr:Consumer Math (2401)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Missing	35	97.2	97.2	97.2
	Before 2002	1	2.8	2.8	100.0
	Total	36	100.0	100.0	

Table E.417. Feeder School Math Department Head Reported Offering These Other Primary or Supplemental Courses

Course Title	Frequency	Percentage (n=21)
Geometry	9	42.86%
General Math	6	28.57%
Algebra	5	23.81%
Self Contained	1	4.76%

Table E.418. Percentage of Feeder School Math Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year Remedial Math Offered as Primary or Supplemental Course

Mth-Pri-Yr:Remedial Math (2402)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Missing	30	83.3	83.3	83.3
	Before 2002	4	11.1	11.1	94.4
	2002 - 03	1	2.8	2.8	97.2
	2003 - 04	1	2.8	2.8	100.0
	Total	36	100.0	100.0	

Table E.419. Frequency of Number of Sections of General Math Offered at Feeder School During Current Academic Year

Mth-Pri-Sec:General Math (2400)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Missing	9	25.0	25.0	25.0
	N/A	8	22.2	22.2	47.2
	2	2	5.6	5.6	52.8
	3	4	11.1	11.1	63.9
	6	1	2.8	2.8	66.7
	7	1	2.8	2.8	69.4
	9 or more	11	30.6	30.6	100.0
	Total	36	100.0	100.0	

Table E.420. Frequency of Number of Sections of Math A Offered at Feeder School During Current Academic Year

Mth-Pri-Sec:Math A (2420)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Missing	21	58.3	58.3	58.3
	N/A	14	38.9	38.9	97.2
	9 or more	1	2.8	2.8	100.0
	Total	36	100.0	100.0	

Table E.421. Frequency of Number of Sections of Math B Offered at Feeder School During Current Academic Year

Mth-Pri-Sec:Math B (2421)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Missing	21	58.3	58.3	58.3
	N/A	14	38.9	38.9	97.2
	5	1	2.8	2.8	100.0
	Total	36	100.0	100.0	

Table E.422. Frequency of Number of Sections of Pre-Algebra Offered at Feeder School During Current Academic Year

Mth-Pri-Sec:Pre-Algebra (2424)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Missing	4	11.1	11.1	11.1
	N/A	5	13.9	13.9	25.0
	1	1	2.8	2.8	27.8
	2	1	2.8	2.8	30.6
	3	1	2.8	2.8	33.3
	5	1	2.8	2.8	36.1
	7	1	2.8	2.8	38.9
	9 or more	22	61.1	61.1	100.0
	Total	36	100.0	100.0	

Table E.423. Frequency of Number of Sections of Beginning Algebra Offered at Feeder School During Current Academic Year

Mth-Pri-Sec:Beginning Algebra (2403)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Missing	7	19.4	19.4	19.4
	N/A	5	13.9	13.9	33.3
	1	2	5.6	5.6	38.9
	3	2	5.6	5.6	44.4
	4	4	11.1	11.1	55.6
	5	4	11.1	11.1	66.7
	6	1	2.8	2.8	69.4
	8	2	5.6	5.6	75.0
	9 or more	9	25.0	25.0	100.0
	Total	36	100.0	100.0	

Table E.424. Frequency of Number of Sections of Intermediate Algebra Offered at Feeder School During Current Academic Year

Mth-Pri-Sec:Intermediate Algebra (2404)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Missing	20	55.6	55.6	55.6
	N/A	14	38.9	38.9	94.4
	5	1	2.8	2.8	97.2
	9 or more	1	2.8	2.8	100.0
	Total	36	100.0	100.0	

Table E.425. Frequency of Number of Sections of Beginning Algebra Part I Offered at Feeder School During Current Academic Year

Mth-Pri-Sec:Beginning Algebra I (2428)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Missing	10	27.8	27.8	27.8
	N/A	9	25.0	25.0	52.8
	2	1	2.8	2.8	55.6
	3	1	2.8	2.8	58.3
	5	1	2.8	2.8	61.1
	6	1	2.8	2.8	63.9
	7	2	5.6	5.6	69.4
	8	2	5.6	5.6	75.0
	9 or more	9	25.0	25.0	100.0
	Total	36	100.0	100.0	

Table E.426. Frequency of Number of Sections of Beginning Algebra Part II Offered at Feeder School During Current Academic Year

Mth-Pri-Sec:Beginning Algebra II (2429)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Missing	18	50.0	50.0	50.0
	N/A	11	30.6	30.6	80.6
	2	2	5.6	5.6	86.1
	6	1	2.8	2.8	88.9
	7	2	5.6	5.6	94.4
	8	1	2.8	2.8	97.2
	9 or more	1	2.8	2.8	100.0
	Total	36	100.0	100.0	

Table E.427. Frequency of Number of Sections of Integrated Math I Offered at Feeder School During Current Academic Year

Mth-Pri-Sec:Integrated Math I (2425)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Missing	20	55.6	55.6	55.6
	N/A	15	41.7	41.7	97.2
	4	1	2.8	2.8	100.0
	Total	36	100.0	100.0	

Table E.428. Frequency of Number of Sections of Integrated Math II Offered at Feeder School During Current Academic Year

Mth-Pri-Sec:Integrated Math II (2426)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Missing	21	58.3	58.3	58.3
	N/A	15	41.7	41.7	100.0
	Total	36	100.0	100.0	

Table E.429. Frequency of Number of Sections of Consumer Math Offered at Feeder School During Current Academic Year

Mth-Pri-Sec:Consumer Math (2401)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Missing	21	58.3	58.3	58.3
	N/A	15	41.7	41.7	100.0
	Total	36	100.0	100.0	

Table E.430. Frequency of Number of Sections of Remedial Math Offered at Feeder School During Current Academic Year

Mth-Pri-Sec:Remedial Math (2402)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Missing	19	52.8	52.8	52.8
	N/A	13	36.1	36.1	88.9
	2	2	5.6	5.6	94.4
	3	1	2.8	2.8	97.2
	4	1	2.8	2.8	100.0
	Total	36	100.0	100.0	

Table E.431. Percentage of Feeder School Math Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year Success with Mathcoach Offered as an Intervention or Basic Program

Mth-Int-Yr:Success with Mathcoach

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Missing	35	97.2	97.2	97.2
	2002 - 03	1	2.8	2.8	100.0
	Total	36	100.0	100.0	

Table E.432. Percentage of Feeder School Math Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year Harcourt Math @ 2002 Offered as an Intervention or Basic Program

Mth-Int-Yr:Harcourt Math 2002(w/Spanish)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Missing	34	94.4	94.4	94.4
	Before 2002	1	2.8	2.8	97.2
	2002 - 03	1	2.8	2.8	100.0
	Total	36	100.0	100.0	

Table E.433. Percentage of Feeder School Math Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year Mathematics by Houghton Mifflin Offered as an Intervention or Basic Program

Mth-Int-Yr:Mathematics by Houghton Miff.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Missing	34	94.4	94.4	94.4
	2002 - 03	2	5.6	5.6	100.0
	Total	36	100.0	100.0	

Table E.434. Percentage of Feeder School Math Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year Concepts and Skills Offered as an Intervention or Basic Program

Mth-Int-Yr:Concepts and Skills

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Missing	22	61.1	61.1	61.1
	Before 2002	8	22.2	22.2	83.3
	2002 - 03	3	8.3	8.3	91.7
	2003 - 04	1	2.8	2.8	94.4
	2004 - 05	2	5.6	5.6	100.0
	Total	36	100.0	100.0	

Table E.435. Percentage of Feeder School Math Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year Structure and Method Offered as an Intervention or Basic Program

Mth-Int-Yr:Structure and Method

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Missing	33	91.7	91.7	91.7
	Before 2002	2	5.6	5.6	97.2
	2002 - 03	1	2.8	2.8	100.0
	Total	36	100.0	100.0	

Table E.436. Percentage of Feeder School Math Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year McGraw-Hill Mathematics Offered as an Intervention or Basic Program

Mth-Int-Yr:McGraw-Hill Mathematics

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Missing	35	97.2	97.2	97.2
	Before 2002	1	2.8	2.8	100.0
	Total	36	100.0	100.0	

Table E.437. Percentage of Feeder School Math Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year Prentice Hall Pre-Algebra Offered as an Intervention or Basic Program

Mth-Int-Yr:Prentice Hall Pre-Algebra

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Missing	19	52.8	52.8	52.8
	Before 2002	9	25.0	25.0	77.8
	2002 - 03	5	13.9	13.9	91.7
	2003 - 04	2	5.6	5.6	97.2
	2004 - 05	1	2.8	2.8	100.0
	Total	36	100.0	100.0	

Table E.438. Percentage of Feeder School Math Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year Prentice Hall Algebra 1 Offered as an Intervention or Basic Program

Mth-Int-Yr:Prentice Hall Algebra 1

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Missing	23	63.9	63.9	63.9
	Before 2002	8	22.2	22.2	86.1
	2002 - 03	1	2.8	2.8	88.9
	2003 - 04	1	2.8	2.8	91.7
	2004 - 05	3	8.3	8.3	100.0
	Total	36	100.0	100.0	

Table E.439. Percentage of Feeder School Math Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year Progress in Mathematics Offered as an Intervention or Basic Program

Mth-Int-Yr:Progress in Mathematics

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Missing	35	97.2	97.2	97.2
	2003 - 04	1	2.8	2.8	100.0
	Total	36	100.0	100.0	

Table E.440. Percentage of Feeder School Math Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year Saxon Math Offered as an Intervention or Basic Program

Mth-Int-Yr:Saxon Math K-3

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Missing	35	97.2	97.2	97.2
	2003 - 04	1	2.8	2.8	100.0
	Total	36	100.0	100.0	

Table E.441. Percentage of Feeder School Math Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year Math 54, 65, 76, and 87 Offered as an Intervention or Basic Program

Mth-Int-Yr:Math 54, 65, 76, and 87

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Missing	33	91.7	91.7	91.7
	Before 2002	1	2.8	2.8	94.4
	2003 - 04	2	5.6	5.6	100.0
	Total	36	100.0	100.0	

Table E.442. Percentage of Feeder School Math Department Heads Who Reported First Academic Year Scott Foresman CA Mathematics Offered as an Intervention or Basic Program

Mth-Int-Yr:Scott Foresman CA Mathematics

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Missing	31	86.1	86.1	86.1
	Before 2002	4	11.1	11.1	97.2
	2004 - 05	1	2.8	2.8	100.0
	Total	36	100.0	100.0	

Table E.443. Feeder School Math Department Heads Reported Offering These Other Intervention or Basic Programs

Program Title	Frequency	Percentage (n=20)
Geometry	3	15.00%
Math	3	15.00%
Algebra	3	15.00%
Algebra 1 Concepts	2	10.00%
Options	1	5.00%
Success Maker Intervention	1	5.00%
College Prep	1	5.00%
Tutor	1	5.00%
SRA	1	5.00%
Adventures Math	1	5.00%
Mathematics Structure & Method	1	5.00%
Math Support	1	5.00%
CAHSEE Intervention	1	5.00%

Table E.444. Frequency of Number of Sections of Success with Mathcoach Offered at Feeder School During Current Academic Year

Mth-Int-Sec:Success with Mathcoach

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Missing	21	58.3	58.3	58.3
	N/A	14	38.9	38.9	97.2
	9 or more	1	2.8	2.8	100.0
	Total	36	100.0	100.0	

Table E.445. Frequency of Number of Sections of Harcourt Math @ 2002 Offered at Feeder School During Current Academic Year

Mth-Int-Sec:Harcourt Math 2002(w/Spanish

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Missing	22	61.1	61.1	61.1
	N/A	12	33.3	33.3	94.4
	9 or more	2	5.6	5.6	100.0
	Total	36	100.0	100.0	

Table E.446. Frequency of Number of Sections of Mathematics by Houghton Mifflin Offered at Feeder School During Current Academic Year

Mth-Int-Sec:Mathematics by Houghton Miff

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Missing	23	63.9	63.9	63.9
	N/A	11	30.6	30.6	94.4
	3	1	2.8	2.8	97.2
	7	1	2.8	2.8	100.0
	Total	36	100.0	100.0	

Table E.447. Frequency of Number of Sections of Concepts and Skills Offered at Feeder School During Current Academic Year

Mth-Int-Sec:Concepts and Skills

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Missing	15	41.7	41.7	41.7
	N/A	7	19.4	19.4	61.1
	6	1	2.8	2.8	63.9
	8	1	2.8	2.8	66.7
	9 or more	12	33.3	33.3	100.0
	Total	36	100.0	100.0	

Table E.448. Frequency of Number of Sections of Structure and Method Offered at Feeder School During Current Academic Year

Mth-Int-Sec:Structure and Method

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Missing	19	52.8	52.8	52.8
	N/A	15	41.7	41.7	94.4
	2	1	2.8	2.8	97.2
	9 or more	1	2.8	2.8	100.0
	Total	36	100.0	100.0	

Table E.449. Frequency of Number of Sections of McGraw-Hill Mathematics Offered at Feeder School During Current Academic Year

Mth-Int-Sec:McGraw-Hill Mathematics

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Missing	23	63.9	63.9	63.9
	N/A	13	36.1	36.1	100.0
	Total	36	100.0	100.0	

Table E.450. Frequency of Number of Sections of Prentice Hall Pre-Algebra Offered at Feeder School During Current Academic Year

Mth-Int-Sec:Prentice Hall Pre-Algebra

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Missing	13	36.1	36.1	36.1
	N/A	7	19.4	19.4	55.6
	1	1	2.8	2.8	58.3
	2	1	2.8	2.8	61.1
	3	1	2.8	2.8	63.9
	5	1	2.8	2.8	66.7
	7	1	2.8	2.8	69.4
	9 or more	11	30.6	30.6	100.0
	Total	36	100.0	100.0	

Table E.451. Frequency of Number of Sections of Prentice Hall Algebra 1 Offered at Feeder School During Current Academic Year

Mth-Int-Sec:Prentice Hall Algebra 1

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Missing	15	41.7	41.7	41.7
	N/A	10	27.8	27.8	69.4
	1	3	8.3	8.3	77.8
	2	1	2.8	2.8	80.6
	6	1	2.8	2.8	83.3
	8	2	5.6	5.6	88.9
	9 or more	4	11.1	11.1	100.0
	Total	36	100.0	100.0	

Table E.452. Frequency of Number of Sections of Progress in Mathematics Offered at Feeder School During Current Academic Year

Mth-Int-Sec:Progress in Mathematics

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Missing	22	61.1	61.1	61.1
	N/A	13	36.1	36.1	97.2
	1	1	2.8	2.8	100.0
	Total	36	100.0	100.0	

Table E.453. Frequency of Number of Sections of Saxon Math Offered at Feeder School During Current Academic Year

Mth-Int-Sec:Saxon Math K-3

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Missing	21	58.3	58.3	58.3
	N/A	14	38.9	38.9	97.2
	4	1	2.8	2.8	100.0
	Total	36	100.0	100.0	

Table E.454. Frequency of Number of Sections of Math 54, 65, 76, 87 Offered at Feeder School During Current Academic Year

Mth-Int-Sec:Math 54, 65, 76, and 87

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Missing	20	55.6	55.6	55.6
	N/A	13	36.1	36.1	91.7
	2	2	5.6	5.6	97.2
	3	1	2.8	2.8	100.0
	Total	36	100.0	100.0	

Table E.455. Frequency of Number of Sections of Scott Foresman CA Mathematics Offered at Feeder School During Current Academic Year

Mth-Int-Sec:Scott Foresman CA Mathematic

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Missing	20	55.6	55.6	55.6
	N/A	12	33.3	33.3	88.9
	2	1	2.8	2.8	91.7
	9 or more	3	8.3	8.3	100.0
	Total	36	100.0	100.0	

Table E.456. Feeder School Math Department Heads Reported Frequency of Full-Time Teachers Working in Math Department During Current Academic Year [1]

DHMM01:# full-time Math teachers

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	2	5.6	5.6	5.6
	4	2	5.6	5.6	11.1
	5	1	2.8	2.8	13.9
	6	5	13.9	13.9	27.8
	7	5	13.9	13.9	41.7
	9	2	5.6	5.6	47.2
	10	4	11.1	11.1	58.3
	11	2	5.6	5.6	63.9
	13	3	8.3	8.3	72.2
	14	3	8.3	8.3	80.6
	15	1	2.8	2.8	83.3
	16 or more	6	16.7	16.7	100.0
	Total	36	100.0	100.0	

Table E.457. Feeder School Math Department Heads Reported Frequency of Teachers in Math Department With Bachelor's as Most Advanced Degree [2]

DHMM02A:Bachelor degree

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	2	5.6	7.7	7.7
	1	6	16.7	23.1	30.8
	2	1	2.8	3.8	34.6
	4	2	5.6	7.7	42.3
	5	1	2.8	3.8	46.2
	6	1	2.8	3.8	50.0
	7	1	2.8	3.8	53.8
	8	2	5.6	7.7	61.5
	10	2	5.6	7.7	69.2
	11	1	2.8	3.8	73.1
	13	2	5.6	7.7	80.8
	14	1	2.8	3.8	84.6
	15 or more	4	11.1	15.4	100.0
	Total	26	72.2	100.0	
Missing	System	10	27.8		
Total		36	100.0		

Table E.458. Feeder School Math Department Heads Reported Frequency of Teachers in Math Department With Some Graduate School as Most Advanced Degree [2]

DHMM02B:Some graduate school

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	3	8.3	9.4	9.4
	1	3	8.3	9.4	18.8
	2	3	8.3	9.4	28.1
	3	1	2.8	3.1	31.3
	4	5	13.9	15.6	46.9
	5	4	11.1	12.5	59.4
	6	3	8.3	9.4	68.8
	7	2	5.6	6.3	75.0
	8	1	2.8	3.1	78.1
	9	1	2.8	3.1	81.3
	10	4	11.1	12.5	93.8
	15 or more	2	5.6	6.3	100.0
	Total	32	88.9	100.0	
Missing	System	4	11.1		
Total		36	100.0		

Table E.459. Feeder School Math Department Heads Reported Frequency of Teachers in Math Department With Master's as Most Advanced Degree [2]

DHMM02C:Masters degree

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	4	11.1	12.1	12.1
	1	5	13.9	15.2	27.3
	2	7	19.4	21.2	48.5
	3	6	16.7	18.2	66.7
	4	5	13.9	15.2	81.8
	5	1	2.8	3.0	84.8
	6	4	11.1	12.1	97.0
	7	1	2.8	3.0	100.0
	Total	33	91.7	100.0	
Missing	System	3	8.3		
Total		36	100.0		

Table E.460. Feeder School Math Department Heads Reported Frequency of Teachers in Math Department With Doctorate as Most Advanced Degree [2]

DHMM02D:Doctoral degree

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	19	52.8	86.4	86.4
	1	3	8.3	13.6	100.0
	Total	22	61.1	100.0	
Missing	System	14	38.9		
Total		36	100.0		

Table E.461. Feeder School Math Department Heads Reported Proportion of Teachers in Math Department Working With an Appropriate Math Credential [3]

DHMM03:Percent with Math credential

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Missing	1	2.8	2.8	2.8
	None	1	2.8	2.8	5.6
	Only a few (less than 25%)	4	11.1	11.1	16.7
	Some (25% - 74%)	7	19.4	19.4	36.1
	Most (75% - 90%)	6	16.7	16.7	52.8
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	17	47.2	47.2	100.0
	Total	36	100.0	100.0	

Table E.462. Feeder School Math Department Heads Reported Proportion of Teachers in Math Department Working With an Emergency Credential or Are a District Intern [4]

DHMM04:% emergency credential or intern

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	None	18	50.0	50.0	50.0
	Only a few (less than 25%)	11	30.6	30.6	80.6
	Some (25% - 74%)	4	11.1	11.1	91.7
	Most (75% - 90%)	1	2.8	2.8	94.4
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	2	5.6	5.6	100.0
	Total	36	100.0	100.0	

Table E.463. Feeder School Math Department Heads Characterization of Experience of Teachers in Math Department Who Teach Primary or Supplemental Math Courses [5]

DHMM05:Experience-Primary teachers

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Missing	1	2.8	2.8	2.8
	Few have 5 or more years	7	19.4	19.4	22.2
	About half have 5 or more years	9	25.0	25.0	47.2
	Most have 5 or more years	19	52.8	52.8	100.0
	Total	36	100.0	100.0	

Table E.464. Feeder School Math Department Heads Characterization of Experience of Teachers in Math Department Who Teach Intervention or Basic Math Programs [6]

DHMM06:Experience-Intervention teachers

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Few have 5 or more years	8	22.2	22.2	22.2
	About half have 5 or more years	7	19.4	19.4	41.7
	Most have 5 or more years	21	58.3	58.3	100.0
	Total	36	100.0	100.0	

Table E.465. Feeder School Math Department Heads Reported Distribution of Economically Disadvantaged Students in General Across Sections of Primary or Supplemental Math Courses [7]

DHMM07A:Economically disadvantaged

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Missing	3	8.3	8.3	8.3
	Clustered in one or a few sections	3	8.3	8.3	16.7
	Across most or all sections	30	83.3	83.3	100.0
	Total	36	100.0	100.0	

Table E.466. Feeder School Math Department Heads Reported Distribution of English Learner Students Across Sections of Primary or Supplemental Math Courses [7]

DHMM07B:English learners

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Missing	3	8.3	8.3	8.3
	Clustered in one or a few sections	15	41.7	41.7	50.0
	Across most or all sections	18	50.0	50.0	100.0
	Total	36	100.0	100.0	

Table E.467. Feeder School Math Department Heads Reported Distribution of Remedial Students in General Across Sections of Primary or Supplemental Math Courses [7]

DHMM07C:Remedial students in general

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Missing	2	5.6	5.6	5.6
	Clustered in one or a few sections	13	36.1	36.1	41.7
	Across most or all sections	21	58.3	58.3	100.0
	Total	36	100.0	100.0	

Table E.468. Feeder School Math Department Heads Reported Distribution of Students Receiving Special Education Services Across Sections of Primary or Supplemental Math Courses [7]

DHMM07D:Receive special ed services

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Missing	4	11.1	11.1	11.1
	Clustered in one or a few sections	20	55.6	55.6	66.7
	Across most or all sections	12	33.3	33.3	100.0
	Total	36	100.0	100.0	

Table E.469. Feeder School Math Department Heads Reported Proportion of Economically Disadvantaged Students in General Who Receive Math Instruction From Teacher Without an Appropriate Math Credential [8]

DHMM08A:Pri Exp-Economic disadvantaged

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Missing	1	2.8	2.8	2.8
	None	15	41.7	41.7	44.4
	Only a few (less than 25%)	12	33.3	33.3	77.8
	Some (25% - 74%)	4	11.1	11.1	88.9
	Most (75% - 90%)	2	5.6	5.6	94.4
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	2	5.6	5.6	100.0
	Total	36	100.0	100.0	

Table E.470. Feeder School Math Department Heads Reported Proportion of English Learner Students in General Who Receive Math Instruction From Teacher Without an Appropriate Math Credential [8]

DHMM08B:Pri Exp-English learners

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Missing	1	2.8	2.8	2.8
	None	18	50.0	50.0	52.8
	Only a few (less than 25%)	10	27.8	27.8	80.6
	Some (25% - 74%)	3	8.3	8.3	88.9
	Most (75% - 90%)	1	2.8	2.8	91.7
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	3	8.3	8.3	100.0
	Total	36	100.0	100.0	

Table E.471. Feeder School Math Department Heads Reported Proportion of Remedial Students in General Who Receive Math Instruction From Teacher Without an Appropriate Math Credential [8]

DHMM08C:Pri Exp-Remedial students

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Missing	1	2.8	2.8	2.8
	None	17	47.2	47.2	50.0
	Only a few (less than 25%)	10	27.8	27.8	77.8
	Some (25% - 74%)	4	11.1	11.1	88.9
	Most (75% - 90%)	1	2.8	2.8	91.7
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	3	8.3	8.3	100.0
	Total	36	100.0	100.0	

Table E.472. Feeder School Math Department Heads Reported Proportion of Students Receiving Special Education Sevices Who Receive Math Instruction From Teacher Without an Appropriate Math Credential [8]

DHMM08D:Pri Exp-Special Ed services

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Missing	2	5.6	5.6	5.6
	None	15	41.7	41.7	47.2
	Only a few (less than 25%)	12	33.3	33.3	80.6
	Some (25% - 74%)	1	2.8	2.8	83.3
	Most (75% - 90%)	3	8.3	8.3	91.7
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	3	8.3	8.3	100.0
	Total	36	100.0	100.0	

Table E.473. Feeder School Math Department Heads Reported Extent of Math Teacher Experience in Teaching California Content Standards Associated With the CAHSEE Requirement [9]

DHMM11:Exp California Content Standards

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Missing	1	2.8	2.8	2.8
	Not at all	1	2.8	2.8	5.6
	Slight extent	1	2.8	2.8	8.3
	Moderate extent	9	25.0	25.0	33.3
	Great extent	13	36.1	36.1	69.4
	Very great extent	11	30.6	30.6	100.0
	Total	36	100.0	100.0	

Table E.474. Feeder School Math Department Heads Reported Extent of Math Course Offerings Being Demanding Courses for Students [10]

DHMM12:Math courses demanding

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Missing	1	2.8	2.8	2.8
	Moderate extent	7	19.4	19.4	22.2
	Great extent	17	47.2	47.2	69.4
	Very great extent	11	30.6	30.6	100.0
	Total	36	100.0	100.0	

Feeder/Middle School Teacher, Part 2 Survey: Frequency Distributions

Table E.475. Feeder School Teachers Subject Area Associated With Reported Courses or Instructional Programs [2]

MST02:Subject area

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	English-Language Arts	196	52.3	52.5	52.5
	Mathematics	177	47.2	47.5	100.0
	Total	373	99.5	100.0	
Missing	Missing	2	.5		
Total		375	100.0		

Table E.476. Type of Reported Feeder School Courses or Instructional Programs [3]

MST03:Type course/instructional program

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Primary course open to all students	276	73.6	74.2	74.2
	Required alternative to primary course	48	12.8	12.9	87.1
	Required supplemental remediation	28	7.5	7.5	94.6
	Elective course open to all students	3	.8	.8	95.4
	Elective course targeted to remediation	9	2.4	2.4	97.8
	Other (specify below)	8	2.1	2.2	100.0
	Total	372	99.2	100.0	
Missing	Missing	3	.8		
Total		375	100.0		

Table E.477. Type of Reported 'Other' Feeder School Courses or Instructional Programs [3]

Other Course or Instructional Program	Frequency	Percentage (n=6)
Primary Course/Required of all students	1	16.67%
Required for 8th Grade	1	16.67%
7th and 8th Grade Combo Course	1	16.67%
Special Education	1	16.67%
Remediation	1	16.67%
Elective Course	1	16.67%

Table E.478. Percentage of Reported Feeder School Courses or Instructional Programs Offered Before or After School [4]

MST04A:Offer Before/After school course

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not marked	363	96.8	97.1	97.1
	Marked	11	2.9	2.9	100.0
	Total	374	99.7	100.0	
Missing	Missing	1	.3		
Total		375	100.0		

Table E.479. Percentage of Reported Feeder School Courses or Instructional Programs Offered as Summer School Course [4]

MST04B:Offer Summer school course

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not marked	357	95.2	95.5	95.5
	Marked	17	4.5	4.5	100.0
	Total	374	99.7	100.0	
Missing	Missing	1	.3		
Total		375	100.0		

Table E.480. Percentage of Reported Feeder School Courses or Instructional Programs Offered as Summer School Program [4]

MST04C:Offer Summer program

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not marked	370	98.7	98.9	98.9
	Marked	4	1.1	1.1	100.0
	Total	374	99.7	100.0	
Missing	Missing	1	.3		
Total		375	100.0		

Table E.481. Percentage of Reported Feeder School Courses or Instructional Programs Offered During Normal School Hours [4]

MST04D:Offer During normal school hours

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not marked	5	1.3	1.3	1.3
	Marked	369	98.4	98.7	100.0
	Total	374	99.7	100.0	
Missing	Missing	1	.3		
Total		375	100.0		

Table E.482. Percentage of Reported Feeder School Courses or Instructional Programs Offered During Intercession Breaks [4]

MST04E:Offer Intercession breaks

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not marked	367	97.9	98.1	98.1
	Marked	7	1.9	1.9	100.0
	Total	374	99.7	100.0	
Missing	Missing	1	.3		
Total		375	100.0		

Table E.483. Frequency of Duration of Reported Feeder School Courses or Instructional Programs [5]

MST05:Duration of course/program

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Quarter	2	.5	.5	.5
	Trimester	9	2.4	2.4	2.9
	Semester	4	1.1	1.1	4.0
	Full school year	358	95.5	96.0	100.0
	Total	373	99.5	100.0	
Missing	Missing	2	.5		
Total		375	100.0		

Table E.484. Frequency of Number of Students Taught Reported Feeder School Courses or Instructional Programs [6]

MST06:Number of students in this course

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	10 or fewer	2	.5	.5	.5
	11 - 30	52	13.9	13.9	14.5
	31 - 60	76	20.3	20.4	34.9
	61 -100	79	21.1	21.2	56.0
	More than 100	164	43.7	44.0	100.0
	Total	373	99.5	100.0	
Missing	Missing	2	.5		
Total		375	100.0		

Table E.485. Proportion of Students Enrolled in Reported Feeder School Courses or Instructional Programs Who Are English Learners [7]

MST07:Proportion English learners

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not sure	17	4.5	4.6	4.6
	Only a few (less than 25%)	202	53.9	54.7	59.3
	Some (25% - 74%)	61	16.3	16.5	75.9
	Most (75% - 90%)	27	7.2	7.3	83.2
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	62	16.5	16.8	100.0
	Total	369	98.4	100.0	
Missing	Missing	6	1.6		
Total		375	100.0		

Table E.486. Proportion of Students Enrolled in Reported Feeder School Courses or Instructional Programs Who Are Students Receiving Special Education Services [8]

MST08:Proportion special education

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not sure	40	10.7	10.8	10.8
	Only a few (less than 25%)	279	74.4	75.6	86.4
	Some (25% - 74%)	30	8.0	8.1	94.6
	Most (75% - 90%)	1	.3	.3	94.9
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	19	5.1	5.1	100.0
	Total	369	98.4	100.0	
Missing	Missing	6	1.6		
Total		375	100.0		

Table E.487. Proportion of Students Enrolled in Reported Feeder School Courses or Instructional Programs Who Are Economically Disadvantaged [9]

MST09:Proportion "at-risk"

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not sure	74	19.7	20.0	20.0
	Only a few (less than 25%)	76	20.3	20.5	40.5
	Some (25% - 74%)	97	25.9	26.2	66.8
	Most (75% - 90%)	58	15.5	15.7	82.4
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	65	17.3	17.6	100.0
	Total	370	98.7	100.0	
Missing	Missing	5	1.3		
Total		375	100.0		

Table E.488. Frequency of Description of Students Enrolled in Reported Feeder School Courses or Instructional Programs [10]

MST10:Students prepared for course

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Most students without prerequisite skills	124	33.1	33.4	33.4
	Some students without prerequisite skills	188	50.1	50.7	84.1
	Almost all well prepared	59	15.7	15.9	100.0
	Total	371	98.9	100.0	
Missing	Missing	4	1.1		
Total		375	100.0		

Table E.489. Proportion of Students Enrolled in Reported Feeder School Courses or Instructional Programs Who Achieved At Least Basic Performance on Last Year's STAR CST Test [11]

MST11:% achieved basic performance

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not sure	59	15.7	16.3	16.3
	Only a few (less than 25%)	84	22.4	23.1	39.4
	Some (25% - 74%)	131	34.9	36.1	75.5
	Most (75% - 90%)	61	16.3	16.8	92.3
	Nearly all (more than 90%)	28	7.5	7.7	100.0
	Total	363	96.8	100.0	
Missing	Missing	12	3.2		
Total		375	100.0		

Table E.490. Percentage of Feeder School Teachers Reporting Low Student Attendance Limits Effectiveness of Reported Feeder School Courses or Instructional Programs [12]

MST12A:Low student attendance

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not at all	82	21.9	22.8	22.8
	Slight extent	126	33.6	35.0	57.8
	Moderate extent	72	19.2	20.0	77.8
	Great extent	38	10.1	10.6	88.3
	Very great extent	42	11.2	11.7	100.0
	Total	360	96.0	100.0	
Missing	Missing	15	4.0		
Total		375	100.0		

Table E.491. Percentage of Feeder School Teachers Reporting Low Student Motivation Limits Effectiveness of Reported Feeder School Courses or Instructional Programs [12]

MST12B:Low student motivation

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not at all	21	5.6	5.8	5.8
	Slight extent	61	16.3	16.7	22.5
	Moderate extent	95	25.3	26.0	48.5
	Great extent	94	25.1	25.8	74.2
	Very great extent	94	25.1	25.8	100.0
	Total	365	97.3	100.0	
Missing	Missing	10	2.7		
Total		375	100.0		

Table E.492. Percentage of Feeder School Teachers Reporting Low Student English Proficiency Limits Effectiveness of Reported Feeder School Courses or Instructional Programs [12]

MST12C:Low English proficiency

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not at all	81	21.6	22.6	22.6
	Slight extent	130	34.7	36.2	58.8
	Moderate extent	84	22.4	23.4	82.2
	Great extent	38	10.1	10.6	92.8
	Very great extent	26	6.9	7.2	100.0
	Total	359	95.7	100.0	
Missing	Missing	16	4.3		
Total		375	100.0		

Table E.493. Percentage of Feeder School Teachers Reporting Low Parental Support Limits Effectiveness of Reported Feeder School Courses or Instructional Programs [12]

MST12D:Low parental support

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not at all	25	6.7	6.9	6.9
	Slight extent	76	20.3	21.1	28.0
	Moderate extent	123	32.8	34.1	62.0
	Great extent	80	21.3	22.2	84.2
	Very great extent	57	15.2	15.8	100.0
	Total	361	96.3	100.0	
Missing	Missing	14	3.7		
Total		375	100.0		

Table E.494. Percentage of Feeder School Teachers Reporting Lack of Materials/ Resources Limits Effectiveness of Reported Feeder School Courses or Instructional Programs [12]

MST12E:Lack of materials/resources

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not at all	152	40.5	42.8	42.8
	Slight extent	116	30.9	32.7	75.5
	Moderate extent	55	14.7	15.5	91.0
	Great extent	23	6.1	6.5	97.5
	Very great extent	9	2.4	2.5	100.0
	Total	355	94.7	100.0	
Missing	Missing	20	5.3		
Total		375	100.0		

Table E.495. Percentage of Feeder School Teachers Reporting Limitations in Own Knowledge or Experience Limits Effectiveness of Reported Feeder School Courses or Instructional Programs [12]

MST12F:Own knowledge/experience limits

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not at all	225	60.0	62.7	62.7
	Slight extent	105	28.0	29.2	91.9
	Moderate extent	12	3.2	3.3	95.3
	Great extent	11	2.9	3.1	98.3
	Very great extent	6	1.6	1.7	100.0
	Total	359	95.7	100.0	
Missing	Missing	16	4.3		
Total		375	100.0		

Table E.496. Percentage of Feeder School Teachers Reporting Own Difficulty in Engaging Students Limits Effectiveness of Reported Feeder School Courses or Instructional Programs [12]

MST12G:Difficulty engaging students

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not at all	158	42.1	44.1	44.1
	Slight extent	149	39.7	41.6	85.8
	Moderate extent	34	9.1	9.5	95.3
	Great extent	15	4.0	4.2	99.4
	Very great extent	2	.5	.6	100.0
	Total	358	95.5	100.0	
Missing	Missing	17	4.5		
Total		375	100.0		

Table E.497. Percentage of Feeder School Teachers Who Use a Textbook for Reported Courses or Instructional Programs [13]

MST13:Use textbook for course/program?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	30	8.0	8.0	8.0
	Yes	343	91.5	92.0	100.0
	Total	373	99.5	100.0	
Missing	Missing	2	.5		
Total		375	100.0		

Table E.498. Feeder School Teachers ELA Textbook Titles [13A]

Textbook Title	Frequency	Percentage (n=160)
Timeless Voices Times Themes	34	21.25%
Literature and Language Arts	32	20.00%
The Language of Literature	35	21.88%
High Point	25	15.63%
Elements of Literature	2	1.25%
Skill Application	2	1.25%
Worriers Grammar	1	0.63%
The Language of Learning	1	0.63%
J & J Language Readers	1	0.63%
Interactive Reader	1	0.63%
Writing and Grammar	1	0.63%
Timeless Treasures	1	0.63%
Skills intervention kit	1	0.63%
Literacy Intervention	1	0.63%

Table E.499. Feeder School Teachers Math Textbook Titles [13A]

Textbook Title	Frequency	Percentage (n=161)
Algebra	70	43.48%
Mathematics Concepts and Skills	45	27.95%
Pre Algebra	33	20.50%
Geometry	5	3.11%
Mathematics Structure and Method	2	1.24%
Scott Foresman Mathematics	2	1.24%
Passports to Algebra	1	0.62%
Foundations for Algebra	1	0.62%
Pre Algebra Integrated	1	0.62%
Basic Math Skills	1	0.62%

Table E.500. Feeder School Teachers Author/Publisher Names [13A]

Textbook Title	Frequency	Percentage (n=362)
Prentice Hall	114	31.49%
McDougal Littell	114	31.49%
Heath	3	0.83%
Holt, Rinehart, Winston	34	9.39%
Hampton Brown	23	6.35%
Larson, Boswell, Stiff, Kanold	22	6.08%
Glencoe/McGraw Hill	14	3.87%
Sopris	7	1.93%
Houghton Mifflin	6	1.66%
Addison Wesley	3	0.83%
Scott Foresman	3	0.83%
Saxon Hake	2	0.55%
Dolciani	2	0.55%
Jane Fell	2	0.55%
Stanley Smith	2	0.55%
AGS	2	0.55%
SRA	1	0.28%
Engelmann, Meyer, Johnson, Carnine	1	0.28%
Danson, Landan, McCraken, Thompson	1	0.28%
Beers Odell Holt Publishing	1	0.28%
College Preparatory Materials	1	0.28%
Jennie Bennet	1	0.28%
August V. Treff and Donald Jacobs	1	0.28%
Harcourt School Publishers	1	0.28%
A Literacy Intervention Curriculum	1	0.28%

Table E.501. Frequency of Year When School Adopted Textbook Used in Reported Feeder School Courses or Instructional Programs [13B]

MST13B:When did school adopt textbook

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not applicable	42	11.2	11.7	11.7
	Before 2002	93	24.8	25.8	37.5
	2002 - 2003	138	36.8	38.3	75.8
	2003 - 2004	64	17.1	17.8	93.6
	2004 - 2005	23	6.1	6.4	100.0
	Total	360	96.0	100.0	
Missing	Missing	15	4.0		
Total		375	100.0		

Table E.502. Proportion of Textbook Used in Reported Feeder School Courses or Instructional Programs [13C]

MST13C:How much of textbook do you use?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Too many variables to categorize	6	1.6	1.6	1.6
	Not applicable	31	8.3	8.3	9.9
	Some (less than 40%)	43	11.5	11.5	21.4
	About half (40% - 60%)	74	19.7	19.8	41.3
	Most (61% - 95%)	154	41.1	41.3	82.6
	All (96% - 100%)	65	17.3	17.4	100.0
	Total	373	99.5	100.0	
Missing	Missing	2	.5		
Total		375	100.0		

Table E.503. Percentage of Feeder School Teachers Reporting Frequency of Using Other Texts in Reported Feeder School Courses or Instructional Programs [14]

MST14A:Use Other text(s)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Less than 1 x per month or never	133	35.5	37.8	37.8
	1 x per month	63	16.8	17.9	55.7
	1 x per week	61	16.3	17.3	73.0
	2 - 3x per week	63	16.8	17.9	90.9
	Daily	32	8.5	9.1	100.0
	Total	352	93.9	100.0	
Missing	System	23	6.1		
Total		375	100.0		

Table E.504. Feeder School Teachers Supplemental Materials Titles [14A]

Title	Frequency	Percentage (n=326)
Grammar, Reading, Writing	44	64.71%
Interactive Reader	5	7.35%
Readers Companion	4	5.88%
Hot Topic	3	4.41%
Accelerated Reader	3	4.41%
Grammar Work Book	2	2.94%
Grammar Usage and Mechanics	2	2.94%
Worriers Grammar	2	2.94%
Writers Craft	2	2.94%
Contemporary Reader	2	2.94%
Skills Selection Support	2	2.94%
Grammar to Go	1	1.47%
Grammar Network	1	1.47%
Spectrum Spelling	1	1.47%
Basic Skills in English	1	1.47%
Reading Writing Sourcebook	1	1.47%
J & J Readers	1	1.47%
Fluency Assessment and Program	1	1.47%
Kate Kinsella Strategies	1	1.47%
Literature & Poetry Materials	24	35.29%
Language Network	5	7.35%
The Language of Literature	4	5.88%
Bridges to Literature	3	4.41%
Elements of Literature	3	4.41%
Timeless Voices Timeless Themes	1	1.47%
Prentice Hall	1	1.47%
Juvenile Adult Literature	1	1.47%
Nonfiction	1	1.47%
Dauliere's Greek Myths	1	1.47%

Table E.504. continued

Title	Frequency	Percentage (n=326)
Novels		
The Giver	5	4.90%
Farewell to Manzanar	5	4.90%
Midsummer Nights Dream	4	3.92%
The Outsiders	4	3.92%
The Call of the Wild	3	2.94%
House on Mango Street	3	2.94%
My Brother Sam is Dead	3	2.94%
Roll of Thunder Hear My Cry	3	2.94%
Holes	3	2.94%
Hatchet	2	1.96%
Lord of the Flies	2	1.96%
Fahrenheit 451	2	1.96%
The Pearl	2	1.96%
Freak the Mighty	2	1.96%
To kill a Mocking Bird	2	1.96%
Summer of my German Soldier	2	1.96%
The Crucible	1	0.98%
Scarlet Letter	1	0.98%
Quiet on the Western Front	1	0.98%
The Crossing	1	0.98%
A Raisin in the Sun	1	0.98%
The Stout Hearted Seven	1	0.98%
Woodsong	1	0.98%
The House of Dies Drear	1	0.98%
The Trojan Horse	1	0.98%
Animal Farm	1	0.98%
Night	1	0.98%
The Old Man and the Sea	1	0.98%
Twelfth Night	1	0.98%
Island of Blue Dolphins	1	0.98%
Sadako and the Paper Cranes	1	0.98%
I felt like I was form another planet	1	0.98%
A Tale of Two Cities	1	0.98%
Where the Red Fern Grows	1	0.98%
Enders	1	0.98%
POW's	1	0.98%
The Metamorphosis	1	0.98%
Bridge to Terabithia	1	0.98%
Julie of the Wolves	1	0.98%
Z for Zachariah	1	0.98%
Macbeth	1	0.98%
Sarah Plain and Tall	1	0.98%
The Witch of Blackbird Pond	1	0.98%
Dear Mr. Henshaw	1	0.98%
The Sniper	1	0.98%
The Jesse Owen Story	1	0.98%
Anne Frank Diary of a Young Girl	1	0.98%
Marod of the Winter Caves	1	0.98%
The Incredible Journey	1	0.98%

Table E.504. continued

Title	Frequency	Percentage (n=326)
Adventures of Tom Sawyer	1	0.98%
The Egypt Game	1	0.98%
Jekyll and Mr. Hyde	1	0.98%
PS Longer Letter Later	1	0.98%
Little Fish	1	0.98%
Colorful Kites	1	0.98%
Don't Bug me	1	0.98%
What's new with Mr. Pizutti	1	0.98%
Somewhere in the Darkness	1	0.98%
The Hobbit	1	0.98%
The Ones who Walk Away	1	0.98%
A Year Down Yonder	1	0.98%
Watsons go to Birmingham	1	0.98%
A Wrinkle in Time	1	0.98%
Call it Courage	1	0.98%
Bud not Buddy	1	0.98%
Long Way from Chicago	1	0.98%
Durango Street	1	0.98%
The Pigman	1	0.98%
The Misfits	1	0.98%
Sounder	1	0.98%
The Contender	1	0.98%
General Knowledge and Reference Materials	24	70.59%
Current Events	3	8.82%
Holt Handbook	3	8.82%
College Preparatory math texts	2	5.88%
Dictionary/Thesaurus	2	5.88%
Tradebooks	2	5.88%
Basic skills	2	5.88%
Daybook	2	5.88%
What's Happening in CA	1	2.94%
What's Happening in the USA	1	2.94%
Junior Scholastic	1	2.94%
Know your world Extra	1	2.94%
MCDL Workbooks	1	2.94%
Americas Choice Curriculum	1	2.94%
Great Source Grade 8	1	2.94%
Little Oxford Book of Quotes	1	2.94%
Readers Handbook	1	2.94%
Pathwise Instructional Strategies	1	2.94%
Newspapers, Magazines, Newsletters	8	23.53%
Los Angeles Times	2	5.88%
Teen Magazine	1	2.94%
Newsweek	1	2.94%
Choice Magazine	1	2.94%
AIMS Magazine	1	2.94%
Mailbox Magazine	1	2.94%
Mathematics		
Algebra and Algebra 1 Materials	37	60.66%
General & Fundamental Math Materials	22	36.07%

Table E.504. continued

Title	Frequency	Percentage (n=326)
Geometry Materials	2	3.28%
Standard Review Guides & Test Materials	6	17.65%
Meeting the California Challenge	1	2.94%
Test Best	1	2.94%
SAT Word Power	1	2.94%
California Standards & Concepts	1	2.94%
California Program workbook	1	2.94%
CAHSEE Education	1	2.94%
Other Materials	19	55.88%
Computer Programs & Technology	4	11.76%
Skills Worksheets & Workbooks	7	20.59%
Websites	2	5.88%
Resource Materials	1	2.94%
Foreign Language Materials	1	2.94%
Not Applicable	13	38.24%

Table E.505. Percentage of Feeder School Teachers Reporting Frequency of Using Commercially Prepared Materials (Not Computer-Based) in Reported Feeder School Courses or Instructional Programs [14]

MST14B:Use Commercial material(s)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Less than 1 x per month or never	91	24.3	26.0	26.0
	1 x per month	70	18.7	20.0	46.0
	1 x per week	101	26.9	28.9	74.9
	2 - 3x per week	67	17.9	19.1	94.0
	Daily	21	5.6	6.0	100.0
	Total	350	93.3	100.0	
Missing	System	25	6.7		
Total		375	100.0		

Table E.506. Feeder School Teachers Descriptions of General Commercially Prepared Materials [14A]

Title	Frequency	Percentage (n=146)
Skills Workbooks	19	32.76%
Standard Based Materials	3	5.17%
Teacher Resource Materials	3	5.17%
Supplemental Materials & Resources	3	5.17%
Key Concept Book	1	1.72%
Book Reports	1	1.72%
California Content Standard Practice	1	1.72%
Foldables	1	1.72%
Flash Cards	1	1.72%
Learning English	1	1.72%
Skills for School Success	1	1.72%
Scott Purdy Posters	1	1.72%
Latin Greek Base Words	1	1.72%
Older Textbooks	1	1.72%
Remedial Drills	1	1.72%
Special Ed Materials	1	1.72%
Study Guide for Re-teaching	1	1.72%
English from the Roots Up	1	1.72%
Perfection Learning Review	1	1.72%
Independent Investigation Method	1	1.72%
Mastery Books	1	1.72%
Review & Re-teach Materials	1	1.72%
Selection 7 Chapter Support Materials	1	1.72%
Prentice Hall Anthology Adapted	1	1.72%
Practice Pages	1	1.72%
Maps & Globes	1	1.72%
Photos & Filmstrips	1	1.72%
Language Practice Materials	1	1.72%
Skills Intervention	1	1.72%
Accent on Art	1	1.72%
Bienvenidos, For Spanish Speakers	1	1.72%
Development Workbooks	1	1.72%
Hot Tips for Teachers	1	1.72%
Focus on Achievement Lessons	1	1.72%
Assessment Materials		
Testing & Standards Review Guides	12	13.64%
Star	2	2.27%
CAHSEE Education	2	2.27%
Test Masters	1	1.14%
California Math Standards	1	1.14%
Carneys How to Prepare for CAT6	1	1.14%
Other Materials		
Worksheets/Workbooks	22	25.00%
Teacher created materials	12	13.64%
Technology	11	12.50%
Games and Puzzles	10	11.36%
Teacher Who Responded Not Applicable	7	7.95%
Resource Materials	6	6.82%
Games & Puzzles	1	1.14%

Table E.507. Feeder School ELA Teachers Descriptions of Commercially Prepared Materials [14A]

Title	Frequency	Percentage (n=63)
Grammar, Reading, & Writing	30	47.62%
Write Source	3	4.76%
Reading for Understanding	3	4.76%
Sadlier Oxford Vocabulary Workshop	2	3.17%
Black Line Masters	2	3.17%
Interactive Reader	2	3.17%
Write to the Future	2	3.17%
Scholastic Read 180	1	1.59%
Reading Workshop Survival Kit	1	1.59%
Writers Choice	1	1.59%
Accelerated Reader	1	1.59%
Readers Companion	1	1.59%
Worldly Wise	1	1.59%
Be a Better Reader	1	1.59%
Step up to Writing	1	1.59%
CA Grammar and Usage Review	1	1.59%
Grammar Strategies	1	1.59%
Word Wise	1	1.59%
Test Best	1	1.59%
Contemporary Reader	1	1.59%
Jane Schaffer Writing Program	1	1.59%
Along these Lines Grammar Book	1	1.59%
Reading for Concepts	1	1.59%
SRA Reading Lab	1	1.59%
MDTP Written Response Materials	1	1.59%
Strategies that Work	1	1.59%

Table E.508. Feeder School Math Teachers Descriptions of Commercially Prepared Materials [14A]

Title	Frequency	Percentage (n=66)
Algebra With Pizzazz	22	33.33%
General Math Related Materials	15	22.73%
Algebra Related Materials	14	21.21%
Geometry Related Materials	5	7.58%
Marcy Cook Materials	4	6.06%
Lucimath materials	3	4.55%
Star Voyagers Program	1	1.52%
NCTM Booklets	1	1.52%
Take It To Your Seat	1	1.52%

Table E.509. Percentage of Feeder School Teachers Reporting Frequency of Using Computer-Based Programs in Reported Feeder School Courses or Instructional Programs [14]

MST14C:Use Computer-based program(s)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Less than 1 x per month or never	179	47.7	51.3	51.3
	1 x per month	80	21.3	22.9	74.2
	1 x per week	44	11.7	12.6	86.8
	2 - 3x per week	27	7.2	7.7	94.6
	Daily	19	5.1	5.4	100.0
	Total	349	93.1	100.0	
Missing	System	26	6.9		
Total		375	100.0		

Table E.510. Feeder School Teachers Descriptions of Computer-Based Materials [14A]

Title	Frequency	Percentage (n=222)
Accelerated Reader	32	14.41%
English & Literary Programs	26	11.71%
Internet	26	11.71%
Teacher Who Responded Not applicable	23	10.36%
Testing & Assessment Programs	22	9.91%
Microsoft Software/PowerPoint & Excel	17	7.66%
Audio CDs & Cassettes	8	3.60%
Math Programs	7	3.15%
My Access-ELA Program	5	2.25%
School's Computer Lab	4	1.80%
Skill Tutorial Porgrams	3	1.35%
Games & Puzzles	3	1.35%
Worksheet Builder	3	1.35%
Worksheets	2	0.90%
Success Maker	3	1.35%
Easy Grade Pro	2	0.90%
Remediation Materials	2	0.90%
Teacher Created Materials	2	0.90%
UPR Radio Broadcasts	1	0.45%
Tutorial	1	0.45%
Computer Based Supplements	1	0.45%
Research Encyclopedia	1	0.45%
Imovie	1	0.45%
Holt- Materials Related to Text	1	0.45%
Research Project	1	0.45%
Research Holocaust Hitler	1	0.45%
Literature Resource Library	1	0.45%
Appleworks	1	0.45%

Table E.510. continued

Title	Frequency	Percentage (n=222)
Plato	1	0.45%
Web Quests	1	0.45%
Wherever	1	0.45%
United Streaming Video Clips	1	0.45%
3D Movie Creator	1	0.45%
Prentice Hall Supplemental materials	1	0.45%
Grade Quick	1	0.45%
Outlook Explorer	1	0.45%
Rubistar	1	0.45%
Teachers Corner	1	0.45%
Test Bank Software	1	0.45%
Clue Finders	1	0.45%
Matchword	1	0.45%
Bank of Activities	1	0.45%
Software Quartermile 1, 2, 3	1	0.45%
Research Articles Discovery	1	0.45%
Teen Newsweek	1	0.45%
Poetry.com	1	0.45%
Discovery Kids	1	0.45%
COW Community of Writers	1	0.45%
Laptop Computers	1	0.45%
Science Programs	1	0.45%

Table E.511. Percentage of Feeder School Teachers Reporting Most Advanced Degree [15]

MST15:What is your most advanced degree?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Bachelors	59	15.7	16.0	16.0
	Some graduate school	152	40.5	41.2	57.2
	Masters	149	39.7	40.4	97.6
	Doctoral	4	1.1	1.1	98.6
	Other	5	1.3	1.4	100.0
	Total	369	98.4	100.0	
Missing	System	6	1.6		
Total		375	100.0		

Table E.512. Percentage of Feeder School Teachers Reporting Years of Experience Teaching Reported Courses or Instructional Programs [17]

MST17:Years teaching this course/program

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 year or less	61	16.3	16.4	16.4
	2 - 3 years	98	26.1	26.3	42.6
	4 - 5 years	69	18.4	18.5	61.1
	6 - 10 years	69	18.4	18.5	79.6
	11 - 20 years	41	10.9	11.0	90.6
	More than 20 years	35	9.3	9.4	100.0
	Total	373	99.5	100.0	
Missing	System	2	.5		
Total		375	100.0		

Table E.513. Percentage of Feeder School Teachers Reporting Total Years of Teaching Experience [18]

MST18:Years teaching experience

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 year or less	19	5.1	5.1	5.1
	2 - 3 years	53	14.1	14.3	19.5
	4 - 5 years	52	13.9	14.1	33.5
	6 - 10 years	90	24.0	24.3	57.8
	11 - 20 years	78	20.8	21.1	78.9
	More than 20 years	78	20.8	21.1	100.0
	Total	370	98.7	100.0	
Missing	Missing	5	1.3		
Total		375	100.0		

Appendix F: Summary of Interview Responses

Demographics

The following chart shows the number and type of interviews conducted in feeder schools and high schools for this project. A total of 17 feeder schools and 47 high schools were visited.

Table F.1. Number and Type of Site Visit Interviews

	General Math & General English Teachers (GMGE)	Administrators (Admin)	Special Education Teachers (SP)	English Learner Teachers (EL)	Special Course Teachers (SP-C)	Other
High School	206	64	66	52	30	8
Feeder School	64	16	12	15	3	0
Total	270	80	78	67	33	8

Results

All interview protocols shared some 'common questions', questions shared by the GMGE and at least one other protocol. There were also 'unique questions' that were only asked on one type of interview protocol. This report is organized mainly around the common questions. Unique questions appear in numerical order and are labeled as unique. When a common question is addressed, results from interviews are presented starting with the largest respondent group. The others follow in descending order by number of interviews conducted. The General Math and English (GMGE) response group was the largest. It will be followed by Administrators (Admin), Special Education (SP), English Learners (EL), and finally Special Courses (SP-C), which includes both remedial and preparatory classes for the CAHSEE. The corresponding question number from a protocol (when it differs from the GMGE protocol) will be noted in parentheses in the question header. When unique questions are discussed, only the group asked the question will be analyzed. A final group, called 'other' included 8 interviews, which were not ultimately included in our analysis. Unless something appears in quotes, it should not be considered a direct quotation, but rather what was captured through note-taking during interviews, as interviews were not recorded.

Common Question 1A-1C GMGE, Admin, SP, (EL Question 2A-2C), SP-C

GMGE. The first two questions, Questions 1A and 1B, asked respondents for a quantitative response, using a 1-to-5-point scale, on the degree to which their department's instruction is based on the California Content Standards. A rating of 1 indicated that instruction is not at all implemented based on the standards, while a 5 indicated full implementation. Question 1A asked them to provide a current rating; Question 1B, a rating for 2 years ago. Table 1 presents the results of this analysis; with respondents generally reporting an increase in standards-based instruction during the two-year period. While all respondents were able to give a current rating, some teachers reported that they had not been teaching or were not at that school two years ago, thus accounting for the reduction in responses.

Table F.2. (GMGE) Rating of Implementation of Standards-Based Instruction

School Type	Mean-Current Year	Mean-2 Years Ago	Mean Difference
High School	4.3 (n=206)	3.3 (n=171)	1.1 (n=171)
Feeder School	4.6 (n=64)	3.4 (n=57)	1.3 (n=57)

Question 1C then asked respondents for examples of how the implementation of standards-based instruction has increased or decreased. We coded a respondent's answer to Question 1C as "increase" if subtracting the rating in Question 1B from the rating in 1A resulted in a positive number, "no change" if the difference was 0, and "could not determine" if the respondent had not been able to give an answer to Question 1B. Results in Table 2 show that most reported an increase; there were no decreases reported.

Table F.3. (GMGE) Broad Differences in the Degree of Implementation of Standards-Based Instruction During a 2-Year Period

GMGE	Increase	Decrease	No change	Could not determine	Total
High Schools	125 (61%)	0	46 (22%)	35 (17%)	206 (100%)
Feeder Schools	42 (66%)	0	14 (22%)	8 (13%)	64 (100%)
Total	167 (62%)	0	60 (22%)	43 (16%)	270 (100%)

Note. Due to rounding, totals may not add to 100%

We then eliminated those responses to Question 1C that had been designated as "no change" and "could not determine," as we were looking for evidence of change. Because there were no responses that indicated a decrease had taken place, we focused only on those 167 responses (125 from high school teachers and 42 from feeder school teachers) that indicated an increase in the degree of implementation of standards-based instruction had taken place. Because respondents were free to give as many responses as they wanted to this question, the number of responses will not match the number of respondents.

As we read the responses, we found several codes that represent how the standards implementation has increased during the 2-year period. The codes are as follows:

- Use of formal documents such as pacing guides or curriculum maps;
- Increased general awareness of the standards;
- Collaboration between teachers, particularly between school levels;
- Common exams, such as district-level benchmark exams;
- The use of texts that are aligned to the California Content Standards;
- Increased student awareness of standards;
- Key personnel who have helped foster implementation of standards;
- The requirement to post standards within the classroom, either on posters or on the board;
- Professional development that is keyed to standards-based instruction;

- Other, including responses we were unable to categorize or that were off topic.

The percentages were calculated by dividing the number of responses (by school level) by the number of respondents (by school level). The total percentages were calculated by dividing the total number of responses (sum of both school levels) by the total number of responses. As an example, there were 44 responses from high school teachers that indicated the use of formal documents; the 44 was divided by 125, the number of high school respondents. There were 69 total responses (both high school and feeder school responses); this number was divided by 167, the total number of respondents.

Table F.4. (GMGE) Examples of the Increase of Instruction Based on the California Content Standards

GMGE	High School (125)	Feeder School (42)	Total (167)
Documents	44 (35%)	25 (60%)	69 (41%)
General awareness	47 (38%)	14 (33%)	61 (37%)
Collaboration	38 (30%)	15 (36%)	53 (32%)
Common exams	31 (25%)	5 (12%)	36 (22%)
Aligned texts	27 (22%)	15 (36%)	36 (22%)
Student awareness	1 (1%)	5 (12%)	22 (13%)
Personnel	16 (13%)	4 (10%)	20 (12%)
Posted	12 (10%)	3 (7%)	15 (9%)
Prof development	11 (9%)	4 (10%)	15 (9%)
Other	32 (26%)	7 (17%)	39 (23%)

Sample responses from “documents”:

- As literacy coach I make sure that the instructional guide is implemented throughout the school.
- …The district has developed a pacing plan…

Sample responses from “general awareness”:

- Overall the standards have gone up and the AYP (adequate yearly progress) has gone up as a whole school because we are focusing on the standards.
- We are more aware of the standards and we found out that a few things we didn’t cover. Such as, some of the algebra concepts needed to be covered in geometry.

Sample responses from “collaboration”:

- We meet as a department once a week, constantly discussing the standards and trying to gear classroom instruction to meet the standards. Sometimes skip materials in textbook if not covering standard.
- We’ve established a curriculum calendar for the entire year. We’ve met with high school teachers to coordinate when curriculum is covered.

Sample responses from “common exams”:

- We have become a part of district-wide assessment that is aligned with content and CAHSEE standards.
- …The assessments are created and given to teachers so they are consistent throughout district…

Sample responses from “aligned texts”:

- We got a new textbook and the standards are located in every selection; we don’t have to search it out ourselves…
- We adopt the textbooks that are aligned with the CA standards. We’re covering the standards as we go through the textbooks.

Sample responses from “student awareness”:

- Pushed to get standards posted on the board, evolved from the number [of the standard] to finally in student’s language; sample work posted around the room; kids write down standard at beginning of class, put in own words, warm up exercises.
- Blackboard configuration for every lesson (standard listed, discussed with students prior to lesson, students analyze the standard and explain what they will be learning).

Sample responses from “personnel”:

- We’ve brought on people on our staff that are more willing to make changes.
- …Grade level leaders were added to help to ensure others in the department are up to speed…

Sample responses from “posted”:

- We hear from the administration that we should have standards posted visibly for our standards.
- Teachers are required to put the objective and the standards on the board and in their daily lesson.

Sample responses from “professional development”:

- We have had many more in-service trainings that make sure we are using standards-based instruction.
- Many of our veteran teachers have retired and we have a new crop of teachers who need more professional development. As we implement small learning communities, we might be more successful in a couple of years, especially as we grade the common essays.

Admin. This question asked administrators about the process of implementing instruction based on the California Content Standards. Respondents were asked to give a 1 to 5 rating, where 1 is not at all implemented and 5 is fully implemented. In the 80 interviews conducted, most administrators (75%) responded that their school rated at the high end of the scale with either a four or five.

Then administrators were asked to rate their schools on the same one to five scale for the level of implementation two years ago. In 11 interviews the administrator stated that they were not in the same school, or the same administrative position two years ago, and were thus unable to give the rating. The table below shows the means and the differences between means over the 2 year period.

Table F.5. (Admin) Ratings of implementation of standards-based instruction

School Type	Mean-Current Year	Mean-2 Years Ago	Mean Difference
High Schools	4.05 (n=64)	2.67 (n=56)	1.38 (n=56)
Feeder Schools	4.5 (n=16)	2.9 (n=13)	1.6(n=13)

Administrators were then asked for an example of the change in implementation. Of those who reported a positive change in implementation, most talked about a rise in awareness of the California content standards, benchmark testing, or aligning curriculum and texts with the content standards. Table 5 shows the broad range of change in implementation.

Table F.6. (Admin) Broad Differences in the Degree of Implementation of Standards-Based Instruction during a Two Year Period

Admin	Increase	Decrease	No change	Could not determine	Total
High Schools	49 (61%)	0	7 (8%)	8 (10%)	64 (80%)
Feeder Schools	13 (16%)	0	0	3 (4%)	16 (20%)
Total	62 (78%)	0	7 (8%)	11 (14%)	80 (100%)

The following are excerpts from interviews where positive change was noted.

- We’re standards driven
- We have developed benchmark tests in math and English and have mapped our curriculum.
- The teachers have more knowledge of the content standards.
- Students are getting a more global view of the standards.
- Benchmarking exams are helping to fully align standards.
- Newer teachers are steeped in standards.
- We have a curriculum that reflects the standards 100%.
- Textbooks are now aligned with California test standards [content standards].
- Everyone knows the standards; they are integrated into every lesson.
- We build our lesson plans around the standards

SP. The analysis for special education teachers was conducted similarly to general education teachers and administrators, using a 1-to-5-point Likert-type scale. As in previous tables, a 1 indicates not at all implemented and 5 indicates fully implemented.

Table F.7. (SP) Ratings of implementation of Standards-Based Instruction

School Type	Mean-Current Year	Mean-2 Years Ago	Mean Difference
High Schools	3.7 (n=64)	2.4 (n=54)	1.3 (n=54)
Feeder Schools	4.1 (n=12)	2.7 (n=12)	1.4 (n=13)

The analysis of Question 1C hinged upon the responses to the previous questions. We eliminated those responses that had been designated as “no change” and “could not determine,” as we were looking for evidence of change. Out of the possible 78 respondents, we focused on 53 responses that indicated an increase in the degree of implementation of standards-based instruction had taken place. In one case a respondent indicated there was a decrease, however, from the supporting comments it appears there may have been confusion when answering or recording the responses to questions 1A and 1B. Because respondents were free to give as many responses as they wanted to this question, the number of responses will not match the number of respondents.

As we read the responses, we found several codes that represent how the standards implementation has increased during the 2-year period. The codes are as follows:

- Formal documents such as pacing guides or curriculum maps;
- Increased general awareness of the standards;
- Collaboration between teachers, particularly between school levels;
- Common exams, such as district-level benchmark exams;
- The use of texts/materials that are aligned to the California Content Standards;
- Increased student awareness of standards;
- Key personnel who have helped foster implementation of standards;
- The requirement to post standards within the classroom, either on posters or on the board;
- Professional development that is keyed to standards-based instruction;
- Other, including responses we were unable to categorize or that were off topic.

Table F.8. (SP) Implementation of standards

Documents	18
General awareness	15
Collaboration	11
Common exams	0
Aligned texts	11
Student awareness	4
Personnel	7
Posted in classroom	3
Professional development	4
Other	9

Sample responses from “documents”:

- Each department has created specific lessons to match the standards and these lessons are rigorous since they follow a pacing plan
- We use all mainstream content standard curriculum when we previously “made it” up
- We do work from Adaptive Readers Companion which has shortened versions of the regular coursework
- We are relying heavily on CAHSEE prep materials provided by the state

Sample responses from “general awareness”:

- …because standards-focused teaching is really the focus now
- Teachers are more aware of the standards, special ed students are participating more in the general ed curriculum, which is standards-based
- Increased, the learning center backs up the instruction that goes on in the general ed classes and anyone can use the center

Sample responses from “collaboration”:

- Our English teachers are working with regular ed teachers to develop a suitable course in reading and writing
- …collaborate on instructional strategies to address content areas

Sample responses from “aligned texts”:

- Literature program stated with a new text 2 years ago that’s aligned to the standards with worksheets keyed to the standards for comprehension checks

Sample responses from “student awareness”:

- The students are learning what the standards are while they learn them; they know what level they are working at and get excited when they are doing higher level material

Sample responses from “personnel”:

- We have all new teachers; older teachers didn’t want to, or know how to, emphasize the standards
- New teachers are starting to focus on instruction more than IEP compliance; aligning IEPs to instruction and content standards

Sample responses from “posted”:

- Standards are posted in the classrooms and teachers write them on the class work

Sample responses from “professional development”:

- The focus of our in-services has been on standards
- All trainings we’ve been through: such as EDI, Peer Observations, Teaching to Standards, plus the materials we use

Sample responses from “other”:

- A roadblock is that 2—3 parents don’t want their kids to have to follow/be accountable for standards; they want it written into their IEP that they don’t have to meet the standards
- Tutorial program implemented this year, also a library tutoring program fully credentialed

EL. English Learner teachers were asked for a quantitative response, using a 1-to-5-point scale, on the degree to which their department’s instruction is based on the California Content Standards. A rating of 1 indicated that instruction is not at all implemented based on the standards, while a 5 indicated full implementation. Question 2A asked them to provide a current rating; Question 2B, a rating for 2 years ago. The 2B rating was subtracted from the 1A rating to determine whether respondents believed their department had increased, decreased, or had no change in the degree of implementation of the California Content Standards over the 2-year period. We found that we needed to add a “could not determine” category to capture responses of new teachers or those who had been at other schools 2 years ago or for blank responses.

Table F.9. (EL) Ratings of Implementation of Standards-Based Instruction

School Type	Mean-Current Year	Mean-2 Years Ago	Mean Difference
High Schools	4.4 (n=51)	2.9 (n=42)	1.5 (n=42)
Feeder Schools	4.0 (n=13)	3.1 (n=13)	0.8 (n=13)

The analysis of Question 2C hinged upon the responses to the previous questions. We eliminated those responses that had been designated as “no change” and “could not determine,” as we were looking for evidence of change. Out of the possible 67 respondents, we focused on 43 responses that indicated an increase in the degree of implementation of standards-based instruction had taken place. In one case a respondent indicated there was a decrease and the reasons were because the school faculty meetings don’t address EL anymore with all the push for NCLB and for improving core subject areas; the effort for EL has decreased. Because respondents were free to give as many responses as they wanted to this question, the number of responses will not match the number of respondents.

As we read the responses, we found several codes that represent how the standards implementation has increased during the 2-year period. The codes are as follows:

- Formal documents such as pacing guides or curriculum maps;
- Increased general awareness of the standards;
- Collaboration between teachers, particularly between school levels;
- Common exams, such as district-level benchmark exams;
- The use of texts/materials that are aligned to the California Content Standards;
- Increased student awareness of standards;
- Key personnel who have helped foster implementation of standards;
- The requirement to post standards within the classroom, either on posters or on the board;

- Professional development that is keyed to standards-based instruction;
- Other, including responses we were unable to categorize or that were off topic.

Table F.10. (EL) Implementation of Standards

EL	
Documents	10
General awareness	11
Collaboration	11
Common exams	1
Aligned texts	15
Student awareness	2
Personnel	9
Posted in classroom	3
Professional development	4
Other	11

Sample responses from "documents":

- English and foreign language departments spend a great deal of time delineating the standards and correlating them to instruction
- We're doing more common lessons; seniors do a research paper and the teachers are teaching the same content standards
- We've got standards "up the wazoo"
- On the downside, now it is very important to follow pacing plans, set for the general population, although that's not a reality for ESL students. Although alignment with standards is better now, there is no real possibility of meeting the pace

Sample responses from "general awareness":

- …came in contact with standards the first time last year, but nothing was being done. Now they meet twice a month to target, unwrap, implement standards in curriculum
- The school stresses standards; they use different approaches to cover materials such as manipulatives
- I think it has increased our focus on literacy

Sample responses from "collaboration":

- The ELD students will be transitioning to the EL curriculum and the alignment between the department will help them
- I can observe in the classes and work with teachers, we do reciprocal teaching and instruction

Sample responses from "common exams":

- Common assessments come from HIGHPOINT

Sample responses from "aligned texts":

- We are piloting new texts and materials that are aligned to the standards
- For ESL, the HIGHPOINT series has been in place for 2-3 years. Now, teacher are more familiar and we are able to get through the pacing much better

Sample responses from “student awareness”:
- Student performance has improved, based on increased attention to the standards

Sample responses from “personnel”:
- We had standards research coaches whose job was to make sure that teachers understood the standards
- Hiring of appropriate, certified, and knowledgeable teachers in ELD

Sample responses from “posted”:
- Having standards posted in the classroom really helps to develop lessons

Sample responses from “professional development”:
- More workshops and seminars
- Teacher preparation, have to be prepares; there is a very rigid focus training
- I see the need for more professional development

Sample responses from “other”:
- We have excellent oversight by our administration; our department was recently audited and found our practices to be successful
- Also after-school free tutoring, teach is CLAD certified, and for special ed students; all (students) have access to the tutoring and snacks are provided

SP-C. Thirty-three Special Courses interviews were conducted in schools. Eighteen of the 33 did not answer question 1A. Question 1B: Respondents did not answer this question 21 times. The following table shows the differences in implementation over the 2 year period.

Table F.11. (SP-C) Rating of Implementation of Standards-Based Instruction

School Type	Mean-Current Year	Mean-2 Years Ago	Mean Difference
High Schools	4.38 (n=13)	3.75 (n=10)	0.63 (n=10)
Feeder Schools	4.5 (n=2)	3.0 (n=2)	1.5(n=2)

The following excerpts are from interviews where positive change was reported.
- Textbook is set up for standards
- Everyone is using the same textbooks.
- Our books are all written to the standards, and teachers are teaching to the book.
- Planning for most teachers has changed from “what do I want to teach?” to “How do I teach to the standards?”
- I am now much more familiar with the standards and how to implement them.

- We have increased awareness of, and pay more attention to the standards.
- For several years we have been using a standards based text.

Common Question 2A-2D GMGE, Admin (also 2E), SP, (EL Question 3A-3D)

GMGE. Questions 2A and 2B were dropped if interviewers used the short protocol. Question 2A asked respondents if they think their incoming students are better or less prepared than students from two years ago. When we do not consider the blank/not applicable responses, we see that "better" was most frequently selected at both high school and feeder school levels.

Table F.12. (GMGE) Beliefs About Incoming Student Preparation, Current v. 2 Years Ago

GMGE	Better	Less	No change	Could not determine	Blank/NA	Don't know	Mixed	Total
High Schools	51 (25%)	26 (13%)	16 (8%)	11 (5%)	99 (48%)	0	3 (1%)	206 (100%)
Feeder Schools	17 (27%)	8 (13%)	3 (8%)	3 (8%)	32 (50%)	1 (2%)	0	64 (100%)
Total	68 (25%)	34 (13%)	19 (7%)	14 (5%)	131 (49%)	1 (<1%)	3 (1%)	270 (100%)

Note. Due to rounding, results may not total 100.

Question 2B asked for examples of better or worse preparation; therefore, we used the results from Question 2A in determining which responses to Question 2B we should analyze. For example, if a particular respondent's answer to Question 2A had been coded as "better prepared" or "less prepared," then that respondent's answer to Question 2B was also analyzed. If a respondent's answer to Question 2A was coded as anything besides "better" or "less," then the answer to Question 2B, if any had been given, was not analyzed.

Codes for responses linked to "better preparation" are as follows:

- Improvement in specific skills ("fractions," "decimals," essay writing");
- General improvement (basic math skills, reading, writing, improved test scores);
- Improvement in earlier grades (also improvement at other school levels, such as when a feeder school teacher discusses improvements being made at the elementary school level);
- More emphasis on standards;
- Ability to offer more advanced course or to cover more of the curriculum, since less time is needed to review material.

Categories with fewer than 5 responses were not included in this analysis. Respondents were not limited to a single response.

Table F.13. (GMGE) Examples of Better Incoming Student Preparation

GMGE	High School (51)	Feeder School (17)	Total (68)
Specific improvement	16 (31%)	6 (35%)	22 (32%)
General improvement	15 (29%)	5 (29%)	20 (29%)
Early improvement	12 (24%)	2 (12%)	14 (21%)
Standards	10 (20%)	2 (12%)	12 (18%)
Advanced course	7 (14%)	0	7 (10%)

Sample responses from "specific improvement":

- I'm seeing kids who are familiar with the ideas behind the standards. With literary criticism, kids understand the biographical analysis stuff which is an 8th grade standard. They're familiar with the lower level stuff but that's the theory behind the standards. Kids understand 8th grade ideas and I can build on that.
- Fewer don't know their multiplication tables. Almost none don't understand the necessity of care in written work and showing the process on paper they used to arrive at an answer.

Sample responses from "general improvement":

- Overall average score on placement tests higher.
- They aren't necessarily better at any one thing, but they are overall more well versed in a variety of things they will see in high school, for example essay.

Sample responses from "early improvement":

- …feels like standards are more fully implemented in earlier grades.
- What makes it hard to say is that yes, the standards are filtering into the earlier grades more and more students are familiar with more types of content (see some geometry in 6th grade) but the benchmark continually raises as well. What was honors before is the norm now. Students are meeting, and will meet, the benchmarks that are set for them…There is more articulation with the schools than ever before. They are a unified school district.

Sample responses from "standards":

- When we review testing strategies, they're already familiar with process of elimination, skipping and going back; also better foundation in standards—more right answers when we review.
- I know the math students at the middle school receive a standards-based approved algebra book and the teachers are moving away from the intro and the basics that are not standards approved.

Sample responses from "advanced courses":

- …We no longer have a Reading 1-level class (1st grade reading level) but we did have this when I started 16 years ago.
- Doing away with pre-Algebra at 8th and 9th grade levels; will begin with Algebra, in line with math standards and CAHSEE depending on Algebra standards.

We followed a reverse coding scheme for answers coded as “less prepared”:

- Specific skills getting worse
- Decline in skills in general, or lack of preparation
- Poor motivation or discipline
- Too much time spent in review; Algebra 1 at eighth grade negatively impacting general math skills; more students needing review.

As in the previous table, categories with fewer than 5 responses were not included in this analysis. Respondents were not limited to a single response.

Table F.14. (GMGE) Examples of Worse Incoming Student Preparation

GMGE	High School (26)	Feeder School (8)	Total (34)
Specific decline	8 (31%)	2 (25%)	10 (29%)
General decline	7 (27%)	2 (25%)	9 (26%)
Poor mot/discipline	3 (12%)	2 (25%)	5 (15%)
Too much review	7 (27%)	0	7 (21%)

Sample responses from “specific decline”:

- Students coming in from junior high are at a lower level now. An example is their poorer vocabulary skills.
- My students don’t have number sense…They’re coming in without even being able to determine if their answers are even in the ballpark. Coming in from elementary school they were struggling with number sense.

Sample responses from “general decline”:

- We see writing skills as being a major area where students are less prepared.
- Reading skills seem to be lower than a few years ago. Writing skills are almost nonexistent.

Sample responses from “poor motivation or discipline”:

- …also attitude problems, students not motivated, even harder to get homework done…
- Student motivation is not what it was previously.

Sample responses from “too much review”:

- Less sections of Algebra 1 because not enough students are prepared.
- The district is pushing to get the kids doing Algebra earlier so they can get into geometry a little sooner. However, they are missing out on the additional year of basics, making them re-teach many basic skills.

Questions 2C and 2D were quantitative questions, similar in format to Questions 1A and 1B in that respondents were asked to supply a rating of 1 to 5 to indicate incoming student preparation. A 1 indicated “very poorly prepared,” a 5 indicated “very well prepared,” with Question 2C pertaining to current incoming students and Question 2D to incoming students from two years ago. Table 14 shows that both high school and feeder school ratings indicate better preparation for current incoming students; however, feeder school ratings are slightly higher.

Table F.15. (GMGE) Ratings of Incoming Student Preparation, Current v. 2 Years Ago

GMGE	Mean-Current Year	Mean-2 Years Ago	Mean Difference
High Schools	2.8 (n=196)	2.6 (n=164)	0.3 (n=162)
Feeder Schools	3.2 (n=62)	2.6 (n=50)	0.6 (n=49)

Admin. This question asked administrators to comment on the preparedness of incoming students. They were asked if students were better or less prepared than students two years ago. A little over half (57%) felt that their incoming students were better prepared. Sixteen percent (16%) felt they were at the same level of preparedness, and only 5 percent said incoming students were less prepared. Notably, 12 administrators stated that they were not in the school or the administrative position two years ago, and therefore could not comment.

Table F.16. (Admin) Rating of Preparedness of Incoming Students

Admin	Better	Less	Same	Don't know/N/A/ blank	Not in school/position two years ago.	Total
High Schools	35(55%)	2(3%)	11(17%)	11(17%)	5(8%)	64
Feeder Schools	11(69%)	2(19%)	2(19%)	1(6%)	0	16
Total	46	4	13	12	5	80

Administrators were then asked for an example of the level of preparedness, be it better or worse. In certain cases we were unable to determine the level of change, or Administrators were unable to rate the preparedness of incoming students from two years ago because they were in another school or another position at that time. Those answers were counted as missing and were not analyzed. The following codes were used to analyze answers showing that students are more prepared now than two years ago. Because respondents were free to give as many responses as they wanted to this question, the number of responses will not match the number of respondents.

- A) Improvement in specific skills ("fractions," "decimals," essay writing")
- B) General improvement (basic math skills, reading, writing, improved test scores)
- C) Improvement in earlier grades (also improvement at other school levels, such as when a feeder school teacher discusses improvements being made at the elementary school level)
- D) More emphasis on standards
- E) Better motivation or discipline
- F) Ability to offer more advanced course or to cover more of the curriculum, since less time is needed to review material.
- G) Teaching to mastery, rather than introducing or moving too quickly through the curriculum
- H) Demographics issue, either a shift or a concern
- Normal variance offered as an explanation of why respondent is seeing better

Table F.17. (Admin) Examples of Better Preparation

Admin	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
High Schools	2	19	13	7	0	2	0	2	1	1
Feeder Schools	0	5	2	1	0	2	0	1	0	0
Total	2	24	16	8	0	4	0	3	1	1

We followed a reverse coding scheme for answers coded as “less prepared”:

- A) Specific skills getting worse
- B) Decline in skills in general, or lack of preparation
- C) Earlier grades not preparing students adequately
- D) Not enough focus on standards
- E) Poor motivation or discipline
- F) Too much time spent in review; Algebra 1 at eighth grade negatively impacting general math skills; more students needing review
- G) Teaching to mastery, rather than introducing or moving too quickly through the curriculum
- H) Demographics issue, either a shift or a concern
- I) Normal variance offered as an explanation of why respondent is seeing better preparation
- Collaboration

When Administrators reported students were less prepared several different examples were sited. Examples with no responses have been omitted from the table.

Table F.18. (Admin) Examples of Students Being Less Prepared

Admin	A	B	H	I
High Schools	1	0	1	1
Feeder Schools	0	2	0	0
Total	1	2	1	1

Question 2C asked Administrators to rate this year’s incoming students’ level of preparedness on a 1 (very poorly prepared) to 5 (very well prepared) point scale. Question 2D used the same 5 point scale and asked Administrators to rate the incoming students 2 years ago. Totals reflect the fact that 17 responses could not be analyzed, most often because the Administrator was in a different school or position two years earlier. Table 18 shows the differences in means regarding students’ level of preparation.

Table F.19. (Admin) Ratings of Incoming Student Preparedness

School Type	Mean-Current Year	Mean-2 Years Ago	Mean Difference
High Schools	3.1 (n=57)	2.5 (n=47)	0.6 (n=47)
Feeder Schools	3.09 (n=16)	2.31 (n=16)	0.78(n=16)

Question 2E asked if the same ratings would be given to the school’s subpopulations. Most Administrators (51%) responded that they would give the same rating, while 45 percent said they saw some portion of their subpopulation as less prepared than the general student population.

Table F.20. (Admin) Differences in Rating Subpopulations versus General Population

Admin	Yes	No	Mixed (yes and no)	Don't know/blank	Total
High Schools	31(48%)	30(47%)	1(2%)	2(3%)	64
Feeder Schools	10(63%)	6(38%)	0	0	16
Total	41	36	1	2	80

Of the Administrators who said subpopulations would not receive the same rating, several examples were listed as being less prepared than students in the general population. The table below shows the frequency that each subpopulation was noted as less prepared. The largest group noted to be less prepared than the general population was English Learners at 35 percent. Specific Ethnic or Racial groups including African American and Hispanic or Latino were named by Administrators as being less prepared in 29 percent of responses. Nineteen percent (19%) of the responses named Special Education, and another 19 percent said Low SES students are less prepared. Since multiple answers were allowed, numbers of responses will not match the number of interviews conducted.

Table F.21. (Admin) Frequency that Subpopulations were Rated as Less Prepared

Admin	English Learners	Special Education	Low SES	Ethnic/Racial groups	All Subpopulations
High Schools	16	10	9	13	6
Feeder Schools	2	0	1	2	2
Total	18	10	10	15	8

SP. Question 2 consists of two parts. The first part asks respondents if they think the incoming SP students were better or less prepared for the course they teach than students were 2 years ago. The second part (2B) was a probe to explain their answer if their response was either better or less prepared.

Table F.22. (SP) Ratings of Incoming Student Preparedness

School Type	Mean-Current Year	Mean-2 Years Ago	Mean Difference
High Schools	2.7 (n=64)	2.2 (n=54)	0.5 (n=54)
Feeder Schools	2.8 (n=12)	2.0 (n=12)	0.7(n=11)

The following table shows the results for the SP teachers for the following categories:

- Better prepared
- Less prepared
- No change
- Could not determine
- Blank or N/A
- Doesn't know
- Mixed response (some are better prepared while others are not)

Table F.23. (SP) Level of Student Preparedness

SP	Better	Less	NC	CND	Blank/NA	DK	Mixed	Total
	22(28%)	9(12%)	10(13%)	2(3%)	34(44%)	0	1(1%)	78

We used the results from Question 2A (better or less prepared) to identify the corresponding responses to Question 2B. For example, if a particular respondent's answer to Question 2A had been coded as "better prepared" or "less prepared," then that respondent's answer to Question 2B was also analyzed. If a respondent's answer to Question 2A was coded as anything besides "better" or "less," then the answer to Question 2B, if any had been given, was not analyzed.

Codes for responses linked to "better preparation" are as follows:

- A) Improvement in specific skills ("fractions," "decimals," essay writing")
- B) General improvement (basic math skills, reading, writing, improved test scores)
- C) Improvement in earlier grades (also improvement at other school levels, such as when a feeder school teacher discusses improvements being made at the elementary school level)
- D) More emphasis on standards
- E) Better motivation or discipline
- F) Ability to offer more advanced course or to cover more of the curriculum, since less time is needed to review material.
- G) Teaching to mastery, rather than introducing or moving too quickly through the curriculum
- H) Demographics issue, either a shift or a concern
- I) Normal variance offered as an explanation of why respondent is seeing better preparation
- J) Collaboration

Table F.24. (SP) Examples of Better Preparedness

SP	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
	6	5	6	2	3	0	1	0	0	2

A sample of the comments received for some of the categories are:

- They are a little bit better at knowing and understanding the tools they can use to help them (methods for writing organization for example)
- Study habits are better; other teachers agree, think it may be because they started with the 20 to 1 student-teacher ratio as 3rd graders
- Basic motivation and attitude toward education is more positive; basic skill in reading and math have improved
- Literacy 3 years ago was maybe 3rd grade; now mid-4th to even mid-5th
- …because the language program at middle school, they come in with better decoding skills, some phonics
- Teachers are being held more accountable to the standards, special ed used to be showing movies all day
- They are focused on learning
- We are fully staffed with special education teachers (instead of substitutes)…successful through collaboration among the teachers

We followed a reverse coding scheme for answers coded as “less prepared”:

- A) Specific skills getting worse
- B) Decline in skills in general, or lack of preparation
- C) Earlier grades not preparing students adequately
- D) Not enough focus on standards
- E) Poor motivation or discipline
- F) Too much time spent in review; Algebra 1 at eighth grade negatively impacting general math skills; more students needing review
- G) Teaching to mastery, rather than introducing or moving too quickly through the curriculum
- H) Demographics issue, either a shift or a concern
- I) Normal variance offered as an explanation of why respondent is seeing better preparation
- Collaboration

Table F.25. (SP) Examples of Less Preparedness

SP	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	3	1	0

A sample of the comments received for some of the categories are:

- There was a difference in student attitude; too many programs, they don’t get critical thinking skills
- Basic reading skills are lower, such as comprehension or even coding. They can use tools…but their level of thinking is lower
- …it seems the students are not getting a grip on the basics; writing is a bigger problem, with math somewhat better
- Many special education students have said they did not even have math in middle school
- It just has to do with the mix of kids; we had very low level readers and some behavioral problems
- The incoming students have more severe needs than those we received in the past
- Broader spectrum of disabilities; 15 years ago half would have been in SDC

EL. Question 3 consists of two parts. The first part asks respondents if they think the incoming EL students were better or less prepared for the course they teach than students were 2 years ago. The second part (3B) was a probe to explain their answer if their response was either better or less prepared.

Table F.26. (EL) Ratings of Incoming Student Preparedness

School Type	Mean-Current Year	Mean-2 Years Ago	Mean Difference
High Schools	2.8 (n=45)	2.5 (n=36)	0.3 (n=36)
Feeder Schools	2.7 (n=13)	2.5 (n=12)	0.2(n=12)

The following table shows the results for the EL teachers for the following categories:

- Better prepared
- Less prepared
- No change
- Could not determine
- Blank or N/A
- Doesn't know
- Mixed response (some are better prepared while others are not)

Table F.27. (EL) Level of Student Preparedness

EL	Better	Less	NC	CND	Blank/NA	DK	Mixed
	11	10	8	3	32	1	4

We used the results from Question 3A (better or less prepared) to identify the corresponding responses to Question 3B. For example, if a particular respondent's answer to Question 3A had been coded as "better prepared" or "less prepared," then that respondent's answer to Question 3B was also analyzed. If a respondent's answer to Question 3A was coded as anything besides "better" or "less," then the answer to Question 3B, if any had been given, was not analyzed.

Codes for responses linked to "better preparation" are as follows:

- A) Improvement in specific skills ("fractions," "decimals," essay writing")
- B) General improvement (basic math skills, reading, writing, improved test scores)
- C) Improvement in earlier grades (also improvement at other school levels, such as when a feeder school teacher discusses improvements being made at the elementary school level)
- D) More emphasis on standards
- E) Better motivation or discipline
- F) Ability to offer more advanced course or to cover more of the curriculum, since less time is needed to review material.
- G) Teaching to mastery, rather than introducing or moving too quickly through the curriculum
- H) Demographics issue, either a shift or a concern
- I) Normal variance offered as an explanation of why respondent is seeing better preparation
- J) Collaboration

Table F.28. (EL) Examples of Better Preparedness

EL	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
	2	4	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0

A sample of the comments received for some of the categories are:

- Writing skills, speaking ability have improved
- Vocabulary and reading composition

- Junior highs are doing a better job of preparing them…can tell they've had direct instruction in grammar
- Out students are more aware of the requirements for graduation

We followed a reverse coding scheme for answers coded as "less prepared":

- A) Specific skills getting worse
- B) Decline in skills in general, or lack of preparation
- C) Earlier grades not preparing students adequately
- D) Not enough focus on standards
- E) Poor motivation or discipline
- F) Too much time spent in review; Algebra 1 at eighth grade negatively impacting general math skills; more students needing review
- G) Teaching to mastery, rather than introducing or moving too quickly through the curriculum
- H) Demographics issue, either a shift or a concern
- I) Normal variance offered as an explanation of why respondent is seeing better preparation
- Collaboration

Table F.29. (EL) Examples of Less Preparedness

EL	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
	1	4	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0

A sample of the comments received for some of the categories are:

- …struggling with the 11th and 12th grader coming at the lower levels; the vocabulary issues, writing and parts of speech, and paragraph and sentence construction
- They have difficulty with reading and writing much more than they used to
- Kids born here who are EL seem to be less prepared (for some reason), struggling with language acquisition
- CELDT test scores lower than suggested by information from preceding teacher, at least one level. Students in system many years are still in EL program while immigrants move ahead faster
- Students that we are getting now are more poorly motivated and can be discipline problems

Common Question 3 GMGE, Admin, SP, (EL Question 4), (SP-C Question 2)

GMGE. Of the 270 responses to this question, all but 25 indicated that the California Content Standards were written into the curriculum. We noted several types of "yes" responses and developed the following coding system:

- General "yes" comment, often only the single word "yes"
- Yes, because their texts are aligned with the standards
- Yes, they are posted in the classroom or in lesson plans

- Yes, and offers specific evidence such as the creation of a curriculum guide or map, scope and sequence document, or district-wide tests designed to measure coverage of the standards

For this question, all other responses (no, unsure, maybe) with the exception of one off-topic response were grouped together. Table 29 shows that nearly all respondents report that the California Content Standards are written into their curricula.

Table F.30. (GMGE) California Content Standards and the Written Curriculum

GMGE	Yes, only	Yes, text	Yes, posted	Yes, specific	No/unsure	Off topic	Total
High Schools	130 (63%)	15 (7%)	5 (2%)	34 (17%)	21 (10%)	1 (<1%)	206 (100%)
Feeder Schools	46 (72%)	4 (6%)	1 (2%)	9 (14%)	4 (6%)	0	64 (100%)
Total	176 (65%)	19 (7%)	6 (2%)	43 (16%)	25 (9%)	1 (<1%)	270 (100%)

Sample responses from “yes, text”:

- In the text, take into account in lesson planning.
- The new textbooks now have them listed. The textbooks say that today we are doing the ‘whatever the main topic is’ and then the students remember that. It is written into our curriculum because the standards are built into the textbooks we are using.
- Sample responses from “yes, posted”:
- A goal for every day is posted on the board. The standards posters are up. We try to relate the daily goal to the standards, which are stated and written for the kids to see.
- Yes, they are all over the place. Every kid has the standards in a little journal that they keep. They are always on the board and the standard that is being addressed is on the board.

Sample responses from “yes, specific”:

- Yes. Curriculum map in effect last year was the school’s own. Besides general standards, it had been divided into EL standards so that certain grades were responsible for, say, punctuation, so that EL instruction was split up across the years. This year, the school follows the district’s curriculum map. As I said, it not only specifies the content standards for instruction but the pacing as well. It does not have the EL instruction standards.
- Yes they are. They have binders, test, and teacher meeting to discuss lesson plans to tie everything in with the standards. The curriculum map has integrated the standards over the past few years.

Sample responses from “no/unsure”:

- We have no set curriculum as a department, but I’m personally making a move toward this.
- Not really. The textbook doesn’t write them in. They have spent a great deal of time correlating problem to problem (they teach in a spiraling mode,

making them match problem to problem to a standard), so they have done that. Just that the book doesn't.

Admin. Question 3 asked Administrators if the California Content Standards are written into the curriculum. Over half of respondents (56%) reported that their curriculum does include the state standards.

Table F.31. (Admin) California Content Standards and the Written Curriculum

Admin	Yes	No	Can't Determine	Blank/N/A	Total
High Schools	31	0	6	27	64
Feeder Schools	14	0	0	2	16
Total	45	0	6	29	80

Of the 80 responses to this question, all but 35 indicated that the California Content Standards were written into the curriculum. We noted several types of "yes" responses and developed the following coding system:

- General "yes" comment, often only the single word "yes"
- Yes, because their texts are aligned with the standards
- Yes, they are posted in the classroom or in lesson plans
- Yes, and offers specific evidence such as the creation of a curriculum guide or map, scope and sequence document, or district-wide tests designed to measure coverage of the standards

Table F.32. (Admin) How Standards Are Incorporated Into Curriculum

Admin	Yes, only	Yes, text	Yes, posted	Yes, specific	No/unsure	Off topic
High Schools	25	3	2	1	0	0
Feeder Schools	13	0	0	1	0	2
Total	38	3	2	2	0	2

SP. Question 3 asked if the California Content Standards are written into the curriculum. Of the 78 possible respondents, only 45 answered this question since it was a long form only question. We noted several types of "yes" responses and developed the following coding system:

- General "yes" comment, often only the single word "yes"
- Yes, because their texts are aligned with the standards
- Yes, they are posted in the classroom or in lesson plans
- Yes, and offers specific evidence such as the creation of a curriculum guide or map, scope and sequence document, or district-wide tests designed to measure coverage of the standards

As indicated by the responses, nearly every person stated that standards were written into the curriculum. It is important to note that in the "Yes, specific" category, in addition to the expected responses that standards are found in a curriculum guide or lesson plan, most of the respondents (6 of the 11) also provided a caveat that the standards are in some way different for special education or that the students are not at

grade level. Also, for this question, all other responses (no, unsure, maybe) with the exception of one off-topic response were grouped together.

Table F.33. (SP) California Content Standards and the Written Curriculum

SP	Yes, only	Yes, text	Yes, posted	Yes, specific	No/unsure	Off topic
	27	2	1	11	4	0

Sample responses are:

- They are also included in the texts
- We have posters with the standards on them and I highlight the ones we're working on each day
- This year we've started a voluntary curriculum mapping effort, state standards are next to the lesson plans
- Specific evidence (of the standards) in curriculum guides, maps, district wide tests
- Yes, with special education they write differential standards for English and math, therefore, they are not at the same level as the general ed
- Yes, but at different levels; not a high school level, but student dependent
- The levels of the student vary so much in special education. I am very aware of the standards and try to reinforce what is being taught in the regular classroom, modifying our materials to cover the content standards but still address the particular learning disability of our students

EL. Question 4 asked if the California Content Standards are written into the curriculum. Of the 67 possible respondents, only 37 answered this question since it was a long form only question. We noted several types of "yes" responses and developed the following coding system:

- General "yes" comment, often only the single word "yes"
- Yes, because their texts are aligned with the standards
- Yes, they are posted in the classroom or in lesson plans
- Yes, and offers specific evidence such as the creation of a curriculum guide or map, scope and sequence document, or district-wide tests designed to measure coverage of the standards

As indicated by the responses, nearly every person stated that standards were written into the curriculum. It is important to note that in the "Yes, specific" category, in addition to the expected responses that standards are found in a curriculum guide or lesson plan, most of the respondents (6 of the 11) also provided a caveat that the standards are in some way different for English learners or that the students are not at grade level. Also, for this question, all other responses (no, unsure, maybe) with the exception of one off-topic response were grouped together.

Table F.34. (EL) How Standards are Incorporated into Curriculum

EL	Yes, only	Yes, text	Yes, posted	Yes, specific	No/unsure	Off topic
	27	7	0	3	0	0

Sample responses are:

- Yes, that ELD standards mesh with ELA standards, the teachers are in constant communication to be sure students are on the road to ELA
- …but I use the standards as a guide for my curriculum
- They are listed in the HighPoint program we are using
- We are using state approved textbooks and incorporate the ELD standards into our curriculum

SP-C. Question 2 asked Special Courses teachers if the California Content Standards are written into the curriculum. The 33 responses are highlighted in the table below. Almost all respondents indicated that the standards are written in (88%).

Table F.35. (SP-C) California Content Standards and the Written Curriculum

SP-C	Yes	No	Can't Determine	Blank/N/A	Total
High Schools	27	2	0	1	30
Feeder Schools	2	1	0	0	3
Total	29	3	0	1	33

Of the 30 affirmative answers, 27 were simply yes, while 3 noted specific ways the standards have been written in to the curriculum.

Table F.36. (SP-C) How Standards are Incorporated into Curriculum

	Yes, only	Yes, text	Yes, posted	Yes, specific	No/unsure	Off topic
High Schools	26	0	0	2	2	30
Feeder Schools	1	0	0	1	1	3
Total	27	0	0	3	3	33

Common Question 4 GMGE, Admin, SP, (EL Question 5), (SP-C Question 3)

GMGE. Respondents typically listed several ways in which their teaching of the California Content Standards was being monitored, and all responses were honored; therefore, readers will note that there are many more responses than there were respondents. There was one blank response for this question.

The list of topics includes the following:

- Common exams, such as benchmark exams
- Observations/evaluations conducted by administrators, department heads, or subject-specific coaches
- Materials alignment, the use of curriculum or pacing guides or the use of textbooks aligned to California Content Standards
- Posting of standards on the board, possibly to foster student awareness of standards
- Lesson plans that were reviewed to ensure that they addressed standards
- Meetings, such as more formal department meetings, during which standards were discussed

- Collaboration, usually more informal than department meetings, which described conversations between teachers or the sharing of ideas or lesson plans
- Professional development or training activities designed to help teachers learn about teaching the standards
- New teacher issues, including comments made by new teachers or mentors to new teachers
- Nothing, describing that either no monitoring is taking place or it is in early stages

Table 37 shows that the use of common exams and observations/evaluations were mentioned most frequently to ensure that teachers were, in fact, teaching the California Content Standards. We note that some observations and evaluations were not conducted solely to determine if a teacher was using standards, since they were typically conducted as part of an annual review process. In fact, some tenured teachers reported being observed only every other year.

Table F.37. (GMGE) Ensuring the Teaching of California Content Standards

GMGE	High Schools (206)	Feeder Schools (63—1 blank)	Total (269)
Common exams	97 (47%)	37 (59%)	134 (50%)
Observations	87 (42%)	31 (49%)	118 (44%)
Materials alignment	40 (19%)	16 (25%)	56 (21%)
Post standards	34 (17%)	9 (14%)	43 (16%)
Lesson plan review	19 (9%)	13 (21%)	32 (12%)
Meetings	33 (16%)	15 (24%)	48 (18%)
Collaboration	24 (12%)	7 (11%)	31 (12%)
Prof development	9 (4%)	4 (6%)	13 (5%)
New teacher	11 (5%)	0	11 (4%)
Nothing	22 (11%)	1 (2%)	23 (9%)

Sample responses from “common exams”:

- We are giving district-wide semester tests and final tests in algebra. This will ensure that teachers teach to the standards. Scores will indicate poor teacher performance. It will be used to hold teachers accountable.
- …we use the benchmark results and the district gets the information and they check to see how many students are passing the benchmarks. This lets them know if a teacher is teaching to the standards.

Sample responses from “observations”:

- Administrators observe us, but I don’t think they can ensure. They only come for one hour and a teacher can throw anything up on the board and a teacher can play with that. Some only put the standards up when they are observed, since administrators make an appointment to formally observe. We are starting this year to do some quick observations by the principal, but it isn’t happening very often…
- …Evaluations by the administrators that function as a tool to determine how well a teacher is prepared and if the teacher is addressing the standard…

Sample responses from “materials alignment”:

- The textbook is driven by the standards; either it says what standard the section teaches, or marks it as an optional section.
- Our lesson plans and activities are aligned to the standards.

Sample responses from “posting”:

- Regular classroom visits to check that standards are posted.
- …They want to see the standards on the board and in lesson plans…

Sample responses from “lesson plans”:

- We take lesson plans and calibrate them to the standards, discussing in department meetings.
- …Turn in quarterly lesson plans, listing standards, to principal.

Sample responses from “meetings”:

- The department discussions and all meetings include a focus on the standards.
- Our departmental meetings help monitor what area we are teaching. In the meetings we discuss if we are behind or too far ahead.

Sample responses from “collaboration”:

- Teachers check up on each other. We go into other classrooms with a checklist and record what we see as effective teaching strategies on how to teach the content standards.
- We grade essays holistically and then give them back to the teacher. You can see which teachers are addressing the standards because it shows through their student work.

Sample responses from “professional development”:

- …professional development constantly reminds us to include the standards; bring sample work from students.
- Our professional development focus is on the standards and level of student work.

Sample responses from “new teacher”:

- …With the people she mentors, she always discusses what is being addressed relative to the standards…
- …The Beginning Teachers Support Association (BTSA) helps new teachers learn how to integrate the standards…

Sample responses from “nothing”:

- None. For good or bad you’re left alone once competency established.
- Absolutely nothing. As Chair, I really don’t have any power to enforce this, and there’s no administrative oversight.

Admin. Question 4 explored what methods are used to ensure that teachers are actually teaching the California Content Standards. There was a broad range of

answers, and the following codes were developed. Several answers could be given by each respondent, so the number of responses does not match the number of interviews conducted.

- A) Common exams, such as benchmark exams
- B) Observations/evaluations conducted by administrators, department heads, or subject-specific coaches
- C) Materials alignment, the use of curriculum or pacing guides or the use of textbooks aligned to California Content Standards
- D) Posting of standards on the board, possibly to foster student awareness of standards
- E) Lesson plans that were reviewed to ensure that they addressed standards
- F) Meetings, such as more formal department meetings, during which standards were discussed
- G) Collaboration, usually more informal than department meetings, which described conversations between teachers or the sharing of ideas or lesson plans
- H) Professional development or training activities designed to help teachers learn about teaching the standards
- I) New teacher issues, including comments made by new teachers or mentors to new teachers
- J) Nothing, describing that either no monitoring is taking place or it is in early stages

Table F.38. (Admin) Methods Used to Ensure Teachers are Teaching the California Content Standards

Admin	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
High School	20	51	19	1	6	20	0	10	0	0
Feeder School	6	8	3	0	2	3	0	0	0	0
Total	26	59	22	1	8	23	0	10	0	0

Sample comments from Administrator interviews:

- Our teacher evaluation process includes the standards
- Benchmark testing occurs three times per course.
- District meetings.
- Observations, benchmark testing (district).
- Both district and administrator level observations include some criteria dealing with California Content Standards.
- We visit classrooms frequently and specifically monitor to see if the content standards are being taught.
- We do classroom audits at the school and district level, use standards based curriculum, formal observations based on the California standards, and require that the standards be posted in kid-friendly language.
- Our department meetings are focused on the standards so that everyone knows what to do.
- Our teacher evaluation system is specific, as we evaluate, we are specifically looking for standards being taught, looking for evidence thereof.

- All curriculum guides and pacing guides are integrated with the standards.
- District adopted standards and we have developed pacing guides for all teachers.
- Our curriculum is aligned to the standards.
- Teachers submit a course map, daily lessons, and unit of inquiry for approval by peers and administration.

SP. This question asked respondents to identify how the school ensures that special education teachers are actually teaching the California Academic Content Standards. All 78 possible respondents answered the question which were wide in scope, ranging from extensive teacher and lesson evaluations to nothing, or very little. Since there are multiple ways to monitor the teaching of standards, the number of responses is higher than the number of respondents.

The list of topics includes the following:

- A) Common exams, such as benchmark exams
- B) Observations/evaluations conducted by administrators, department heads, or subject-specific coaches
- C) Materials alignment, the use of curriculum or pacing guides or the use of textbooks aligned to California Content Standards
- D) Posting of standards on the board, possibly to foster student awareness of standards
- E) Lesson plans that were reviewed to ensure that they addressed standards
- F) Meetings, such as more formal department meetings, during which standards were discussed
- G) Collaboration, usually more informal than department meetings, which described conversations between teachers or the sharing of ideas or lesson plans
- H) Professional development or training activities designed to help teachers learn about teaching the standards
- I) New teacher issues, including comments made by new teachers or mentors to new teachers
- J) Nothing, describing that either no monitoring is taking place or it is in early stages
- K) IEP goals

Table F.39. (SP) Methods for Ensuring CA Standards are Being Taught

SP	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K
	24	32	10	9	18	7	0	3	0	10	12

Sample responses from “common exams”:

- We have the district benchmarks and SP students take those also
- District-wide teas, three writing tests per year
- They test quarterly based on the content standards and the way that the curriculum is set up; our students take the tests, too

Sample responses from “observations”:

- We usually have two or three unannounced visits by our principal every year
- The administrators are supposed to go around and monitor it; notice I said “are supposed to.”
- Our principals do classroom walkthroughs; they look for standards

Sample responses from “materials alignment”:

- The textbooks we are using are aligned to the state standards
- Math classes have been using the guide book as a homework study guide

Sample responses from “posting”:

- Place them on the board, lesson planning, I put them in IEPs under the goals

Sample responses from “lesson plans”:

- We indicate standards covered in lesson plans and monitor coverage in each curricular area
- We follow scripted curriculums and a reference to the standards are made in all the lesson plans
- Younger teachers must turn in lesson plans and are observed more often

Sample responses from “meetings”:

- We also have staff meetings where the standards are discussed in at least a third of these meetings

Sample responses from “professional development”:

- More coaching and support in how to teach and implement standards in the classroom
- …EDI was mandatory that we all take

Sample responses from “nothing”:

- I really believe the majority of the teachers are not teaching toward the curriculum; resource teachers are supposed to teach what the regular teachers are teaching and the majority of them do not
- Just the teacher’s word, I believe, their professionalism and personal ethics

Sample responses from “IEP”:

- …however, we are working on standards that are below grade level; IEP goals are very different than the standards
- For special education ,we’re not driven to the standards, more what we identify in their IEPs as to what they need
- We all try to teach to the same content standards, but the issue for special education students is what students can do as defined in their IEP

EL. This question asked respondents to identify how the school ensures that teachers are actually teaching the California Academic Content Standards. All 67 possible respondents answered the question which were wide in scope, ranging from extensive teacher and lesson evaluations to nothing, or very little. Since there are multiple ways to

monitor the teaching of standards, the number of responses is higher than the number of respondents.

The list of topics includes the following:

- A) Common exams, such as benchmark exams
- B) Observations/evaluations conducted by administrators, department heads, or subject-specific coaches
- C) Materials alignment, the use of curriculum or pacing guides or the use of textbooks aligned to California Content Standards
- D) Posting of standards on the board, possibly to foster student awareness of standards
- E) Lesson plans that were reviewed to ensure that they addressed standards
- F) Meetings, such as more formal department meetings, during which standards were discussed
- G) Collaboration, usually more informal than department meetings, which described conversations between teachers or the sharing of ideas or lesson plans
- H) Professional development or training activities designed to help teachers learn about teaching the standards
- I) New teacher issues, including comments made by new teachers or mentors to new teachers
- J) Nothing, describing that either no monitoring is taking place or it is in early stages
- K) IEP goals

Table F.40. (EL) Methods for Ensuring CA Standards are Being Taught

EL	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K
	20	31	14	8	11	7	12	6	5	9	0

Sample responses from “common exams”:

- We have district quarterly assessments
- The school conducts district wide tests at the end of the year and we have benchmark tests given quarterly
- For us, we are creating more common assignments (and tests)
- The ELD kids are also taking the benchmark tests for English and math, which is not explicit for ELD but some standards do cross over

Sample responses from “observations”:

- Our teacher evaluations and observations cover this
- The principals conduct observations once every other year for a tenured teacher and once a year for non-tenured teachers
- Administrators conduct walkthroughs and evaluations, they rarely happen and most last about 3 minutes

Sample responses from “materials alignment”:

- …you can’t help but teach the standards because they’re in the textbook

- For language arts, school uses HighPoint curriculum, for EL and remedial students. The standards for HighPoint map to lower grade level standards, do not include 6-8 curriculum standards
- Sample responses from “posting”:
- We are putting standards up in the classroom every day, it has become second nature

Sample responses from “lesson plans”:
- We have portfolios and materials we have to submit
- In English classes, these focus lessons are written with the EL and English standards by grade level. We also use a standards-based rubric for school wide writing
- Lesson plans get submitted every 6 weeks (aligned with marking periods)

Sample responses from “meetings”:
- We have department meeting to disseminate information and then we show them how to do it
- The EL department meets several times a year to align the cubiculum

Sample responses from “collaboration”:
- Common planning time for ELD teachers
- We do have weekly collaboration meeting on Wednesdays where this is the major topic of discussion. I don’t think a teacher would last long here if they weren’t addressing the standards

Sample responses from “professional development”:
- We have 6 follow-up trainings and three are scheduled for next year
- In-servicing helps us keep track of the standards

Sample responses from “new teachers”:
- We have standards coaches
- The district has an EL leader that oversees the EL program for the district

Sample responses from “nothing”:
- No formal monitoring system in place; the management time required for the previously used forms was excessive and is no longer an expectation for teachers to use
- Strength from our department is great; no supervision

SP-C. Multiple responses were allowed, so the number does not match the number of interviews. The list of topics includes the following:
- A) Common exams, such as benchmark exams
- B) Observations/evaluations conducted by administrators, department heads, or subject-specific coaches
- C) Materials alignment, the use of curriculum or pacing guides or the use of textbooks aligned to California Content Standards
- D) Posting of standards on the board, possibly to foster student awareness of standards

- E) Lesson plans that were reviewed to ensure that they addressed standards
- F) Meetings, such as more formal department meetings, during which standards were discussed
- G) Collaboration, usually more informal than department meetings, which described conversations between teachers or the sharing of ideas or lesson plans
- H) Professional development or training activities designed to help teachers learn about teaching the standards
- I) New teacher issues, including comments made by new teachers or mentors to new teachers
- J) Nothing, describing that either no monitoring is taking place or it is in early stages
- K) IEP goals
- Codes with no responses have been omitted.

Table F.41. (SP-C) Methods to Ensure CA Standards are Being Taught

SP-C	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
High Schools	9	13	2	2	3	1	0	0	0	7
Feeder Schools	1	3	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0
Total	10	16	2	2	4	2	0	0	0	7

Sample responses from Special Courses Interviews:

- This year the administrators are conducting five to six mini observations compared to only two done last year.
- We have benchmark exams.
- Administrators monitor and observe us.
- We use the district assessment tests.
- We have district testing at the end of the semester that will test what we covered.
- Observations ensure implementation

Common Question 5A-5C GMGE, (Admin 5), (SP 5A,B), (EL 6A,B), (SP-C 4A,B)

GMGE. Question 5A asked respondents to explain how their school ensures that teachers have a common expectation and definition of “mastery.” There were no blank responses; codes used in the analysis of this question are as follows:

- There is no formal process or consistent definition, or respondent does not know of such a process or definition
- Use of the same materials or the same grading system or common rubrics
- Informal communication
- Common exams or benchmarks at either the department, school, or district level
- Standards awareness, articulation, expectations
- Staff or department meetings, professional development training
- Documents such as pacing or curriculum guides
- Materials or textbooks aligned to the California Content Standards
- Observations or evaluations by administrators or peers
- Data analysis

Again, we note that respondents were free to give as many responses as they felt they needed to describe how their school defined mastery, so the number of responses will be greater than the number of respondents. We also note that codes with fewer than 10 responses were omitted from this analysis. Percentages were determined by dividing the number of responses per category by the number of possible respondents by school level; total responses are based on total number of respondents. Results show that "common exams" was the option most frequently selected.

Table F.42. (GMGE) What Ensures that Mastery Means the Same Thing to all Teachers?

GMGE	High School (206)	Feeder School (64)	Total (270)
No formal process	64 (31%)	14 (22%)	78 (29%)
Same materials	37 (18%)	9 (14%)	46 (17%)
Informal communication	16 (8%)	2 (3%)	18 (7%)
Common exams	73 (35%)	30 (47%)	103 (38%)
Student awareness	11 (5%)	4 (6%)	15 (6%)
Meetings, PD	41 (20%)	8 (13%)	49 (18%)
Documents	30 (15%)	19 (30%)	49 (18%)
Aligned texts	13 (6%)	3 (5%)	16 (6%)
Observations	17 (8%)	7 (11%)	24 (9%)
Data analysis	12 (6%)	5 (8%)	17 (6%)

We also examined how the responses to "no formal process or consistent definition" were clustered among schools. We found that at 23 schools at least two respondents replied that there was no formal process or consistent definition of mastery; at 16 schools, only one respondent replied similarly. A couple of schools showed strong consistency in these responses, with four of the five respondents at one school and 4 of 10 at another school stating there was no formal process to ensure that mastery means the same thing to all teachers.

Sample responses from "no formal process":

- …I have higher standards than other teachers and it turns me green to see some teachers pass an essay
- I don't know. This seems to be at discretion of teacher
- That is where there is a big gap. We can take five different teachers and have five different results. This is an area that is lacking.

Sample responses from "staff/department meetings":

- …Because of these discussions, everyone understands mastery...

Sample responses from "common exams/benchmarks":

- The most common way is the assessments from the focus lesson as a department. Scoring is completed using a Scantron and administrators post our results…
- …We do use the benchmarks and finals which help us to keep uniform, but how teachers grade them is still up to the teacher.

Sample responses from “pacing/curriculum guides”:

- Through the district curriculum map teachers are on the same page with mastery and content standards…

Question 5B asked whether the same process of ensuring mastery is used for special education and English Learner students. Of the 270 respondents, 44 responses were either blank or not applicable because they said they did not teach special education or EL students, or they said they did not know. Seventeen respondents replied that these students were being held to different degrees of mastery, while 111 respondents replied that mastery or standards were basically the same, even when they used accommodations listed in students’ IEPs. Thus, students would be held to the same mastery level or standards, but they would be permitted more time to do their work or would have the amount of work reduced. We were unable to analyze the remaining responses with any confidence; for example, respondents often described the use of accommodations as listed in IEPs but claimed that this resulted in modified mastery.

We were unable to determine how teachers went about reducing the amount of work; eliminating 5 questions from a 20-question test may not result in a lessening of standards or lowered mastery expectations if students are still required to complete some upper-level questions. On the other hand, if teachers eliminate the most difficult questions, or all the questions from a particular content area, then it is likely that their special education students are not receiving the same exposure to standards or mastery as their fellow students who are not classified as special education.

The fact that special education and English learners often move at a slower pace, or are given more time to complete assignments, has proved troublesome to some teachers who find it difficult to hold them to the same pace as non-special education students. Others blame the number of standards, which they see as too many, for special education students’ failure to master standards.

Those teachers who stated that they have mainstreamed students in their classes typically described how they differentiated instruction, such as the use of visuals or repetition for these students. Usually, teachers stated that mainstreamed students had few accommodations and were held to the same mastery levels as the other students. However, there were some exceptions to this.

Sample responses from “different degrees of mastery”:

- Most of our special education students are mainstreamed as well as our sheltered students. We do need to modify because they can’t meet the standard, they usually need additional time and they work with resource teachers. Many cannot meet the standards, so we need to modify the outcome as well as the delivery of instruction.
- Currently the special education curriculum is modified because the students have individual IEPs to meet their goals that may not align with the standards. Though students are held accountable for the standards, as long as they meet the IEP goals, the teacher is considered successful.
- Every special education student has modifications in IEP; teachers modify performance expectations, definition of mastery.

- That is what we have been working on in our staff development and professional development. What does mastery and grade appropriate work look like? I do not think that we have come to consensus as a group to see what that looks like. All students need to be doing the same mastery work.
- Special education students and EL students are included in the scope and sequence and the benchmarks. Accommodations are made for these students so they can master a skill. We are frustrated because we can't get to the mastery because of so many standards.

Sample responses from "same degree of mastery":

- The same process; however, if the student has an IEP then the special considerations are given to them that are stated on the IEP.
- Same. These students don't have a separate set of standards.
- Only modification would be if they have a 504 plan or something; they would just write smaller pieces, have more time to do it, would give them more scaffolding.
- It's the same process. They get the same test and same set of criteria. Whatever the ed code allows students to do is done. State testing doesn't care if students are special education or EL, whatever grade they're in; those are the standards they take. There are CA standards for EL kids, so they get this on top of the regular standards.

Sample responses from "could not determine":

- Modified. Special education has a separate class in math. They're privy to the questions on teacher-made tests ahead of time.
- Mastery for the special education student is according to the IEP and our assessment practices. There is no coordination with the EL department or training. As a new teacher I don't know how to make those modifications. I don't know what EL modifications should look like in a regular classroom.
- Case-by-case basis. Sometimes modified.

Question 5C asked whether teachers have an informal method to monitor individual student mastery of standards. General education math and ELA teachers typically responded with ways their students are monitored for standards mastery both formally (department- or district-level exams, for example) and informally (teacher-created tests or quizzes, homework assignments, or class work). Of the 270 teacher interviews, 167 discussed using various informal assessment methods, with 40 of the 167 specifically mentioning "mastery" or "standards." Because we believe that the idea of mastery of standards is the key finding of this analysis, we include a few representative comments before presenting the more general analysis.

Mastery/standards comments

- …It is an ongoing process to get teachers to move away from skills-based assessment and teaching to standards-based teaching and tests.
- …Today, for a final for Algebra and I checked myself to see if the standard was covered, making sure the students knew the standard that was being covered…

- At the beginning of the year, I give my students a copy of the standards for each chapter. All the lessons have the standard and all the units with their titles have the standards listed. When the students take a quiz the standard is listed. Afterwards, the student checks off each standard that is covered and by the end of the year, all teachers and students know what has been covered.
- …I have a lovely chart where I have the standard and the student's name beneath it. I check if the student has mastered the standard.
- The students get standards-based teaching and re-teach and re-test based on the outcomes. The standards are written in the grade book and students get marks when they have passed the standards.

Although it is clear from these comments that teachers are paying attention to standards, it is also clear that some are still focused on just covering the standards rather than having their students master them. It is also likely that many teachers are relying on common exams instituted by the department, school, or district as a more formal measure of student mastery. (We note that the issue of school-wide monitoring of student mastery is addressed in Question 6A.)

We now present the more general analysis of those responses we identified as informal methods of monitoring student mastery of standards. There were 66 blank responses, 44 from high school teachers and 22 from feeder school teachers. As in previous questions, the number of responses will be greater than the number of actual respondents, which are found in the column headings. We developed 10 main codes:

- Casual assessments, such as a show of hands, holding up work on a whiteboard, or other quick assessments that often are not graded.
- Routine assessments such as might be found in any classroom; might include quizzes, teacher-developed tests, or tests provided by the textbook publisher. Typically, these are graded.
- Observation during class
- Use of rubrics
- Homework, projects, or presentations
- Discussion, questioning, or conferencing
- Materials targeted to standards
- Monitoring work done in class
- Monitoring through writing assignments, which can include journals or portfolios
- Other

Table F.43. (GMGE) Does the Teacher Use an Informal Method to Monitor Student Mastery of Standards?

GMGE	High School (162)	Feeder School (42)	Total (204)
Casual	8 (5%)	6 (14%)	14 (7%)
Routine	56 (35%)	15 (36%)	71 (35%)
Observe	20 (12%)	6 (14%)	26 (13%)
Rubrics	9 (6%)	4 (10%)	13 (6%)
Homework	20 (12%)	8 (19%)	28 (14%)
Discuss	42 (26%)	5 (12%)	47 (23%)
Materials	18 (11%)	1 (2%)	19 (9%)
Class work	15 (9%)	3 (7%)	18 (9%)
Writing	18 (11%)	5 (12%)	23 (11%)
Other	15 (9%)	5 (12%)	20 (10%)

Casual assessments

- …I have a thumbs up, thumbs down assessment at end of each period…
- …We review and the students use a whiteboard, students hold the answer up and I can quickly see how they are getting the concept…

Routine assessments

- …End of unit tests are used…
- Summative and formative exams, pre/post assessments.

Observation

- "By the look in their eyes."

Rubrics

- …Depending on the standard, if we grade to a rubric the student knew about in advance, it is clear to the student where his or her weakness (is), clear what is being graded for. She gives no major assignment without giving students a scoring rubric in advance.
- Rubrics are used to teach with for individual students. A "C" means you can go into the world and use the skills and "A" is university bound. There are no "Ds". Rubrics are based completely on the standards…Standards-based rubrics should be used for each topic across the entire state.

Homework

- Student's assignments are turned in and graded…

Discussion

- …There are question and answer sessions at the end of the period.

Materials

- Tests we give through the year (are) keyed to standards
- Tests have been revised to tie to standards and test vocabulary used in CAHSEE…

Class work

- I monitor when they are working on class work…
- I call students up to the board even when they have been absent from an assignment because I pick students randomly…

Writing

- I use dialogue journals to check for mastery…
- …some teacher have students write papers on the core standards and how they have mastered the.
- …If it's a writing essay, I give them a chance to improve their grade as they work through a writing assignment since I only grade the final draft and not any of the rough drafts.

Other

- A lot of what we do could be considered informal. But what we do covers everything very well.
- Reviewing to make sure all standards are covered and offering remediation as needed.

Admin. This question explores the methods used to ensure that the California Content Standards are being taught at the appropriate instructional level or grade level that is expected by all teachers of a particular course-that "mastery" means the same thing to all teachers. Codes used in the analysis of this question are as follows:

- A) There is no formal process or consistent definition, or respondent does not know of such a process or definition
- B) Use of the same materials or the same grading system or common rubrics
- C) Informal communication
- D) Common exams or benchmarks at either the department, school, or district level
- E) Standards awareness, articulation, expectations
- F) Staff or department meetings, professional development training
- G) Documents such as pacing or curriculum guides
- H) Materials or textbooks aligned to the California Content Standards
- I) Observations or evaluations by administrators or peers
- J) Data analysis
- K) Placement or tracking of students
- L) CAHSEE practice test
- M) Remediation activities
- N) Excessive material, or material that is too difficult, that teachers are expected to cover
- O) Progress reports/IEPs

Again, we note that respondents were free to give as many responses as they felt they needed to describe how their school defined mastery, so the number of responses will be greater than the number of respondents. We also note that codes with no responses were omitted from this analysis.

Table F.44. (Admin) What Ensures that Mastery Means the Same Thing to all Teachers?

Administrator Responses	High Schools	Feeder Schools
A	5	1
B	6	2
C	3	2
D	9	8
E	2	1
F	13	4
H	2	0
I	5	1
J	4	4
O	1	0
Blank	30	2

SP. Question 5A asked respondents to explain how their school ensures that teachers have a common expectation and definition of "mastery." Codes used in the analysis of this question are as follows:

- A) There is no formal process or consistent definition, or respondent does not know of such a process or definition
- B) Use of the same materials or the same grading system or common rubrics
- C) Informal communication
- D) Common exams or benchmarks at either the department, school, or district level
- E) Standards awareness, articulation, expectations
- F) Staff or department meetings, professional development training
- G) Documents such as pacing or curriculum guides
- H) Materials or textbooks aligned to the California Content Standards
- I) Observations or evaluations by administrators or peers
- J) Data analysis
- K) Placement or tracking of students
- L) CAHSEE practice test
- M) Remediation activities
- N) Excessive material, or material that is too difficult, that teachers are expected to cover
- O) Progress reports/IEPs

It should be noted that respondents were free to give as many responses as they felt they needed to describe how their school defined mastery, so the number of responses will be greater than the number of respondents.

Table F.45. (SP) What Ensures that Mastery Means the Same Thing to all Teachers?

SP	
A	9
B	11
C	6
D	12
E	2
F	12
G	2
H	4
I	6
J	1
K	1
L	0
M	2
N	5
O	18

Unlike the general math and English teachers, the number of teachers stating there was no formal process or consistent definition of mastery was significantly less (less than 10% of the respondents compared to over 25%) and the clustering analysis is not applicable with this teacher subpopulation. As one would anticipate, numerous respondents indicated that IEPs play a significant role in defining, as well as, assessing mastery for special education students.

Sample responses from selected categories are provided, starting with “no formal process”:

- No oversight
- Rubrics, even on a state-wide level, would be helpful. Standards give a lot of leeway, but rubrics would determine what means mastery
- In special ed, it doesn’t (isn’t a formal process); not sure it needs to be, my expectations are much higher than other special ed teachers

Sample responses from “same materials or grading”:

- We’ve been trained on coordinating our materials with that being taught in regular ed classes
- Yes, we are using the same tests and books. We haven’t aligned scheduled yet because we have student with different abilities. The pacing plan is not appropriate for this type of student

Sample responses from “Progressive reports/IEPs”:

- Mastery is reflected by accomplishing goals in IEP
- As a special education department we looked at the content standards, but the curriculum is driven by the IEP
- It is very difficult in special education. Have kids with reading levels from 3-9 grades. I look at the standards and teach the standards, but mastery is what is on their IEP not what is on the CA standards

Question 5B asked whether the same process of ensuring that the standards are being taught at the appropriate instructional level or grade level (that mastery means the same thing) is done for special education as general education students. It appears from the responses that the process determining that is similar (i.e., benchmarks, collaboration, curriculum calibration, data analysis), but, defining mastery or how it applies to special education students is not so clear. Of the 78 respondents, only 10 did not respond or provided an off-topic response.

The remaining 68 respondents noted that there were differences in how the standards are being applied to special education students with regard to depth, time, quantity, and grading. It is not the purpose of this effort to determine what types of accommodations, or modifications, are appropriate or acceptable. That would be up to the reader after reviewing several sample responses.

Sample responses are:

- Yes, the same. The same information is presented, just that we do a lot of scaffolding in the classroom
- Same. Resource students receive accommodations, but not modifications… extends time, reduced amount of assignment, or open book-type questions
- Same, there are accommodations (extra time, reading a test) but the process is the same. For students in special day classes, then there are modifications…different math and science, career class
- Yes, same…it is difficult to measure them; difficult to grade a students if a student is only doing a fraction of the work
- Yes, the same. We have to modify the standards somewhat to better fit the capabilities of the students
- Yes, but also modified to meet the RSP student's needs. Grading is also modified for these students, which contributes to them lagging behind regular ed peers
- No, it is modified. We teach at the level that the students are ready to learn because of their IEP
- Modified. We use the content standards, but we frequently have to calibrate them to the reading level off the students. We try to hit the CAHSEE standards
- Modified. That is a good question. I lower my standards for students to meet the standards; we assess and put it in their IEP
- We modify, the delivery is not as concentrated
- Modifications as stated on the student's IEPs should still be in place with CAHSEE
- Modified. The curriculum is a modified version of the general education curriculum, but is aligned with the standards
- Its modified, but we teach the same stuff; the response from the student is modified

EL. Question 6A asked respondents to explain how their school ensures that teachers have a common expectation and definition of "mastery." Codes used in the analysis of this question are as follows:

- A) There is no formal process or consistent definition, or respondent does not know of such a process or definition
- B) Use of the same materials or the same grading system or common rubrics
- C) Informal communication
- D) Common exams or benchmarks at either the department, school, or district level
- E) Standards awareness, articulation, expectations
- F) Staff or department meetings, professional development training
- G) Documents such as pacing or curriculum guides
- H) Materials or textbooks aligned to the California Content Standards
- I) Observations or evaluations by administrators or peers
- J) Data analysis
- K) Placement or tracking of students
- L) CAHSEE practice test
- M) Remediation activities
- N) Excessive material, or material that is too difficult, that teachers are expected to cover
- O) Progress reports/IEPs

It should be noted that respondents were free to give as many responses as they felt they needed to describe how their school defined mastery, so the number of responses will be greater than the number of respondents.

Table F.46. (EL) What Ensures that Mastery Means the Same Thing to all Teachers?

EL	
A	9
B	2
C	6
D	17
E	6
F	18
G	6
H	13
I	3
J	1
K	7
L	0
M	1
N	1
O	0

Unlike the general math and English teachers, the number of teachers stating there was no formal process or consistent definition of mastery was significantly less (less than 15% of the respondents compared to over 25% from the general education teachers) and the clustering analysis is not applicable with this teacher subpopulation. There were many similarities between the EL and special education teacher responses, with a few exceptions. EL had more responses regarding the use of materials/textbooks aligned with standards (H) and student placement (K), while there were significantly

fewer comments regarding the use of the same materials/grading (B) and not surprisingly progress reports/IEPS (O).

Sample responses from selected categories are provided, starting with “no formal process”:

- We don’t have a standardized way of assessing
- Nothing. Teachers can do nothing in these schools and nothing will happen

Sample responses from “common exams/benchmarks”:

- Through common assessments, focus lessons, and their periodic assessments. Mastery of a focus lesson is 80%
- Those benchmark exams, which are grade level specific
- All the EL teachers have met and they formulated benchmarks to meet the standards for each level
- They have discussed common goals and established school-wide writing assignments

Sample responses from “staff or department meetings”:

- There are teacher meetings and preschool in-services. Writing assessments are shared and grade level meetings are conducted. The administration emphasizes standards alignment
- One of the difficulties was grading, but in the last training we focused on grading and we now have a while system at pretty much the same level of mastery
- There is not a common definition in terms of mastery, it is an issue. She is not sure if an “A” in her class corresponds to an “A” in another HighPoint class. Also, she may have given an “A” to a student reading at 3rd grade level and someone else who is at an 8th grade level. In history, she has some students who speak no English; she can’t modify the curriculum enough to meet their learning needs.

Sample responses from “student placement”:

- …regularly assess each student’s capability; this is done upon entry into the program and continues throughout the year
- Placement in ELD classes is determined by testing results…our EDI instruction model encourages we teach at grade level

Question 6B asked whether the same process of ensuring that the standards are being taught at the appropriate instructional level or grade level (that mastery means the same thing) is done for special education as general education students. It appears from the responses that the process determining that is similar (i.e., benchmarks, collaboration, curriculum calibration, data analysis), but, defining mastery or how it applies to EL students is not so clear. Of the 67 respondents, 9 did not respond or provided an off-topic response. The remaining 58 respondents, as with the special education teachers, noted that there were differences in how the standards are being applied to EL students with regard to depth, time, quantity, and grading.

Sample responses are:

- Same process. The EL department does more scaffolding than the general education students. They use the same questions but ensure they understand the language
- ESL uses the same benchmark assessment as for regular students, but some modifications would be made. For example, in writing a character study, ESL might have a lower vocabulary expectation, inconsistencies in grammar that wouldn't obstruct reading; the student understand the text read and knows basic skills of organization, note taking, and how to develop a piece of writing. It's the sophistication that varies with ESL
- The same process. Our ELD level 1-5 don't necessarily match up with grade level, but students are expected to increase one level per year; only modification is that an aide goes with several students to their Health class. Most teachers modify as needed for specific EL students, allowing them to demonstrate proficiency in more appropriate ways
- Same. For EL the HighPoint curriculum is used. It spells out all the standards and what's expected of the students. As far as determining mastery, this is bard entirely on the student portfolios. There are specific rubrics for each test in the portfolio (writing, oral, listening)
- No, it is modified. There are some modifications in grading, with more time being allowed on tests and assessments, and with reducing the scope of the assignments
- The process is modified. The EL development standards and the LA department worked with an outside organization to develop a correlation of 83 pages of standards and they are cumbersome. We were trained on the essentials needed for EL students to be successful when they transition in the classroom. We don't focus lessons on the lowest EL students because the problem is finding someone to write them. In EL development, we are trying to develop a smooth transition in the four domains of language and the emphasis of academics, but their academics are really lacking
- Modified. In ESL, there is a portfolio system for mastery
- It is heavily modified. We have to build scaffold to get the students there, we use more modifications because of the linguistics
- Modified. Student mastery is not at the same level as a regular student. Mastery of the language is not complete; however, their grammar is comparable. Their vocabulary, their sentence structure, and their speech are far inferior to a mainstreamed student. WL students have separate standards and we base on their own standard

SP-C. Most respondents said that there was no process for ensuring that 'mastery' means the same thing to all teachers, or that they were unaware of any process. Codes with no responses were omitted from the table below.

Table F.47. (SP-C) What Ensures that Mastery Means the Same Thing to all Teachers?

Special Courses Responses	High Schools	Feeder Schools
A	12	0
B	2	0
C	3	0
D	3	1
F	5	0
G	1	2
H	2	1
I	4	0
J	1	0
Blank	2	0

Sample responses from special courses interviews:

- It is left up to me.
- I do.
- I don't think there is (anything that ensures mastery means the same thing to different teachers)
- It's up to the teacher to make sure that the level is being maintained.
- There's nothing in place right now.
- They are just beginning to focus on mastery level.

Common Question 6A, B GMGE, (Admin 6A only), (SP 6), (EL 7A, C), (SP-C 5A, C)

GMGE. Questions 6A and 6B were not asked if interviewers were using the short interview form. Question 6A asked respondents if their school had a system for monitoring an individual student's mastery of the California Content Standards. Of the 270 possible respondents, 93 (68 high school and 25 feeder school teachers) stated that their school has such a system, while 34 said that their school does not. Fourteen respondents either did not know or gave an off-topic response. Blank responses numbered 129.

While only the 93 positive responses will be analyzed in the following section, we found several types of responses worth noting that were found in the other responses. Several respondents, for example, stated that their school has a monitoring system, but that it may not present material at the student level:

- …We have portfolios and keep a collection of their work. We have benchmark tests and results for individuals. We look at what kinds of questions kids are missing. We also get test scores at the end of the year. These things aren't actually individual. They're more global. It's hard to find time to analyze all of this.
- The district assessment test results are sent to the school. Don't know if they look at individual students or just the average.
- Benchmark and district analysis breaks up the information in subgroups.
- We have a Dataworks system in place, but I don't know if this monitors individual student mastery or not.

Other respondents addressed the issue of partial implementation:

- Test scores that one could research, but not necessarily frequently used.
- …Occasionally look at test data during weekly meetings. Don't know how seriously some people take this test data.
- Test results were sent to Dean of Instruction, but results have not been processed for analysis as we had hoped.

Finally, several respondents stated that their monitoring systems were in the early stages:

- Not right now. We probably will have a system by next year.
- Just getting up and running.

Question 6B asked those who responded "yes" to Question 6A to describe the monitoring system in use at their school. We developed several codes, the first three of which are closely related, and we note that codes with fewer than 10 total responses were dropped from further analysis:

- Use of various tests, including district-level benchmark tests; state tests such as the STAR, CST, or CAHSEE; and teacher-developed tests
- Data analysis of test results
- Computer program or database that matches test results to standards
- IEPs

Table F.48. (GMGE) School-Wide Mastery System Description

GMGE	High School (68)	Feeder School (25)	Total (93)
Tests	40 (59%)	17 (68%)	57 61%)
Data analysis	14 (21%)	3 (12%)	17 (18%)
Computer program	11 (16%)	6 (24%)	17 (18%)
IEPs	9 (13%)	2 (8%)	11 (12%)

Sample responses coded as "tests":

- Our formal way to measure mastery is the benchmark tests that kids take…
- District assessment at end of semester in Algebra courses.
- District-wide tests. Also, marking period grades are really looked at. Through that system, students are referred for tutoring after or before school.

Sample responses coded as "data":

- …We do data analysis at least four times a year in looking at our students, focusing on students who are below basic, trying to differentiate instruction for students who need help…
- Just district tests and review of test data. There is a matrix for retention, using district test results.

Sample responses coded as "computer program":

- The benchmark assessment goes to a computer-accessed Standards Master that reports on how each child matches up to the standards.
- …We also use Edusoft that crunches this data for us.

Sample responses coded as “mentoring”:

- We have mentoring. Teachers go over weaknesses of students who have scored low. Sometimes they’re formally assigned. About three quarters of the staff has signed up to mentor two students. Some kids come in as early as five-thirty in the morning.

Admin. Question 6A asked administrators if their school had a system for monitoring an individual student’s mastery of the California Content Standards. Of the 80 possible respondents, 78 stated that their school has such a system, while none said that their school does not. Two respondents either did not know or gave an off-topic response.

Respondents were asked to describe the monitoring system in use at their school. Several answers were allowed, so the number of responses does not match the number of interviews conducted. We developed nine codes, the first three of which are closely related:

- A) Use of various tests, including district-level benchmark tests; state tests such as the STAR, CST, or CAHSEE; and teacher-developed tests
- B) Data analysis of test results
- C) Computer program or database that matches test results to standards
- D) Mentoring
- E) Staff conversations about students
- F) Portfolios
- G) IEPs
- H) Special courses for students who have either previously not passed or who are at risk of not passing the CAHSEE
- I) Other tracking system, such as folders or placement tests

Table F.49. (Admin) School-Wide Mastery System Description

Administrator	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
High School	39	21	9	1	8	2	10	3	4
Feeder School	12	4	2	0	1	0	1	1	0

SP. This question asks how the respondents’ school monitors individual student mastery of the California Content Standards. Of the 78 possible respondents, 61 stated that their school has such a system, while 1 said that their school does not. Four respondents either did not know or gave an off-topic response and there was 1 Blank response.

For Question 6, based on teacher responses describing the monitoring system in use at their school, we developed nine codes:

- A) Use of various tests, including district-level benchmark tests; state tests such as the STAR, CST, or CAHSEE; and teacher-developed tests
- B) Data analysis of test results
- C) Computer program or database that matches test results to standards (e.g., Edusoft, Learn)
- D) Mentoring
- E) Staff conversations about students

- F) Portfolios
- G) IEPs
- H) Special courses for students who have either previously not passed or who are at risk of not passing the CAHSEE
- I) Other tracking such as folders, placement tests, grades, assignments, year end essay

Table F.50. (SP) School-Wide Mastery System Description

SP	A	B	C	D	E	1	G	H	I
	34	22	3	4	4	2	46	3	8

Sample responses are as follow:

- They do all the state and district tests
- We have benchmarks...our school's rubrics measure how close each student is to mastering a standard
- Pretest/posttest is how best to tell where the students are
- We are looking at assessment scores, teacher comments, IEP meetings, observation, work samples; our program is driven by test data and we receive diagnostic reports through our computerized system
- We have Renaissance Place and look at a student's state testing results and benchmark results
- Case managers work with regular teachers
- Special ed teachers are at every department meeting…they modify teaching and lessons
- Regular, ongoing collaboration with teachers
- All my students have an IEP
- Mastery is defined in the IEP goals
- We have massive after-school tutoring for CAHSEE prep
- Report card grades reflect the district pacing plan

EL. This series of questions focus how the respondents' school monitors individual student mastery of the California Content Standards. The first question (7A) seeks to identify the components of a monitoring system, the last question (7C) asks to identify informal monitoring methods if no formal process is present, and the second question (7B, only EL teachers were asked this) seeks to identify how the formal process may be modified for EL students. Of the 67 possible respondents, 61 (91%) stated that their school has such a system, while 1 said that their school does not. Four respondents (6%) either did not know or gave an off-topic response and there was 1 Blank response.

For Question 7A, based on teacher responses describing the monitoring system in use at their school, we developed nine codes:

- A) Use of various tests, including district-level benchmark tests; state tests such as the STAR, CST, or CAHSEE; and teacher-developed tests
- B) Data analysis of test results

- C) Computer program or database that matches test results to standards (e.g., Edusoft, Learn)
- D) Mentoring
- E) Staff conversations about students
- F) Portfolios
- G) IEPs
- H) Special courses for students who have either previously not passed or who are at risk of not passing the CAHSEE
- I) Other tracking such as folders, placement tests, grades, assignments, year end essay

Table F.51. (EL) School-Wide Mastery System Description

EL	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
	32	19	3	1	6	2	9	6	9

Sample responses are as follow:

- EL students are tested multiple times: CAHSEE, CELDT, HighPoint, unit tests
- We have benchmark assessments and norm testing
- Primarily through systematic review of test data
- We have a specific district level counselor who comes in to work with EL students
- We also collaborate with regular education teachers to monitor student performance
- We have benchmark portfolios where we check off the essential standards that have been mastered
- Focus lessons, tutoring
- We have established student study teams who identify and work with at risk students
- Whatever assignments are given are aligned with the standards so we can see if students achieve mastery

Question 7C is a follow up question to 7A for respondents to describe any informal methods they use to monitor student mastery if no formal process was in place. However, since only one respondent stated there was no monitoring system in place, it is evident with the number of responses received that teachers use both formal and informal monitoring processes. The following codes were established based on teacher responses:

- A) Classroom work; includes tests or quizzes, rubrics, additional materials, special projects
- B) Questioning students, oral assessments
- C) Staff conversations, department meetings, collaboration
- D) Other

Table F.52. (EL) Informal Methods Used to Monitor Mastery

EL	A	B	C	D
	21	6	5	4

Sample responses are as follows:

- Use supplementary material to extend standards they are learning
- Use the textbook assessments and the ROLA
- I use teacher observations, their homework, and repetitive drills
- I am using a rubric on a 4 or 5 point scale
- Asking students to so a reflection; a mapping exercise of skills learned to text read
- Conversations, open ended questions, picking students at random to answer questions
- Teacher to teacher conversations are held over lunch and during planning periods
- Discussions and collaboration with other teachers
- Save some assessments in portfolio, use required forms to gather data

The third question in this series, 7B, was only asked of the EL teachers to determine if the monitoring process was modified for EL students and in what ways. Out of the 62 who responded to this question, 37 (60%) stated the process was the same and 5 provided answers that were off topic. The remaining 20 (32%) respondents stated the process was modified. Over half the respondents (12) who said that the process was modified stated that EL students have to take additional tests such as the CELDT, CAELD, HighPoint, transition tests, or benchmark tests. Four responses focused on instructional differences, 2 indicated they used portfolios to assess power ELD standards, and 2 provided no additional information.

SP-C. This question looked at the ways in which schools monitor an individual student's mastery of the California Content Standards. Most teachers responded that test scores, grades, or benchmark exams were used.

Multiple responses were allowed, so the number does not match the number of interviews conducted. The codes used follow.

- A) Use of various tests, including district-level benchmark tests; state tests such as the STAR, CST, or CAHSEE; and teacher-developed tests
- B) Data analysis of test results
- C) Computer program or database that matches test results to standards (e.g., Edusoft, Learn)
- D) Mentoring
- E) Staff conversations about students
- F) Portfolios
- G) IEPs
- H) Special courses for students who have either previously not passed or who are at risk of not passing the CAHSEE
- I) Other tracking such as folders, placement tests, grades, assignments, year end essay

Table F.53. (SP-C) Ways to Monitor Individual Student Mastery

SP-C	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
High Schools	39	21	9	1	8	2	10	3	4
Feeder Schools	12	4	2	0	1	0	1	1	0

Sample responses from special courses interviews:

- We test students and review their results
- I get a printout of all students' scores in the previous year's tests.
- The big picture is the STAR test scores.
- Baseline tests are given at the beginning and then again at the end.
- We have students taking writing assessments after each level of instruction.
- It is the benchmarking program they use
- WE have ongoing observations
- Special Education students follow their IEPs
- We use benchmark tests that are given every quarter.

Unique Question GMGE 7A-7B

GMGE. Questions 7A and 7B were not included on the short interview form. Question 7A was not intended to be analyzed, but rather to serve as a way of helping determine passing or at-risk rates asked in Question 7B. For example, if a respondent replied in Question 7B that he or she had an at-risk rate of about 7 students per class, we could then look back at that person's response in Question 7A to better gauge an at-risk rate for that respondent.

We analyzed Question 7B by constructing two scales, one for passing rates and the other for at-risk rates. Much like a thermometer, each scale ranged from 0 to 100. We divided each scale into five unequal portions: 0-50, 51-70, 71-84, 85-94, and 95-100 for the passing rate scale and 0-5, 6-15, 16-29, 30-49, and 50-100 for the at-risk scale. We deliberately "skewed" these scales; the passing scale, for example, has smaller divisions as the passing rate increases and a large division for passing rates that fall within the 50 percent and below zone. The at-risk scale, on the other hand, shows smaller division as the at-risk rate declines and a large division for at-risk rates within the 50 percent and above zone. Our rationale for this approach was that it really did not make much difference if a school's reported pass rate, for example, was 25 percent or 45 percent, since it impacted more than half of the students. On the other hand, smaller divisions in the low at-risk and high passing scales would allow us to sort them through a finer sieve.

We assigned each division a letter code to serve as an identifier (see Table 54) with which to code entries. Respondents often provided an estimated pass rate as well as an at-risk rate, which was typically for students who had not yet taken the CAHSEE. Many respondents offered several pass or at-risk rates for different groups at their schools, such as juniors and freshmen or students in advanced or regular programs. Because of this, one cannot assume a single response per respondent. Results show a wide range of responses, with nearly as many respondents reporting student pass rates at 50 percent or below as those reporting pass rates of from 95 percent to 100 percent.

Table F.54. (GMGE) Question 7B Responses by School Level

GMGE Pass scale	High Schools	Feeder Schools
A (95%-100%)	18	NA
B (85%-94%)	5	NA
C (71%-84%)	8	NA
D (51%-70%)	6	NA
E (0%-50%)	16	NA
At-risk scale		
F (0%-5%)	7	3
G (6%-15%)	17	4
H (16%-29%)	9	2
I (30%-49%)	19	5
J (50%-100%)	24	5
Other responses		
Blank	92	33
Could not determine	10	10
Not applicable	3	4
No results yet	32	NA

Perhaps one of the more interesting findings from this analysis is a group of comments we categorized as Not Applicable. From their comments, it appeared that most of these respondents taught at feeder schools or taught freshmen. They were unable or unwilling to provide percentages of students considered at risk of not passing the CAHSEE, even though it is likely that their current courses were covering at least some of the California Content Standards that would later appear on the CAHSEE. It seems plausible that a student performing poorly in a feeder school would be considered at risk of not passing CAHSEE.

Unique Question Admin 7A, 7B

Admin. This question asked administrators about changes in instructional practices or strategies in classrooms to meet the needs of individual students. The most common responses are detailed in the following table. Response from feeder schools was low, so the table represents only high school administrator responses. Multiple answers were allowed, so totals will not match the number of respondents. One quarter of administrators reported using staff development to address individual student needs.

Table F.55. (Admin) Changes in Instruction Practice to Meet Individual Student Needs

Admin	
Staff development	20
Off the shelf program	6
Tutoring labs	4

Since most administrators reported using staff development in the previous question, we explored the changes in professional development opportunities centered on individual student needs. Many different responses were given, but only the most frequent are shown in the following table.

Table F.56. (Admin) Changes in Professional Development Opportunities based on Individual Student Needs

Differentiated Instruction	6
SDAIE method	4
AVID	5
No change	6

Unique Question GMGE 8A-8B

GMGE. In Question 8A, respondents were asked whether students who had not passed CAHSEE, or who were considered at risk of not passing it, were spread evenly throughout the general population of the school or were concentrated in certain groups. Our coding scheme comprised the following concepts:

- Spread out
- Grouped
- Minority as majority, used when respondents said that the majority of their school population consisted of a "minority" group, such as a respondent who noted the school's population was about 98% Hispanic.
- Blank
- Don't know
- Not applicable, typically used when respondents said that this question did not apply to them because they taught middle school or early high school, or when respondents said that their high CAHSEE pass rate make this a non-issue.
- Off topic/could not determine.

Results show that most believed those at-risk and those who had not yet passed CAHSEE were spread throughout the school, followed closely by those who thought these students were grouped in subpopulations.

Table F.57. (GMGE) Responses to Distribution of At-Risk or Not Passing Student Populations

	Spread out	Grouped	Minority as Majority	Blank	Don't know	Not applicable	Off topic; could not determine	Total
High Schools	86 (42%)	81 (39%)	3 (1%)	1 (<1%)	10 (5%)	14 (7%)	11 (5%)	206 (100%)
Feeder Schools	24 (38%)	21 (33%)	0	10 (16%)	0	7 (11%)	2 (3%)	64 (100%)
Total	110 (41%)	102 (38%)	3 (1%)	11 (4%)	10 (4%)	21 (8%)	13 (5%)	270 (100%)

When we coded Question 8B, we used only those 102 interviews identified as "grouped." The number of responses will not equal the number of respondents, because respondents were free to give as many responses as applied to their school situation. Codes are as follows:

- Ethnic groups, including Hispanic/Latino, African American, Southeast Asian
- High poverty

- Special education students
- Low ability, including those students who do not qualify for special education programming, 504 students, below grade level
- Transfers or migrants
- English learners
- Outside problems, such as low motivation, lack of parental involvement, truancy, or probation
- Other, such as students in a particular grade.

Results showed slight differences between high school teachers, who reported that most at-risk students and those who had not yet passed CAHSEE were to be found in special education and EL subpopulations, and feeder school teachers, who stated that special education and low ability students were those at risk of not passing the CAHSEE.

Table F.58. (GMGE) Subpopulations Considered At Risk or Who Have Not Yet Passed CAHSEE

GMGE	Ethnic	Sp Ed	High Poverty	Low Ability	EL	Transfers	Outside	Other
High School (81)	16 (20%)	38 (47%)	16 (20%)	18 (22%)	37 (46%)	3 (4%)	13 (16%)	8 (10%)
Feeder School (21)	6 (29%)	9 (43%)	6 (29%)	9 (43%)	7 (33%)	1 (5%)	7 (33%)	0
Total (102)	22 (22%)	47 (46%)	22 (22%)	27 (26%)	44 (43%)	4 (4%)	20 (20%)	8 (8%)

Sample response from “ethnicity”:
- The biggest concentration is in the (specific ethnicity) population.
- Sample response from “special education”:
- Some special education student might have trouble.

Sample response from “high poverty”:
- It’s mainly in the (specific ethnicity) and low SES which are overlapping numbers a lot of the time…

Sample response from “low ability”:
- Nonmotivated kids who are not special education but have very low level skills.

Sample response from “English learner”:
- Those groups are special education students, EL students, and students that are below grade level in reading.

Sample response from “transfers”:
- SES, ELD, migrant are main groups…

Sample response from “outside”:

- The kids that have low motivation and that are not pushed by their parents; those are the ones that are at risk of not passing this test.
- Sample response from “other”:
- They’re all in my sixth-period class.

Common Question (Admin 8), (SP-C 6)

Admin and SP-C. Administrators and Special Courses teachers were asked a series of questions about changes to the school’s curriculum that are attributable to CAHSEE. Over half (52%) of administrators reported that they have implemented CAHSEE prep or remediation classes or tutoring for students who have previously failed or are determined to be at risk of failing. Administrators were asked about the demographic makeup of these classes. Answers varied greatly depending on the demographic make up of the school; however the major groups mentioned were EL, SP, African American, Hispanic/Latino, and Asian student populations, as well as students with low SES.

The classes are offered at different times in different schools, from during school to before and after school, and on Saturdays in some cases. We asked teachers about funding for these remediation and prep classes. Several sources were cited such as local and state funding and Federal sources like Title 1 and NCLB grants. We asked whether students receive credit for remediation and prep classes. Over half the time (52%) teachers did not respond to this question. Of the teachers that did respond, nearly all (94%) said that students did receive credit, either math or English credit, or an elective credit.

Administrators and Special Courses teachers agreed that demand is the same as last year, or has increased. A few schools reported that they have been able to reduce the number of sections of remediation or prep classes being taught because of higher CAHSEE pass rates, however this was not typical. The curriculum for the class was either chosen at the school or district level. Curricula were either off-the-shelf, or locally developed. Teachers usually received some training on the curriculum being used. Materials used in the classes were either off-the-shelf or teacher made. Teachers typically volunteered, or were ‘drafted’ to teach remediation or prep classes. For those who teach in the before and after school and Saturday programs, there is often no extra pay.

We asked whether the special courses were doing what they were designed to do. According to administrators, they have not received data yet to determine gains being made. Anecdotally, they feel that the classes are helping students, but note that EL and SP students still struggle. Sample responses from administrators follow.

- We haven’t received results yet, but students interviewed felt they did much better on the test this time
- Seems like it anecdotally, teachers say understanding increases, kids crowd them, show up on Saturdays
- For lower level students, no. For borderline, probably

- Early results yes, bringing kids up
- The program is functioning very well and is providing support to students and they are passing
- If a student doesn't understand the language it is difficult for him to pass
- Not dramatically, but it's probably better than not having the classes

Common Question (SP 8A, B), (EL 9A, B)

SP. Question 8 consists of two parts. The first part asks respondents if the teacher ever has the opportunity to team teach with the general education teacher. If they answered "Yes" then the second part (8B) probed them to describe how frequently that happens. Of the respondents who answered this question (76), over half indicated that they did not team teach, however, there were several additional comments (12) noted that they are planning to in the future. There were also several comments (10) indicating they will not team teach due to time, resources, or that it didn't work well in the past.

Table F.59. (SP) Opportunities to Team Teach With GMGE Teachers

SP	Yes	No	Doesn't Know	Blank/NA
	32	43	0	1

For those respondents who answered "Yes" to the first question, the following table shows how often the special education teachers are able to team teach with the general education teachers. Very Frequent is defined as daily or weekly, Moderately Frequent is once a month or every other month, Infrequent is defined as once or twice a year or semester.

Table F.60. (SP) Frequency of Team Teaching with GMGE Teachers

SP	Very Frequent	Moderately Frequent	Infrequent	Never	N/A	Could Not Determine
	19	2	4	2	2	1

A sample of the comments received for some of the categories are:

- Sometimes it is done every day the entire year in reading and algebra 1
- Daily, somebody is in somebody's class all the time; we prepare materials of the teachers, it is a team situation
- Very regular contact having to do with trouble shooting and team teaching with the America History teacher
- Once or twice a month, however the master teacher is comfortable with it
- …more infrequently or an as needed basis; we have offered collaboration with some teachers and have been told "no thanks"
- Some years yes, some years no. Occasionally an opportunity comes up
- We consult every day in English, but don't actually do any of the teaching

Question 9 consists of two parts. The first part asks respondents if the teacher ever has the opportunity to team teach with the general education teacher. If they answered "Yes" then the second part (9B) probed them to describe how frequently that happens. Of the respondents who answered this question (67), over two-thirds indicated

that they did not team teach, however, there were a few additional comments (8) noting that they are planning to in the future. There were also a few comments (7) indicating that they do collaborate and plan with the general education teachers in a more informal way.

Table F.61. (EL) Opportunities to Team Teach with GMGE Teachers

	Yes	No	Doesn't Know	Blank/NA
EL	15	47	1	4

For those respondents who answered "Yes" to the first question, the following table shows how often the EL teachers are able to team teach with the general education teachers. Very Frequent is defined as daily or weekly, Moderately Frequent is once a month or every other month, Infrequent is defined as once or twice a year or semester.

Table F.62. (EL) Frequency of Team Teaching with GMGE Teachers

	Very Frequent	Moderately Frequent	Infrequent	Never	N/A	Could Not Determine
EL	9	4	3	0	0	0

A sample of the comments received for some of the categories are:

- Yes, we are in teams
- Yes, ELD resource teachers go in and teach writing in lower level classrooms. Note this year is ELD math and reading/writing coaches go into classes daily to provide support and interact with a teacher in their resource hour
- I work with teacher and collaborate on instruction daily
- Maybe once every other month, it depends on the schedule, space, topic, and how many students
- Only a couple times a year, maybe; EL students in special-interest academics

Unique Question EL 8A, 8B

EL. Question 8 is only asked of EL teachers and consists of two parts (A and B). The question asks teachers if EL students ever receive content instruction in math in their native language, or if content is taught only in English (SDAIE—Specially Designed Academic Instruction Delivered in English). For those who answered "Yes" then the second part (9B) probed them to estimate the percentage of the EL students receiving instruction in their native language.

Of the 67 respondents who answered this question, nearly two-thirds indicated that they do not present content in a student's native language. For those who volunteered additional information when answering "no" (28 of 42), 22 respondents stated that there is native language support available for the students in the classroom to help clarify instructions or content.

Table F.63. (EL) Do Students Receive Content Instruction in Their Native Language?

	Yes	No	Doesn't Know	Blank/NA
EL	20	42	4	1

For those respondents who answered “Yes” to the first question, the following table shows the approximate percentage of EL student who receive instruction in their native language. It is evident that it is generally a smaller portion of the EL population and it should be noted that from the few additional comments received, these responses would apply only to those EL students who are less than an intermediate level.

Table F.64. (EL) What Percentage of Instruction Do Students Receive in Their Native Language?

	Less than 10%	10 to 20 %	30 to 40%	Nearly 100%
EL	1	9	2	3

Unique Question Admin 8D-8F

The first question focused on changes made to a school’s curriculum that were attributed to CAHSEE. Most often administrators said they had not made changes. A substantial group of administrators said that they were more focused on teaching to the standards, using pacing guides, or aligned curriculum or texts. The following table shows the most frequent responses.

Table F.65. (Admin) Changes Made to Curriculum Attributable to CAHSEE

No change	18
Teaching to/alignment with Standards	14
District level assessments	4

The next question asked administrators about changes in electives their school is able to offer as a result of CAHSEE. Some administrators reported making no changes. Of the administrators who said changes had been made, the most frequent response was that support classes or tutoring have been added. Some administrators said they have been forced to drop some elective classes in order to provide enough CAHSEE support classes. Others reported that students are doing well with CAHSEE in their school and they have been able to drop the level of CAHSEE support and add more classes of other types to their schedule.

Table F.66. (Admin) Changes to Electives Attributable to CAHSEE

Support class/tutoring	15
Dropped some electives	7
Added more classes	2

The final question in this series asked if any other program or curriculum changes had occurred that are attributable to CAHSEE. Again most administrators reported they were using CAHSEE support classes or tutoring.

Table F.67. (Admin) Other Program/Curriculum Changes Attributable to CAHSEE

Support class/Tutoring	23
Raising awareness	2

Common Question 9A-9B GMGE, (SP 7), (EL 10)

GMGE. Questions 9A and 9B asked respondents how frequently they met with special education or English Learner teachers, respectively, to plan or collaborate on instruction or to discuss a particular student's needs. We developed the following simple frequency codes:

- Very frequent—daily, weekly, 2 or 3 times per month, every couple of weeks;
- Moderately frequent—every month, every other month;
- Infrequent—1 or 2 times per semester; 1 or 2 times per year, on occasion, rarely, as needed;
- Never
- Not applicable—used when we could determine that the respondent did not have special education or English Learner students;
- Could not determine
- Blank

The following table shows the results of our analysis. General education teachers are more likely to report very frequent contact with special education teachers than with English Learner teachers. Based on some of the comments, we suspect that a large number of respondents who replied that they never meet with special education or English Learner teachers do not have any of these students in their classrooms; collapsing those two categories ("Never" and "Not applicable") into a single category would show a greater number of general education teachers reporting no contact at all with English Learner teachers than with special education teachers (131 and 72, respectively).

Table F.68. (GMGE) Teachers' Reported Frequencies of Meetings with Special Education and EL Teachers

	Special Education (Question 9A)			English Learner (Question 9B)		
	GMGE High School (206)	GMGE Feeder School (64)	Total (270)	GMGE High School (206)	GMGE Feeder School (64)	Total (270)
Very frequent	55 (27%)	20 (31%)	75 (28%)	23 (11%)	7 (11%)	30 (11%)
Moderately frequent	17 (8%)	9 (14%)	26 (10%)	14 (7%)	11 (17%)	25 (9%)
Infrequent	65 (32%)	17 (27%)	82 (30%)	49 (24%)	14 (22%)	63 (23%)
Never	29 (14%)	8 (13%)	37 (14%)	65 (32%)	9 (14%)	74 (27%)
NA	27 13%)	8 (13%)	35 (13%)	38 (18%)	19 (30%)	57 (21%)
CND	12 (6%)	2 (<1%)	14 (5%)	12 (6%)	2 (3%)	14 (5%)
Blank	1 (<1%)	0	1 (<1%)	5 (2%)	2 (3%)	7 (3%)

Sample responses from "very frequent" special education:

- This year, I meet weekly with a special education teacher because I have an autistic child in my class.
- I collaborate every day. I have a special ed teacher in my room every day. Sometimes she actually teaches my class because she can show kids a better way of understanding problems than I can.

Sample responses from “moderately frequent” special education:

- On an as-needed basis, which may be quite often if the student is struggling. The resource teacher will come to my class. We have IEP meetings, where we meet 6 times a year to discuss progress and set up a contract for students who need a lot of support.
- Whenever we have our department meetings. That occurs frequently, every month. We talk about students and who needs what.

Sample responses from “infrequent” special education:

- A face to face meeting, maybe once a school year. Communication is handled through paperwork, IEP and progress report; there are paper notices.

Sample response from “never” special education:

- Never have. Teaching assistant comes 3-4 times a week, but we don’t have time to work together.

Sample response from “Not applicable” special education:

- In my case, I don’t have any students that are special education students.

Sample responses from “very frequent” English Learner:

- Team meetings twice a month. We get together twice a month and teachers of all disciplines are there to discuss students’ progress.
- On a daily basis, as we eat lunch together every day.

Sample response from “moderately frequent” English Learner:

- Once a month all English teachers and EL teachers get together to discuss.

Sample response from “infrequent” English Learner:

- Hardly ever, as we don’t have non-English speaking kids in our math classes.

Sample response from “never” English Learner:

- I don’t deal with any of them.

Sample response from “not applicable” English Learner:

- Don’t really have any EL students, so this is not an issue.

SP. This question asks special education teachers how frequently they met with regular education teachers to plan or collaborate on instruction or to discuss a particular student’s needs. We developed the following simple frequency codes:

- Very frequent—daily, weekly, 2 or 3 times per month, every couple of weeks;
- Moderately frequent—every month, every other month;
- Infrequent—1 or 2 times per semester; 1 or 2 times per year, on occasion, rarely, as needed;
- Never
- Not applicable—used when we could determine that the respondent did not have special education or English Learner students;

- Could not determine
- Blank

The following table shows that nearly three-quarters of the special education teachers responding to this question (57) indicated they work with general education on a frequent or moderately frequent basis, monitoring student progress and helping those who are having difficulty. Several teachers, who indicated they meet infrequently with general education teachers, wished they could meet more often, citing that limited time and large case loads are a problem.

Table F.69. (SP) Frequency of Collaboration Between SP and GMGE Teachers

SP	Very frequent	Moderately frequent	Infrequent	Never	NA	Could not determine	Blank
	47	10	10	2	3	5	0

Sample responses:

- Meet over lunch 2-3 times a week, constant exchange of documents
- One period every day to collaborate in the regular classroom
- Every 7 days there is a collaboration period built into our schedule
- …check/monitor kids weekly to help those having difficulty; doing a study skills class for resource students
- Send out paperwork to double check grades 3 times a semester; personally visit student classrooms
- I meet with every teacher on an annual basis to plan the IEP, then on an as need basis when students are having trouble
- Not nearly enough; we don't have time, once or twice per semester per student
- I wish, not possible in a school of this size; no conference period where we can all meet together
- Never, I don't since my students work with me

EL. This question asks respondents to indicate how frequently they met with general education teachers to plan or collaborate on instruction or to discuss a particular student's needs. We developed the following simple frequency codes:

- Very frequent—daily, weekly, 2 or 3 times per month, every couple of weeks;
- Moderately frequent—every month, every other month;
- Infrequent—1 or 2 times per semester; 1 or 2 times per year, on occasion, rarely, as needed;
- Never
- Not applicable—used when we could determine that the respondent did not have special education or English Learner students;
- Could not determine
- Blank

The following table shows that just over half of the EL teachers responding to this question indicated they work with general education on a frequent or moderately frequent basis, monitoring student progress and suggest changes to instruction. The

teachers, who indicated they meet infrequently with general education teachers, did not elaborate enough to suggest any particular reason.

Table F.70. (EL) Frequency of Collaboration Between EL and GMGE Teachers

EL	Very frequent	Moderately frequent	Infrequent	Never	NA	Could not determine	Blank
	25	10	7	9	2	11	1

Sample responses are as follows:

- Our literacy program allows us to have students in common so this happens on a daily basis
- Common planning is every day
- We meet informally between class times or sometime at lunch or after school
- Many times we call meetings or talk to each other during lunch, its basically informal
- Once every 6 weeks, planning for History HighPoint class
- Student study teams happen once every other month
- Infrequently, mostly with special education.
- It's pretty infrequent, not a common practice, there's never enough time
- Not lately, they used to and plan to do that more
- He's ESL1, so there is no meeting with the general ed teacher

Common Question (SP 9B), (EL 11B)

SP. Question 9B was focused on special education teachers (a similar question was asked of the EL teachers) and asked if their department was involved in any formal or informal professional development for the school's general education teachers. The analysis indicates that nearly half of the respondents are involved, in some way, with the professional development sessions on special education that are presented to general education teachers. The type of involvement often is presenting information more informally at staff meetings, however, there were several who stated they organize (obtain guest speakers or form parent/teacher panels) segments on special education issues at school professional development or in-service training sessions.

Table F.71 (SP) Involvement in GMGE Professional Development

SP	Yes	Occasionally	No	Not Sure
	22	16	28	12

The following is a sample of the comments:

- We're involved in everything; the last one was on the laws and the needs of special education and 504 and accommodations
- We do a lot of training at our faculty meeting and professional development sessions
- We just did an in-service on one of the buy back days, a 2.5 hour overview off the types of disabilities
- Occasionally we present at staff meetings and we have had a district staff person to address the faculty

- Yes, at times they help with informal training on a as requested basis
- No, we haven't been for about 3-4 years
- Not really, they plan to restart it, but it hasn't happened

Common Question 10A-10C GMGE, (Admin 7C), (SP 9A, C), (11A, C)

GMGE. We wanted to investigate the professional development requirements that general education teachers had in order to prepare themselves for teaching these students. We also wanted to find out how the administration ensures that teachers actually use what they learn in professional development.

We found that responses to the questions regarding professional development requirements were primarily divided among three major areas: either they were unaware or did not know of any professional development requirements related to special education or EL, or such training was not required, or the requirement had been covered during the teacher certification process. The other responses were scattered among codes such as specific time frames, blanks, or "could not determine;" the actual number of responses was very few, with all but one code having fewer than 10 responses each.

We also found variations within these three areas. Some districts, for example, require all staff to have CLAD certification, while others require only those teachers assigned to sheltered English classrooms to have it. Teachers in some districts report being unable to attend professional development because of budget cutbacks, while teachers in other districts are still able to attend.

Table F.72. (GMGE) Teachers' Reported Frequency of Special Education and English Learner Professional Development

	Special Education (Question 10A)				English Learner (Question 10B)			
	Don't know	Not required	Certifi-cation	Yearly	Don't know	Not required	Certifi-cation	Yearly
High Schools (206)	34 (17%)	88 (43%)	38 (18%)	22 (11%)	33 (16%)	61 (30%)	74 (36%)	11 (5%)
Feeder Schools (64)	10 (16%)	26 (41%)	9 (14%)	6 (10%)	11 (17%)	25 (39%)	11 (17%)	6 (9%)
Total (270)	44 (16%)	114 (42%)	47 (17%)	28 (10%)	44 (16%)	86 (32%)	85 (31%)	17 (6%)

Sample of special education "don't know" responses:

- I have not been in this district long enough to answer.
- I just finished my credentials so I really don't know.

Sample of special education "not required" responses:

- They don't. With the budget crunch, they're asking you not to go. A lot of money gets shuffled to AP.
- Never required to take prescribed PD, but are given information we're required to read and follow.
- I don't think I've ever been "required" to participate, but we do discuss special ed issues at the beginning of each year.

Sample of special education “through certification” responses:

- I have my life credential, so I am not required to take anything.
- To get credential, you have to go through a mainstreaming course. Volunteer mainly for other classes.
- I don’t know, because I had to take coursework on that to get my credential. I’ve never in 10 years had professional development on that particular issue.

Sample of English Learner “don’t know” responses:

- I don’t know. I think I had some PD in the winter.
- I don’t recall specific to EL.

Sample of English Learner “not required” responses:

- This would only be required of ESL teachers and teachers of sheltered students. By the time students are in her class, they’re “regular.”
- They don’t (require). Probably two weeks ago we talked about addressing diversity and equity in the classroom.
- Professional development is a yearly requirement but you have options as to what types to take. The special ed and EL professional development is offered. Mentorship seems to be more effective.

Sample of English Learner “through certification” responses:

- I had to get a CLAD credential, but nothing beyond that.
- I don’t know what they are doing since I don’t have any EL students. The new teachers have the CLAD.
- They have a high Hispanic population; all teachers have to get through CLAD and learn the different EL strategies for students.

The third question in this series asked how administrators ensured that teachers used what they learned in professional development. Respondents discussed various ways that this might be accomplished, and often they suggested multiple methods. Therefore, the number of responses will not necessarily equal the number of respondents. The following codes were developed; other codes with low numbers of responses were dropped from further analysis:

- Observation/evaluation by an administrator or department head. Note, however, that this method was usually associated with the teacher’s regular observation and not specifically as part of a professional development follow-up measure.
- Little or nothing being done to ensure that professional development is being used.
- Don’t know
- Documentation through lesson plan or portfolio submission; also samples of student work.
- Documentation through submitting a report or survey after taking the professional development.
- Sharing or discussing with colleagues at a department meeting.

Table F.73. (GMGE) Methods to Ensure Professional Development is Used

	Observation	Nothing or very little	Don't know	Share	Lesson plan	Survey
High Schools (206)	88 (43%)	43 (21%)	15 (7%)	31 (15%)	16 (8%)	11 (5%)
Feeder Schools (64)	39 (61%)	12 (19%)	3 (5%)	13 (20%)	6 (9%)	3 (5%)
Total (270)	127 (47%)	55 (20%)	18 (7%)	44 (16%)	22 (8%)	14 (5%)

Sample comments from "observation":

- We are evaluated once a year and are subject to reviews.
- All teachers that are non-tenured are evaluated once a year. All tenured teachers are evaluated once every two years.
- I don't know if they can pick it up other than on evaluations or observations, which are done only every other year under the Stull Law. Beginning teachers get much more observation. She thinks this is one of the keys, what is happening in the classrooms.

Sample comments from "nothing":

- They don't, since we don't have a PD requirement.
- The follow-up is better but nonexistent before. Now sometimes we hear a little about it but we're not quite there yet.
- Sometimes follow-up; discussed where kids are weak in math…but nothing regular; spotty.

Sample comments from "don't know":

- Doesn't know because she is a first-year teacher. The district offers teacher development for ELL, writing, science and math. Service learning is open to anyone.
- I'm not aware of that happening.

Sample comments from "share":

- Principal always asks us to share information we get at conferences and workshops…
- …everyone must share what they have learned off site with the other teachers.
- …they ask us to share the training with other people in a meeting, but I haven't been asked to do that yet.

Sample comments from "lesson plan":

- We just finished "Writing across the curriculum" for a month period. Teachers were required to use compare/contrast strategies in all classrooms and evidence was provided by samples collected on certain due dates.
- It is required that we incorporate reading objectives into lesson plans…
- For new teachers, they have to insert what they learned in professional development into their lesson plans…

Sample comments from “survey”:

- I don’t think there’s any systematic formal method. More like an informal survey.
- By coming in to observe teaching and giving teachers questionnaires to fill out regarding what they learned in professional development.
- I think we do a lot of self reflection, like a survey or a follow-up meeting or discussion.

From the comments as a whole, it is apparent that monitoring the use of professional development could be improved. Even though many of the comments were related to the use of observation or evaluation, most of the observations or evaluations appeared to be more routine and not designed specifically to follow up on training.

Admin. This question asked Administrators how they ensure that teachers are using what they learn in Professional Development. Only the most frequent answers are included in the table below. The categories were Observation, No method, or sharing information informally with other staff.

Table F.74. (Admin) Methods to Ensure Professional Development is Used

Administrators	Observation	Nothing or Very little	Share
High Schools	46	5	13
Feeder Schools	13	0	10
Total	59	5	23

Sample responses from Administrator Interviews:

- Monitoring by classroom observations.
- Walkthroughs, being visible in classrooms, teacher evaluations.
- Through our evaluation process.
- We (the administration) go and look, collect the data, and report back to the teacher on our findings.
- We look for evidence that teachers are using these techniques when we visit their classes for observation and evaluation.
- The administrators have monthly observations of classrooms.
- Classroom observation and departmental meetings.
- Observation including a form that includes what standards are being addressed, what the students are learning, what the assignment is.
- Administrators visit the classrooms and monitor. We have access to look at grading systems and grades. We talk a lot to the kids and we know them well.
- Accountability through observation and data ensures that professional development is being used.

SP. For the special education teachers, we also asked if they knew of any requirements for general education teachers to receive special education training, how the implementation of the training was monitored, and how the special education teachers or departments were involved in the training that is provided.

Table F.75. (SP) Professional Development Opportunities

SP	Don't know	Not required	Through certification
	36(46%)	21(27%)	10(13%)

Sample of "don't know" responses:

- Don't know how often, but I think we are offered some choices that may address this
- I don't think its ever been a requirement; we have offered several sessions to general education teachers but they aren't widely attended

Sample of "not required" responses:

- Not required; they do require them to have certain credentials
- No, but we as a department have asked for time to in-service out general ed teachers

Sample of "through certification" responses:

- There is no requirement that they do beyond certification
- Yes, all teachers must have some professional development for special education in order to become accredited

The third question in this series (9C), corresponding to the general math and English question 9C, asked how administrators ensured that teachers used what they learned in professional development. Respondents discussed various ways that this might be accomplished, and often they suggested multiple methods. Therefore, the number of responses will not necessarily equal the number of respondents. The following codes were developed; however, due to very low numbers in some of them, only the first six will be presented:

- Observation/evaluation by an administrator or department head. Note, however, that this method was usually associated with the teacher's regular observation and not specifically as part of a professional development follow-up measure.
- Little or nothing being done to ensure that professional development is being used.
- Don't know
- Documentation through lesson plan or portfolio submission; also samples of student work.
- Documentation through submitting a report or survey after taking the professional development.
- Sharing or discussing with colleagues at a department meeting.
- Teacher professionalism, which means that teachers are on the "honor system" to use what they have learned
- Test scores
- Through facilitators, coaches, or mentors; also the BTSA program.

Table F.76. (SP) Methods to Ensure Professional Development is Used

SP	Observation	Nothing or Very little	Don't know	Share	Lesson plan	Survey
	35	21	40	14	2	0

Sample comments from "observation":

- Administrators make sure they observe all teachers weekly
- They come in for about 10-15 minutes once every 2 years for tenured teachers; don't think they can ensure this
- The administrators asks us to present what we've learned to the rest of the faculty
- That is up to administrators, but its not very systematic

Sample comments from "nothing":

- We have a pretty self-motivated staff
- We have to write teacher performance objectives at the beginning of the year…no follow up whether that goal has been completed

Sample comments from "don't know":

- Have no idea; haven't been able to go to one because of lack of money
- I don't know how they ensure that, but that's clearly they're expectation

Sample comments from "share":

- We are asked to share information received at conference and workshops with our colleagues at faculty meetings and our Saturday training sessions
- We also have follow-up meeting on professional development, for example, after an in-service
- Sample comments from "lesson plan":
- The requirement is for lesson plans to be submitted
- They legally can ask for lesson plans and whatever to show what evidence of planning

From the comments as a whole, it is apparent that monitoring the use of professional development could be improved. Even though many of the comments were related to the use of observation or evaluation, most of the general math and English teachers indicated observations or evaluations appeared to be more routine and not designed specifically to follow up on training. This holds true for special education and EL teachers, as well.

The second question (9B) was focused on special education teachers (a similar question was asked of the EL teachers) and asked if their department was involved in any formal or informal professional development for the school's general education teachers. The analysis indicates that nearly half of the respondents are involved, in some way, with the professional development sessions on special education that are presented to general education teachers. The type of involvement often is presenting information more informally at staff meetings, however, there were several who stated they organize (obtain guest speakers or form parent/teacher panels) segments on

special education issues at school professional development or in-service training sessions.

Table F.77. (SP) Involvement in GMGE Professional Development

SP	Yes	Occasionally	No	Not Sure
	22	16	28	12

The following is a sample of the comments:

- We're involved in everything; the last one was on the laws and the needs of special education and 504 and accommodations
- We do a lot of training at our faculty meeting and professional development sessions
- We just did an in-service on one of the buy back days, a 2.5 hour overview of the types of disabilities
- Occasionally we present at staff meetings and we have had a district staff person to address the faculty
- Yes, at times they help with informal training on a as requested basis
- No, we haven't been for about 3-4 years
- Not really, they plan to restart it, but it hasn't happened

EL. For the EL teachers, we also asked if they knew of any requirements for general education teachers to receive EL training, how the implementation of the training was monitored, and how the EL teachers or departments were involved in the training that is provided.

Table F.78. (EL) Professional Development Opportunities

EL	Don't know	Not required	Through certification
	21	28	17

Sample of "don't know" responses:

- We have summer trainings; not sure if they are mandatory, but we are encouraged to go
- I don't think anything is required; topics are up to the teachers and they take what they feel they need
- I have no idea; perhaps once in the last four years

Sample of "not required" responses:

- EL professional development is offered, but teachers have options as to what topics they attend
- It is never required, but it is often offered
- Has not been required, all teacher have either CLAD, ELD, or BCLAD

Sample of "through certification" responses:

- There is no requirement to her knowledge, CLAD is the only time it is required and even in the EL department there isn't a requirement beyond CLAD
- Last year everyone was CLAD certified
- Twice a year CELDT training is offered to the teachers

The third question in this series (11C), corresponding to the general math and English question 11C, asked how administrators ensured that teachers used what they learned in professional development. Respondents discussed various ways that this might be accomplished, and often they suggested multiple methods. Therefore, the number of responses will not necessarily equal the number of respondents. The following codes were developed; however, due to very low numbers in some of them, only the first six will be presented:

- Observation/evaluation by an administrator or department head. Note, however, that this method was usually associated with the teacher's regular observation and not specifically as part of a professional development follow-up measure.
- Little or nothing being done to ensure that professional development is being used.
- Don't know
- Documentation through lesson plan or portfolio submission; also samples of student work.
- Documentation through submitting a report or survey after taking the professional development.
- Sharing or discussing with colleagues at a department meeting.
- Teacher professionalism, which means that teachers are on the "honor system" to use what they have learned
- Test scores
- Through facilitators, coaches, or mentors; also the BTSA program.

Table F.79. (EL) Methods to Ensure Professional Development is Used

EL	Observation	Nothing or Very little	Don't know	Share	Lesson plan	Survey
	27	13	21	7	3	0

Sample comments from "observation":

- This year we have teacher driven presentations on individualizing instruction at our staff meetings
- …not directly, but it would show up in scores or observations
- …they might see is through observations and evaluations, we are professional and use what we learn when we need it
- They do "action walks" and observations

Sample comments from "nothing":

- Other than hiring people who are motivated to do what is required, there is no formal accountability
- There's really no accountability to ensure teachers are using what they learn

Sample comments from “don’t know”:

- I don’t know the specifics, but the principal is on top of everything
- There is an expectation that teacher use what they learn, but I don’t know how it is being monitored

Sample comments from “share”:

- In our department meetings we often reflect and we have to turn in a group summary of what we are teaching; they may ask how we are implementing what we learned
- If we go, we are required to fill out a conference form and present information at a department meeting
- Sample comments from “lesson plan”:
- Looked for in lesson plans and actions

From the comments as a whole, it is apparent that monitoring the use of professional development could be improved. Even though many of the comments were related to the use of observation or evaluation, most of the general math and English teachers indicated observations or evaluations appeared to be more routine and not designed specifically to follow up on training. This holds true for EL and special education teachers, as well.

The second question (11B) was focused on EL teachers (a similar question was asked of the special education teachers) and asked if their department was involved in any formal or informal professional development for the school’s general education teachers. The analysis indicates that over half of the respondents are not involved with the professional development sessions on EL that are presented to general education teachers. Only one quarter of the EL teachers indicated they have some involvement with the professional development programs compared to nearly three quarters of the special education teachers.

Table F.80. (EL) Involvement in GMGE Professional Development

EL	Yes	Occasionally	No	Not Sure
	10	7	36	13

The following is a sample of the comments:

- Yes, she’s presented general ed workshops to regular teachers to help EL students
- Yes, I do the formal; I throw in methodology and statistics at them
- Yes, we did some writing process workshops…part of a reading program
- We did provide some training called ENL (English as a Non-Native Language); I gave this two semesters in a row, once a month
- In general, no, however I teach writing and do staff development for both general ed and EL staff
- Actually, I am supposed to be doing that soon, but haven’t yet done it
- Being coordinator, this is what I would like to see happen
- No, not me per say, the department chair might

Common Question (SP 10A, B), (EL 12A, B)

SP. Question 10 consists of two parts. The first part asks respondents if the school or district have any programs designed especially for parents of special education teachers. If they answered "Yes" then the second part (10B) probed them to describe those programs. Of the respondents who answered this question (43), nearly three-quarters indicated there was some type of program to help parents. Those programs included some community (out side of the school) services, meetings or special event workshops, more formal class-type opportunities, school-based parent organizations, and school liaison services.

Table F.81. (SP) Does School Have Programs for SP Parents?

SP	Yes	No	Doesn't Know	Blank/NA
	32	10	1	35

For those respondents who answered "Yes" to the first question, the following codes were developed to indicate the type of programs that are available to parents:

- A) Community services
- B) Workshops or meetings
- C) Classes (formal, structured presentations)
- D) School-based organization
- E) Liaison

Table F.82. (SP) Types of Programs for SP Parents

SP	A	B	C	D	E
	7	15	1	9	3

A sample of the comments received for some of the categories are:

- A coalition of 5 school districts offers training to parents that we pass along
- There are lots of programs that families can use, the more profound you are, the more likely you are to have programs available to you
- There is a District Advisory Board and a SELP (special education local plan) which is a planning workshop for parents of transitioning students to our school
- The district also offers classes on social skills, behavior issues, etc
- …resource meetings and classes for parents offered quarterly by the district
- We have a council of special education parents who meet several times a year; the district is very good about doing parent outreach
- Parent resource network is available for them to contact with issues
- The school liaison person even transports parent to IEP meetings in addition to handling various communications

EL. Question 12 consists of three parts. The first part asks respondents if the school or district have any programs designed especially for parents of EL students. If they answered "Yes" then the second part (12B) probed them to describe those programs. The third part of the question (12C) asks if their department plays a role in these programs.

Of the respondents who answered this question (64), all but 5 indicated there was some type of program to help parents. The programs ranged from informal contact such as workshops, meetings, and school liaisons to the more formal and organized support groups, classes, and community services. Over three-quarters of the EL departments are involved in some capacity (e.g., parental notification, planning, presenting)

Table F.83.(EL) Does School Have Programs for EL Parents?

EL	Yes	No	Doesn't Know	Blank/NA
	59	5	0	3

For those respondents who answered "Yes" to the first question, the following codes were developed to indicate the type of programs that are available to parents:

- A) Community services
- B) Workshops or meetings
- C) Classes (formal, structured presentations)
- D) School-based organization
- E) Liaison

Table F.84. (EL) Types of Programs for EL Parents

EL	A	B	C	D	E
	1	28	14	22	2

Samples of the comments received are as follows:

- The Gear Up grant is for outreach to parents
- …give strategies to parents on how to help students , assist parents to get on line to get homework and understanding what the grades mean
- There are newcomer meetings for populations coming from refugee camps, including workshops for parents
- We have district-wide EL meetings four times a year for parents and school personnel to discuss issues related to the EL program
- This school does have an ELD class for anyone interested in learning English
- We used Title 1 money to have parenting classes, language classes, a legal aid program, and a parent center
- There is a district bilingual advisory board that parents can join
- We have eight monthly ELAC (EL Advisory Council) meetings throughout the year; distributing any new information regarding the EL program, only a handful of parent show up
- We have a program called PACIMl parents meet once a month to get school information such as advise on how to help with homework

The third question was asking if the EL department were involved in any of the programs. It is evident from the responses that over half of the EL departments do, in fact, provide a variety of support for the different programs.

Table F.85. (EL) Involvement in Parent Programs

EL	Involved	No Involvement	Blank	Didn't Know	Off-topic
	38	11	7	3	8

For those respondents who answered that they were "Involved" to this question, the following codes were developed to indicate the type of support they provided to the various programs:

- A) Parental notification only, follow up to ensure parents complete forms
- B) Attends, available for questions but no other involvement
- C) Plans the meetings, runs the meetings
- D) Presents the content
- E) All, handles everything

Table F.86. (EL) Type of Support Given for Various Programs

EL	Notification	Attends/Available	Plans/Runs	Presents content	All
	5	3	18	7	7

A sample of the comments received for some of the categories are:

- …act as support, pass out flyers to the students, encourage parents to go, don't plan them
- The committee is formal (district), since I am the only EL teacher I attend as the rep
- It is my job to ensure the meetings are held once a month. I do the minutes of the meetings and advise the parents when they are going to be held
- We do a lot of consulting, act as a liaison between parents and school, do the logistics involving the program
- Each site has EL meetings, but they have tried time and time again but can't get the patents to get involved.
- We are completely responsible for that
- We make the agenda, schedule the meetings, produce flyers and other materials, and conduct the meetings
- We do whatever needs to be done

Unique Question GMGE Q11A and B

These two questions focused general education respondents on how they target instruction to individual students and how often such instruction occurs. This was done to capture information on what they were likely to do if they had special education or EL students in their classes. Nearly every teacher responded, with only one not asked due to time constraints, two not applicable (one of whom was a math coach who worked mostly out of the classroom), and one who could not remember doing anything specific. Of those who responded, 65 (24%)specifically mentioned tailoring or accommodating for special education students and 40 (15%) tailoring for EL students. There was some overlap, with many respondents mentioning how instruction was tailored for both groups. Also, many respondents described in general terms methods of tailoring instruction.

We analyzed responses using several codes:

- Giving student extra time to complete assignments or tests (77 responses, 29%)
- Tutoring (52 responses, 20%)
- Grouping or pairing students for collaborative work (45 responses, 17%)
- Preferential seating (30 responses, 4%)
- Working one-on-one with a student (24 responses, 9%)
- Taking into consideration a student's learning style or strength (46 responses, 17%)
- Modifying (typically reducing) the amount required on a homework assignment or test, selecting an easier book (57 responses, 21%)

A selection of representative comments follows:
Extra time:

- …Some are given longer times to complete tests and assignments…
- I give more time on the assignments…

Tutoring:

- …tutor many students during their lunchtime on a voluntary basis…
- Since my special education student is behind in the Algebra 1 class, I provide him tutoring after school…

Grouping:

- Work in cooperative groups and force a mix of abilities in each group…
- …I also do pair-share and small group work…

Preferential seating:

- …I've moved the seating arrangements for students who need to be closer to the front of the room…
- RSP (special education) sit in front in my room…

One-on-one:

- Mostly, I do a one-on-one, independent work as I check.
- I give extended time and one-on-one…
- Learning style:
- Vary tests for student capability—filling grids or not; different assessment options—essay, poster, hands-on or demo.
- …Teacher also has some students that instead of writing an essay, they were allowed to draw pictures (e.g., of conflicts).

Modifying amount:

- I use some of the textbook and I bought a supplemental reader to accommodate the story. The 11th graders are studying Macbeth but many of them have a second grade reading level…
- ...a paper is requested and what makes a good paper is no different, but the general (education student) will get a 5-paragraph paper and the college prep

or AP may have to do several pages. The depth is different, but what makes the essay good is the same…

- …Tiered assessment on every test, where a student can get a passing grade of C by answering just so many questions; the questions at the bottom of the test are the hardest, for the A and B students.

Extending the time allowed for assignment or test completion would seem to come into direct conflict with other district programs, such as the use of a pacing or curriculum guide that ensures teachers and students stay on the same schedule or a common exam that is to be taken during a specific period. If certain students are given extended time to learn or complete material during class, they must be "caught up" in time to meet the demands of the district pacing guide or common exam and to keep from falling farther and farther behind. Often, this is done through the use of extra mathematics or English/Language Arts classes conducted in conjunction with the special education department or in the resource room. If students are receiving double blocks of instruction in core areas, it is likely that their instruction is being limited in other areas so as to fit in the core subjects.

Question 11B asked if tailored instruction was done on a regular basis; if time permitted, interviewers tried to obtain a more specific frequency. We developed the following codes:

- Very frequent—either daily, 2 or more times per week, do for everyone
- Moderately frequent—weekly or 2 to 3 times per month
- Infrequent—monthly or less frequently
- Never
- Not applicable
- Only a "yes" answer with no frequency
- Could not determine
- As needed

Table F.87. (GMGE) Is Tailored Instruction Done on a Regular Basis?

	High School (206)	Feeder School (64)	Total (270)
Very frequent	66 (32%)	26 (41%)	92 (34%)
Moderately frequent	18 (9%)	4 (6%)	22 (8%)
Infrequent	7(3%)	1 (2%)	8 (3%)
Never	7(3%)	2 (3%)	9 (3%)
Not applicable	1 (<1%)	0	1 (<1%)
Blank	9 (4%)	2 (3%)	11 (4%)
Yes only	87 (42)	22 (34%)	109 (40%)
Could not determine	2 (<1%)	5 (8%)	7 (3%)
As needed	9 (4%)	2 (3%)	11 (4%)

Sample responses from "very frequent":

- I have to do this to have any kind of success in my class. This is done on a daily basis.
- Yes, a couple of times per week.

Sample responses from “moderately frequent”:

- Does not happen very frequently, maybe once every two weeks. Call a student out if knows not doing well instead of waiting for that student to ask for help…
- Yes, about every week. Don’t often put student on different curriculum, but does work with students before/after school, during lunch, etc. to give them more individualized help.

Sample responses from “infrequent”:

- Depends on complexity of topic. Three times a year.
- Yes, as needed; probably once or twice a month, depending on the need.

Common Question 12A-D, 13A-D GMGE, (Admin 9A-D, 10A-D), (SP 11A-D), (EL13A-13D), (SP-C 7A-D)

GMGE. Questions 12 and 13 are nearly identical; the difference is that Question 12 deals with the school’s general student population and Question 13 deals with student subpopulations. Because of their similarities, we will discuss them together. Questions 12 and 13 each had four parts—two quantitative and two qualitative subquestions. 12A and 13A asked respondents to give a 1-to-5 rating on the degree of CAHSEE support shown to the general population and subpopulations, respectively. A rating of 1 represented doing just what is required; a 5 represented doing innovative things beyond the minimum requirement. If they responded with ratings of 3, 4, or 5, they were asked to provide specific examples of support; this followup question was 12B or 13B. Questions 12C and 13C were similar to 12A-13A in construction, except that it asked respondents to think back two years and give a 1-to-5 rating for CAHSEE support shown then. Finally, Questions 12D and 13D asked respondents for recommendations to improve the level of CAHSEE support for general and subpopulations, respectively.

The quantitative data analysis shows only slight differences between general populations and subpopulations, with the ratings for current year general population showing a minor increase compared to current year subpopulations.

Table F.88. (GMGE) Rating of CAHSEE Support Shown to General Student Population

School Type	Mean-Current Year (Question 12A)	Mean-2 Years Ago (Question 12C)	Mean Difference
High School	3.5 (n=202)	2.6 (n=165)	1.0 (n=165)
Feeder School	3.3 (n=54)	2.6 (n=46)	0.7 (n=46)

Table F.89. (GMGE) Rating of CAHSEE Support Shown to Student Subpopulations

School Type	Mean-Current Year (Question 13A)	Mean-2 Years Ago (Question 13C)	Mean Difference
High School	3.4 (n=190)	2.6 (n=149)	0.9 (n=148)
Feeder School	3.0 (n=51)	2.6 (n=42)	0.6 (n=40)

Questions 12B and 13B were follow-up questions to Questions 12A and 13A, which asked general education teachers to rate the degree of CAHSEE support shown to the general student population and student subpopulations, respectively. In Questions 12A and 13A, teachers were asked for ratings on a 1-to-5-point scale, with 1 representing doing what is required and 5 representing doing more innovative things for CAHSEE support. The ratings were then linked to the corresponding responses to the follow-up question, and those responses linked to ratings of 3 and higher were then analyzed. Of responses to Question 12A, there were 38 respondents who gave ratings of 1 or 2; of responses to Question 13A, there were 49 respondents who have ratings of 1 or 2.

Although there were many codes that were developed, we focused on the ones that had 10 or more responses. We note that respondents were not limited to a single response; thus, the number of responses will not match the number of respondents. For responses to Question 12B, the following codes were selected:

- Courses that include remedial, intervention, support, preparation, or tutoring;
- Use of study guides or CAHSEE sample questions;
- Morale-building activities, such as student incentives or teacher mentoring programs;
- More awareness of CAHSEE, including student awareness;
- Use of practice tests or practice of test-taking strategies;
- More awareness of standards in general;
- Use of district pacing guide, curriculum maps, or scope and sequence documents;
- Materials or textbooks, either supplemental or aligned to standards;
- Curricular flexibility, such as a 2-year Algebra program, or moving students from one level to another;
- General review, typically done as part of class instruction (daily warm-ups);
- An outside program, such as AVID, Gear Up, Kaplan, Read 180;
- Teacher professional development.

We followed the same criterion for selecting codes for Question 13B, again selecting those with at least 10 responses. Although many codes are the same as those found in Question 12B, there are some interesting differences that occur, since respondents were asked to consider different populations as they answered these two questions. The codes for Question 13B are as follows:

- Courses that include remedial, intervention, support, preparation, or tutoring;
- Use of study guides or CAHSEE sample questions;
- Concept that subpopulations receive the same support, instruction, expectations as the majority population;
- Morale-building activities, such as student incentives or teacher mentoring programs;
- More attention being paid or that the group is being targeted for special attention;
- Use of practice tests or practice of test-taking strategies;
- More awareness of standards in general;
- Personnel, such as those who can serve as translators;
- General review, typically done as part of class instruction (daily warm-ups);

Table F.90. (GMGE) CAHSEE Support Given to General Populations and Subpopulations

	Q 12B			Q 13B		
	GMGE High School (163)	GMGE Feeder School (35)	Total (198)	GMGE High School (146)	GMGE Feeder School (31)	Total (177)
Courses	93 (57%)	7 (20%)	100 (51%)	67 (46%)	8 (26%)	75 (42%)
Study guides	54 (33%)	3 (9%)	57 (29%)	28 (19%)	0	28 (16%)
Morale	21 (13%)	0	21 (11%)	14 (10%)	1 (3%)	15 (8%)
CAHSEE awareness	21 (13%)	0	21 (11%)			<10
Practice tests	18 (11%)	2 (6%)	20 (10%)	12 (8%)	0	12 (7%)
Standards awareness	9 (6%)	10 (29%)	19 (10%)	8 (5%)	4 (13%)	12 (7%)
Pacing guide	8 (5%)	6 17%)	14 (7%)			<10
Texts	12 (7%)	1 (3%)	13 (7%)	9 (6%)	2 (6%)	11 (6%)
Flexibility	10 (6%)	2 (6%)	12 (6%)			<10
Review	10 (6%)	1 (3%)	11 (6%)	8 (5%)	2 (6%)	10 (6%)
Outside program	7 (4%)	4 (11%)	11 (6%)			<10
Prof dev	8 (5%)	3 (9%)	11 (6%)			<10
Sameness	0	0	0	12 (8%)	5 (16%)	17 (10%)
Targeted	0	0	0	14 (10%)	0	14 (8%)
Personnel			<10	5 (3%)	5 (16%)	10 (6%)

Sample responses from “courses”:

- …Remedial classes are offered after school. (Q12B)
- After-school tutoring for at-risk students before testing; prep class in summer…(Q 13B)

Sample responses from “study guides”:

- Study guides are given to students to help them with CAHSEE requirements…(Q12B)
- …State prep booklets, and teachers go through them with students. (Q13B)

Sample responses from “morale”:

- The school is great in encouraging students with incentives and just getting the message out and telling them that they are going to make it. There are posters around the school offering encouragement…(Q12B)
- I think we do everything in our power to work with these kids. We give lots of incentives and rewards for good work and effort. (Q13B)

Sample responses from “CAHSEE awareness”:

- The school has made CAHSEE a focus for teacher emphasis. (Q12B)
- Students recognize the importance of the test. (Q12B)

Sample responses from “practice tests”:

- …Teachers also provided with test taking strategy PowerPoint to go over with students. (Q12B)
- …We practice taking the test in class…(Q13B)

Sample responses from “standards awareness”:

- Using the standards and making that the focus of instruction. (Q12B)
- …Each student has their own content standards booklet…(Q13B)

Sample responses from “pacing guide”:

- …Core binders aligned to standards, therefore CAHSEE…(Q12B)
- Spent a great deal of inservice time talking standards, articulated within department and other departments…(Q13B)

Sample responses from “texts”:

- Additional materials have been supplied to teachers to use toward achieving mastery of content standards. (Q12B)
- Using the state adopted standards-based texts and materials. (Q13B)

Sample responses from “flexibility”:

- …We’ve broken the Algebra class into 2 years instead of 1. By doing that, the kids who are struggling with CAHSEE have the option of taking that class. Kids don’t have to do that but we strongly encourage it…(Q12B)
- Double math classes to meet the requirements. (Q12B)

Sample responses from “review”:

- …The math teachers are doing the warm ups on standards that are on the CAHSEE. (Q12B)
- …We sometimes have a “Block Day” in which time will be blocked for review of standards. (Q13B)

Sample responses from “outside program”:

- …Read 180 for freshmen…(Q12B)
- …We have tutoring offered every day after school, even from Kaplan, Sylvan…(Q12B)

Sample responses from “professional development”:

- …They have two extra inservice days a year to improve teaching practices and new teachers have an extra week…(Q12B
- …In the English department, through meetings and professional development, we are focusing on the CAHSEE exam and an essay question…(Q12B)

Sample responses from “sameness”:

- …I do not do anything different than I would for everybody else. (Q13B)
- I don’t think there’s a difference between the subpopulation support and the general support…(Q13B)

Sample responses from “targeted”:

- The school has programs for these specific groups. (Q13B)
- They spend more time on subpopulation students, like special education, EL and at-risk students who are close to passing because they want to get these kids over the hump. But this takes away time given to all kids and that time should be equal…(Q13B)

Sample responses from “personnel”:

- …EL kids have translators in the classroom, they have after school tutoring with translators…(Q13B)
- …Hiring teachers from different backgrounds…(Q13B)

Respondents were then asked for recommendations they had to improve the level of CAHSEE support for the general student population at their school (Question 12D) as well as for student subpopulations (Question 13D). Because respondents were free to offer as many recommendations as they wanted, the number of responses will not equal the number of respondents. With such an open-ended question, it should come as no surprise that there were many recommendations; due to low numbers, we limited our analysis to those recommendations with 10 or more responses. The number of respondents was determined by subtracting the total number of blanks and off-topic responses from the total number of high school and feeder school respondents. The following were recommendations suggested for the general student population:

- Courses such as remediation or preparation, other targeted classes for CAHSEE, or tutoring, all designed to help prepare or remediate students for CAHSEE;
- Improving parent involvement, motivation, or education, or offering special programs to help parents;
- Addressing testing concerns that teachers have, including reducing the amount of testing or the number of standards, the belief that the CAHSEE is testing the wrong things or that it is biased, the desire to have available a complete released test form, the development of an alternate testing schedule, or the desire for the CAHSEE to be strengthened;
- The use of practice tests or testing strategies;
- The desire for better articulation or communication between school levels, such as elementary and middle schools or middle and high schools;
- The desire for additional materials or equipment, not necessarily related to CAHSEE;
- The desire for increased teacher awareness, involvement, motivation, accountability, or buy in;
- The desire for increased student awareness about CAHSEE;
- The desire for additional materials related to the CAHSEE:

- The recognition that CAHSEE should be a concern for teachers in grades other than CAHSEE testing grades.

GMGE teachers made similar recommendations to improve the level of CAHSEE support for student subpopulations, such as remediation courses, student motivation, parent involvement, articulation between schools, and testing concerns. They made the following different recommendations:

- The desire for personnel who can better meet the needs of these students, such as translators for EL students or additional special education aides or teachers;
- Recommendations specifically related to second language issues, such as texts, translators, or classes. We recognize that this recommendation and the previous one are closely related.

Table F.91. (GMGE) Teachers' Recommendations to Improve the Level of CAHSEE Support

	Question 12D			Question 13D		
	High Schools (182)	Feeder Schools (51)	Total (233)	High Schools (161)	Feeder Schools (44)	Total (205)
Courses	56 (31%)	6 (12%)	62 (27%)	42 (26%)	7 (16%)	49 (24%)
Parents	21 (12%)	5 (10%)	26 (11%)	23 (14%)	7 (16%)	30 (15%)
Testing concerns	15 (8%)	5 (10%)	20 (9%)	8 (5%)	2 (5%)	10 (5%)
Practice tests	7 (4%)	7 (14%)	14 (6%)			<10
Articulation	4 (2%)	9 (18%)	13 (6%)	4 (2%)	7 (16%)	11 (5%)
Materials	7 (4%)	5 (10%)	12 (5%)			<10
Teacher aware	10 (5%)	1 (2%)	11 (5%)			<10
Student aware	8 (4%)	2 (4%)	10 (4%)			<10
CAHSEE materials	9 (5%)	1 (2%)	10 (4%)			<10
Beyond CAHSEE	6 (3%)	4 (8%)	10 (4%)			<10
Personnel			<10	10 (6%)	3 (7%)	13 (6%)
2nd language issue			<10	13 (8%)	4 (9%)	17 (8%)

Sample responses from “courses”:

- We could improve by providing even more interventions for students needing it during the school day, but that would have to replace electives, which is not a popular idea. (Q12D)
- We offer tutoring for English learners and separate sessions for anybody, but it is done with special ed in mind…We need more sessions—it is first come first serve—so when it is full they do not get any help. (Q13D)

Sample responses from “parents”:

- Parent education would be a good thing. They should know what’s expected, have some input…(Q12D)
- With the EL students, we may need to contact the Spanish speaking parents to make it important. (Q13D)

Sample responses from “testing concerns”:

- …Think our kids get tested (and pulled out of class) so much that we should make sure they know the CAHSEE is a top priority test. Kids don’t know which test they are taking for what. We should look at scheduling for tests (maybe have half-day release during testing window). (Q12D)
- I would recommend that we make the CAHSEE much more challenging. (Q12D)
- From what I’ve heard I think some who teach in special education and EL believe that the exam is biased toward their students and they feel helpless. Not sure how to improve that. (Q13D)

Sample responses from “practice tests”:

- For us, it would be great to see released test questions that apply to the middle school content standards. With those released questions, you get a sense of what is being assessed. (Q12D)
- I would offer…practice testing, testing trick…(Q12D)

Sample responses from “articulation”:

- There still needs to be improvement and articulation between the middle school and high school. Teachers in the 6th, 7th, and 8th grade should be meeting with high school teachers. (Q12D)
- I would say articulation. We communicate a lot but we need more time to do it, either through a compact day or other way. More structured time would be a benefit. (Q13D)

Sample responses from “materials”:

- We need more novels related to CAHSEE. (Q12D)
- …We need materials that help them to write a persuasive in 10 minutes…(Q12D)

Sample responses from “teacher awareness”:

- I think we should try to get more teachers involved in providing extra help to students…(Q12D)
- Maybe trying to improve teacher attitude about administering the CAHSEE would give all teachers a better idea of what all needs to be in place for students to pass. (Q12D)

Sample responses from “student awareness”:

- Spend more time explaining how important the test is. (Q12D)
- Think just to talk about why they need to do well…(Q12D)

Sample responses from “CAHSEE materials”:

- Keep teachers abreast of changes. For example, if the alignment is changing, we need an updated resource/binder. (Q12D)
- …I think every child needs their own individual practice book on the standards. (Q12D)

Sample responses from “beyond CAHSEE”:

- I don’t think all teachers are sure of what is on the test itself. I saw examples of essays. It’s just given to 10th grade teachers. I think it should be given to 9th grade teachers so they can align their instruction to standards. Even give it to the 11th and 12th grade teachers. (Q12D)
- I’ve never sat down with colleagues to look at what’s on CAHSEE; that should be a bigger focus for teachers of 9th graders, before they have to take it. Familiarity with terminology used on the test, test-taking strategies…(Q12D)

Sample responses from “personnel”:

- We need qualified, trained special education teachers. (Q13D)
- …Extra ELD curriculum would be more effective. The class size should be smaller and the right qualified teacher…(Q13D)

Sample responses from “2nd language issue”:

- I think we could get a better job of getting bilingual materials…(Q13D)
- Do they have a Spanish version of the algebra portion? Their focus is language. Our 6th grade text has Spanish glossary, but little help. (Q13D)

Finally, we offer the following comments from the same school as an indication of what efforts still must be made to provide students with needed remediation:

- The school does not offer support except to pass along the CAHSEE booklet…
- I would like to see us being able to take the kids that don’t pass and have a focused class on bringing up those skills.
- When they become seniors they need to take those kids aside who haven’t passed and help them to pass.
- A tutoring program specifically targeting CAHSEE would be helpful for the students…

Admin. Table 92 shows ratings administrators gave for the level of CAHSEE support shown to the student population as a whole.

Table F.92. (Admin) Ratings of CAHSEE Support

	Rating				
Administrators	1	2	3	4	5
High Schools	1	5	17	21	16
Feeder Schools	5	1	1	8	1

Table 93 shows administrator examples of CAHSEE support being given to students.

Table F.93.(Admin) Types of CAHSEE support offered for students

Administrators	High Schools	Feeder Schools
Courses	22	4
Study guides	7	0
Morale	4	1
CAHSEE awareness	5	0
Practice tests	1	0
Standards awareness	3	4
Pacing guide	0	1
Texts	3	1
Flexibility	2	1
Review	3	1
Outside program	4	0
Prof dev	2	0
Sameness	0	0
Targeted	0	0
Personnel	0	0

Sample statements from Administrator Interviews:

- We offer support classes in Language Arts for our at risk population
- After school tutoring.
- Saturday school.
- Each 10th grade student is given a study guide of released materials from the state.
- Those different intervention courses
- Test-taking strategies, after-school programs, distribute CAHSEE prep books from state.
- Teachers stay after school, voluntarily work with students on Saturday. Every student got a state-produced CAHSEE book in English and math.
- We have an intensive tutoring program after school.

Table F.94. (Admin) Ratings of CAHSEE Support Two Years Ago

	Rating						
Administrators	0	1	2	3	4	5	Don't Know
High Schools	0	9	15	12	10	3	15
Feeder Schools	1	3	2	3	3	1	3

In the Administrative Interviews question 9D often went unanswered. Therefore the table below highlights the most frequent responses.

Table F.95. (Admin) Recommendations for Improving CAHSEE Support

Administrators	High Schools	Feeder Schools
Courses	10	2
Parents	1	1
Articulation	2	1
Student Awareness	1	1
Teacher Involvement	1	0
No recommendation/Continue what school does now	8	4

Administrators were asked for ratings on a 1-to-5-point scale, with 1 representing doing what is required and 5 representing doing more innovative things for CAHSEE support. The ratings were then linked to the corresponding responses to the follow-up question, and those responses linked to ratings of 3 and higher were then analyzed. Of responses to Question10A, there were 16 respondents who gave ratings of 1 or 2.

Table F.96. (Admin) Current Ratings for Subpopulation CAHSEE Support

School Type	Mean-Current Year	Mean-2 Years Ago	Mean Difference
High School	3.1 (n=57)	2.5 (n=47)	0.6 (n=47)
Feeder School	3.09 (n=16)	2.31 (n=16)	0.78(n=16)

Many administrators suggested continuing the programs that are currently available in their schools. When Administrators made suggestions for new support for subpopulations to get ready for CAHSEE, they most often mentioned offering Remediation/Preparatory Classes, Tutoring, or targeting these classes to specific populations (13%). New materials were suggested 4 percent of the time. Raising student and parental awareness were suggested 4 percent of the time as well.

Sample responses from Administrator interviews:

- Focus more on special education needs for students.
- Offer more support classes without taking away elective offerings.
- Getting parents involved.
- Make subgroup populations key targets.
- After school intervention for below and far below basic in English and math.
- Offer tutoring.
- Offer intervention earlier, after the first 8 weeks of school.
- Opportunity for classes specifically designed with language strategies for EL.
- Outreach to African Americans to overcome low rates of showing up for remedial, prep opportunities.

SP. Question 11B is a follow-up to Question 11A, which asked special education teachers to rate the degree of CAHSEE support shown to the special education student population at this school. In the question 11A, teachers were asked for ratings on a 1-to-5-point scale, with 1 representing doing what is required and 5 representing doing more innovative things for CAHSEE support. The ratings were then linked to the corresponding responses to the follow-up question, and those responses linked to ratings of 3 and higher were then analyzed. Out of the total responses to Question 11A, 78, there were 46 respondents who gave ratings of 3 or higher.

Table F.97. (SP) Ratings of CAHSEE Support Shown to SP Students

School Type	Mean-Current Year	Mean-2 Years Ago	Mean Difference
High School	3.3 (n=61)	2.3 (n=51)	1.0 (n=51)
Middle School	2.6 (n=9)	1.5 (n=7)	1.2 (n=7)

A large set of codes were generated to categorize the responses to 11B across all interview types, however, the list below contains only those categories that applied to the special education teacher responses. Also, it is important to note that respondents were not limited to a single response; thus, the number of responses will not match the number of respondents (46). For responses to Question 11B, the following codes were selected:

- Courses that include remedial, intervention, support, preparation, or tutoring
- Use of study guides or CAHSEE sample questions
- Morale-building activities, such as student incentives or teacher mentoring programs
- More awareness of standards in general
- Use of practice tests or practice of test-taking strategies
- Texts that are aligned to the standards
- Professional development to improve teacher skills
- Personnel, such as those who can serve as translators

Table F.98. (SP) Examples of CAHSEE Support

SP	11B
Courses	23
Study guides	5
Morale	4
CAHSEE awareness	7
Practice tests	3
Texts	1
Prof dev	4
Personnel	6

It is evident from the table that the bulk of the effort to support special education students is the addition of or modification of classes. There is a wide range of the kinds of classes that have been implemented; such as tutoring (before, during, after school), test prep, CAHSEE remediation, literacy, new math and English, and targeted labs after school. Sample responses received are:

- We offer tutoring at lunch and after school, along with pull-outs where students come once or twice for a period of heavy CAHSEE remediation
- We have the support classes math and also for English
- Saturday school focuses on CAHSEE skills
- The classes, there are plenty of them. Kids are screened for their needs. There are two prep math and English classes
- We have been supplied with the books and materials we need to prepare the students for the CAHSEE
- Obtained the state CAHSEE study guides
- Students have incentive and prizes; we had about 200 participants
- Incentives like treats, extended lunch periods during testing to motivate the student to do their best
- Teachers will conference with students (about CAHSEE) during their planning time and after school
- We've been sent to in-services to help us get ready
- The teachers attend in-service workshops to gain information

- We have a math aide that floats between general classes
- The school has recognized that a specialist needs to teach the CAHSEE classes

Respondents were asked for recommendations they had to improve the level of CAHSEE support for the special education student population at their school (Question 11D). Because respondents were free to offer as many recommendations as they wanted, the number of responses will not equal the number of respondents. With such an open-ended question, it should come as no surprise that there were many recommendations.

The following were recommendations suggested for the special education student population:

- Courses such as remediation or preparation, other targeted classes for CAHSEE, or tutoring, all designed to help prepare or remediate students for CAHSEE
- Improving parent involvement, motivation, or education, or offering special programs to help parents;
- Addressing testing concerns that teachers have, including reducing the amount of testing or the number of standards, the belief that the CAHSEE is testing the wrong things or that it is biased, the desire to have available a complete released test form, the development of an alternate testing schedule, or the desire for the CAHSEE to be strengthened
- The use of practice tests or testing strategies
- The desire for better articulation or communication between school levels, such as elementary and middle schools or middle and high schools
- The desire for additional materials or equipment, not necessarily related to CAHSEE;
- The desire for increased teacher awareness, involvement, motivation, accountability, or buy-in
- The desire for increased student awareness about CAHSEE
- The desire for additional materials related to the CAHSEE
- The recognition that CAHSEE should be a concern for teachers in grades other than CAHSEE testing grades
- Accommodations; mirroring the student's IEP, allow more accommodations
- Collaboration between teachers, helping each other, team teaching

Table F.99. (SP) Recommendations to Improve Level of CAHSEE Support

SP	
Courses	28
Parents	8
Testing concerns	4
Practice tests	3
Articulation	1
Materials	3
Teacher aware	1
Student aware	4
CAHSEE materials	4
Beyond CAHSEE	3
Personnel	6
Accommodations	10
Collaboration	2

Of the possible 78 respondents, 12 either did not answer the question or had no idea how to improve the level of CAHSEE support for the special education students while another 4 stated they could offer no suggestions because they are doing all they can do. Of the remaining 62 respondents, as with the other interview categories, the addition of new courses was the most common response (over one third); stating there was a need to provide classes geared specifically to CAHSEE remediation, additional periods of English or math, tutoring opportunities, and various workshops. There were also concerns expressed that more accommodations (to match students IEPs) should be provided for the CAHSEE requirement. A few additional suggestions not charted were to provide more student data to the teachers, initiate a peer mentoring program, and obtain more administrative support. The following are examples of responses from selected categories.

Sample responses from “courses”:

- She would like to set up a mandatory after school tutoring session (for credit) to focus on CAHSEE
- Need to further reduce class since in CAHSEE support classes for special ed students, we now have 20 students in these classes
- Offer CAHSEE prep courses specifically geared to special ed students, courses in strategies would also help
- We tried this tutorial class the second half of the year; would like to see it throughout the year…we were cramming and it would be easier to have more time

Sample responses from “parents”:

- More interaction with parents would be helpful to explain the reality of the need to do well on CAHSEE, regardless of their disability. This would also increase parent support for their child in school life
- …more parental involvement; attending open house, back to school night, and learn to work with their child’s homework assignment

Sample responses from “testing concerns”:

- They get lost, kids are so low; they should not take the test
- Think they need an alternative assessment

Sample responses from “materials”:

- We could use more multimedia resources like games and visuals
- Our research-based materials to target special needs are minimal

Sample responses from “personnel”:

- Smaller class size, too large right now with over 15 students. They are going to hire a new teacher
- In-service for regular teachers so they have a better idea of what they can do in classes for these students

Sample responses from “accommodation”:

- For example, the CAHSEE booklets can’t be enlarged (like the STAR test) for the nearly blind student
- I don’t’ believe that they should validate the scores without the accommodations students have as part of their IEP
- I think we should allow those student to use calculator on the math portion of the test

Sample response from “collaboration”:

- Involve special ed teachers with more team-teaching with general ed teachers; more time to interact with them

EL. Question 13B is a follow-up to Question 13A, which asked EL teachers to rate the degree of CAHSEE support shown to the EL student population at this school. In the question 13A, teachers were asked for ratings on a 1-to-5-point scale, with 1 representing doing what is required and 5 representing doing more innovative things for CAHSEE support. The ratings were then linked to the corresponding responses to the follow-up question, and those responses linked to ratings of 3 and higher were then analyzed. Of the 67 total responses to Question 13A, there were 42 respondents who gave ratings of 3 or higher.

Table F.100. (EL) Ratings of CAHSEE Support Shown to EL Students

School Type	Mean-Current Year	Mean-2 Years Ago	Mean Difference
High School	3.4 (n=49)	2.2 (n=41)	1.2 (n=41)
Middle School	2.5 (n=12)	1.9 (n=12)	0.6 (n=12)

A large set of codes were generated to categorize the responses to 13B across all interview types, however, the list below contains only those categories that applied to the EL teacher responses. Also, it is important to note that respondents were not limited to a single response; thus, the number of responses will not match the number of respondents (46). For responses to Question 13B, the following codes were selected:

- Courses that include remedial, intervention, support, preparation, or tutoring
- Use of study guides or CAHSEE sample questions

- Morale-building activities, such as student incentives or teacher mentoring programs
- More awareness of standards in general
- Use of practice tests or practice of test-taking strategies
- Pacing guides
- Texts that are aligned to the standards
- Professional development to improve teacher skills
- Personnel, such as those who can serve as translators

Table F.101. (EL) Examples of CAHSEE Support

EL	13B
Courses	23
Study guides	7
Morale	4
CAHSEE awareness	9
Practice tests	7
Pacing guide	1
Texts	3
Personnel	1

It is evident from the table that the bulk of the effort to support EL students is the addition of or modification of classes. There is a wide range of the kinds of classes that have been implemented; such as tutoring (before, during, after school), test prep, CAHSEE remediation, literacy, new math and English, and targeted labs after school. Sample responses received are:

- The school offers the CAHSEE academy for 4 hours. This was the second year that was offered
- Lots of EL students are involved in Read 180 and the HighPoint program. We have Saturday school and after school tutoring
- Teachers provide focus lesson, after school tutoring, and library time after school
- We have the Accelerated Reader program which has books in both Spanish and English
- The school purchased CAHSEE preparation books and they will be used for the CAHSEE preparation class
- Every EL student has a workbook for help with mastery of the content standard
- There are school incentives for students
- The information is out there to the students; the administration pushes it, the department pushes the kids to get ready
- Try to gear all instruction toward helping pass the test
- Test taking skills and after school classes to assist
- Our curriculum is aligned with our choice of textbooks and we have strong support from our principal
- I had an EL1 bilingual pair educator with me all the time

Respondents were asked for recommendations they had to improve the level of CAHSEE support for the EL student population at their school (Question 13D). Because respondents were free to offer as many recommendations as they wanted, the number

of responses will not equal the number of respondents. With such an open-ended question, it should come as no surprise that there were many recommendations.

The following were recommendations suggested for the EL student population:

- Courses such as remediation or preparation, other targeted classes for CAHSEE, or tutoring, all designed to help prepare or remediate students for CAHSEE
- Improving parent involvement, motivation, or education, or offering special programs to help parents;
- Addressing testing concerns that teachers have, including reducing the amount of testing or the number of standards, the belief that the CAHSEE is testing the wrong things or that it is biased, the desire to have available a complete released test form, the development of an alternate testing schedule, or the desire for the CAHSEE to be strengthened
- The use of practice tests or testing strategies
- The desire for better articulation or communication between school levels, such as elementary and middle schools or middle and high schools
- The desire for additional materials or equipment, not necessarily related to CAHSEE;
- The desire for increased teacher awareness, involvement, motivation, accountability, or buy-in
- The desire for increased student awareness about CAHSEE
- The desire for additional materials related to the CAHSEE
- The recognition that CAHSEE should be a concern for teachers in grades other than CAHSEE testing grades
- Accommodations; mirroring student's IEP, allow more or alternative accommodations
- Collaboration between teachers, helping each other, team teaching

Table F.102. (EL) Recommendations for Improving CAHSEE Support

EL	
Courses	18
Parents	4
Testing concerns	2
Practice tests	9
Articulation	0
Materials	7
Teacher aware	4
Student aware	6
CAHSEE materials	5
Beyond CAHSEE	3
Personnel	7
Accommodations	1
Collaboration	2

Of the possible 67 respondents, 15 either did not answer the question or had no idea how to improve the level of CAHSEE support for the special education students while another 3 stated they could offer no suggestions because they are doing all they

can do. Of the remaining 49 respondents, as with the other interview categories, the addition of new courses was the most common response (over one third); stating there was a need to provide classes geared specifically to CAHSEE remediation, additional periods of English or math, tutoring opportunities, and various workshops. A few additional suggestions not charted were to provide more student data to the teachers, smaller classes, and improved placement of students. The following are examples of responses from selected categories.

Sample responses from “courses”:

- Mandatory for students who are a level 2-5 to take reading comprehension and writing comprehension as an ALL elective
- I think we are doing a good job; perhaps we could do more review in the classrooms
- ELD3 classes we need something like VISION and we don’t have anything like it

Sample responses from “testing concerns”:

- Combine the CAHSEE with the STAR test
- We are over testing our kids and not enough instruction. I resent the amount of time that I am proctoring the test

Sample responses from “materials”:

- More computers, EL students seem behind in technology; they do a lot of writing, and computers help with editing
- The teachers need more materials geared specifically for English learners
- Ordered software to improve reading comprehension, writing, will set up 2 more computer labs

Sample responses from “beyond CAHSEE”:

- Not much in-service pointing out why CAHSEE is important to middle school as well as to high school
- I think a lot should be done prior to the students coming to schools here. There is a lot lacking between middle and high school performance and there needs to be a bridge such as incentive types or training or summer program for transitioning students

Sample responses from “personnel”:

- We need more professional development training; our EL students get lost in the cracks because teachers don’t like working with them since their skill level is so low
- Training of what the CAHSEE expects; I’m not fully convinces that the standards will address everything we need for the CAHSEE

SP-C. Of the 33 respondents, 70 percent rated their degree of support for at risk students at the high end of the range with a three, four, or five.

Table F.103. (SP-C) Degree of CAHSEE Support

SP-C	Rating					
	Doing What is Required				Cutting Edge	
	1	2	3	4	5	Other
High Schools	2	5	8	9	4	2
Feeder Schools	0	1	1	1	0	0
Total	2	6	9	10	4	2

The following codes were used to analyze the Special Courses teacher responses.

- Courses that include remedial, intervention, support, preparation, or tutoring;
- More attention being paid or that the group is being targeted for special attention;
- Personnel, such as those who can serve as translators;

Table F.104. (SP-C) Type of CAHSEE Support

SP-C	
Courses	9
More attention to group	5
Personnel	2

Note. The table shows the top three responses.

Sample responses from special courses interviews:

- They are offering a remedial course.
- We have after school tutoring.
- Regular warm ups with the students that are CAHSEE preparation strategies that are integrated in the lesson.
- This prep class, we have tutoring every day after school. The media center is opened until 5 pm and is available to all students. Tutoring also goes on in the classrooms and in the computer lab. Teachers are always seen in their classroom tutoring students.
- I get a lot of resources from my resource provider and the administration.
- Focus on students who are at risk and provide the tutorial after school.

Teachers were asked to rate the class from two years ago. Responses counted as “Other” include blank, don’t know, ratings of zero, and teachers who were not in the same school or were in a different position two years ago.

Table F.105. (SP-C) Teacher Ratings of CAHSEE Support Two Years Ago

SP-C	Rating					
	Doing what is required				Cutting Edge	
	1	2	3	4	5	Other
High Schools	5	6	4	0	0	15
Feeder Schools	1	1	1	0	0	0
Total	6	7	5	0	0	15

Special Courses instructors were then asked to give recommendations for ways to improve the level of CAHSEE support for students. Teachers most often

recommended more remediation courses (36%). Second most (18%); they expressed the desire for more materials. The third most popular response (6%) was the desire for more teacher training, awareness, involvement, motivation, accountability, or buy-in. Some sample statements from special courses interviews are below.

- Order new materials to help them be successful and be interested in reading.
- I would like it to be a requirement for students to stay after school or have a study hall period.
- I would like to see more materials for each standard and for the CAHSEE.
- I believe they should offer the specialized course as an elective to the ninth graders.
- Keep offering prep classes, add more sections.
- To provide teachers with training on information about the CAHSEE test and provide some training about what is happening in the preparation class.
- Provide more resources.
- Institute a formalized tutoring class.
- Give a 5 or 10 minute review like the math department during tutoring in the library after school.
- Add a Saturday to help students with CAHSEE.
- Increase the number of (remedial) classes offered.
- Need to have better materials.
- Offer the class during the regular school day, involve more teachers.

Common Question 14A, B GMGE, (Admin 11A, B)

GMGE. Question 14A asked respondents whether they have seen changes in student motivation or attitude in their student population as a whole that they attribute to the CAHSEE graduation requirement. Although this question was set up as a simple yes-no format; we felt a matrix table would best reflect the responses that we received. The first column is the number of responses that indicated (with no additional supporting comment) that there was either a change in motivation or attitude, that there was no change, or we could not determine whether a change did, or did not, occur. The next three columns contain the number of responses received (by type of change) that were positive (more serious, trying harder), neutral (not concerned, don't care), or negative (anxious, attendance problems).

Almost 50 percent of the respondents indicated that they have seen no change in the motivation or attitude of their students due to the CAHSEE requirement. Of those indicating they have seen a change in student's motivation (26% of the responses), nearly two-thirds responded that the change was positive as opposed to negative. There were 17 responses there were off topic or not applicable and 12 comments that were changes not related to the CAHSEE requirement.

Table F.106. (GMGE) Reported Changes in Student Motivation or Attitude Attributable to CAHSEE

Motivation or Attitude	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Total
Yes, Change				
GMGE High School 3	46	6	18	73
GMGE Feeder School 0	4	2	4	10
Unknown				
GMGE High School 0	10	13	8	31
GMGE Feeder School 0	1	3	2	6
No, Change				
GMGE High School 35	7	18	4	64
GMGE Feeder School 17	0	10	3	30
Total 55	68	52	39	214

Sample "Yes" comments are:

- The CAHSEE has helped…some students take their classes more seriously
- The attitude is better this year because they are better informed
- Yes, those who have older siblings know the importance
- Students are more concerned about their performance on the test
- Students get pretty restless, more question about why they have to take it and more skeptical. They tend to talk a bit more but not too much trouble

Sample "No" comments are:

- Haven't seen changes in attitude, students don't want to fail and they take it seriously
- No, the population is too fluid
- No, I don't think the CAHSEE affects their attitude, the day of the test the students had good attendance
- No, they do not take it seriously, they are immature

Sample "Not indicated" comments are:

- More concerned about passing to get out of high school (class work)
- Not sure, most students see it as just another test

The follow up question (14B) regarding student motivation or attitude change due to the CAHSEE was to ask how the school has responded to those changes. Although answers varied, the most common responses were to talk about the exit exam importance, new classes or scheduling modifications, incentive programs, and parent involvement. A large number of responses were comments indicating there was little or no school response. A variety of other responses include: providing standards-based texts and CAHSEE workbooks, classroom student placement changes, increasing collaborative teaching opportunities, teacher professional development, and improved communication between feeder schools.

We developed several codes:

- General positive motivation, such as helping students trying harder, understand the importance of the CAHSEE
- New classes; tutoring, CAHSEE remediation, class flexibility, practice tests

- Incentive programs
- Increased parent involvement
- No response, school has done nothing yet

Table F.107. (GMGE) Reported Response to Change in Student Motivation or Attitude Attributable to CAHSEE

GMGE	High School	Feeder School	Total
Positive motivation	43	9	52
New classes	32	5	37
Incentive programs	15	1	16
Parental involvement	5	3	8
No response	22	11	33
Other	11	5	16

First, talking to students regarding the importance of passing the exit exam was the highest response, with teachers and administrators doing “pep talks” that focus on the importance and seriousness of passing the CAHSEE, while at the same minimizing fear. One school was developing a video to “hype it (the exit exam) up.” Another way for students to see that schools are taking the CAHSEE seriously was by providing a better school environment; from removing chronic discipline problems to increased school security.

Another significant portion of the responses involved the creation of (implemented or planned) additional tutoring or remedial classes and special programs during or after school and on Saturdays. Also several indicated there were changes to the course schedule, such as adding an additional period of math or English. Several schools had implemented a variety of special programs to increase the numbers of students passing the exit exam such as new interactive computer tutorials, 2-3 week workshops, peer counseling, and cultural diversity programs for students and their parents. Some of the specific programs mentioned by teachers and administrators were: Read 180, Quantum Learning, Renaissance Math, Youth Authors, Beyond the Bell, AVID, Gear Up, and Kaplan.

In addition to trying to create a positive atmosphere around the exit exam, to motivate students to improve attendance and testing performance, many schools offered a variety of incentives such as tickets for movies, field trips, free video rental, or special lunches. A number of achievement and awards programs were mentioned, as well, ranging from formal year-end award ceremonies to recognition during school announcements or in the classroom.

Approximately 20 percent of the respondents indicated that they were not aware of anything the school was doing about the change in student motivation or attitude. Although it appears to be a negative response (and was in several cases) several respondents provided additional comments such as: the school or district was taking a “wait-and-see attitude” at this time, there was nothing to change because they have a high pass rate, or that it wasn’t a big enough issue yet. The later response came from some middle schools and from those who felt that it will become a big deal only when students start getting denied diplomas.

Sample responses include:

- The school has provided better information about the test and has provided more materials
- I think we have a wait-and-see attitude
- We drill it into the kids, if the teachers take is seriously, then the students will
- The principal comes around and talks to the students and the counselors do, too
- We provided an extrinsic motivational carnival this year
- Yes, the school has established two classes in math and English for student having problems
- We've talked about implementing a 5th year program…CAHSEE should be a K-14 issue, not a high school issue
- We extended the essentials class
- The school is changing the schedule and hiring the most qualified teachers
- The school is incredible (reaching out to parents); sometimes they face angry parents and dogs going to their houses. They have a police escort sometimes
- As a department, we talk about CAHSEE at back-to-school night and in parent meetings
- Co-teaching with the resource teacher
- No, we have a high passing rate
- We've tried to motivate them with incentives and rewards but these kids don't care

Admin. Administrators were asked to rate changes in student motivation or attitude attributable to CAHSEE. Table 108 shows their responses.

Table F.108. Change in Student Motivation or Attitude in High Schools

Reported Change	Positive Change	Neutral Change	Negative Change
Yes	58%	42%	44%
Neutral	10%	25%	33%
No Change	31%	33%	23%

This means that 33 percent of Administrators saw a change in their student population's motivation or attitude attributable to CAHSEE. Of that 33 percent, over half (58%) saw positive change. Thirty-one percent (31%) saw no change. From that group, 31 percent felt that change had not occurred, but student motivation and attitude were positive.

When Administrators reported change in question 11A, we looked to see how schools responded to changes in motivation and attitude. Most Administrators who responded to this question reported offering remedial classes or tutoring. The next largest group reported using more rewards (cookouts, giveaways, etc.) in order to raise student morale. The last group reported using other methods to raise student motivation. All reported responses in the table below were reported by high schools; therefore feeder schools are not represented.

Table F.109. Responses to Reported Change in Motivation and Attitude

Administrators	Remediation	Morale	Student Motivation
High Schools	15	7	5

Common Question 15A, B GMGE, (Admin 12A, B), (SP 12A, B), (EL 14A, B), (SP-C 8A, B)

GMGE. Question 15A asked respondents whether they have seen changes in student motivation or attitude in their student subpopulations that they attribute to the CAHSEE graduation requirement. Although this question was set up as a simple yes-no format; we felt a matrix table would best reflect the responses that we received. The first column is the number of responses that indicated (with no additional supporting comment) that there was either a change in motivation or attitude, that there was no change, or we could not determine whether a change did, or did not, occur. The next three columns contain the number of responses received (by type of change) that were positive (more serious, trying harder), neutral (not concerned, don't care), or negative (anxious, attendance problems).

Most of the respondents (more than 50%) indicated that they have seen no change in the motivation or attitude of the subpopulations due to the CAHSEE requirement. Of those indicating they have seen a change in student's motivation (26% of the responses), there is not a big difference between those who indicated that the change is positive, or negative, in nature. There were 23 responses there were off topic or not applicable (nearly three quarters of those were from middle schools) and 5 comments that were changes not related to the CAHSEE requirement.

Table F.110. (GMGE) Change in Motivation or Attitude in Subpopulations Attributable to CAHSEE

Motivation or Attitude	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Total
Yes, Change				
GMGE High School 5	22	1	17	45
GMGE Feeder School 0	7	0	3	10
Unknown				
GMGE High School 0	12	10	18	40
GMGE Feeder School 0	4	2	3	9
No, Change				
GMGE High School 56	4	8	10	78
GMGE Feeder School 22	0	5	0	27
Total 83	49	26	51	209

Sample "Yes" comments are:

- Same as the general population, students are serious about passing this test and pay attention when reviewing for it
- I see a big change, students are meeting the standards, we raised the bar 3 years ago

- Students have accepted they have to pass the graduate, doesn't correspond to behavior or absenteeism
- It has changed…the math lab which is the lowest class has a very low attendance

Sample "No" comments are:

- No, I think our EL department is kind of focused…get the kids involved
- No, It is not the focus of junior high kids
- A lot of them feel, particularly minority groups, the testing and the school stress on testing is overkill and biased against them
- It is the same population and I am seeing the same thing with them…very nervous

Sample "Not indicated" comments are:

- But I noticed some of the EL students are asking and checking and doing more of the "picky" things that they need to do in order to know
- Lower classes just don't seem to care
- They are concerned and anxious…afraid they will fail

The follow up question (15B) asked how the school has responded to those changes in student motivation or attitude due to the CAHSEE requirement. Although answers varied, the most common responses were to talk about the exit exam importance, new classes or scheduling modifications, incentive programs, and parent involvement. A large number of responses were comments indicating there was little or no school response. A variety of other responses include: providing standards-based texts and CAHSEE workbooks, classroom student placement changes, increasing collaborative teaching opportunities, teacher professional development, and improved communication between feeder schools.

We developed several codes:

- General positive motivation, such as helping students trying harder, understand the importance of the CAHSEE
- New classes; tutoring, CAHSEE remediation, class flexibility, practice tests
- Incentive programs
- Increased parent involvement
- No response, school has done nothing yet

Table F.111. (GMGE) Response to Change in Student Motivation or Attitude in Subpopulations Attributable to CAHSEE

	High School	Feeder School	Total
Positive motivation	31	5	36
New classes	30	1	31
Incentive programs	16	5	21
Parental involvement	6	2	8
No response	20	10	30
Other	16	2	18

There were no significant differences between the responses for the general population (in Question 14B) and the subpopulations. Talking to students regarding the importance of passing the exit exam was the highest response for both and doing similar activities such as “pep talks” and improving the school environment. Similarly, teacher reported a variety of incentives (special lunches or tickets to movies) to boast morale.

Another significant portion of the responses involved the creation of (implemented or planned) additional tutoring or remedial classes and special programs during or after school and on Saturdays. As stated in Question 14B, several indicated there were changes to the course schedule, such as adding an additional period of math or English, in addition to computer tutorials and workshops. Some of the specific programs mentioned by teachers and administrators were: Read 180, Quantum Learning, Renaissance Math, Youth Authors, Beyond the Bell, AVID, Gear Up, and Kaplan.

Approximately 22 percent of the respondents indicated that they were not aware of anything the school was doing about the change in student motivation or attitude. Although it appears to be a negative response (and was in several cases) several respondents provided additional comments such as: the school or district was taking a “wait-and-see attitude” at this time, there was nothing to change because they have a high pass rate, or that it wasn’t a big enough issue yet. The later response came from some middle schools and from those who felt that it will become a big deal only when students start getting denied diplomas.

Sample responses include:

- The school has provided much more information about the tests
- We give pep talks to try to make the CAHSEE less intimidating and scary
- I’ve seen more interest and concern both from students and parents because of the school’s many efforts to provide them information
- The amount of tutoring sessions after school has increase; students are getting the help they need, especially the EL population
- We have accommodated these students by working one on one, extra time on assignment and tests, and more visual aides
- Counselors do presentations to our classes on how to take the CAHSEE
- We have purchased CAHSEE prep books and issue constant reminders of the test
- The is a Hispanic program and an African American program now for parents
- Same as with the general population, informing parents is the most important thing
- Yes, they are bringing up these issues more often during professional development
- We’re also using more rubrics that are standards-based
- No, the school needs to be more proactive instead of reactive
- There has been no awareness, so there are no changes

Admin. Again in this question response from feeder schools was low so they are not represented in the table.

Table F.112. (Admin) Reported Change in Motivation or Attitude of Subpopulation Attributable to CAHSEE

High Schools	Positive Change	Neutral Change	Negative Change
Yes	10%	14%	14%
Neutral	3%	5%	1%
No Change	5%	19%	3%

Most often, Administrators did not answer this question (69%). When they did, they most often reported (9%) that their school has taken some measure to raise CAHSEE awareness with their staff and students.

Sample statements from Administrators:

- I have a meeting right after this interview to talk with 10th and 11th graders to talk about CAHSEE.
- In the weeks leading up to the test, we were talking a lot about it; mail notification to parents; calls home for any students who miss the 1st day.
- We have become much better by telling kids their test results; they have pre and post testing and lab. The special ed department is communicating with parents and students about their test results so they understand what they mean.
- The administration walks through one week prior to the testing and we talk about the importance of passing the test. We try to motivate and talk about our school tradition, the 100 years of this school and what it means to be a graduate of this school.
- Try to offer more incentive and validate why they have to take the test.
- We're targeting more interventions for our subpopulations.
- Parent education, student education, more communication with all parties.
- Try to keep kids motivated, remind them it's important to pass; base lessons on standards, create lessons that coincide with what's involved in passing CAHSEE.
- Counseling students and instilling confidence that they can do it.
- Tutoring group meets once a week and parents meet once a month with students.

SP. Unlike the general math and English teachers, a much larger portion of the special education teachers (53%, as opposed to 26%) indicated that they have seen changes in the motivation or attitude of their students due to the CAHSEE requirement. Of those, half of the responses were negative in nature. There were 2 responses there were off topic or not applicable and 2 comments that were changes not related to the CAHSEE requirement.

Table F.113. (SP) Change in Student Motivation or Attitude Attributable to CAHSEE

Motivation or Attitude	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Total
Yes, Change - 2	9	3	14	28
Not indicated - 0	4	4	4	12
No, Change - 6	2	5	0	13
Total - 8	15	12	18	53

Note. Description of table is in GMGE 15A, B

Sample "Yes" comments are:

- Kids are more motivated; 40% of special ed passed math and 49% passed English
- I think the students are doing more than they thought they could do, they're excelling but the stress of that has negatively impacted other aspects of their lives
- Some students are more apprehensive
- Yes, they are frustrated; it is another hurdle put in front of them
- See more students giving up and talking about dropping out

Sample "No" comments are:

- Those that want to pass the test are working hard to pass
- No change. I think they are encouraged by their scores and they know they are almost passing
- I haven't seen a change because they have always had to pass some kind of test
- I don't think my kids are that aware of it

Sample "Not indicated" comments are:

- Not many students are absent when its given
- Students aren't aware of the exam
- They wonder why they should do it, what is the point of trying hard

The follow up question (12B) asked how the school had responded to those changes in student motivation or attitude due to the CAHSEE requirement. Although answers varied, the most common responses were to talk about the exit exam awareness and importance (positive motivation), new classes or scheduling modifications, incentive programs, and parental involvement. There were several comments indicating there was little or no school response. Other responses that were received mentioned: standards-based texts and CAHSEE workbooks, an off-the-shelf program, and working on behavior problems.

We developed several codes:

- General positive motivation, such as helping students try harder and understand the importance of the CAHSEE
- New classes; tutoring, CAHSEE remediation, class flexibility, practice tests
- Incentive programs
- Increased parent involvement
- No response, school has done nothing as yet

Table F.114. (SP) School Response to Change in Student Motivation or Attitude Attributable to CAHSEE

SP	
Positive motivation	14
New classes	7
Incentive programs	7
Parental involvement	2
No response	11
Other	6

Similar to the general math and English teachers, the most number of responses were regarding the importance of passing the exit exam through counseling and encouragement. New classes and additional tutoring opportunities geared to the exit exam and special education students were also mentioned.

Sample responses include:

- Counsel the students one-on-one to encourage students to do their best.
- Some students really want to graduate and they are motivated to learn and spend time here, they don't fool around
- Putting the class in place to address the needs of these kids has really helped
- They need a pre-test offered through a course
- Students meet with counselors to help calm their fears and we offer CAHSEE support classes
- End of year recognition awards include special ed students, without identifying those students for their disability
- We have stressed to our students to be here and parents are calling in for more practice packets
- Special education has a lot of behavior classes and we need the support; if behavior problems aren't solved, we can't teach
- We are working on Renaissance Math to help fill in the student performance gaps
- Using the CAHSEE guides really seemed to help this year
- I believe the district is taking a wait and see attitude regarding special ed students; they are waiting to see how they circumvent using the IEP modifications and accommodations
- Not really, we haven't gotten any help; we had to scrounge for textbooks, this was hard

EL. Unlike the general math and English teachers, a much larger portion of the EL teachers (43%, as opposed to 26%) indicated that they have seen changes in the motivation or attitude of their students due to the CAHSEE requirement. Of those, there were a few more positive than negative comments. There were 8 responses there were off topic or not applicable and 3 comments that were changes not related to the CAHSEE requirement.

Table F.115. (EL) Change in Student Motivation or Attitude Attributable to CAHSEE

Motivation or Attitude	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Total
Yes, Change 4	12	2	7	25
Not indicated 0	5	5	4	14
No, Change 14	0	2	3	19
Total - 18	17	9	14	58

Note: description of table is in GMGE 15A, B

Sample "Yes" comments are:

- When I specifically talk about CAHSEE requirements, it heightens student motivation
- They are definitely more motivated; they come after school…but would not have if there wasn't the requirement
- Yes, a slight increase in motivation and attitude, though they seem in denial
- Once they take the test and don't pass, they are overwhelmed

Sample "No" comments are:

- I don't think any long term changes, during the week of the exam they are stressed, but then they go back to the regular flow
- No, I don't think they have a clue what CAHSEE is
- No changes, they feel hopeless about it and don't have the desire to continue

Sample "Not indicated" comments are:

- Some are trying, others don't care
- I don't think they are even thinking about it right now, too far out

The follow up question (14B) asked how the school has responded to those changes in student motivation and attitude due to the CAHSEE requirement. Although answers varied, the most common responses were new classes or scheduling modifications, talk about the exit exam importance, incentive programs, and parental involvement. There were some comments indicating there was little or no school response. Other responses include: providing standards-based texts and workbooks, test prep help, and working on discipline problems.

We developed several codes:

- General positive motivation, such as helping students trying harder, understand the importance of the CAHSEE
- New classes; tutoring, CAHSEE remediation, class flexibility, practice tests
- Incentive programs
- Increased parent involvement
- No response, school has done nothing as yet

Table F.116. (EL) School Response to Change in Student Motivation or Attitude Attributable to CAHSEE

	EL
Positive motivation	8
New classes	13
Incentive programs	5
Parental involvement	3
No response	10
Other	10

The first two categories have switched for the EL teachers as compared to the general math and English teachers. New classes and additional tutoring opportunities were mentioned most often; one school mentioning an EL peer counseling program to assist and collaborate with teachers on translations. They also focused on emphasizing the importance of passing the CAHSEE and encouraging them to do well through proper sleep, balanced eating, and other rewards such as certificates and special events.

Sample responses include:

- We have had cultural diversity training and have offered Career Night programs for the parents and students
- We have increased the opportunities for CAHSEE tutorials after school
- They are trying to implement more programs for next year such as EL referrals to peer counseling
- Same thing we do with CA test; encourage them to get enough sleep, put them with someone they know to administer the test, and eat a good breakfast
- At this school we visited a school with more success. We are in the middle of evaluating our ELD program and the goal is to give them more time in ELD than going through English a second time.
- The staff created the preparation materials, I let them take them home
- The students are very aware of the standards, they are posted on the board
- The administration put students with high absentee rates and discipline problems in Saturday school to deal with the problem
- We haven't really done anything yet, except for identifying some individual students for assistance

SP-C. We asked Special Courses teachers if they have seen changes in student motivation or attitude attributed to CAHSEE. Sixty-six percent (66%) of respondents said they have seen changes. The table below shows the types of change reported. Most often teachers reported a positive change (54%). Neutral and negative change were each reported 23 percent of the time.

Table F.117. (SP-C) Changes in Student Attitude or Motivation

High School	Positive Change	Neutral Change	Negative Change
Yes	54%	23%	23%

This question asked Special Courses teachers what response their school had given to the changes in motivation or attitude reported in question 8A. (Only yes responses were analyzed.) Teachers reported that they were unaware of a response from the school 32 percent of the time. When teachers were aware of a response from the school, 27 percent described a positive expectation of the students, and about discussing the importance of the test with students. Eighteen percent (18%) said that the school would continue or expand opportunities for students to attend remedial classes or tutoring, or that CAHSEE awareness in general was raised. Nine percent (9%) of the time teachers mentioned using an outside program for remediation, such as Read 180. Additional personnel (counselors, coaches, and mentors) were mentioned 5 percent of the time as a response to changes in attitude or motivation related to CAHSEE. Some sample responses from special courses interviews are below.

- I don't really know. We have the support of administrators.
- Counselors went to all tenth grade classes discussing the importance of CAHSEE.
- I don't know if the school is aware of the changes the CAHSEE class is impacting on the school.
- Positive attitude; teachers want to send us their students from regular class because they see the attitude we get.
- We encourage the students and continue to talk about the importance of the test.
- I don't know that they have responded. There's definitely not been enough celebration of those that have passed.
- I do my cheerleading act to motivate them and tell them they only need 55% to pass, to lower their fear level.
- I do lots of reviews and remind them they have to put forth effort and can't give up.
- Just keep stressing the importance of doing their best.
- We talk about the CAHSEE test daily.

Common Question 16A-C GMGE, (Admin 13A-C)

GMGE. Question 16A asked respondents whether they anticipate changes in student motivation or attitude in their student population as a whole when the Class of 2006 is held to the CAHSEE graduation requirement. This question was set up as a simple yes-no format; we see that, of those who responded, most stated that they anticipate changes in student motivation or attitude:

Table F.118. (GMGE) Teachers' Beliefs that Student Motivation will Change Under CAHSEE

GMGE	Yes	No	Don't know	Could not determine	Off topic	Blank
High Schools (206)	80 (39%)	21 (10%)	4 (2%)	2 (<1%)	1 (<1%)	98 (48%)
Feeder Schools (64)	20 (31%)	8 (13%)	0	3 (5%)	0	33 (52%)
Total (270)	100 (37%)	29 (11%)	4 (1%)	5 (2%)	1 (<1%)	131 (49%

Question 16B asked the 100 “yes” respondents to describe anticipated changes. Note that respondents described positive as well as negative anticipated changes. We developed several codes:

- General positive motivation, such as trying harder or becoming more serious about the CAHSEE;
- Motivation by example, or becoming more serious or motivated after having seen some students be denied a high school diploma;
- More focused on studies, including getting more out of their classes, better homework completion rates, and increased attendance;
- More focused on studies at the middle school level; especially important since much of CAHSEE’s content is at the middle school level;
- Increased anxiety;
- Quitting or dropping out;
- Both positive and negative impacts;
- Increased parent involvement.

Respondents were free to give multiple responses; therefore, the number of responses will not equal the number of respondents.

Table F.119. (GMGE) Teachers' Anticipated Changes in Student Motivation Under CAHSEE

GMGE	High Schools (80)	Feeder Schools (20)	Total (100)
Positive motivation	30 (38%)	4 (20%)	34 (34%
Motivation by example	5 (6%)	5 (25%)	10 (10%)
More focused	14 (18%)	4 (20%)	18 (18%)
More focused, Feeder School	0	4 (20%	4 (4%)
Anxiety	19 (24%)	0	19 (19%)
Quitting	6 (8%)	1 (5%)	7 (7%)
Positive/negative	6 (8%)	0	6 (6%)
Parent involve	3 (4%)	3 (15%)	6 (6%)

Sample responses from “positive motivation”:

- I feel like the general population will be motivated to pass that test.
- Next year when we have them in two math courses they will realize the importance of CAHSEE and understanding math to graduate.

Sample responses from “motivation by example”:

- As they see the older students who struggle and maybe don’t pass, I think they’ll become more aware.
- Underclassmen will see direct effect of doing it or blowing it off, as long as there’s teeth behind it.

Sample responses from “more focused”:

- Because suddenly there is a test that will keep them from graduating without passing. This is an impetus for work happening in high school.

- A lot of those who took the test for granted will realize they really need to pass it, whatever that takes.

Sample responses from “more focused, feeder school”:

- It will show them that the work they do now will affect whether they get a high school diploma.
- It’ll be a driving force in their academic achievement, a goal to shoot for; their preparation in middle school will help them focus on the exit exam to get High School diploma.

Sample responses from “anxiety”:

- The kids will feel the pressure, but it does not necessarily mean that they would study.
- I think there will be panic with EL students.

Sample responses from “quitting”:

- Some of my students will be overwhelmed and possibly give up—quit trying—they do now; may try to drop out of school, do whatever they can to avoid it.
- Perhaps there could be a dropout rate problem…You tend to have three groups of kids, the ones who aren’t going to try, the ones who will pass and do fine, and the middle group who wants to try, will try hard, be serious about it, and then fail. She is worried about the middle group.

Sample responses from “positive/negative”:

- Some will rise to the occasion and some will give up.
- A few kids will focus more; a few more will drop out.

Sample responses from “parent involvement”:

- When younger students see that older siblings and friends don’t get a diploma, I hope it will cause them to become more serious. Hopefully, that will also impact the parents…
- Parents will demand more help for their kids.

Question 16C asked respondents for possible action the school might take in response to those anticipated changes. Again, only the answers from respondents who answered “yes” to Question 16A were analyzed. Respondents were not limited to a single response, so the number of responses will not equal the number of respondents. We used the following codes, and we note that those codes with fewer than 6 total responses were dropped from further analysis:

- More of the same program or new programs to help students, including tutoring, CAHSEE-specific remediation, or preparation programs;
- Continuing the same type or level of remediation or preparation programs;
- Stressing the importance of the CAHSEE;
- Student accountability;
- Curriculum alignment activities, which also include cross-curricular issues;
- Parent involvement and education’
- Improving morale

Table F.120. (GMGE) School Response to Anticipated Changes in Attitude or Motivation

GMGE	High Schools (80)	Feeder Schools (20)	Total (100)
More programming	30 (38%)	7 (35%)	37 (37%)
Same programming	11 (14%)	1 (5%)	12 (12%)
Stress importance	6 (8%)	3 (15%)	9 (9%)
Student accountability	9 (11%)	1 (5%)	10 (10%)
Curriculum alignment	6 (8%)	3 (15%)	9 (9%)
Parent involve	4 (5%)	3 (15%)	7 (7%)
Morale	6 (8%)	0	6 (6%)

Sample responses from “more programming”:

- We should conduct remediation and preparation classes throughout the entire year and not just before test time.
- School could offer seniors who haven’t passed a special class to zero in on CAHSEE prep and remediation.

Sample responses from “same programming”:

- Continue what they are doing with the extra classes, tutoring, and during school support.
- CAHSEE reviews, such as we did this year.

Sample responses from “stress importance”:

- I wish we could get the parent, students, teachers involved; maybe bring some high school students to talk to the middle school students about CAHSEE.
- Just keep talking about the importance and hoping we get the message across to all students.
- Sample responses from “student accountability”:
- The motivation will probably be good so it will be positive for the school. Also, since the students will be held accountable, the school will be watching the teachers (especially those who don’t like to teach the standards).
- I think holding them in the 8th grade until they pass…

Sample responses from “curriculum alignment”:

- All of us need to ensure that we make connections to what kids are learning now and how that impacts their future learning.
- We need to stress the importance of articulation and collaboration between the middle school and high school even more.

Sample responses from “parent involvement”:

- Try for more parent involvement, educate parents how to help students be successful.
- It certainly needs to be recognized that there are populations we’re not reaching, and we must; we have a Hispanic population here, but it’s not focused on, a community we’re missing.

Sample responses from “morale”:

- Perhaps some sort of reward system for getting good attendance on test day, and a reward system for having a certain percentage of students in the school pass on the first attempt.
- We already have tutoring sessions built in. Maybe later on we’ll add awards for higher scores.

Admin. Administrators were asked if they anticipate changes in student motivation or attitude attributable to CAHSEE. The table below shows their responses.

Table F.121. (Admin) Anticipated Changes in Student Motivation or Attitude

Administrators	Yes	No	Unsure	Blank	Total
High Schools	26	13	4	27	70
Feeder Schools	6	2	0	2	10
Total	32	15	4	29	80

Multiple answers were allowed, so totals do not match the number of respondents. Only the most popular responses are reported in the table below.

Table F.122. (Admin) Types of Change in Student Motivation

Administrators	High Schools	Feeder Schools
Positive motivation	10	3
Motivation by example	0	1
More focused, Feeder School	1	0
Anxiety	5	2
Quitting	2	1
Parent involve	2	5

Sample statements from administrator interviews:

- Kids will be more serious about the need to do well.
- Student attitudes and motivation will be more serious about it.
- Kids take it very seriously.
- Students will be more motivated in math and English classes.
- Slight positive changes in kids who have been apathetic, but only if they know they’re stuck in class until they pass it.
- They’re going to be taking it seriously, asking for help, showing up for tutoring, parents make them come, they have buy-in.
- They’re going to be interested in knowing what they need to do to pass that.
- A big reality check will happen when they realize this will affect them. Disbelief, shock, fear, and a sense of urgency will hit many of these students.
- Increase on the test focus and offer more ways for students to be successful.
- They’ll take their algebra more seriously.
- If they cancel the tests, students will not be motivated. It will have no meaning to them.
- Take the test more seriously, one letter grade won’t change GPA, but CAHSEE is make or break.
- We need to continually work with kids to build sense of possibility of passing.

Only responses from schools who said yes to 13A are analyzed below.

Table F.123. (Admin) School Response to Anticipated Changes Under CAHSEE

Administrators	High Schools	Feeder Schools	Total
More programming	10	1	11
Same programming	4	0	4
Stress importance	2	3	5
Student accountability	2	0	2
Parent involve	4	0	4
Morale	3	1	4
Blank	2	0	2

Common Question 17A-C GMGE, (Admin 14A-C), (SP 13A-C), (EL 15A-C), (SP-C 9A-C)

GMGE. This series of questions is similar to the previous series; the difference is that student subpopulations rather than the population of the school as a whole are the focus of inquiry. Question 17A asked respondents whether they anticipate changes in student motivation or attitude among subpopulations when the Class of 2006 is held to the CAHSEE graduation format. We found similar responses to those in Question 16A, with most of those who responded stating that they anticipate changes in attitude or motivation.

Table F.124. (GMGE) Teachers' Beliefs About Subpopulation Student Motivation Under CAHSEE

GMGE	Yes	No	Don't know	Could not determine	Off topic	Blank
High Schools (206)	72 (35%)	19 (9%)	3 (1%)	4 (2%)	1 (<1%)	107 (52%)
Feeder Schools (64)	18 (28%)	7 (11%)	3 (5%)	2 (3%)	0	34 (53%)
Total (270)	90 (33%)	26 (10%)	6 (2%)	6 (2%)	1 (<1%)	141 (52%)

Question 17B asked the 90 "yes" respondents to describe the anticipated changes. We used the same responses as in Question 16B; however, there were some changes in the frequency of these responses:

- General positive motivation, such as trying harder or becoming more serious about the CAHSEE;
- Increased anxiety;
- More focused on studies, including getting more out of their classes, better homework completion rates, and increased attendance;
- Quitting or dropping out;
- Motivation by example, or becoming more serious or motivated after having seen some students be denied a high school diploma;
- Increased parent involvement.

Table F.125. (GMGE) Teachers' Anticipated Changes to Subpopulation Student Motivation Under CAHSEE

	High Schools (72)	Feeder Schools (18)	Total (90)
Positive motivation	21 (29%)	4 (22%)	25 (28%)
Increased anxiety	19 (26%)	0	19 (21%)
More focused	12 (17%)	3 (17%)	15 (17%)
Quitting	10 (14%)	1 (6%)	11 (12%)
Motivation by example	3 (4%)	5 (28%)	8 (9%)
Parent involvement	3 (4%)	4 (22%)	7 (8%)

Sample responses from “positive motivation”:

- Some moderate positive change is expected, but a lot of the subpopulations struggle just to get through their classes.
- Many students are motivated to graduate; it will just take time as it becomes ingrained and they don’t have memories of it not being required.

Sample responses from “increased anxiety”:

- They will be very anxious. Traveling students will be anxious, they come from underperforming schools. Our data shows they may not have a problem, but they will be afraid that they won’t pass.
- I’d say the subpopulations would see it as an added burden. Some of those kids have accommodations built into their program and having a state test being added to this makes me wonder how this will play out.

Sample responses from “more focused”:

- They may take it more seriously; they might be more inclined to go to interventions and tutoring.
- Maybe take on a life of its own in Hispanic community because of the language barrier—our kids are going to have to learn English.

Sample responses from “quitting”:

- Some will see as hurdle they can’t get over; may give up or drop out, go for night school.
- They’ll just drop out; I’ve seen the special ed kids so upset about it, “Why even come to school if I’m not going to graduate?”

Sample responses from “motivation by example”:

- Some still expect it to be waived again. Some are on the border between caring, not caring. Students in the year behind 2006 will decide they’d better care.
- I think when students see other students not graduating they will know that this is for real.

Sample responses from “parent involvement”:

- The word will spread around the parents will see and learn from family members and they might provide more support…

- The parents we deal with are very supportive of their children's achievements because their own education is limited; they want their children to achieve; the whole community is supportive—Hispanics, African Americans.

Question 17C asked the 90 "yes" respondents what action their school might take in response to those anticipated changes, keeping subpopulations in mind. Respondents offered fewer actions than they did to Question 16C, as categories with fewer than 5 responses were not analyzed. Categories are as follows:

- More of the same programming or new programs, such as tutoring, CAHSEE-specific remediation, or preparation programs;
- Student accountability;
- Parent involvement;
- Morale;
- Curriculum alignment activities, including cross-curricular issues.

Table F.126. (GMGE) Potential Actions Schools Might Take in Response to Changes in Subpopulation Student Motivation Under CAHSEE

GMGE	High Schools (72)	Feeder Schools (18)	Total (90)
More programming	30 (42%)	10 (56%)	40 (44%)
Student accountability	9 (13%)	0	9 (10%)
Parent involvement	4 (6%)	3 (17%)	7 (8%)
Morale	5 (7%)	1 (6%)	6 (7%)
Curriculum alignment	4 (6%)	1 (6%)	5 (6%)

Sample responses from "more programming":

- It seems like we're already doing everything we can. I'd love to see kids that are not passing be able to take another class that offers remedial support instead of taking an elective. I'm not talking about study skills or study hall—but remedial assistance.
- They could expand the after-school class; currently it is a prep class with 60 lessons, to offer it during the day as a remediation class. That way more kids would get the opportunity.

Sample responses from "student accountability":

- I don't think what the school does will make a difference; kids need to see consequences. If they can pass their classes, CAHSEE should be nothing.
- …We want to hold the 9th grader more responsible for grade and behavior.

Sample responses from "parent involvement":

- Design program accordingly; more parent meetings, more contact outside walls, takes a village.
- Again, after-school programs, "parent institute" with Spanish-speaking sections to make parents more comfortable with the whole process of school.
- Sample responses from "morale":
- The school has tried to motivate students through prizes instead of an internal motivation (e.g., graduated).

- We need to make the importance of CAHSEE more known. Give students pat on back (e.g., certificate) for passing the CAHSEE to give them immediate feedback on how important it is.

Sample responses from “curriculum alignment”:

- Just making sure we are all using the textbooks and the standards, using the data better and creating exit exams that reflect the standards that are tested.
- The school will have to make a more school-wide effort, not just English and math departments.

Admin. Administrators were asked if they anticipate changes in student motivation or attitude in the various subpopulations when CAHSEE becomes a graduation requirement.

Table F.127. (Admin) Changes in Motivation or Attitude Within Subpopulations

Administrators	Yes	No	Other(blank, N/A/, Don’t know, off topic)	Total
High Schools	19	12	33	64
Feeder Schools	5	5	6	16
Total	24	17	39	80

Only respondents who answered yes to 14A are analyzed in the table below. Multiple responses were allowed.

Table F.128. (Admin) Types of Change in Student Motivation or Attitude

Administrators	High Schools	Feeder Schools
Positive motivation	5	2
Motivation by example	1	0
More focused, Feeder School	0	0
Anxiety	4	1
Quitting	2	0
Parent involve	0	2
Other	4	3

Sample responses from administrators:

- Kids will be more serious about the need to do well.
- The subpopulation affected the most will be the special education students. I think they will be motivated to improve skill levels more than they already are.
- Special education students will see that accommodations usually afforded will not be there for the CAHSEE.
- Special education students will see that they’ll need to come up to a certain standard to pass CAHSEE and attain a diploma.
- The data will show subpopulations affected more negatively, higher failure rates, mostly EL, title one, I’m hoping it will create a sense of urgency, purpose.
- Students will need to accept the importance.
- It will create a larger drop-out rate.

- Students will be a lot more anxious because now they will have one more requirement to meet to get a high school diploma.
- Initially I predict to see an increase in the drop out rate for the first 2 years after CAHSEE is a requirement.
- They will want to pass.

Question 14C asked Administrators what response their school may have to anticipate changes in student motivation or attitude within their subpopulations. The table below shows these responses.

Table F.129. (Admin) School Response to Anticipated Change in Student Attitude or Motivation Under CAHSEE

Administrators	High School	Feeder Schools	Total
More programming	4	0	4
Same programming	4	1	5
Stress importance	0	2	2
Student accountability	1	0	1
Parent involve	4	1	5
Blank	5	2	7
Total	18	6	24

Sample responses from administrator interviews:

- We are looking to add additional support classes outside the regular school day in English and math.
- Offer more classes to help them prepare.
- Add electives for vocational training.
- Increase support services for those in danger or who haven't passed after multiple attempts.
- Increased focus on importance.
- We need to start addressing this here (middle school), make students aware, talk about it.
- Get more parent buy in for the tutorial program and any other extras offered beyond the school day.
- We need the community to respond.
- We need to continue communication with parents.
- More parental outreach to help them motivate their kids.
- Community meetings, parent meetings, parent ed classes--parent math night, CAHSEE exposure.

SP. This series of questions asks respondents if they believe there will be changes in the motivation or attitude of special education students when the Class of 2006 is held to the CAHSEE graduation requirement. Those who answered "Yes" were then asked in Question 13B to identify what those changes would be and in Question 13C to indicate what they felt the school could do in response to those changes.

Table F.130. (SP) Anticipated Change in Motivation or Attitude Under CAHSEE

SP	Yes	No	Don't know	Could not determine	Off topic	Blank
	57	13	0	2	2	4

In the follow up Question 13B, the following codes were developed for those who responded "yes" to the previous question:

- General positive motivation, such as trying harder or becoming more serious about the CAHSEE;
- Increased anxiety;
- More focused on studies, including getting more out of their classes, better homework completion rates, and increased attendance;
- Quitting or dropping out;
- Motivation by example, or becoming more serious or motivated after having seen some students be denied a high school diploma;
- Increased parent involvement.

Table F.131. (SP) Type of Anticipated Change in Student Motivation or Attitude Under CAHSEE

SP	
Positive motivation	21
Increased anxiety	18
More focused	0
Quitting	22
Motivation by example	5
Parent involvement	8

Sample responses from "positive motivation":

- When the exam becomes part of the news, the students may start being more aware of the exam
- I might see some reasonable improvement in attitude and effort
- I can see some change in positive motivation if we provide preparation classes all year long, not just for two weeks before the test

Sample responses from "increased anxiety":

- Demoralization
- Very frustrated that something they thought they could achieve (diploma) is taken away; they are aware they have difficulties in school, that test will be hard for them
- My problem is that CAHSEE doesn't measure other areas of giftedness, like are, mechanical, etc. There students will not graduate because they struggle in either math or English and that just doesn't feel right

Sample responses from "quitting":

- If they fail again and again and we can offer them any differentiated support, some of them will ask "Why bother"?
- More hopelessness; the dropout rate will increase

- We will see more drop-outs, more special education kids just stay home and not try
- They're going to shut down; not necessarily drop-out but just quit
- Already seen kids wondering what they will do without a diploma

Sample responses from "motivation by example":

- Once they see their older peers being held back, they will get more serious about doing their best

Question 13C asked respondents what action their school might take in response to those anticipated changes in motivation or attitude. The categories are as follows:

- More of the same programming or new programs, such as tutoring, CAHSEE-specific remediation, or preparation programs;
- Student accountability;
- Parent involvement;
- Morale;
- Curriculum alignment activities, including cross-curricular issues.
- Personnel; new or special resource, professional development

Table F.132. (SP) School Response to Anticipated Change in Student Motivation or Attitude Under CAHSEE

SP	
More programming	28
Student accountability	0
Parent involvement	8
Morale	12
Curriculum alignment	4

Sample responses from "more programming":

- Set up systematic tutoring programs specifically or special education students
- We are restoring intensive reading (literacy) and double period of math prep/pre-algebra
- I don't think the school can do anymore; we are doing what we need to do
- I think if we continue our practice sessions, the assessments, review and feedback for the assessment, and communicate with them it will improve the scores

Sample responses from "parent involvement":

- We're talking openly with the parents to discuss the reality their child probably won't get a high school diploma
- We also need to educate the community to understand the impact of diploma versus certificate of completion issues
- The necessity of the kids passing the test will probably cause parents to get more involved and want the school to take more action to ensure their kids pass

Sample responses from “Morale”:

- Students could hear more from special ed student who have passes; we have plenty
- I hope we enhance the understanding within the culture and recognition and progress towards that. Some kind of celebratory process to keep that in front of them in a positive, not punitive way

Sample responses from “curriculum alignment”:

- Providing more support for math and LA classes to keep class size low
- Thinks at risk kids have to be more rigorous with school work across curriculum, they need more time in the class room.

EL. This series of questions asks respondents if they believe there will be changes in the motivation or attitude of EL students when the Class of 2006 is held to the CAHSEE graduation format. Those who answered “Yes” were then asked in Question 15B to identify what those changes would be and in Question 15C to indicate what they felt the school could do in response to those changes.

Table F.133. (EL) Anticipated Change in Student Motivation or Attitude Under CAHSEE

EL	Yes	No	Don’t know	Could not determine	Off topic	Blank
	45	10	2	2	3	5

In the follow up Question 15B, the following codes were developed for those who responded “yes” to the previous question:

- General positive motivation, such as trying harder or becoming more serious about the CAHSEE;
- Increased anxiety;
- More focused on studies, including getting more out of their classes, better homework completion rates, and increased attendance;
- Quitting or dropping out;
- Motivation by example, or becoming more serious or motivated after having seen some students be denied a high school diploma;
- Increased parent involvement.

Table F.134. (EL) Type of Anticipated Change in Student Motivation or Attitude Under CAHSEE

EL	
Positive motivation	15
Increased anxiety	7
More focused	9
Quitting	8
Motivation by example	6
Parent involvement	0

Sample responses from “positive motivation”:

- They have become more serious about learning and understanding what’s expected of them
- There will be more effort, seeking more information on how to take the exam, wanting to know how to take the exam
- Most students are motivated to graduate, and it will motivate them

Sample responses from “increased anxiety”:

- With EL kids, the language is an issue so that is what makes them worry. Some may not be able to pass because of the language, some lack motivation
- …their stress level is going up, the district has had an exit exam in the past, but it wasn’t tied to a diploma

Sample responses from “more focused”:

- Once they see they are going to be held to it, a lot will be wanting to learn more and take tutoring classes
- …more willing to find the need for doing things like reading essays, reading comprehension, and grammar

Sample responses from “quitting”:

- Enormous numbers of EL students are failing; once letters go out, the dropout rate will increase and they will head into the work force to help their family
- She has had drop-outs already feeling that they won’t be able to make it

Sample responses from “motivation by example”:

- The students are going to have a wake-up call once the class of 2006 is held responsible for the graduation requirement
- When student aren’t passing, it will be a rude awakening for the students and the parents

Question 15C asked respondents what action their school might take in response to those anticipated changes in motivation or attitude. Due to responses from the EL teachers, an additional category, Personnel, was added that was not included in the analysis for the general math and English. The categories are as follows:

- More of the same programming or new programs, such as tutoring, CAHSEE-specific remediation, or preparation programs;
- Student accountability;
- Parent involvement;
- Morale;
- Curriculum alignment activities, including cross-curricular issues.
- Personnel; new or special resource, professional development

Table F.135. (EL) School Response to Anticipated Change in Motivation or Attitude Under CAHSEE

EL	
More programming	21
Student accountability	2
Parent involvement	3
Morale	4
Curriculum alignment	3
Personnel	3

Sample responses from "more programming":

- I think we need directed test prep for these students
- We will have more Saturday programs and after school programs
- Have more CAHSEE training and prep classes
- We've taken so many actions already (need to continue what they are doing)

Sample responses from "parent involvement":

- We need to exercise a parent liaison program
- We need more community networking and better support services since there will a lot of anger and finger-pointing out of this

Sample responses from "curriculum alignment":

- We need to get them double blocked and make sure students in the classes are there because the need it
- Changing curriculum to better address CAHSEE

Sample responses from "Personnel":

- There will be more collaboration between the EL teachers and the regular teachers
- Have more resource coaches to help teachers

SP-C. This question asked special courses teachers if they anticipate changes in student motivation or attitude in their at risk students in the class that will be required to pass CAHSEE to graduate. Many (39%) said they did expect to see changes. Only 9 percent said they expected no change.

Table F.136. (SP-C) Anticipated Change in Student Motivation or Attitude Under CAHSEE

SP-C	Yes	No	Other(blank, N/A, Don't know, off topic)	Total
High Schools	11	2	17	30
Feeder Schools	2	1	0	3
Total	13	3	17	33

Special Courses teachers reported most often (40%) that the change in motivation reported in 9A was positive.

Codes with no responses have been omitted.

Table F.137. (SP-C) Type of Anticipated Change in Attitude or Motivation Under CAHSEE

SP-C	High Schools	Feeder Schools
Positive motivation	8	1
Motivation by example	1	0
Anxiety	1	0
Quitting	3	0

Special Courses teachers described the changes they expect. Sample comments from their interviews are below.

- They will try harder since it will really happen.
- If anything, it will increase motivation; they're looking forward to the first chance to pass in 9th grade.
- Hopefully it will wake them up to the importance of passing.
- The closer to the test and the reality of it, the more they are motivated.
- I think there's a self-respect and pride they get from passing.
- I believe students want to be held accountable.
- I think the kids are going to realize they must pass the exam to graduate.
- I can see a positive difference in this year's juniors over this year's seniors.
- If they see they are indeed being held accountable, then future classes will take it more seriously.

Common Question 18A, B GMGE, (Admin 15A, B), (SP 13A, B), (EL 16A, B), (SP-C 10A, B)

GMGE. Question 18A asked respondents if students in the Class of 2006 are ready to be held accountable to the requirement that they pass the CAHSEE to receive a high school diploma.

Responses were divided among several coding categories: yes, no, mixed, don't know, not applicable, blank, refused, and off topic, with the first three categories receiving most of the responses. The analysis shows that a majority of respondents believe that students should be required to pass the CAHSEE in order to receive a high school diploma. We note, however, that feeder school respondents were less willing to commit to holding students in the Class of 2006 accountable, perhaps because of perceived unfamiliarity with the CAHSEE.

Table F.138. (GMGE) Teachers' Beliefs about CAHSEE Accountability

GMGE	Yes	No	Mixed	DK	Blank	Refuse	OT
High Schools (206)	137 (67%)	32 (16%)	27 (13%)	8 (4%)	0	2 (<1%)	0
Feeder Schools (64)	23 (36%)	21 (33%)	10 (16%)	4 (6%)	2 (3%)	1	3 (5%)
Total (270)	160 (59%)	53 (20%)	37 (14%)	12 (4%)	2 (<1%)	3 (1%)	3 (1%)

Question 18B, the final question on the GMGE protocol, asked respondents to provide a reason for their response to the previous question. The analysis of this question will be limited to the first three categories (yes, no, mixed), since there are so

few responses in the remaining categories. Note that some respondents provided more than one response to the question; therefore, the number of responses will not match the number of respondents. We developed several codes, to be used with all three categories. Note that some are more positive in nature, some more negative. In a few cases, respondents who stated that students are ready to be held to the CAHSEE graduation requirement gave a reason that was more negative. The opposite was also true, with a few respondents who do not believe students are ready to be held accountable giving positive reasons. The codes are as follows:

- Generally ready (consistent exposure to standards, ample time for preparation, teachers who have worked hard to prepare students, curriculum on target);
- Students are more motivated, taking CAHSEE more seriously;
- Students need to be held accountable;
- Students have not been given enough time to prepare;
- Students are weak academically;
- EL will struggle;
- Special education will struggle;
- Students have a poor attitude about CAHSEE, poor student motivation, lack of parent involvement;
- Materials, curriculum, teachers have not been adequate;
- CAHSEE is “not that big a deal” (easy, basic level for the most part);

Table F.139. (GMGE) Reasons for Beliefs about CAHSEE Accountability

GMGE	“Yes” responses			“No” responses			“Mixed” responses		
	High School (137)	Feeder School (23)	Total (160)	High School (32)	Feeder School (21)	Total (53)	High School (27)	Feeder School (10)	Total (37)
Generally ready	67 (49%)	11 (48%)	78 (49%)	0	0	0	5 (19%)	1 (10%)	6 (16%)
Motivated	11 (8%)	3 (13%)	14 (9%)	0	0	0	1 (4%)	0	1 (3%)
Need accountability	20 (15%)	4 (17%)	24 (15%)	6 (19%)	1 (5%)	7 (13%)	0	1 (10%)	
Not enough time	0	0	0	3 (9%)	1 (5%)	4 (8%)	0	0	0
Academically weak	1 (<1%)	0	1 (<1%)	10 (31%)	8 (38%)	18 (34%)	5 (19%)	2 (20%)	7 (19%)
Special ed concern	2 (1%)	0	2 (1%)	1 (3%)	0	1 (2%)	6 (22%)	0	6 (16%)
Poor attitude	6 (4%)	0	6 (4%)	3 (9%)	4 (19%)	7 (13%)	3 (11%)	0	3 (8%)
Materials concern	2 (1%)	1 (4%)	3 (2%)	3 (9%)	6 (29%)	9 (17%)	1 (4%)	2 (20%)	3 (8%)
“Not big deal”	17 (12%)	2 (9%)	19 (12%)	0	1 (5%)	1 (2%)	2 (7%)	0	2 (5%)
Blank	12 (9%)	0	12 (8%)	2 (6%)	1 (5%)	3 (6%)	3 (11%)	4 (40%)	7 (19%)

GMGE Teachers' Reasons for Accountability Beliefs

As expected, we see some differences in reasons given by the different categories of respondents, with the “yes” respondents stating that students are

generally ready, they are more motivated, students need to be held accountable, and that the CAHSEE tests lower level skills. The other categories of respondents stated that their students were academically weak, with special concern for EL and special education students, particularly from those in the "mixed" category.

Sample responses from "generally ready":

- I think the teachers are at a point that they are teaching what students need to know.
- The students I teach have a very sound foundation and they have the ability to pass it.
- Sample responses from "academically weak":
- Based on performance in the classroom, very challenging to get them up to grade level, most a couple of grades below; same probably true in math or even more extreme.
- The students have always been passing classes and some teachers (in high and middle schools) pass students without true mastery of the course. Those students who are getting passed along will not be ready. Social promotion will hurt students' chances of passing.

Sample responses from "not enough time":

- They have not had adequate time to prepare…
- This kind of change takes 12 years. It's unfair because those students have only been taught by the standards for three or four years.

Sample responses from "motivated":

- …They are taking content more seriously. The few that haven't passed yet are actually reading the study guides, asking more questions of the teachers, and talking among themselves more about what they do and do not know. They know it's serious this time and there is an element of fear.
- It has been a hot topic for the last several years. Students know it's not going away. The administration talks about this repeatedly. We address this at all parent nights and in materials sent home. I hear students talking about it and understanding they will have to pass it to graduate.

Sample responses from "need accountability":

- Somebody has to be first. They've had 2 years, knew it was coming. Their responsibility.
- These are high school students and they should be able to pass this low level test (not high school level test). They may not know answers yet, but mostly students' fault. Everyone needs to get used to the fact that the CAHSEE is counting and more attention will be paid to classes in the future.

Sample responses from "poor attitude":

- …Their number one problem is lack of motivation and focus and when they feel pressure they give up…
- The overall attitude of students right now is non-responsibility. They don't understand that they will be held accountable. The students aren't afraid of

anything anymore. It's a societal problem that can't necessarily be solved in the schools…

Sample responses from "EL concerns" and "special ed concerns":

- We get students who don't even speak English when they get here and there's no way they can pass the test in such a short time. Same would be true for some of our special ed students because of their special needs.
- Unfair for ESL or special ed students.
- Sample responses from "materials concern":
- They've had a good education, but their English texts were not entirely standards based until their sophomore year. If they were in this district, though, they had a good education that should get them through the CAHSEE.
- We're still working on getting materials really focused on standards. Don't feel confident I have all I need to test all those standards.
- Sample responses from "CAHSEE not a big deal":
- …It's not very hard. It's basically tenth-grade skills that they have to pass.
- I don't think the requirement is that difficult. It's a pretty low bar.

Admin. Question 15A asked administrators if they believe students in the class of 2006 are ready to be held accountable to the CAHSEE graduation requirement. Most Administrators said yes (48%).

Table F.140. (Admin) Beliefs about CAHSEE Accountability

	Yes	No	Mixed (Yes and No)	Blank
High Schools	33	7	5	19
Feeder Schools	5	4	3	4
Total	38	11	8	23

Question 15B explored the reasoning behind administrator's answers to 15A. Multiple responses were allowed, so the number of responses does not match the number of interviews conducted. Codes with no responses have been omitted.

- Generally ready (consistent exposure to standards, ample time for preparation, teachers who have worked hard to prepare students, curriculum on target);
- Students are more motivated, taking CAHSEE more seriously;
- Students need to be held accountable;
- Students have not been given enough time to prepare;
- Students are weak academically;
- EL will struggle;
- Special education will struggle;
- Students have a poor attitude about CAHSEE, poor student motivation, lack of parent involvement;
- Materials, curriculum, teachers have not been adequate;
- CAHSEE is "not that big a deal" (easy, basic level for the most part);

Table F.141. (Admin) Reasons for Beliefs about CAHSEE Accountability

Administrators	"Yes" responses		"No" responses		"Mixed" responses	
	High School	Feeder School	High School	Feeder School	High School	Feeder School
Generally ready	22	3	1	0	3	0
Motivated	2	0	0	0	0	0
Need accountability	3	1	1	0	0	0
Not enough time	1	0	1	0	0	0
EL concern	0	0	2	1	1	0
Special ed concern	1	0	1	0	2	0
Poor attitude	0	0	3	0	0	0
Materials concern	1	0	1	0	0	0
"Not big deal"	5	1	0	0	0	0
Blank	3	1	2	0	0	1

SP. Question 14A asked respondents if students in the Class of 2006 are ready to be held accountable to the requirement that they pass the CAHSEE to receive a high school diploma.

Responses were divided among several coding categories: yes, no, mixed, don't know, not applicable, blank, refused, and off topic. A review of the data indicated that over half the respondents believe that special education students are not ready to pass the CAHSEE in order to receive a high school diploma (42 out of 78 possible respondents). A little over a quarter of the respondents (16) stated that students were ready with 15 providing mixed responses.

Table F.142. (SP) Beliefs about CAHSEE Accountability

SP	Yes	No	Mixed	DK	NA	Blank	Refuse	OT
	16 (21%)	42 (54%)	15 (19%)	2 (3%)	2 (3%)	1 (1%)	0	0

Question 14B is a follow-up question (why or why not) to 14A, which asks if the respondent feels the Class of 2006 is ready to be held accountable to the CAHSEE graduation requirement. Of the 78 possible respondents (for 14A), 42 stated they weren't ready for the requirement, while 16 stated they were ready, and 15 had mixed responses. A total of 72 respondents provided more detailed information regarding their answer.

The responses are presented in the three categories (yes, no, mixed). We found that over half of the teachers felt students were not ready because the students were weak academically, needs improved materials and curriculum, and needed more accommodations. The most common responses for the respondents indicating students were ready for the CAHSEE requirement were the students have had ample time to prepare and have received adequate support (classes, materials) to be successful. The mixed responses for the most part indicated a concern that lower level special education students will not be prepared for the requirement.

For those respondents providing additional information after stating they felt students were not ready to be held accountable for the CAHSEE ("no" to Question 14A), we developed seven codes to :

- A) Not enough time to prepare
- B) Weak academically
- C) EL/Special Ed will struggle
- D) Students have a poor attitude about the test, defeated
- E) Materials and curriculum have not been adequate
- F) Need more accommodations for the students
- G) Other

Table F.143. (SP) Reasons for Negative Beliefs about CAHSEE Accountability

SP	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
	5	18	3	2	6	6	2

Sample responses coded as "no":

- Some kids just don't have the ability
- …their reading level is so low they can't understand the question or story, in math they are still learning basics
- Special education students by design don't retain information, have holes, just by the nature of their disability
- Its an uphill battle before we start, need to improve early intervention programs for reading and writing
- Kids should have the same accommodations (calculator, being read to) as they get during school
- They need to be able to use their calculator
- The district wasn't on board with standards, I think they forgot about special education initially
- We haven't gotten enough material that covers the CAHSEE standards.

For those respondents, who responded "yes" to Question 14A indicating they felt student were ready to be held accountable for the CAHSEE, we developed seven codes:

- A) Constant exposure to content standards, ample time for preparation
- B) Teachers have worked hard to prepare students
- C) Students are bright, capable
- D) Students are more motivated, take it more seriously, have high expectations
- E) Students need to be held accountable
- F) Sufficient support in types of classes and materials
- G) Other

Table F.144. (SP) Reasons for Positive Beliefs about CAHSEE Accountability

SP	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
	4	0	1	3	0	4	1

Sample responses coded as “yes”:

- Because of all the opportunities they have and the resources we provide
- They’ve been in the process enough years to get their act together
- …level of support: tutors, outside classes, parental support, time and money
- They are successful because they are doing well in their math and English classes.
- Its not that hard a test; it’s the minimum of what they should be able to do

For those respondents, who responded “mixed” to Question 14A indicating they felt some students were ready and others were not ready to be held accountable for the CAHSEE, we developed seven codes:

- A) EL/Special Ed will struggle, lower levels won’t make it and higher levels will
- B) No time to teach mastery
- C) Apathy is a problem, poor attitude, defeated, not serious
- D) Some should have no problem passing, CAHSEE is minimum competency
- E) Some will pass, some will fail regardless of the requirement
- F) Students are motivated to do it
- G) Other

Table F.145. (SP) Reasons for Mixed Beliefs about CAHSEE Accountability

SP	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
	4	2	1	1	2	1	4

Sample responses coded as “Mixed”:

- …but the bottom 25% won’t ever be ready…it an uphill battle for those kids
- How can they pass with a disability
- Future groups will get more structure…class of 2006 did not get this from the beginning
- Not every student has the capability to pass
- Those students who are mainstreamed should be able to pass the requirement
- The one of most concern to me is the writing

EL. Question 16A asked respondents if students in the Class of 2006 are ready to be held accountable to the requirement that they pass the CAHSEE in order to receive a high school diploma.

Responses were divided among several coding categories: yes, no, mixed, don’t know, not applicable, blank, refused, and off topic. A review of the data indicated that nearly half the respondents believe that EL students are not ready to pass the CAHSEE in order to receive a high school diploma (30 out of 67 possible respondents). A little over a quarter of the respondents (18) stated that students were ready with 15 providing mixed responses.

Table F.146. (EL) Beliefs about CAHSEE Accountability

EL	Yes	No	Mixed	DK	NA	Blank	Refuse	OT
	18 (27%)	30 (44%)	15 (22%)	1 (2%)	2 (3%)	1 (2%)	0	0

Question 16B is a follow-up question (why or why not) to 16A, which asks if the respondent feels the Class of 2006 is ready to be held accountable to the CAHSEE graduation requirement. Of the 67 possible respondents (for 16A), 30 stated they weren't ready for the requirement, while 18 stated they were ready, and 15 had mixed responses. A total of 52 respondents provided more detailed information regarding their answer.

The responses are presented in the three categories (yes, no, mixed). We found that nearly half of the teachers felt students were not ready and that the students needed more time or were weak academically. The most common responses for the respondents indicating students were ready for the CAHSEE requirement were the students have received adequate support (classes, materials) to be successful and their expectations were high. The mixed responses for the most part indicated a concern that lower level EL students will not be prepared for the requirement.

For those respondents providing additional information after stating they felt students were not ready to be held accountable for the CAHSEE ("no" to Question 14A), we developed seven codes to :

- A) Not enough time to prepare
- B) Weak academically
- C) EL/Special Ed will struggle
- D) Students have a poor attitude about the test, defeated
- E) Materials and curriculum have not been adequate
- F) Need more accommodations for the students
- G) Other

Table F.147. (EL) Reasons for Negative Beliefs about CAHSEE Accountability

EL	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
	11	6	0	5	3	1	3

Sample responses coded as "no":

- It's a 5-7 year process to learn an academic language; it's unrealistic to have kids learn English in a year.
- Students need more time to get skills up to the targeted level.
- A lot of kids come with limited background of their native language, they don't know how to read or write.
- The test is too difficult for them…every question is a problem.
- Those who are English proficient are having trouble passing, so those not familiar with the language might need modifications or develop different benchmarks.
- The entire community must get involved for these students to be successful.

For those respondents who responded "yes" to Question 14A, indicating they felt student were ready to be held accountable for the CAHSEE, we developed seven codes:

- A) Constant exposure to content standards, ample time for preparation
- B) Teachers have worked hard to prepare students

- C) Students are bright, capable
- D) Students are more motivated, take it more seriously, have high expectations
- E) Students need to be held accountable
- F) Sufficient support in types of classes and materials
- G) Other

Table F.148. (EL) Reasons for Positive Beliefs about CAHSEE Accountability

EL	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
	3	2	0	4	1	6	3

Sample responses coded as "yes":

- They have some of the same materials…if teachers use them then there shouldn't be a problem.
- They have study guides designed with sample questions so they know what to expect.
- I think if an EL student is motivated to work extra hard, they will make it.
- …they are rising to the occasion.
- Because standards have been implemented for 5 years.
- We have been more accountable to teaching the standards.

For those respondents, who responded "mixed" to Question 14A indicating they felt some students were ready and others were not ready to be held accountable for the CAHSEE, we developed seven codes:

- A) EL/Special Ed will struggle, lower levels won't make it and higher levels will
- B) No time to teach mastery
- C) Apathy is a problem, poor attitude, defeated, not serious
- D) Some should have no problem passing, CAHSEE is minimum competency
- E) Some will pass, some will fail regardless of the requirement
- F) Students are motivated to do it
- G) Other

Table F.149. (EL) Reasons for Mixed Beliefs about CAHSEE Accountability

EL	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
	5	1	1	1	1	2	1

Sample responses coded as "Mixed":

- Lower level students will still have problems because of their lack of language skills
- Students who have been in our school for four years are ready
- Once they start realizing it, more are going to be more serious
- Our expectations and the districts are much higher than they were.

SP-C. Question 10A asked Special Courses teachers if they believe at-risk students in the class of 2006 are ready to be held accountable to the CAHSEE graduation requirement. They were very closely split; 30 percent said yes and 27 percent said no.

Table F.150. (SP-C) Beliefs about CAHSEE Accountability

SP-C	Yes	No	Mixed (Yes and No)	Blank
High Schools	10	7	6	7
Feeder Schools	0	2	0	1
Total	10	9	6	8

- Generally ready (consistent exposure to standards, ample time for preparation, teachers who have worked hard to prepare students, curriculum on target);
- Students are more motivated, taking CAHSEE more seriously;
- Students need to be held accountable;
- Students have not been given enough time to prepare;
- Students are weak academically;
- EL will struggle;
- Special education will struggle;
- Students have a poor attitude about CAHSEE, poor student motivation, lack of parent involvement;
- Materials, curriculum, teachers have not been adequate;
- CAHSEE is “not that big a deal” (easy, basic level for the most part);

Table F.151. (SP-C) Reasons for Beliefs about CAHSEE Accountability

Special Courses	“Yes” responses (9)		“No” responses (10)		“Mixed” responses (7)	
	High School	Feeder School	High School	Feeder School	High School	Feeder School
Generally ready	6	0	0	0	0	0
Motivated						
Need accountability	2	0	1	1	0	0
Not enough time	0	0	0	0	3	0
Academically weak	0	0	2	0	0	0
EL concern	0	0	0	0	1	0
Special ed concern	0	0	2	1	0	0
Poor attitude	0	0	1	0	1	0
Materials concern	0	0	0	1	0	0
“Not big deal”	1	0	0	0	0	0
Blank	0	0	1	0	2	0

Special Courses teachers were asked to explain further their answers from 10A. Some sample responses from their interviews follow.

- It’s totally fair that they be held accountable because they’ve known about it and have had sufficient numbers of years of math instruction based on the California standards.
- They’re ready; they need to be held accountable.
- They’re ready to see the results of their efforts.
- Everybody must be held accountable.
- We believe in them; back that up with giving the resources they need to succeed.
- We are providing all the support that they need.

- The CAHSEE standards are minimal; all should be able to pass to graduate.
- They have had opportunities with after-school programs and in-school programs to help them prepare for the test.
- Foundation has been laid, they know what's expected of them, and not holding them accountable would send the wrong message.
- We're not asking anything of them that the real world is not expecting of them
- My group of students is just getting started in reading.
- Even if given more time, they can't answer. Some of these students are still adding by counting their fingers. These students tend to drop out of their regular classes.
- Most of my students have sensory deficits that keep them from doing well on tests.
- Not fair to tell a student who tried, passed all classes, that they can't graduate; when the mother has been in every IEP, the kid has met all the goals, if the kid doesn't graduate, there's going to be a lawsuit.
- The students aren't taking it seriously.
- The high school gets blamed for the outcome of the kids, but the kids come to us with low skills.

High School Summaries

Each of the 47 high school summaries contains school-level demographics obtained from CAHSEE data and an overview of the types of interviews conducted (e.g., Administrator, General Math teacher). The Interview Summary portion of the school summary contains synopses of all interview results collected within each school.

To generate interview summaries, individual interview reports were compiled into school-level folders. Analysts read through each folder and looked for common themes. Specific questions used to guide the school summaries included:

1. Have students been given the opportunity to learn (coverage of California Academic Content Standards)?
2. What actions has the school taken to prepare at-risk students for the CAHSEE?
3. What is being done to remediate students who did not pass CAHSEE?
4. What is being done for the ELL students?
5. What is being done for the special education students?
6. Are there programs that have been implemented that should have an impact?
7. How has the student preparation at the feeder schools changed?
8. Are students in the Class of 2006 ready to be held accountable to the CAHSEE graduation requirement?

For the demographic data, each high school was classified by several characteristics. Each characteristic was divided into three or four categories. Each high school was assigned to a single category for each characteristic. Characteristic were divided into three categories such that approximately 25 percent of schools were small, 50 percent medium, and 25 percent large. High school pass rates for the ELA or math portion of the CAHSEE were divided into the four categories used in previous reports.

For the last question (Are students in the Class of 2006 ready to be held accountable to the CAHSEE graduation requirement?), interviews for each school were grouped by interview type—administrator, math teacher, ELA teacher, EL teacher, and special education teacher. Each interview was reviewed to determine whether the interviewee stated if students at that school should be held accountable to the CAHSEE graduation requirement. All interviews for each type at the school were then examined to determine whether “most yes” (more than 50% “yes”), “split” (50%-50%), or “most no” (more than 50% “no”) of all the interviewees of that type stated whether the Class of 2006 should be held accountable.

Since high schools and interviewees were told that they would not be identified in any reports, school summaries were edited for possibly identifying information. However, in doing the editing, researchers were careful to keep ideas or concepts that were important. Thus, exact numbers or percentages were generally changed to broader terms—very large number, large percentage, few, etc. Exact terms, phrases, or titles of programs were not used when researchers believed these to be specific to an individual, school, or district rather than having a more wide-spread use.

School #01

School Size	Small (<450 students)
Hispanic Percentage	Small (<20%)
African American Percentage	Medium (2-10%)
Economically Disadvantaged Percentage	Small (<20%)
EL Percentage	Medium (6-27%)
SD Percentage	Medium (7-10%)
CAHSEE ELA pass rate – Spring 2005	Moderate (>75-90%)
CAHSEE Math pass rate – Spring 2005	Moderate (>75-90%)

The research team interviewed the following types of staff/faculty:

- administrators,
- math teachers,
- ELA teachers,
- EL teachers, and
- special education teachers.

Interview Summary

Have students been given the opportunity to learn? (Coverage of California Academic Content Standards)

Instruction is focused on standards. Additionally, they have "Block Days" where time is blocked for review of standards. Teachers feel that because of the constant emphasis on the test and core content standards that students will be successful.

What actions has the school taken to prepare at-risk students for the CAHSEE?

About 15 percent of the student population has been identified as being at risk academically. District offers summer classes for CAHSEE prep. Special classes are available during homeroom and advisory period. There is an advisor-advisee program where teachers are assigned to advise selected students. There is time set aside in the school day for advisees to meet with advisors.

What is being done to remediate students who did not pass the CAHSEE?

They have a CAHSEE prep classes for about 50 students. One teacher hired specifically for this program for one period per day. Students can do independent study during advisory period (just started this year). The district offers summer classes for CAHSEE prep and those who have failed the test.

What is being done for the ELL students?

Primary languages are Spanish and various Asian languages. Reading and writing ability is lower than two years ago due to students coming to this country with less education from their native countries. However, many of the Asian EL students are among the highest math performers. The school adopted High Point (a language development course that incorporates all curricular areas). There is a district-wide curriculum for EL (and special education) students that are monitored through IEPs and peer review. All classes are taught in English. There is a perception that the Hispanic population does not view diplomas with the same significance as other students. The

school is continuing efforts within interdisciplinary “families” across the curriculum to bolster morale. The school also has the ELAC (EL advisory committee) that meets about four times per year to discuss issues affecting EL students and parents in the school.

What is being done for the special education students?

Special education teachers are teaching the standards and focused on CAHSEE. Students are more motivated. For the Class of 2006, about 40 percent of special education students have passed math and almost 50 percent have passed English. Teachers anticipate all current students will be successful in passing CAHSEE before they turn 22.

Are there programs that have been implemented that should have an impact?

CAHSEE prep and advisory independent study will aid those motivated. Block Days help focus on standards. Programs may become more intense and individualized after test results come back for most recent test of the Class of 2006.

How has the student preparation at the feeder schools changed?

Math teacher comment was that they seemed to be a little better prepared. ELA teacher indicated that they are not as prepared because of lack of dialogue between the feeder schools and the high schools and because the curriculum is not aligned across the district. EL teachers see the EL students as less prepared, but this is based on the feeling that more students are arriving in the states with less of an educational foundation.

Are students in the Class of 2006 ready to be held accountable to the CAHSEE graduation requirement?

Administrators - NA
Math teachers – most “yes”
ELA teachers – most “yes”
EL teachers – most “yes”
Special education teachers – most “yes”

School #02

School Size	Small (<450 students)
Hispanic Percentage	Small (<20%)
African American Percentage	Small (<2%)
Economically Disadvantaged Percentage	Small (<20%)
EL Percentage	Small (<6%)
SD Percentage	Medium (7-10%)
CAHSEE ELA pass rate – Spring 2005	High (>90%)
CAHSEE Math pass rate – Spring 2005	High (>90%)

The research team interviewed the following types of staff/faculty:

- administrators,
- math teachers,
- ELA teachers,
- EL teachers, and
- special education teachers.

Interview Summary

Have students been given the opportunity to learn? (Coverage of California Academic Content Standards)

Staff feels CAHSEE standards are so minimal that the vast majority of students and staff do not worry about covering the content. Virtually all students are college-bound and serious about getting the most out of their high school education. Administration has not seen the need to change much over the last several years. The school's staff has high expectations for their students and an excellent success rate. Teacher indicated that the students think CAHSEE is a joke. Students are well beyond the minimum standards measured by CAHSEE when they get to the high school.

What actions has the school taken to prepare at-risk students for the CAHSEE?

There are no specific CAHSEE preparation classes. However, there is a sheltered language arts multi-grade class and a sheltered math multi-grade class. A special education teacher stated that most of the at-risk students or students who have not passed the CAHSEE are resource students. Math teacher indicated that most at-risk students are special education students or students transferring into the school from outside the district.

What is being done to remediate students who did not pass the CAHSEE?

All students in the Class of 2006 have already passed the CAHSEE. A teacher meets with students who did not pass the CAHSEE as needed or at least every two weeks to review progress.

What is being done for the ELL students?

There are no specific CAHSEE preparation classes. However, there is a sheltered language arts multi-grade class and a sheltered math multi-grade class. ELL teacher stays involved with students in the regular classes. Good communication with regular teachers. Every teacher is CLAD certified. ELL teacher works with the ELL

students. Students have been anxious about the CAHSEE. However, ELL students are motivated to pass the CAHSEE. ELL teachers states that the students will succeed because of the high expectations the staff holds for all students. Math teacher works with ELL teacher for students who did not pass the CAHSEE to work on barriers to the students' performance.

What is being done for the special education students?

Teachers expressed concern about the growth of their special education population and the increased severity of these students' disabilities. There are about 25 students on 504s in language arts or math. Regular classroom teacher indicated that there was good communication both ways between the resource teachers and the regular classroom teachers. There are language arts and math resource courses for students who are not up to grade level. Special education is driven by IEPs and not standards. However, the staff tries to align the IEPs as much as possible with the standards.

Administrator stated that there was a lot of anxiety with special education students about accommodations being offered, but those fears have been allayed. Group of special education parents who meet regularly to communicate issues with their children. School representative attends meetings. The test is disliked by the special education students, but they are taking the test more seriously. Special education teacher thinks they will be successful because of their current performance. Special education students get support both in school and outside school. Students get tutors, outside classes, and parental support and time to get their child the help they need. Money is available both in the school and from parents.

Are there programs that have been implemented that should have an impact?

School has a SST (Student Study Team) to intervene with struggling students.

How has the student preparation at the feeder schools changed?

Students from the feeder schools are the same or better than two years ago. Math teacher stated middle school teachers do an excellent job. A teacher said the CAHSEE should be given in middle school where all the standards are taught and tested in the classes.

Are students in the Class of 2006 ready to be held accountable to the CAHSEE graduation requirement?

Administrators – most "yes"
Math teachers – most "yes"
ELA teachers - NA
EL teachers – most "yes"
Special education teachers – most "yes"

School #03

School Size	Small (<450)
Hispanic Percentage	Medium (20-60%)
African American Percentage	Large (>10%)
Economically Disadvantaged Percentage	Medium (20-60%)
EL Percentage	Medium (6-27%)
SD Percentage	Large (>10%)
CAHSEE ELA pass rate – Spring 2005	Low (>50-75%)
CAHSEE Math pass rate – Spring 2005	Low (>50-75%)

The research team interviewed the following types of staff/faculty:

- administrators,
- math teachers,
- ELA teachers,
- EL teachers, and
- special education teachers

Have students been given the opportunity to learn? (Coverage of California Academic Content Standards)

Teachers indicated a heavy focus on standards. Standards being taught in the class are required to be posted on the blackboard. Textbooks now say "California Standards" on the cover. Some teachers indicated that because the textbook says "California Standards" that using the book ensures that the standards are covered. This could be a result of the level of students each teacher has in the class.

Over 50 percent of the students are at the "far below basic" level. All Algebra I and English teachers were required to review using the CAHSEE prep booklets for the six weeks prior to testing. Some teachers pointed out that although the prep booklets were passed out, no instructions were provided on how to use the booklets or how to review the material.

Math students may be coming in better prepared so that less time is being devoted in some classes to reviewing basic math topics. English teachers were mixed with one saying better prepared and the other stating they are at a lower level especially in their vocabulary skills.

What actions has the school taken to prepare at-risk students for the CAHSEE?

Math teachers indicate that maybe as high as 70 percent to as low as 50 percent have passed or should pass. There are about 30 percent to 50 percent who have not yet passed or are at risk of not passing. The sophomore class has a greater percentage at risk than the freshman class. Most of these at-risk students are EL or Special Education.

What is being done to remediate students who did not pass the CAHSEE?

There will be a special course next year based on low CST scores—far below basic and below basic if there is room. Principal estimates that the class will include 75 percent of ELD population, 100 percent of Special Education, and 60-75 percent of low

SES students. Many of the Algebra I and English 10 teachers who taught the remedial six-week curriculum this year will teach this year-long course next year.

What is being done for the ELL students?

Instruction and class materials have been improved over the last couple years. Teachers believe the increase is due to the school's focus on literacy. They are using the SRA corrective reading program and are using the CAHSEE reasoning and writing materials provided by the district. The standardized blackboard configuration has helped to provide a clear focus and is thought to be clearer to the students.

Only about half of the ELL/ELD students are Spanish speakers. Teachers are working with the students. They think that the ELD 3 (maybe only ELD 4 and above) and above students eventually will be able to pass the CAHSEE. The others will not because they lack the necessary language skills. A teacher indicated that the lower levels are mostly 18-year olds who have given up and stopped trying. However, the upper division EL students are more focused on standards and their writing has improved. New comers to the program are questionable.

One teacher indicated that there are more problems in this population than the schools can address. The entire community must get involved for these students to be successful.

What is being done for the special education students?

In special education, teacher feels more positive about CAHSEE because there was an increase in passing rates. The school is restoring an intensive reading (literacy) class and a double period of math prep/Algebra. However, there are students who will not be able to pass the test. The estimate is probably the bottom 25 percent will not be able to pass.

Are there programs that have been implemented that should have an impact?

The CAHSEE preparation classes should help. The school will examine the impact of the six-week preparation program on the most recent test. The school is planning to have special CAHSEE preparation classes next year for at-risk students. Student entry into these classes will be based on low CST scores—students who scored far below basic and below basic if there is room. Principal estimates that the class will include 75 percent of ELD population, 100 percent of Special Education, and 60-75 percent of low SES students. Many of the Algebra I and English 10 teachers who taught the remedial six-week curriculum this year will teach this year-long course next year. However, staffing is expected to be cut by more than 10 teachers which may impact all plans.

How has the student preparation at the feeder schools changed?

Math students may be coming in better prepared so that less time is being devoted in some classes to reviewing basic math topics. English teachers were mixed with one saying better prepared and the other stating they are at a lower level especially in their vocabulary skills.

Are students in the Class of 2006 ready to be held accountable to the CAHSEE graduation requirement?

Administrators – most “yes”
Math teachers – most “yes”
ELA teachers – most “no”
EL teachers – most “no”
Special education teachers – most “yes”

School #04

School Size	Small (<450 students)
Hispanic Percentage	Large (>60%)
African American Percentage	Large (>10%)
Economically Disadvantaged Percentage	Large (>60%)
EL Percentage	Large (>27%)
SD Percentage	Medium (7-10%)
CAHSEE ELA pass rate – Spring 2005	Low (>50-75%)
CAHSEE Math pass rate – Spring 2005	Low (>50-75%)

The research team interviewed the following types of staff/faculty:

- administrators,
- math teachers,
- ELA teachers,
- EL teachers, and
- special education teachers.

Interview Summary

Have students been given the opportunity to learn? (Coverage of California Academic Content Standards)

The research team indicated that "it appears that this school has just very recently begun to be concerned with standards, CAHSEE, and the instructional implications of providing a meaningful and rigorous curriculum for all students." Leadership at the school does appear to be strong or forceful. However, the research team indicated that the leadership was conscientious and striving to "bring the staff and school culture along."

There are now benchmark tests in math and English that are aligned with the school's curriculum. Teachers are now teaching to standards, addressing the standards that will be covered in their lesson plans, and informing students of standards that will be covered in the instruction. An ELA teacher indicated this has started, but has not yet been fully implemented by all teachers. However, the teacher did think the department was in the process of strengthening the ELA classes. An ELA teacher stated that there may be issues with the feeder middle schools covering the standards that should be addressed while in middle school. Both math and ELA teachers indicated that the textbooks are on the state adopted list which should help the teachers teach to the standards. An ELA teacher stated that there are more students in the remedial reading programs than are not.

What actions has the school taken to prepare at-risk students for the CAHSEE?

One teacher estimated that the school would have about 15-20 percent of their students who would not pass the CAHSEE. Students at risk are predominantly African-Americans and low SES (large overlap). Most of these students come from one poorly-performing, feeder middle school. Teachers thought that many students believe the state will back off on the requirement to pass CAHSEE to graduate.

The school invited almost 300 at-risk freshmen and sophomores with low STAR test results and juniors who had not passed the CAHSEE to voluntarily enroll in a non-credit six-week after-school and summer program for CAHSEE preparation. Only about half of the invitees participated.

What is being done to remediate students who did not pass the CAHSEE?

Students were offered a voluntary after-school and summer non-credit CAHSEE preparation class. Principal indicated that the school **may** offer a mandatory CAHSEE preparation class for all students who did not pass one or both portions in the future.

What is being done for the ELL students?

The EL teacher has recently obtained textbooks which the teacher feels will address the EL student needs. In English, they are using the Reading Plus program. Spanish-speaking students have a Spanish-speaking math teacher. The school has aides who speak other student-spoken languages if needed. Students are offered voluntary CAHSEE preparation tutorials after school. The EL teacher stated that many students come in at such a low level of language proficiency that many will be unable to pass the CAHSEE. There are exceptions, but it will be a challenge.

What is being done for the special education students?

The principal stated that the special education teachers are seeing the need to offer more than has been offered in the past.

Are there programs that have been implemented that should have an impact?

Not really until the school implements during school CAHSEE preparation classes.

How has the student preparation at the feeder schools changed?

Indication is that it has not changed. From one teacher, students from one of the middle school are more at-risk than other middle schools.

Are students in the Class of 2006 ready to be held accountable to the CAHSEE graduation requirement?

Administrators – most “yes”
Math teachers – most “yes”
ELA teachers - split
EL teachers – most “no”
Special education teachers – most “no”

School #05

School Size	Small (<450 students)
Hispanic Percentage	Medium (20-60%)
African American Percentage	Medium (2-10%)
Economically Disadvantaged Percentage	Small (<20%)
EL Percentage	Small (<6%)
SD Percentage	Medium (7-10%)
CAHSEE ELA pass rate – Spring 2005	Moderate (>75-90%)
CAHSEE Math pass rate – Spring 2005	High (>90%)

The research team interviewed the following types of staff/faculty:

- administrators,
- math teachers,
- ELA teachers,
- EL teachers, and
- special education teachers.

Interview Summary

Have students been given the opportunity to learn? (Coverage of California Academic Content Standards)

The school and teachers are stressing standards throughout the curriculum and instruction. The district has created benchmark tests for each class that are based upon the content standards. Teachers also indicated that the text books are now more aligned with the California standards which they feel is helping them better cover the standards. Lesson plans and instruction are being mapped to the standards. Principal stated that they have worked to implement both vertical and horizontal alignment of standards teaching throughout the school.

What actions has the school taken to prepare at-risk students for the CAHSEE?

Principal states that this is embedded into the curriculum especially in math. For the lower-level math classes, the teachers put more emphasis on the CAHSEE strands and the standards. Additionally, Algebra I is divided over a two-year period (four semesters) so that teachers can move slower through the material to ensure students are able to learn the material. Tutoring is even more aggressive. There is a partnership for getting tutors with the local college/university. The 9th grade classes are capped at 20 students allowing teachers to provide more individual attention to struggling students.

What is being done to remediate students who did not pass the CAHSEE?

The school has a fairly high pass rate for the CAHSEE. There are only a few students who have not yet passed the CAHSEE in the junior class. Teachers indicate that the majority of these students are special education students and low SES students. The biggest hurdle for CAHSEE appears to be math. Special education students, anyone taking Algebra A, B, or 1 are given an extra hour of math.

What is being done for the ELL students?

There are only a small number of EL students at the school. Most ELL students are in an EL ELA class and in a regular ELA class. The regular ELA class covers the standards. There are still some EL students in a special EL class. The students in this class are not ready to go beyond the basics. The ELL students are getting two hours of English instruction each day.

What is being done for the special education students?

The RSP special education students are being mainstreamed into the regular math classes. These students also receive an additional hour of math each day. Reports from the teachers indicate that many of the special education students are doing better in the Algebra A course than the regular education students. There is a floating special education aide who floats between math classrooms to assist the RSP students. The resource teacher uses the CAHSEE study guides and released questions, and re-teaches what they are not getting in their other classes. The RSP teacher states that many of her students are rising to the challenge. The teacher indicates that they may be getting Ds in the class, but they are participating more and being exposed to more material than in the past. The RSP teacher indicates that the RSP students will be ready for the CAHSEE because of all the opportunities they have and the resources that the school is providing them.

Are there programs that have been implemented that should have an impact?

The two-year algebra class and the smaller classes for freshmen should have an impact. District benchmark tests help to keep teachers on track and on-level.

How has the student preparation at the feeder schools changed?

The principal thinks they are better prepared. Some of the same efforts occurring at the high school are occurring at the middle schools. District middle schools are focused on standards-based instruction. All 8th grade students now are taking Algebra. Math teachers indicate that some are failing, but that all even the students who are failing are making more progress than they used to. The middle school principal stated bluntly that the standards have been in place now for a while and that the students are being taught what the state says they should be taught. Everything should be matching and prepared. Middle school special education teachers are now doing more articulation with the high school special education teachers.

Are students in the Class of 2006 ready to be held accountable to the CAHSEE graduation requirement?

Administrators – most “yes”
Math teachers – most “yes”
ELA teachers - most “yes”
EL teachers – most “no”
Special education teachers – most “yes”

School #06

School Size	Medium (450-700 students)
Hispanic Percentage	Large (>60%)
African American Percentage	Small (<2%)
Economically Disadvantaged Percentage	Large (>60%)
EL Percentage	Medium (6-27%)
SD Percentage	Small (<7%)
CAHSEE ELA pass rate – Spring 2005	Low (50-75%)
CAHSEE Math pass rate – Spring 2005	Moderate (>75-90%)

The research team interviewed the following types of staff/faculty:

- math teachers,
- ELA teachers,
- EL teachers, and
- special education teachers.

Interview Summary

Have students been given the opportunity to learn? (Coverage of California Academic Content Standards)

Math teachers are covering the standards at the high school. Additionally, the school spends 20 minutes per day for at least five weeks before the CAHSEE focused on a certain standard each day.

What actions has the school taken to prepare at-risk students for the CAHSEE?

The school offers a full-year, two-hour elective course for English CAHSEE preparation during regular school hours. Most students are low SES who score from the 5th to 30th percentile. These students tend to have multiple problems—poor grades in general, attendance problems, behavior problems, and many suspensions.

What is being done to remediate students who did not pass the CAHSEE?

The school offers a full-year, two-hour elective course for English CAHSEE preparation during regular school hours. Most students are low SES scoring from the 5th to 30th percentile.

What is being done for the ELL students?

ELL teacher sees the EL2 students in the class two periods per day. There is a mix of Hispanic and Asian in the class. The students are almost illiterate in their native language. The students' families are extremely low educated and low income. These students are barely speaking English, but their writing is better than their speaking skills. There are many EL1, EL2, and EL3 students who are mainstreamed, but are either struggling or lost. Content instruction is only in English. EL teachers use the CAHSEE preparation booklets and try to get the students familiar with the CAHSEE vocabulary.

What is being done for the special education students?

The focus for the special education students is standards-based instruction. However, mastery for the special education student is meeting the IEP goals.

Are there programs that have been implemented that should have an impact?

The math teachers believe that the focus on standards has gone up across the math department. Math teachers are teaching the standards. The district benchmark tests that are given every six weeks are focused on the standards that should be taught in the class and set the bar for acceptable performance.

There are both CAHSEE preparation and remediation classes at the school.

How has the student preparation at the feeder schools changed?

Most math teachers with at least two years' experience believe that students are coming in better prepared than two years ago.

Are students in the Class of 2006 ready to be held accountable to the CAHSEE graduation requirement?

Math teachers – most "yes"
ELA teachers - most "yes"
Special education teachers – most "yes"

School #07

School Size	Large (>700 students)
Hispanic Percentage	Medium (20-60%)
African American Percentage	Medium (2-10%)
Economically Disadvantaged Percentage	Medium (20-60%)
EL Percentage	Small (<6%)
SD Percentage	Small (<7%)
CAHSEE ELA pass rate – Spring 2005	High (>90%)
CAHSEE Math pass rate – Spring 2005	High (>90%)

The research team interviewed the following types of staff/faculty:

- administrators,
- math teachers,
- ELA teachers, and
- EL teachers.

Interview Summary

Have students been given the opportunity to learn? (Coverage of California Academic Content Standards)

Both math and ELA teachers indicated that their curriculum and instruction was focused on the content standards.

What actions has the school taken to prepare at-risk students for the CAHSEE?

The principal stated that on the surface the school seems to be doing fairly well. However, when examined more closely, the principal found that about one-third of the students are doing very well and two-thirds of the students are floundering.

There is a Saturday school for students identified as being below or far below basic on CST, or who did not pass the CAHSEE. Initially, this was mandatory when it was after school. Now more voluntary since it is on Saturday, but there are contractual aspects of the tutoring. The school pays Kaplan to teach half-day class on Saturdays.

For incoming ninth graders, over 60 percent had a basic, below, or far below basic score. This summer, the school will have a mandatory three-week summer school for incoming ninth-graders who scored at any of the lower three levels on math or English. Curriculum is standards-based instruction to address gaps indicated in seventh grade CST. Ninth graders who are proficient or advanced will still have to take one-week summer school.

Next year, the school will offer a two-hour block of English and math based on CST scores. This will be conducted by extending the day. Some students may need to take the two periods for both subjects.

What is being done to remediate students who did not pass the CAHSEE?

There is a Saturday school for students identified as being below or far below basic on CST, or who did not pass the CAHSEE. Initially, this was mandatory when it

was after school. Now more voluntary since it is on Saturday, but there are contractual aspects of the tutoring. The school pays Kaplan to teach half-day class on Saturdays.

What is being done for the ELL students?

Classes are targeting all the CAHSEE standards. The ELD standards mesh with the ELA standards.

What is being done for the special education students?

Not much discussed at the principal level. No Special Education teacher interviewed.

Are there programs that have been implemented that should have an impact?

The summer school, Saturday school, and two-hour block periods should all have an impact.

How has the student preparation at the feeder schools changed?

The teachers vary on the ratings they give on the preparation at the middle school. They indicate that the better students are about as well prepared to a little better prepared. However, several teachers indicate that the regular students may not be as prepared. However, some of these teachers also state that the quality of the students also has changed and that there are not as many good students within a class.

Are students in the Class of 2006 ready to be held accountable to the CAHSEE graduation requirement?

Administrators – most “yes”
Math teachers – most “yes”
ELA teachers - most “yes”
EL teachers – most “yes”
Special education teachers – most “yes”

School #08

School Size	Large (>700 students)
Hispanic Percentage	Medium (20-60%)
African American Percentage	Medium (2-10%)
Economically Disadvantaged Percentage	Large (>60%)
EL Percentage	Medium (6-27%)
SD Percentage	Medium (7-10%)
CAHSEE ELA pass rate – Spring 2005	Moderate (>75–90%)
CAHSEE Math pass rate – Spring 2005	Moderate (>75–90%)

The research team interviewed the following types of staff/faculty:

- administrators,
- math teachers,
- EL teachers, and
- special education teachers.

Interview Summary

Have students been given the opportunity to learn? (Coverage of California Academic Content Standards)

The principal stated that there has been a focus and emphasis on teaching to the content standards this year. Teachers stated that the curriculum and instruction is aligned with content and CAHSEE standards.

What actions has the school taken to prepare at-risk students for the CAHSEE?

One math teacher indicated that 40 percent of his students are at risk of not passing the CAHSEE. An ELA teacher stated that 70 percent of his/her students are at risk of not passing CAHSEE. The teacher added that these students were mostly EL Spanish-speaking students.

The school has a special CAHSEE "support" class for students who did not pass CAHSEE and all 9th graders who are two grade levels or more below grade level. This class is not voluntary. The classes have about 40 percent 9th graders, 30 percent 10th graders, and 30 percent 11th graders. Of this group the majority are Hispanic with at least half of these students being English-language learners, one-fourth special education, and about one-tenth low SES. The class is conducted during the day and is a year-long course. Next year the course also may be during extended periods. The students in the course take it for credit. Courses have about 20 students per class. This year there were math and reading CAHSEE support courses. This year there were just a very large number of students in English and about half as many in math. The principal expects the numbers to triple next year. Next year this will be offered during the day and during extended period.

What is being done to remediate students who did not pass the CAHSEE?

The school has a special CAHSEE "support" class for students who did not pass CAHSEE and all 9th graders who are two grade levels or more below grade level. This class is not voluntary. The classes have about 40 percent 9th graders, 30 percent 10th graders, and 30 percent 11th graders. Of this group the majority are Hispanic with at

least half of these students being English-language learners, one-fourth special education, and about one-tenth low SES. The class is conducted during the day and is a year-long course. Next year the course also may be during extended periods. The students in the course take it for credit. Courses have about 20 students per class. This year there were math and reading CAHSEE support courses. This year there were just a very large number of students in English and about half as many in math. The principal expects the numbers to triple next year. Next year this will be offered during the day and during extended period.

What is being done for the ELL students?

About two-thirds of the ELL students are not passing the CAHSEE. A large percentage of the students in the support classes are Hispanic.

What is being done for the special education students?

Special education students are put in a basic course to get double instruction.

Are there programs that have been implemented that should have an impact?

The support classes should have an impact.

How has the student preparation at the feeder schools changed?

The school has several feeder schools. Some are preparing students better than others. One was rated as excellent and another as poor. Overall, the preparation was rated as about the same by administrators, more prepared by the math teacher, resource students about the same (but special day less prepared). The ELA teachers split with one rating them as about the same and the other as less prepared. However, both teachers stated that the incoming students reading and writing skills were weak areas.

Are students in the Class of 2006 ready to be held accountable to the CAHSEE graduation requirement?

Administrators – most “yes”
Math teachers – most “no”
ELA teachers - most “yes”
Special education teachers – most “no”

School #09

School Size	Large (>700 students)
Hispanic Percentage	Large (>60%)
African American Percentage	Small (<2%)
Economically Disadvantaged Percentage	Large (>60%)
EL Percentage	Large (>27%)
SD Percentage	Large (>10%)
CAHSEE ELA pass rate – Spring 2005	Very Low (<=50%)
CAHSEE Math pass rate – Spring 2005	Very Low (<=50%)

The research team interviewed the following types of staff/faculty:

- administrators,
- math teachers,
- ELA teachers,
- EL teachers, and
- special education teachers.

Interview Summary

Have students been given the opportunity to learn? (Coverage of California Academic Content Standards)

District has gone district-wide through Algebra 1 in math. District has a two-year algebra program, but the school decided to go to a one-year course. There are district-wide assessments in math. The school has "unwrapped" the ELA standards and is addressing them in grade level. Assistant principal feels they still have a way to go in ELA. District does have a periodic assessment in ELA. Assistant principal thinks the school is in the middle of program improvement in focusing on the content standards. Assistant principal is trying to restructure the school to focus on students as individuals within small learning communities.

The math teacher felt they were being given the opportunity to learn before and that the school is still doing a good job (rating of 4 on a 1 to 5 scale). The department gives students options to take classes to help them pass. Students are encouraged to take Saturday school or another class to help them through the CAHSEE.

ELA teachers feel that they are almost fully implemented (ratings ranged from 5 to 3.6 on a 1 to 5 scale). There were several comments about the previous department chair wanting to stay in front.

What actions has the school taken to prepare at-risk students for the CAHSEE?

No specific comments were directed toward the at-risk students other than the normal programs. Both math and ELA courses are designed to be teaching the standards. There is some "tracking" of students into classes that are appropriate for the student's current abilities.

What is being done to remediate students who did not pass the CAHSEE?

The school offers elective classes (for credit) during school, after-school classes (funded by a grant from NCLB), and Saturday classes (funded by Title 1). The school is using the Kaplan program for regular students who have not passed CAHSEE (also special education students and EL students). Teachers also received training on the Kaplan program from Kaplan.

ELA and math teachers talked about the variety of opportunities students have to take CAHSEE-specific remediation courses.

What is being done for the ELL students?

ESL is using the High Point program. The school is using the Kaplan program for EL student who have not passed CAHSEE (also special education students and regular students). Teachers also received training on the Kaplan program from Kaplan. There are special (CAHSEE preparation?) classes. EL teacher did not feel that the High Point or Kaplan programs were appropriate for the EL students. The EL teacher felt that programs for EL students were inappropriate and EL students are not ready for CAHSEE.

What is being done for the special education students?

The school is using the Kaplan program for EL student who have not passed CAHSEE (also EL and regular students). Teachers also received training on the Kaplan program from Kaplan. There are special (CAHSEE preparation?) classes. Classes are offered before and after school, on Saturdays, and during intercession. Students who are off track have the opportunity to get credit.

Special education teacher does not believe the resource teachers are teaching toward the standards-based curriculum like they are supposed to be.

Are there programs that have been implemented that should have an impact?

Assistant principal thinks the school is in the middle of program improvement in focusing on the content standards. Assistant principal is trying to restructure the school to focus on students as individuals within small learning communities. Next year there is supposed to be co-teaching with the regular and resource teachers. Special education teacher believes this will improve the service provided for the special education population.

How has the student preparation at the feeder schools changed?

Assistant principal feels that it is about the same. However, he feels that they are less rather than more prepared. There is a lot of social promotion. Students have learned that if they are quiet they more forward. Math teacher gave a similar rating for now and two years ago. Both ratings were a 3 on the 1 to 5 scale. ELA teachers varied slightly with the current freshman class being rated at about a 2.33 (two 2s and one 3). The rating for two years ago was 2.67 (two 3s and one 2). Middle school math teachers do not feel that many of their students will be able to pass the CAHSEE based on their current performance. The high school general math teacher felt that about 60 to 70 percent would graduate while the prep/remedial math teacher felt that about half the students would not be prepared. This teacher added that a big part is that the students

will have difficulty because they do not understand the language. Several of the MS math teachers commented on poor basic math skills, a lack of effort, and the fact that many students were not ready for Algebra. The MS ELA teacher felt that most of the at-risk students would not pass the CAHSEE. The MS is offering special classes (developing readings and writers course) for students well below grade level and after school and Saturday programs. The special courses have been in place for about three years and are having an impact. Teacher talked about the lack of student motivation and parental support. Many MS students are resisting all efforts to help them at the middle school.

Are students in the Class of 2006 ready to be held accountable to the CAHSEE graduation requirement?

Math teachers – most “yes”
ELA teachers - most “yes”
EL teachers – most “no”
Special education teachers – most “yes”

School #10

School Size	Large (>700 students)
Hispanic Percentage	Medium (20-60%)
African American Percentage	Medium (2-10%)
Economically Disadvantaged Percentage	Large (>60%)
EL Percentage	Large (>27%)
SD Percentage	Medium (7-10%)
CAHSEE ELA pass rate – Spring 2005	Moderate (>75-90%)
CAHSEE Math pass rate – Spring 2005	Moderate (>75-90%)

The research team interviewed the following types of staff/faculty:

- administrators,
- math teachers,
- ELA teachers, and
- special education teachers.

Interview Summary

Have students been given the opportunity to learn? (Coverage of California Academic Content Standards)

Principal believes the school had fully implemented instruction based on the California Academic Content Standards two years ago and has done a better job over the last two years. The principal believes that all staff and faculty are focused on ensuring all students graduate. The principal stated that they have made strong gains on CAHSEE pass rate and expect even greater improvement this year. There is a district pacing plan for math and reading.

In the lower level math courses, the high school has had to alter the instructional content to re-teach what students should have learned by the 7th grade.

The special education teachers rated the implementation of instruction based on the California Academic Content Standards within the special education department as a 3 on a 1 to 5 scale. This was up from the 1 (not at all implemented) compared to the rating they would have given the program two years ago.

What actions has the school taken to prepare at-risk students for the CAHSEE?

While the school offers after-school tutoring and a relatively short-term Saturday class, the focus is to prepare at-risk students for the CAHSEE and high school graduation in the regular class. The focus is on “power standards” for the test. The teachers teach those skills first and ensure the students master those skills. Remediation work is done in the course of the regular class. Students are re-grouped in math every five weeks. There is in-house tutoring and a CAHSEE prep program in both English and math.

During the second semester, students who are at risk or have not passed the math portion of CAHSEE are in a special class that focuses on the standards—not just the CAHSEE standards, but the fundamentals. There were 10 sections of this class this spring.

What is being done to remediate students who did not pass the CAHSEE?

While the school offers after-school tutoring and a relatively short-term Saturday class, the focus is to prepare at-risk students for the CAHSEE and high school graduation in the regular class. The focus is on “power standards” for the test. The teachers teach those skills first and ensure the students master those skills. Remediation work is done in the course of the regular class.

During second semester, at-risk students or students who have not passed the CAHSEE math are in a special class focused on the standards—not just the CAHSEE standards, but the fundamentals. There were 10 sections of this class this spring.

In ELA, lower scoring students will be referred to a block with reading and English.

What is being done for the ELL students?

There are no specific programs targeted toward the EL students. They can go to tutoring and the Saturday classes. The test is difficult for many of these students. No EL teacher was interviewed.

What is being done for the special education students?

The special education teacher gave the school a rating of 2 on a 1 (doing what is legally required) to 5 (could not ask for more) scale on the degree of CAHSEE support shown to special education students at the school. The teacher stated that the special education students were initially left out (probably just an oversight) of several support programs (e.g., special education students were initially not invited to the Saturday school).

Are there programs that have been implemented that should have an impact?

Articulation of standards efforts with the middle school. Saturday schools. Focusing on standards.

How has the student preparation at the feeder schools changed?

The principal gives the middle schools a rating of 3 on a scale of 1 to 5. This is up from the 1 he gave two years ago. The principal indicated that the school is taking a more proactive approach with the middle schools. The high school is starting to articulate the math standards with the middle school. Math teachers indicate that student preparation from the middle school still appears to be weak and is relatively unchanged from two years ago.

Are students in the Class of 2006 ready to be held accountable to the CAHSEE graduation requirement?

Math teachers – most “yes”

Special education teachers – split

School #11

School Size	Medium (450-700 students)
Hispanic Percentage	Large (>60%)
African American Percentage	Small (<2%)
Economically Disadvantaged Percentage	Large (>60%)
EL Percentage	Large (>27%)
SD Percentage	Medium (7-10%)
CAHSEE ELA pass rate – Spring 2005	Low (>50-75%)
CAHSEE Math pass rate – Spring 2005	Low (>50-75%)

The research team interviewed the following types of staff/faculty:

- administrators,
- math teachers,
- ELA teachers,
- EL teachers, and
- special education teachers.

Interview Summary

Have students been given the opportunity to learn? (Coverage of California Academic Content Standards)

Principal rates the school as a 4 on the 1 to 5 scale of implementing standards-based instruction. This is an increase from what the rating would have been two years ago. Principal said that the process has been slow because it is a large district. At the district level, teachers are in the process of developing pacing calendars and selecting textbooks that are standards-based. Principal credits Edusoft with assisting teachers to develop assessments that are standards based.

Math has a pacing guide and quarterly assessments. ELA is still working on pacing guides.

What actions has the school taken to prepare at-risk students for the CAHSEE?

There is a Saturday CAHSEE academy which runs from September to February which focuses on all the different substrands. There is also an after school tutoring program for juniors using a CAHSEE prep book.

What is being done to remediate students who did not pass the CAHSEE?

Currently, there are no CAHSEE remediation courses. They will be starting remediation classes next year for juniors and seniors. “Measuring Up” will be used for ELA and “Applied Math” for the math courses.

The seniors will be required to take two math courses a day if they have not passed the CAHSEE. They have found that they must stress getting ready for CAHSEE during the school day. About 35 percent of the students in the Class of 2006 have not passed the CAHSEE math. Many are right on the edge.

What is being done for the ELL students?

The EL program is very proactive about monitoring student mastery. The Title 1 EL coordinator works to move students out of EL and into college preparatory classes. Students coming into high school as EL3 or EL4 have a good chance of reclassifying before they graduate, so they are thinking of doubling up their English courses.

There are literacy classes for students who score below the 60th percentile. Those students are in double English classes.

There is also an after school tutoring program for juniors using a CAHSEE prep book. EL students were targeted and teachers submitted lists recommending students.

There is a Saturday CAHSEE academy which runs from September to February which focuses on all the different substrands. They began as EL academies but it was opened to everyone this year and an all-call went out in both Spanish and English to all parents and students.

There is more support for EL students because there is more pressure on EL teachers to align to standards and make the curriculum more rigorous to make the students able to pass CAHSEE. EL department is using more scaffolding than regular education to help the students prepare

What is being done for the special education students?

Special education students have not received the focus yet. The special education department is being revamped and should be more in sync in 3 to 4 years.

Are there programs that have been implemented that should have an impact?

The use of standards-aligned textbooks, pacing calendars, and standards-aligned assessments.

How has the student preparation at the feeder schools changed?

Feeder schools have made a more concerted effort to teach to the California standards. As a result, the students are better prepared, especially the sophomores. There are challenges because this is not a unified system. This makes it more of a challenge for articulation between the high school and middle schools.

Are students in the Class of 2006 ready to be held accountable to the CAHSEE graduation requirement?

Administrators – most “no”
Math teachers – most “yes”
ELA teachers - split
EL teachers – most “yes”
Special education teachers – most “no”

School #12

School Size	Large (>700 students)
Hispanic Percentage	Large (>60%)
African American Percentage	Large (>10%)
Economically Disadvantaged Percentage	Large (>60%)
EL Percentage	Large (>27%)
SD Percentage	Large (>10%)
CAHSEE ELA pass rate – Spring 2005	Low (>50-75%)
CAHSEE Math pass rate – Spring 2005	Low (>50-75%)

The research team interviewed the following types of staff/faculty:

- administrators,
- math teachers,
- ELA teachers,
- EL teachers, and
- special education teachers.

Interview Summary

Have students been given the opportunity to learn? (Coverage of California Academic Content Standards)

Big improvement over the last two year (one administrator rated 0.5 previously and 2.5 now). Two others rate it as 4 now and 2 previously. The other administrator rates it at 3 which is up from a 1 the administrator would have given it two years ago.

Teachers indicate that there is a wide disparity in the instruction from teacher to teacher at the school. Several teachers commented that not all teachers are teaching to standards. One teacher stated that they were still working on getting materials really focused on standards. He did not feel confident that he had all he needed to test all the standards. There was concern by some math teachers that the middle school teachers were not adequately prepared in math to teach algebra and the transition to teaching algebra in the 8th grade was made too quickly.

What actions has the school taken to prepare at-risk students for the CAHSEE?

A district-specific program is offered for prep and remedial students. Sessions are conducted for several hours on Saturdays. Students attend this Saturday school each 9-week session. There appear to be continuous sessions—one starts after the previous one ends. There also are after-school sessions. During school, there are “Essential Skills” classes offered on a voluntary basis.

What is being done to remediate students who did not pass the CAHSEE?

A district-specific program is offered for prep and remedial students. Sessions are conducted for several hours on Saturdays. Students attend this Saturday school each 9-week session. There appear to be continuous sessions—one starts after the previous one ends. There also are after-school sessions. During school, there are “Essential Skills” classes offered on a voluntary basis.

What is being done for the ELL students?

A district-specific program is offered for prep and remedial students. Sessions are conducted for several hours on Saturdays. Students attend this Saturday school each 9-week session. There appear to be continuous sessions—one starts after the previous one ends. There also are after-school sessions. During school, there are "Essential Skills" classes offered on a voluntary basis. There are EL only Essential Skills classes.

What is being done for the special education students?

This school has all new special education teachers now. According to interview the older teachers did not want to or know how to emphasize the standards. The new teachers only know standards and are better at teaching them. There is a lack of standardization. Some teachers challenge the students. Teachers said that some students say that other teachers' classes are a joke. There is an increased awareness that standards need to be taught especially in the special education department. Curriculum is based around standards. Teachers are aligning IEPs more to the standards than before.

Are there programs that have been implemented that should have an impact?

The various prep/remedial classes and a increased focus on standards.

How has the student preparation at the feeder schools changed?

Administrators rate the preparation as the same or lower than two years ago.

Are students in the Class of 2006 ready to be held accountable to the CAHSEE graduation requirement?

Administrators – most "yes"
Math teachers – split
ELA teachers - split
EL teachers – most "yes"
Special education teachers – most "yes"

School #13

School Size	Large (>700 students)
Hispanic Percentage	Large (>60%)
African American Percentage	Medium (2-10%)
Economically Disadvantaged Percentage	Large (>60%)
EL Percentage	Large (>27%)
SD Percentage	Large (>10%)
CAHSEE ELA pass rate – Spring 2005	Low (>50-75%)
CAHSEE Math pass rate – Spring 2005	Low (>50-75%)

The research team interviewed the following types of staff/faculty:

- math teachers,
- ELA teachers,
- EL teachers, and
- special education teachers.

Interview Summary

Have students been given the opportunity to learn? (Coverage of California Academic Content Standards)

Math teacher rates a 4 on a 1 to 5 scale on the process of implementing instruction based on the California Academic Content Standards. The district has pacing guides and assessments in math. A math teacher said that about 70 percent of the juniors taking the Algebra class have not passed the CAHSEE. About 75 percent of the sophomores and freshmen in an algebra class are at risk of not passing the CAHSEE. An ELA teacher indicated that 40 percent of the sophomores (Class of 2007) are at risk of not passing the CAHSEE.

What actions has the school taken to prepare at-risk students for the CAHSEE?

Students who are low in ELA (Reading) are placed into a special 2-hour a day program. The program uses *Read 180*, *Elements of Literature*, and *Basics* for grammar. Students not meeting the standards after the first year can take a second year. There are about a large number of students in this program. Teacher indicates that they need more support and remedial support. The high transient population hinders their efforts. The students need more consistency, but have no classes to help them.

What is being done to remediate students who did not pass the CAHSEE?

Students not passing the math portion of the CAHSEE are assigned a set number of hours and specific PLATO lessons to complete.

English teachers talked about after school tutoring and Saturday schools.

What is being done for the ELL students?

The school has a very large Hispanic population. About half of these students are non-native speakers. Additionally, there is a large number of non-native speaking, non-Hispanic students. *Read 180* and *Highpoint* programs are offered for students who do not pass CAHSEE or who are risk of not passing CAHSEE. There also are Saturday school and after school programs. About 90 percent of the students in the Saturday

school are EL students. Teacher anticipates that the Saturday school program will double in size when students are held accountable for passing CAHSEE.

The EL program also conducts test preparation—teaching students how to take a test. One teacher was confident that most of the EL students would be able to pass the CAHSEE.

What is being done for the special education students?

Teachers are being held more accountable. Special education used to be showing movies all day. There are after school and Saturday programs. School has purchased Aiming High which is a CAHSEE study guide.

Are there programs that have been implemented that should have an impact?

Lower grades (elementary, etc) are using the Open Court program. Teachers are hoping that this program will get the students reading so that they are better prepared by the time they make it to high school.

How has the student preparation at the feeder schools changed?

There were indications that the students may not be as prepared in math. Teachers are looking forward to when the first batch of students from a recently adopted elementary school program make it to the high school.

Are students in the Class of 2006 ready to be held accountable to the CAHSEE graduation requirement?

Math teachers – most “yes”
ELA teachers - most “yes”
EL teachers – most “yes”
Special education teachers – most “yes”

School #14

School Size	Large (>700 students)
Hispanic Percentage	Large (>60%)
African American Percentage	Medium (2-10%)
Economically Disadvantaged Percentage	Large (>60%)
EL Percentage	Large (>27%)
SD Percentage	Medium (7-10%)
CAHSEE ELA pass rate – Spring 2005	Low (>50-75%)
CAHSEE Math pass rate – Spring 2005	Low (>50-75%)

The research team interviewed the following types of staff/faculty:

- administrators,
- math teachers,
- ELA teachers,
- EL teachers, and
- special education teachers.

Interview Summary

Have students been given the opportunity to learn? (Coverage of California Academic Content Standards)

There has been a huge change over the last two years. Administrator indicated he would have rated at 1 or 2 on a 1 to 5 scale two years ago, now would rate at about a 4. In ELA, they have implemented a standards-based course provided by district. There is a pacing plan for math. There also are interim assessments for math and ELA. The school created a building-level curriculum. The ELA department is using the California Challenge textbook bought using Title 1 money. Teachers used to prepare students for CAHSEE. Teachers stated that scores jumped.

What actions has the school taken to prepare at-risk students for the CAHSEE?

There are voluntary Saturday sessions and after-school tutoring. Students who are having trouble passing algebra are notified of the Math Skills Lab that focuses on basic skills and is designed around the 7th grade standards. This lab has very low attendance with many students absent. CAHSEE is not enough motivation for them to be there. The school is a year-round school. There are 5-week intercession classes (2 ½ hours) available for students when school is not in session. These classes are for working on CAHSEE.

What is being done to remediate students who did not pass the CAHSEE?

The school notifies the juniors who did not pass the CAHSEE of the availability of voluntary after-school and Saturday programs. Students who are having trouble passing algebra are notified of the Math Skills Lab that focuses on basic skills and is designed around the 7th grade standards. There are 5-week intercession classes (2 ½ hours) available for students when school is not in session (equivalent of summer school). These classes are for working on CAHSEE.

What is being done for the ELL students?

EL classes are using the *High Point* program. Approximately two-thirds of the students in the Saturday program are Hispanic. According to the EL teacher, the Saturday program may not be geared as much as it should toward the EL population. EL teacher has requested a special textbook for them because of their difficulty in reading.

What is being done for the special education students?

Special education teachers indicated that they did not think enough was being done in the middle schools to prepare the students for the CAHSEE. The school is providing additional tutoring, materials, and after school help. One teacher stated that he did not think the school can do any more.

Are there programs that have been implemented that should have an impact?

The focus on standards-based instruction should show some improvement. Voluntary classes—predominantly outside normal school hours—should be effective for those students attending them. It was unclear if any/many during school prep/remedial classes are being offered. AVID program should provide assistance to a small group of dedicated students—not necessarily those at risk or needing remediation.

How has the student preparation at the feeder schools changed?

Administrator believes it is better. Middle school started an AVID program a couple years ago. There will be as many as 60 students from that program coming into the school each year now. Additionally, the middle schools have been raising their performance scores. Math students may not be as prepared as previously. Many are weak in their basic skills.

Are students in the Class of 2006 ready to be held accountable to the CAHSEE graduation requirement?

Administrators – most “yes”
Math teachers – most “yes”
ELA teachers - most “yes”
EL teachers – most “no”
Special education teachers – most “no”

School #15

School Size	Medium (450-700 students)
Hispanic Percentage	Medium (20-60%)
African American Percentage	Large (>10%)
Economically Disadvantaged Percentage	Large (>60%)
EL Percentage	Large (>27%)
SD Percentage	Medium (7-10%)
CAHSEE ELA pass rate – Spring 2005	Low (>50-75%)
CAHSEE Math pass rate – Spring 2005	Very Low (<=50%)

The research team interviewed the following types of staff/faculty:

- administrators,
- math teachers,
- ELA teachers, and
- special education teachers.

Interview Summary

Have students been given the opportunity to learn? (Coverage of California Academic Content Standards)

There has been a large turn-over of teachers in the math department over the last few years. The new teachers are trained in the standards. Textbooks have been adopted that have the standards incorporated in them. The district has developed a pacing plan. Some of the district assessments are pressuring teachers to perform. The math teacher indicated a problem between the pacing guide, the textbook, and the district assessments. Teacher did not feel that the three were aligned. Questions in the textbook were not as challenging as the questions on the district assessment. The teacher felt she had to develop harder questions on her own that would be comparable to the district assessment. The pacing guide required the teacher to skip around in the book.

ELA teachers also indicated that textbooks and workbooks were aligned with the standards. There is a pacing guide for ELA classes. All ELA teachers are working on the same standards and are doing backward planning. Both ELA teachers gave a rating of 5 on a scale of 1 to 5.

What actions has the school taken to prepare at-risk students for the CAHSEE?

The administrator indicated that there is an intercession class and classes during school hours for preparation and remediation. The school also offers Saturday school. Classes are offered in eight-week cycles.

One teacher gave the school a rating of -5 on a 1 to 5 scale for its efforts two years ago. The support has improved up to a 0 now though.

A general education teacher recommended passing out some CAHSEE preparation booklets and having a CAHSEE preparation class for students and would like to see some remediation materials put together for the students who do not pass the CAHSEE.

What is being done to remediate students who did not pass the CAHSEE?

A general education teacher recommended passing out some CAHSEE preparation booklets and having a CAHSEE preparation class for students and would like to see some remediation materials put together for the students who do not pass the CAHSEE.

What is being done for the ELL students?

There is a large EL population at the school. However, neither the administrator nor any of the staff discussed anything that was being done to assist the EL students. One teacher did mention that the school had shelter classes, but did not elaborate.

What is being done for the special education students?

The administrator indicated that there is an intercession class and classes during school hours for preparation and remediation. Some of the sections are set aside for special education students.

Special education teacher said that instruction in the department is based on standards. The department follows what district provides. There are pacing guides for the special education department. Teacher said that they have been teaching to standards for a long time, and that a certain percentage of the special education students will be prepared for the CAHSEE.

Are there programs that have been implemented that should have an impact?

The school has set up programs that should be effective for the students who decide to use them. Because of the students' environment (transient and foster care) many students may not be at the school long enough to benefit from the efforts.

How has the student preparation at the feeder schools changed?

One teacher indicated that there is too large a gap between middle school preparation and high school demands. This teacher complained that the elementary schools and middle schools do not hold the students accountable. The ELA teachers rated the middle schools a 2 and a 3. The math teacher gave a rating of 1.5. The administrator rated the middle schools at 3. However, the administrator stated that charter schools have come into the area and have recruited the top students.

Teachers at one of the feeder middle schools do not feel their students will be prepared for the CAHSEE by the time they get to high school. They feel that their students are too far behind when they leave grade school to ever catch up and be at the level required by CAHSEE. Teachers said that students were already 3 to 4 years behind when they reached the middle school. Most students at the middle school need extensive remedial work which is not being provided.

Teachers at the middle school want CAHSEE preparation material so that they can start preparing students for CAHSEE. They have very little knowledge of CAHSEE or what is covered on the assessment.

Are students in the Class of 2006 ready to be held accountable to the CAHSEE graduation requirement?

Administrators – most “no”
ELA teachers - split
Special education teachers – most “yes”

School #16

School Size	Large (>700 students)
Hispanic Percentage	Large (>60%)
African American Percentage	Medium (2-10%)
Economically Disadvantaged Percentage	Large (>60%)
EL Percentage	Large (>27%)
SD Percentage	Large (>10%)
CAHSEE ELA pass rate – Spring 2005	Low (>50-75%)
CAHSEE Math pass rate – Spring 2005	Low (>50-75%)

The research team interviewed the following types of staff/faculty:

- administrators,
- math teachers,
- ELA teachers,
- EL teachers, and
- special education teachers.

Interview Summary

Have students been given the opportunity to learn? (Coverage of California Academic Content Standards)

The school uses standardized, benchmark assessments for both math and ELA. The curriculum is standards driven. There is an ongoing effort to ensure instruction is aligned with the content standards. Principal believes that the school is well on its way in implementing the content standards giving the school a rating of 4 on a 1 to 5 scale. Two years ago the principal would have given a rating of 2 or 3. Vice principal would give the school rating of 5 compared with a 3 rating two years ago. Two years ago they had blueprints but were still in the process of ensuring that each teacher had a curriculum map based on state standards. The school began aligning instruction to standards three years ago. In ELA, the curriculum map went into effect last year. All students were given the CAHSEE preparation booklet. Some teachers spent up to 20 minutes a day starting in February in a structured review of things that would be on the CAHSEE.

What actions has the school taken to prepare at-risk students for the CAHSEE?

The school has a summer school student skills math intervention class for incoming freshman. The plan is to get 200 students in the class. There are 200 incoming ninth graders scoring below basic or far below basic. The school has identified about 100 freshmen for the math lab. ERWC has about 100 students identified. African American administration and staff are working to raise the motivation level of students and parents. One CAHSEE preparation course is taught by African Americans and led by an African American administrator.

The grant tutoring program is offered to 9th graders who scored below basic and far below basic on the CST. About 200 students participated. Attendance was much improved (incentives were given each week). This tutoring program has a 30-hour course requirement. Students must attend a minimum of 24 hours to receive credit.

Math lab is an elective class that is targeted to low scoring (far below basic) math students. Scholastic *Read 180* is not a CAHSEE prep class, but the teacher incorporates CAHSEE blueprints in the curriculum.

Students are given sessions on test-taking strategies and have after-school and Saturday programs especially for CAHSEE. They have been given lessons in regular classes geared toward the CAHSEE.

What is being done to remediate students who did not pass the CAHSEE?

Math and English Essentials class is required for seniors who have not passed the CAHSEE. Last year 70 percent of the students in this class eventually passed CAHSEE. A large percentage of those students are Hispanic with some African American, special education, and EL.

What is being done for the ELL students?

EL students have the EL programs in the school and are encouraged to participate in the various CAHSEE preparation programs and the grant tutoring program. There was only one EL teacher teaching the grant-funded tutoring program. Teachers commented that it has definitely improved performance. The CAHSEE provides students with more motivation to boost their performance and make the additional effort. The low EL students will not be ready/prepared to pass the CAHSEE. The language skills will not permit them to perform up to the required standards. However, the exam does motivate the students to try harder to get to the point they can pass.

What is being done for the special education students?

Special education teacher rated the implementation at a 5 on a 1 to 5 scale. Students are better prepared because of early intervention in elementary and middle school. Almost all schools have *Language!* and *Read 180* programs. These were implemented in the district almost four years ago. The various CAHSEE prep and grant-funded tutoring program also are available for special education students. Program has had a very positive impact on attitude and performance for the special education students who have attended.

Are there programs that have been implemented that should have an impact?

Staff has noted a change in culture. Students now know that it is important to pass. Teachers believe that students who go through the grant-funded tutoring program will be able to catch up enough to pass the CAHSEE. The school's math coach has made a difference. Administration is looking at coaches in other subjects as well.

How has the student preparation at the feeder schools changed?

Principal feels that the feeder schools are providing somewhat better prepared students but that there is not a quantifiable difference. Principal indicates that the middle schools have implemented *Open Court*. Vice principal believes the middle school students are better prepared in both English and math.

A teacher said that the middle school students are poorly prepared. However, the teacher said that they are being properly prepared with their middle school experience, but have not mastered the concepts from elementary school—they have not mastered the basic concepts.

Are students in the Class of 2006 ready to be held accountable to the CAHSEE graduation requirement?

Administrators – most “yes”
Math teachers – most “yes”
ELA teachers - most “yes”
EL teachers – split
Special education teachers – split

School #17

School Size	Large (>700 students)
Hispanic Percentage	Large (>60%)
African American Percentage	Medium (2-10%)
Economically Disadvantaged Percentage	Large (>60%)
EL Percentage	Large (>27%)
SD Percentage	Medium (7-10%)
CAHSEE ELA pass rate – Spring 2005	Low (>50-75%)
CAHSEE Math pass rate – Spring 2005	Low (>50-75%)

The research team interviewed the following types of staff/faculty:

- math teachers,
- ELA teachers,
- EL teachers, and
- special education teachers.

Interview Summary

Have students been given the opportunity to learn? (Coverage of California Academic Content Standards)

Everything is aligned to the standards in the math and ELA programs. All math tests are the same district wide. There are district-level math course exit exams that have been aligned to the standards. Students must have an A or B on a test to "pass" the test. There are focus lessons (a short 10 to 20-minute mini-lesson focused on a standard conducted at the beginning of class each day) in ELA.

What actions has the school taken to prepare at-risk students for the CAHSEE?

In math, Students at risk retake the courses as needed. There is a semester long CAHSEE preparation/remediation math class that can be taken only twice for credit, but more frequently if needed to pass the CAHSEE. The course was developed by the district and released to the school to implement. The course is now in its third year. The texts used are the *CA Math Review* and *Meeting the California Challenge*. The demand has fluctuated and has increased recently. About half of the students in the class are EL and 10 percent are special education. The course is individually designed for each student.

There are no structured tutoring or Saturday classes for math or ELA.

Freshman classes have about 20 students.

What is being done to remediate students who did not pass the CAHSEE?

There are required CAHSEE classes for students who did not pass the CAHSEE.

What is being done for the ELL students?

The "newcomers" tend to be at a higher level than the students coming from the feeder middle schools. There is after-school tutoring available for EL students.

What is being done for the special education students?

Each special education student gets a CAHSEE preparation booklet. CAHSEE preparation classes and tutoring are available. Very few special education students have passed the CAHSEE math.

Are there programs that have been implemented that should have an impact?

Other than the CAHSEE requirements course, few programs have been developed and implemented.

How has the student preparation at the feeder schools changed?

Math level seems lower each year and their basic math skills are not fully developed. ELA teachers give a rating of 2 or 3 on a scale of 1 to 5.

Are students in the Class of 2006 ready to be held accountable to the CAHSEE graduation requirement?

Math teachers – most “yes”
ELA teachers - most “yes”
EL teachers – most “yes”
Special education teachers – split

School #18

School Size	Medium (450-700 students)
Hispanic Percentage	Medium (20-60%)
African American Percentage	Medium (2-10%)
Economically Disadvantaged Percentage	Small (<20%)
EL Percentage	Medium (6-27%)
SD Percentage	Medium (7-10%)
CAHSEE ELA pass rate – Spring 2005	Low (>50-75%)
CAHSEE Math pass rate – Spring 2005	Low (>50-75%)

The research team interviewed the following types of staff/faculty:

- administrators,
- math teachers,
- ELA teachers,
- EL teachers, and
- special education teachers.

Interview Summary

Have students been given the opportunity to learn?

Math teachers say they teach the standards. They did a review of the standards and found a few things that were not being covered. Teachers have made adjustments in the courses. Math teacher stated that the students are very prepared and that they have a good, well-rounded knowledge base. However, there will be some that will not be able to pass, but that has always been the case.

Department meetings emphasize standards and review implementation. ELA teacher indicated that the California Academic Content Standards have been fully implemented into the instruction. Two years ago, they were in transition. The district has provided an on-line program that is aligned with the standards. However, the teacher indicated that the degree of alignment in the classroom may vary based on the material individual teachers decide to use. Funding will impact obtaining newer material.

ELA teacher indicated that the Reading portion of CAHSEE is more than fair and that a regular person should be able to pass by the time they graduate.

What actions has the school taken to prepare at-risk students for the CAHSEE?

One teacher stated that those having the most problems with CAHSEE are found in low SES and certain ethnic groups.

A teacher stated that the school had after-school tutoring, but it was dropped because of funding. Individual teachers now do tutoring. A math teacher stated that the school does a good job of offering peer tutoring and that teachers offer tutoring before and after school and during lunch. A teacher indicated a need for a reading program because there are students reading at the 6th or 7th grade level.

Principal talked about reduced class size and the creation of the Math 1, 2, and 3 courses that have helped students. Principal also said that the English department has a summer reading program. There is some test preparation that goes on through the year. Students who did not pass the math components of the CAHSEE and have struggled with algebra and geometry are enrolled in high school math and a student can be enrolled in that class as a junior. In English, there is reading recovery and English 1, 2, 3, and 4.

What is being done to remediate students who did not pass the CAHSEE?

Teachers do not hear about the CAHSEE until just before it is given; this generally deals with logistics rather than academic issues.

There are math classes for students who have not passed the CAHSEE. Math seems to be the harder test for the students. The number of students in the class has increased. There is a six-week summer course for students who have failed the CAHSEE. The class is two hours for math and two hours for English.

There is some emphasis discussed by ELA teachers about helping students who are not meeting goals. However, other than the summer course, there does not appear to be any focused course on getting the students to pass the CAHSEE.

Because of funding cuts, after-school tutoring has been discontinued.

What is being done for the ELL students?

There are support classes for EL in reading, writing, and speaking. Students are placed in these classes based on a language assessment test given by the EL coordinator. It is mandatory for students at level 2-5 to take reading comprehension and writing comprehension as an ELL elective. ELL teacher goes over the CAHSEE requirements with ELL and sophomore students. EL teacher uses the CAHSEE test prep books, makes assignments that fit, analyzes student weaknesses, and reviews. Also, the EL teacher gives sample tests.

ELL students are not functioning anywhere near grade level. The students come in with limited background in their native language. They do not know how to read or write. They have little home support because their parents also have limited educational background. It is very difficult for ELL students who are low 1, 2, or 3 to pass the CAHSEE. EL teacher thought there was one student who had a chance of passing the CAHSEE in the class. However, that student did not show up to take the test.

Math teacher indicated that nothing is being done differently for the ELL or special education students.

What is being done for the special education students?

Math teacher indicated that nothing is being done differently for the ELL or special education students.

Are there programs that should have an impact?

None

How has the student preparation at the feeder schools changed?

Reading is improving. The high school had a reading recovery program that is being phased out because there are not enough students needing it anymore. ELA teacher thinks some students are arriving at the school with a 6th or 7th grade reading level. Teacher indicates that nothing is in place to assist those students at the school.

Are students in the Class of 2006 ready to be held accountable to the CAHSEE graduation requirement?

Administrators – most “yes”
Math teachers – most “yes”
ELA teachers - most “yes”
EL teachers – most “no”
Special education teachers – most “yes”

School #19

School Size	Small (<450 students)
Hispanic Percentage	Small (<20%)
African American Percentage	Large (>10%)
Economically Disadvantaged Percentage	Medium (20-60%)
EL Percentage	Medium (6-27%)
SD Percentage	Small (<7%)
CAHSEE ELA pass rate – Spring 2005	High (>90%)
CAHSEE Math pass rate – Spring 2005	Moderate (>75-90%)

The research team interviewed the following types of staff/faculty:

- administrators,
- math teachers,
- ELA teachers, and
- special education teachers.

Interview Summary

Have students been given the opportunity to learn? (Coverage of California Academic Content Standards)

The school expects all students to graduate and go into four-year colleges/universities. District mandated that the school look at standards. The three administrators rated the school between 3 and 4 or 4 on the 1 to 5 scale. Teachers have common lessons. Students are tracked by ability. Some sixth graders are taking algebra. Only the lower-level students are taking (and passing) algebra in the 8th grade. Most students are already on to higher levels of math.

What actions has the school taken to prepare at-risk students for the CAHSEE?

There are interventions in 6th, 7th and 8th grades so that students are prepared by ninth grade. There are no high school CAHSEE preparation classes.

What is being done to remediate students who did not pass the CAHSEE?

Not required. Almost every student passes the CAHSEE the first time it is administered.

What is being done for the ELL students?

The EL population is very small. These students are in regular classes and are provided the instruction in those classes to be successful.

What is being done for the special education students?

The special education population is very small. These students are in regular classes and are provided the instruction in those classes to be successful.

Are there programs that have been implemented that should have an impact?

No programs required. The normal curriculum is geared to prepare students for a four-year college/university.

How has the student preparation at the feeder schools changed?

The consensus was that students may be less well prepared when they arrive at the school in the 6th grade because of some of the elementary school programs. However, all students are prepared to take and pass the CAHSEE by 9th grade.

Are students in the Class of 2006 ready to be held accountable to the CAHSEE graduation requirement?

Administrators – most "yes"
Math teachers – most "yes"
ELA teachers - most "yes"
Special education teachers – most "yes"

School #20

School Size	Medium (450-700 students)
Hispanic Percentage	Large (>60%)
African American Percentage	Large (>10%)
Economically Disadvantaged Percentage	Large (>60%)
EL Percentage	Large (>27%)
SD Percentage	Small (<7%)
CAHSEE ELA pass rate – Spring 2005	Low (>50-75%)
CAHSEE Math pass rate – Spring 2005	Low (>50-75%)

The research team interviewed the following types of staff/faculty:

- administrators,
- math teachers,
- ELA teachers, and
- EL teachers.

Interview Summary

Have students been given the opportunity to learn? (Coverage of California Academic Content Standards)

All teachers stated that their instruction was aligned to the content standards. All teachers gave a rating of at least 4 on a 1 to 5 scale.

What actions has the school taken to prepare at-risk students for the CAHSEE?

At-risk ELA sophomore students are placed in CAHSEE preparation course from mid-January until the CAHSEE is given in March. Students are put into the class based on their proficiency levels. Students with proficiency levels of 3, 4, and 5 are assigned to the class. The class meets during the regular block schedule five days per week. Over two-thirds of the students were EL and only a small number were special education students.

Math teachers did not discuss any prep or remediation class for this year. One teacher said he provided one-on-one assistance (including review materials and assignments) to students asking for assistance. One math teachers did mention CAHSEE review sessions conducted on two Saturdays immediately prior to the test with students receiving rewards for attending both days and classes getting rewards for 90 percent attendance. An ELA teacher stated that there were preparation classes in both math and ELA.

What is being done to remediate students who did not pass the CAHSEE?

According to a math teacher, last year the school offered a CAHSEE remediation class. According to the teacher, the class was not offered this year because of budget cuts.

Math teachers did not discuss any prep or remediation class for this year. One teacher said he provided one-on-one assistance (including review materials and assignments) to students asking for assistance. One math teachers did mention CAHSEE review sessions conducted on two Saturdays immediately prior to the test with

students receiving rewards for attending both days and classes getting rewards for 90 percent attendance.

What is being done for the ELL students?

Math has tutoring. CAHSEE preparation booklets for English and Math are available in the students' native language (Spanish). These are often used. EL classes are aligned with the standards. CAHSEE prep classes, tutoring and Saturday classes for test prep are available.

What is being done for the special education students?

No special education teachers were interviewed. CAHSEE preparation classes are open to special education students. Teachers did not discuss anything special that was being provided beyond what was being done for all other students.

Are there programs that have been implemented that should have an impact?

The CAHSEE preparation class may have an impact. Teachers discussed the need for more and longer term (e.g. full-year or semester) remedial and preparation efforts.

How has the student preparation at the feeder schools changed?

Math teachers indicated that students were either slightly better prepared or the same. ELA teachers indicated slightly less well prepared. EL teachers indicated some improvement.

Are students in the Class of 2006 ready to be held accountable to the CAHSEE graduation requirement?

Math teachers – most "yes"
ELA teachers - most "yes"
EL teachers – split

School #21

School Size	Large (>700 students)
Hispanic Percentage	Small (<20%)
African American Percentage	Medium (2-10%)
Economically Disadvantaged Percentage	Small (<20%)
EL Percentage	Small (<6%)
SD Percentage	Small (<7%)
CAHSEE ELA pass rate – Spring 2005	High (>90%)
CAHSEE Math pass rate – Spring 2005	High (>90%)

The research team interviewed the following types of staff/faculty:

- administrators,
- math teachers,
- ELA teachers, and
- EL teachers.

Interview Summary

Have students been given the opportunity to learn? (Coverage of California Academic Content Standards)

Teachers and administrators rate the implementation of standards-based content as either a 4 or 5 on a 1 to 5 scale.

What actions has the school taken to prepare at-risk students for the CAHSEE?

The at-risk population is EL and Hispanic students. They have tried different remediation and interventions. Lower-level course are highly focused on the standards. Some students may need more intensive individual assistance. A lot has been done with reading. Incoming 9th grade students are screened. Students with reading problems are put into a Reading 180 class, for which there are a limited number of seats. There is a tutoring program for at-risk freshmen and another tutoring program for Grades 10-12 conducted by teachers and students.

What is being done to remediate students who did not pass the CAHSEE?

There are remediation classes for students, but not necessarily focused on CAHSEE.

What is being done for the ELL students?

About half are Spanish-speaking students and the other half is a mixture of several other languages. Most EL students are Level 4 and above. However, about half of the EL population is newly arrived. There are some students who are more transient. There are special remedial classes for students who do not pass the CAHSEE.

What is being done for the special education students?

No special education teachers were interviewed.

Are there programs that have been implemented that should have an impact?

The staff thinks that the programs they have in place are doing everything they can for their students.

How has the student preparation at the feeder schools changed?

This is a unified school district with good articulation with the middle schools. Students come in well prepared. Staff indicates that they have been focused on standards for about 6 or 7 years.

Are students in the Class of 2006 ready to be held accountable to the CAHSEE graduation requirement?

Math teachers – most “yes”
ELA teachers - most “yes”
EL teachers – most “yes”

School #22

School Size	Medium (450-700 students)
Hispanic Percentage	Medium (20-60%)
African American Percentage	Small (<2%)
Economically Disadvantaged Percentage	Medium (20-60%)
EL Percentage	Medium (6-27%)
SD Percentage	Medium (7-10%)
CAHSEE ELA pass rate – Spring 2005	Moderate (>75-90%)
CAHSEE Math pass rate – Spring 2005	Moderate (>75-90%)

The research team interviewed the following types of staff/faculty:

- administrators,
- math teachers,
- ELA teachers,
- EL teachers, and
- special education teachers.

Interview Summary

Have students been given the opportunity to learn? (Coverage of California Academic Content Standards)

District and school are very driven to teach standards. Administrator gave the school a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5 on implementing instruction based on the content standards. Benchmarking exam aligned to the standards help keep the focus on the standards. Each class has performance expectations which involve three assessments. Students have to pass the assessments to pass the class.

What actions has the school taken to prepare at-risk students for the CAHSEE?

CAHSEE preparation courses are really the EL classes, A/B/C/D Algebra classes, and Experiences in Literature English classes. Counselors receive a list of students who have not passed the exit exam and teacher recommendations are also used. Placement in these classes is mandatory when selected. For 10th grade students there is also a fundamentals class for the at-risk population. Special education students also may be in these classes. Students receive credit for these classes. Students are being identified more quickly who are at risk of not passing the test. There are summer remediation classes for the CAHSEE.

Middle school also has started intervention classes for students who are not meeting the standards. Middle school is much more aware of standards and has focused on teaching to the standards and linking the instruction on standards with the students to what will be needed to pass the CAHSEE.

What is being done to remediate students who did not pass the CAHSEE?

About half of the 11th grade students have passed the CAHSEE. Most of truly at-risk students have already self-selected out. One teacher commented that there are some juniors who should have chosen the vocational education path.

During school CAHSEE preparation courses are really the EL classes, A/B/C/D Algebra classes, and Experiences in Literature English classes. Counselors receive a list of students who have not passed the exit exam and teacher recommendations are also used. Placement in these classes is mandatory when selected. After school tutoring also is available

What is being done for the ELL students?

All EL classes are aligned with the standards. Special assistance, mentoring, and tutoring is offered. There are additional classes and tutoring services provided for those students who do not pass the CAHSEE. The EL teacher indicates that there is good articulation between the high school and the middle schools.

What is being done for the special education students?

All diploma-seeking special education students are mainstreamed. Students and parents make the decision to pursue a diploma or not.

According to a special education teacher, the system has changed the placement of students based solely on the CAHSEE. According to this teacher, students who can not pass or will not pass are placed in the vocational tech track.

Are there programs that have been implemented that should have an impact?

Programs including preparation and remediation courses have been focused on the needs of the students.

How has the student preparation at the feeder schools changed?

Generally, teachers and administrators felt that the student preparation at the feeder schools has improved.

Are students in the Class of 2006 ready to be held accountable to the CAHSEE graduation requirement?

Administrators – most “yes”
Math teachers – most “yes”
ELA teachers - most “yes”
EL teachers – most “yes”
Special education teachers – most “yes”

School #23

School Size	Small (450 students)
Hispanic Percentage	Medium (20-60%)
African American Percentage	Large (>10%)
Economically Disadvantaged Percentage	Medium (20-60%)
EL Percentage	Small (<6%)
SD Percentage	Small (<7%)
CAHSEE ELA pass rate – Spring 2005	High (>90%)
CAHSEE Math pass rate – Spring 2005	High (>90%)

The research team interviewed the following types of staff/faculty:

- administrators,
- math teachers, and
- ELA teachers.

Interview Summary

Have students been given the opportunity to learn? (Coverage of California Academic Content Standards)

All students have been given the opportunity to learn. Instruction covers all content standards. Higher-level courses go beyond those standards.

What actions has the school taken to prepare at-risk students for the CAHSEE?

In the math department, all students who are thought to be at risk are directed to a website to use to prepare them. Students keep a log of problems and are given specific one-on-one assistance. The program was not voluntary.

Both ELA teachers thought that all their students were at-risk for the reading portion of the CAHSEE. Teachers indicated that the students come to the school without a lot of the basic skills for academic success. However, the teachers remained focused on the curriculum and provide assistance to students needing help in the regular coursework. Tests are reviewed/debriefed so that students can understand weak areas. Teacher indicated that about 90-95 percent of the students are doing all their homework for the regular curriculum.

Regular classes are generally fairly small which allows teacher to tailor to individual student needs. Every student at the school must participate in the AVID program. This program provides study skills, note taking, counseling, and career planning.

There are about two class periods dedicated to CAHSEE review prior to the test.

What is being done to remediate students who did not pass the CAHSEE?

There are no special remediation classes at the school.

What is being done for the ELL students?

EL students are level 4 and above.

What is being done for the special education students?

Math teacher stated that there were no special education students at the school.

Are there programs that have been implemented that should have an impact?

The entire school concept should have an impact.

How has the student preparation at the feeder schools changed?

Teachers were mixed on the preparation. There is some indication that there were more EL issues in the more recent classes.

Are students in the Class of 2006 ready to be held accountable to the CAHSEE graduation requirement?

Administrators – most “yes”
Math teachers – most “yes”
ELA teachers - most “yes”

School #24

School Size	Medium (450-700 students)
Hispanic Percentage	Medium (20-60%)
African American Percentage	Medium (2-10%)
Economically Disadvantaged Percentage	Medium (20-60%)
EL Percentage	Medium (6-27%)
SD Percentage	Large (>10%)
CAHSEE ELA pass rate – Spring 2005	Low (>50-75%)
CAHSEE Math pass rate – Spring 2005	Low (>50-75%)

The research team interviewed the following types of staff/faculty:

- administrators,
- math teachers,
- ELA teachers,
- EL teachers, and
- special education teachers.

Interview Summary

Have students been given the opportunity to learn? (Coverage of California Academic Content Standards)

General education teachers rated implementation of instruction based on standards between 4 and 5 on a 1 to 5 scale. Special education teachers were more varied in their ratings with ratings varying between 3 and 5. EL teachers rated their implementation at a 5 with a comment that "we do everything based on the benchmarks/standards we are given."

What actions has the school taken to prepare at-risk students for the CAHSEE?

Math students are grouped by ability. School uses a placement test, as well as grades and teacher recommendations for grouping. Teachers go back and teach previous math standards as required.

There will be an extra class offered next year to at-risk freshmen before they take the CAHSEE for the first time. This extra class will be in addition to their normal math class. About 50 percent of the current 9th grade population is below average and needs to be remediated to 7th grade standards.

Special class called "Language!" for at-risk students below the 39th percentile on STAR. The program is K-12. The school offers five sections of the class. Currently, this is a semester-long "required" elective course. Class is conducted during the school day. About 25 percent of these students are EL students.

What is being done to remediate students who did not pass the CAHSEE?

There was no special remediation class this year. There were a few juniors who did not pass. However, about 40 percent of the 9th and 10th grade class is at-risk based on grades. The remediation class offered a couple years ago was discontinued when

CAHSEE implementation was delayed. The plan is to start a special remediation class for 11th grades next year.

What is being done for the ELL students?

EL students have an after school program twice a week. Tutor from local college is available during all lunches.

The school has a large AVID program. Almost all of these students will go onto college.

What is being done for the special education students?

Special education students are coming in better prepared. More focus on standards and preparing students for the CAHSEE at lower levels. The earlier teachers are no longer showing movies all day.

RSP teacher stated that over 60 percent of RSP students are passing the CAHSEE. Extra assistance is being provided by the special education department for these students. However, despite what the department does, there will always be some students who will not pass.

The school has a special education CAHSEE preparation course for math and ELA. Course is a full-semester for credit elective course. Texts used are the CAHSEE preparation booklets.

Are there programs that have been implemented that should have an impact?

Addition of CAHSEE prep and remedial courses next year should have an impact. Double blocking in math should provide extra instruction and cover weak areas.

How has the student preparation at the feeder schools changed?

Math teachers do not think that students are as prepared as before. Because of a curriculum change math teachers think many 7th grade standards were not adequately covered. High school teachers are having to teach these standards before moving on.

Are students in the Class of 2006 ready to be held accountable to the CAHSEE graduation requirement?

Administrators – most “yes”
Math teachers – most “yes”
ELA teachers - split
EL teachers – split
Special education teachers – most “no”

School #25

School Size	Small (<450 students)
Hispanic Percentage	Large (>60%)
African American Percentage	Small (<2%)
Economically Disadvantaged Percentage	Large (>60%)
EL Percentage	Large (>27%)
SD Percentage	Medium (7-10%)
CAHSEE ELA pass rate – Spring 2005	Low (>50-75%)
CAHSEE Math pass rate – Spring 2005	Very Low (<=50%)

The research team interviewed the following types of staff/faculty:

- math teachers, and
- ELA teachers.

Interview Summary

Have students been given the opportunity to learn? (Coverage of California Academic Content Standards)

Math and ELA teachers are teaching content standards. All math and ELA teachers rate the implementation of instruction of content standards at 4 or above on a 1 to 5 scale. Pacing guide and standardized assessments have been implemented for both math and ELA. Instruction is at two levels—grade level and remediation as required. Math teachers said that because of the success in focusing on standards and having high expectations there are more students taking higher level math classes.

What actions has the school taken to prepare at-risk students for the CAHSEE?

There is mandatory tutoring for all students who are getting Ds or Feeder School in math classes.

There are special reading classes at the freshmen level and a special summer class for students who will be 9th graders. Sophomores have prep skills in their regular classes

What is being done to remediate students who did not pass the CAHSEE?

Math and ELA departments have had a CAHSEE prep class (actually for students who did not pass the CAHSEE) for two years. Students who did not pass the CAHSEE are required to take the CAHSEE prep class.

What is being done for the ELL students?

EL students are placed with a teacher who is bilingual, but the standards are the same.

What is being done for the special education students?

RSP students are being given special attention in math classes, as are all students who are having problems. Special education students also have a study skills class.

Are there programs that have been implemented that should have an impact?

The various assistance programs have and should continue to have an impact. The school has a very high pass rate for the CAHSEE.

How has the student preparation at the feeder schools changed?

ELA teachers are split. Math teachers believe that the students are coming in better prepared.

Are students in the Class of 2006 ready to be held accountable to the CAHSEE graduation requirement?

Math teachers – most “yes”
ELA teachers - most “yes”

School #26

School Size	Large (>700 students)
Hispanic Percentage	Medium (20-60%)
African American Percentage	Small (<2%)
Economically Disadvantaged Percentage	Medium (20-60%)
EL Percentage	Large (>27%)
SD Percentage	Medium (7-10%)
CAHSEE ELA pass rate – Spring 2005	Moderate (>75-90%)
CAHSEE Math pass rate – Spring 2005	Moderate (>75-90%)

The research team interviewed the following types of staff/faculty:

- administrators,
- math teachers,
- ELA teachers,
- EL teachers, and
- special education teachers.

Interview Summary

Have students been given the opportunity to learn? (Coverage of California Academic Content Standards)

Most administrators and teachers rate implementation of instruction on the content standards at 5 on a 1 to 5 scale. Those who did not rate a 5, rated the implementation at a 4.

Math teachers rate at a 4 or a 5 on the 1 to 5 implementation scale. ELA teacher rated implementation as a 4.

What actions has the school taken to prepare at-risk students for the CAHSEE?

"Bridge" program for incoming students from the 8th graders to get them up to speed with the content standards.

CAHSEE math and ELA academy preparation/intervention classes.

What is being done to remediate students who did not pass the CAHSEE?

Mandatory after school program where students have to put in a minimum of 60 hours. Students get an elective credit if they complete the hours. About one-third of the students are EL and two-thirds are special education.

Closely monitoring the pass rate for these students.

What is being done for the ELL students?

The school offers a Literature for Success program and after school tutoring with language support

What is being done for the special education students?

The school offers special classes and tutoring.

Are there programs that have been implemented that should have an impact?

Special classes and tutoring.

How has the student preparation at the feeder schools changed?

Most administrators feel that middle schools have improved. It was pointed out that almost a quarter of the incoming students are not well prepared.

Math teachers indicated that the students are improving and are receiving standards-based instruction. ELA teacher thinks that the middle school teachers are more focused on the standards than teachers at the high school. Student preparation has improved.

Are students in the Class of 2006 ready to be held accountable to the CAHSEE graduation requirement?

Administrators – most “yes”
Math teachers – most “yes”
ELA teachers - most “yes”
EL teachers – most “yes”
Special education teachers – most “yes”

School #27

School Size	Large (>700 students)
Hispanic Percentage	Medium (20-60%)
African American Percentage	Medium (2-10%)
Economically Disadvantaged Percentage	Small (<20%)
EL Percentage	Small (<6%)
SD Percentage	Small (<7%)
CAHSEE ELA pass rate – Spring 2005	Moderate (>75-90%)
CAHSEE Math pass rate – Spring 2005	Moderate (>75-90%)

The research team interviewed the following types of staff/faculty:

- administrators,
- math teachers,
- ELA teachers,
- EL teachers, and
- special education teachers.

Interview Summary

Have students been given the opportunity to learn? (Coverage of California Academic Content Standards)

All math courses are standards based. Math teacher gives a rating of 5 on a 1 to 5 scale on implementation of instruction based on content standards. District has developed a curriculum pacing guide. Math teachers are providing every 10th grader with the state study guide.

ELA teachers give a rating between 3 and 5 on a 1 to 5 scale on implementation of instruction based on content standards. ELA teachers provide and go over the CAHSEE study booklets and provide skills for taking the test. One teacher stated that the ELA teachers are changing from literature-based instruction toward the California Academic Content Standards. Department has created a document to show what standards to teach when reading a piece of literature rather than specifying a particular work and trying to fit standards to it.

What actions has the school taken to prepare at-risk students for the CAHSEE?

Math teacher believes that almost 50 percent of 9th graders are at risk. Math department offers an after school program for any student at risk. Program is offered by unpaid teachers.

ELA teachers indicated that after-school tutoring was available.

What is being done to remediate students who did not pass the CAHSEE?

After or before school CAHSEE remediation tutoring has been available. The course started with a handful of students. Most students who need it get bussed home, so they cannot stay after school. Evening course earlier this year worked better because a parallel English course was offered for parents. All students were EL—almost all Hispanic—and all were low SES.

The school has a learning lab that is open half an hour before school and an hour after school.

What is being done for the ELL students?

ELA teachers stated that EL and special education students are clustered with teachers who can handle them. One general education teacher stated that EL teaching strategies work so well that they are used with the general population as well.

Special tutoring for EL learners and separate sessions for anybody, but it is done with special education in mind.

A teacher commented that the ELL program at the school has set up the EL students for failure, was not well organized, and initially lacked needed books.

What is being done for the special education students?

Special tutoring for EL learners and separate sessions for anybody, but it is done with special education in mind. Math classes have been using the guide book as a homework study guide. Teachers assign at least five problems per day prior to the CAHSEE.

Are there programs that have been implemented that should have an impact?

Currently, the school only offers voluntary after or before school tutoring.

How has the student preparation at the feeder schools changed?

Math believes that feeder districts are pushing hard and that students are fairly well prepared. Few students at the school do not pass.

ELA teacher feel that the general population are well prepared. There has been an improvement over the last two years. Middle school teachers have been trained in the writing process and it shows on the student performance.

Are students in the Class of 2006 ready to be held accountable to the CAHSEE graduation requirement?

Administrators – most “yes”
Math teachers – most “yes”
ELA teachers - most “yes”
EL teachers – most “no”
Special education teachers – most “no”

School #28

School Size	Small (<450 students)
Hispanic Percentage	Large (>60%)
African American Percentage	Large (>10%)
Economically Disadvantaged Percentage	Large (>60%)
EL Percentage	Medium (6-27%)
SD Percentage	Large (>10%)
CAHSEE ELA pass rate – Spring 2005	Very Low (<=50%)
CAHSEE Math pass rate – Spring 2005	Very Low (<=50%)

The research team interviewed the following types of staff/faculty:

- administrators,
- math teachers,
- ELA teachers,
- EL teachers, and
- special education teachers.

Interview Summary

Have students been given the opportunity to learn? (Coverage of California Academic Content Standards)

The school is geared toward getting its extremely transient students the credits they need to complete high school and pass the CAHSEE. Students have two hours of math, English, and reading class.

What actions has the school taken to prepare at-risk students for the CAHSEE?

All students at this school are at risk. Less than 20 students will have passed the CAHSEE this year (less than 20% from the Class of 2006). Math teacher indicates that there is not much hope of anyone else passing. Students are grouped by their abilities and needs. There are linguistic classes, math support classes, and reading programs. Teachers use a study guide for the CAHSEE "Measuring Up" to help instruction. School offers after-school FREE tutoring. Tutor is CLAD certified and there is program for special education.

What is being done to remediate students who did not pass the CAHSEE?

A variety of remedial classes are available, as well as tutoring and voluntary after-school and Saturday tutoring or CAHSEE preparation classes. The overall impression from the interviews is that the staff could not do much more for these students. Some students are responding, but others are too far behind and are not motivated to try.

What is being done for the ELL students?

School offers some ELL programs. The school started using the text "Measuring Up" which is specific to the content standards this year. Bilingual para-educators work with students and make home visits; however, services for students needing full Spanish support are more limited. There are only 2 or 3 students receiving any instruction in their native language. The school offers free after-school tutoring.

What is being done for the special education students?

Special education teachers are meeting with teachers discussing individual students, their IEPs, and methods to help them. Teachers plan lessons with Special Education teacher assistance.

Are there programs that have been implemented that should have an impact?

Teachers indicate that students who are working will be successful. The ones who have not clicked to accountability are not there yet. Once they see more are realizing it, more are going to be more serious.

How has the student preparation at the feeder schools changed?

A feeder middle school also was visited. The high school staff indicates that the students coming from district schools appear to be more focused on standards and prepared now for the CAHSEE than the students coming from other district schools in the past. However, about 90 percent of the students coming to the school are at risk of not passing the CAHSEE. The middle school principal indicates that they have improved considerably over the last couple years in getting students ready for the CAHSEE. However, he still rates the school at 3 on a scale of 1 to 5.

Are students in the Class of 2006 ready to be held accountable to the CAHSEE graduation requirement?

Administrators – most “yes”
Math teachers – most “yes”
ELA teachers - most “yes”
EL teachers – most “yes”
Special education teachers – most “yes”

School #29

School Size	Small (<450 students)
Hispanic Percentage	Small (<20%)
African American Percentage	Large (>10%)
Economically Disadvantaged Percentage	Large (>60%)
EL Percentage	Medium (6-27%)
SD Percentage	Medium (7-10%)
CAHSEE ELA pass rate – Spring 2005	Very Low (<=50%)
CAHSEE Math pass rate – Spring 2005	Very Low (<=50%)

The research team interviewed the following types of staff/faculty:

- administrators,
- math teachers,
- ELA teachers, and
- special education teachers.

Interview Summary

Have students been given the opportunity to learn? (Coverage of California Academic Content Standards)

The standards are posted, texts are aligned and regular in-services addressing the standards are in place. This school seems to still be in the process of implementing the standards fully.

What actions has the school taken to prepare at-risk students for the CAHSEE?

An elective CAHSEE math course is offered (English has been offered in the past but the focus this year is on math). After-school and weekend tutoring are offered. Students use the CAHSEE prep book.

What is being done to remediate students who did not pass the CAHSEE?

A CAHSEE remediation course is offered. Saturday classes are also available.

What is being done for the ELL students?

CLAD certification is required. No ELL teacher was interviewed at this school.

What is being done for the special education students?

The SRA program is used. There is collaboration among special education and general education teachers. Concern expressed over this department needing more support (e.g., a reading specialist).

Are there programs that have been implemented that should have an impact?

Could need more to address ELL and special education populations here. Feel that they are doing a lot to help their students.

How has the student preparation at the feeder schools changed?

Not much feedback here. No clear indication of how prepared students are.

Are students in the Class of 2006 ready to be held accountable to the CAHSEE graduation requirement?

Administrators – most “yes”
Math teachers – most “yes”
ELA teachers - most “yes”
Special education teachers – most “no”

School #30

School Size	Large (>700 students)
Hispanic Percentage	Large (>60%)
African American Percentage	Medium (2-10%)
Economically Disadvantaged Percentage	Medium (20-60%)
EL Percentage	Medium (6-27%)
SD Percentage	Medium (7-10%)
CAHSEE ELA pass rate – Spring 2005	Low (>50-75%)
CAHSEE Math pass rate – Spring 2005	Low (>50-75%)

The research team interviewed the following types of staff/faculty:

- administrators,
- math teachers,
- ELA teachers,
- EL teachers, and
- special education teachers.

Interview Summary

Have students been given the opportunity to learn? (Coverage of California Academic Content Standards)

A focused effort on standards implementation began about 3 years ago. There is a high level of teacher collaboration and administrative monitoring. Each class starts out with "Focus Lessons," which are linked to the standards.

What actions has the school taken to prepare at-risk students for the CAHSEE?

English Literacy and Algebra/Geometry Fundamentals courses are offered. A summer academy in math is offered for incoming students. Before- and after-school tutorials are available, as is a Saturday tutorial prior to testing.

What is being done to remediate students who did not pass the CAHSEE?

Remediation is provided in both English and Algebra.

What is being done for the ELL students?

"Newcomers school" prepares students before they actually arrive on campus. Otherwise, more needs to be developed to assist this population.

What is being done for the special education students?

Double blocks in reading and math are offered. Otherwise, more needs to be developed to assist this population.

Are there programs that have been implemented that should have an impact?

Concerns were expressed over lack of services targeting special education and ELL. Existing programs were praised for their level of success.

How has the student preparation at the feeder schools changed?

Though not everyone was in total agreement, the general attitude is that students are better prepared, though there exists some concern about attitudes.

Are students in the Class of 2006 ready to be held accountable to the CAHSEE graduation requirement?

Administrators – most “yes”
Math teachers – most “yes”
ELA teachers - most “yes”
EL teachers – most “yes”
Special education teachers – most “no”

School #31

School Size	Large (>700 students)
Hispanic Percentage	Medium (20-60%)
African American Percentage	Medium (2-10%)
Economically Disadvantaged Percentage	Medium (20-60%)
EL Percentage	Medium (6-27%)
SD Percentage	Large (>10%)
CAHSEE ELA pass rate – Spring 2005	Moderate (>75-90%)
CAHSEE Math pass rate – Spring 2005	Low (>50-75%)

The research team interviewed the following types of staff/faculty:

- administrators,
- math teachers,
- ELA teachers,
- EL teachers, and
- special education teachers.

Interview Summary

Have students been given the opportunity to learn? (Coverage of California Academic Content Standards)

Standards-aligned materials are being used and the standards are posted. It is unclear how organized the system of monitoring standards is at this school.

What actions has the school taken to prepare at-risk students for the CAHSEE?

A teacher-student mentor program is in place, as well as a credit recovery program. Individual teachers reported offering after-school tutoring. There seems to be much talk of the need to offer more programs.

What is being done to remediate students who did not pass the CAHSEE?

The credit recovery program, though not designed to directly address CAHSEE, has helped students who have failed. Counselors place students who have failed into appropriate classes so they can meet the standards. There seems to be much talk of the need to offer more programs.

What is being done for the ELL students?

Before- and after-school tutoring is available and CLAD certification is recommended for teachers. There seems to be much talk of the need to offer more programs.

What is being done for the special education students?

Modifications are made to classroom instruction. There seems to be much talk of the need to offer more programs.

Are there programs that have been implemented that should have an impact?

Though pass rate isn't extremely low, more could be done here to meet the needs of students failing, or at risk of failing, CAHSEE.

How has the student preparation at the feeder schools changed?

The perception seems to be that students are better prepared.

Are students in the Class of 2006 ready to be held accountable to the CAHSEE graduation requirement?

Administrators – most “yes”
Math teachers – most “yes”
ELA teachers - most “yes”
EL teachers – split
Special education teachers – most “no”

School #32

School Size	Large (>700 students)
Hispanic Percentage	Large (>60%)
African American Percentage	Large (>10%)
Economically Disadvantaged Percentage	Medium (20-60%)
EL Percentage	Medium (6-27%)
SD Percentage	Medium (7-10%)
CAHSEE ELA pass rate – Spring 2005	Low (>50-75%)
CAHSEE Math pass rate – Spring 2005	Low (>50-75%)

The research team interviewed the following types of staff/faculty:

- administrators,
- math teachers,
- ELA teachers,
- EL teachers, and
- special education teachers.

Interview Summary

Have students been given the opportunity to learn? (Coverage of California Academic Content Standards)

Feeder middle school is focused on teaching the standards—more now than a couple years ago. However, the middle school had more special programs for CAHSEE before it was delayed. Teachers in the middle school say that elementary schools also are now doing a better job preparing students than before. High school teachers are focused on teaching the standards.

At the high school, math and English language arts teachers are focused on the California content standards and the CAHSEE. Curriculum, lesson plans, and textbooks are matched with the standards.

What actions has the school taken to prepare at-risk students for the CAHSEE?

Most students who do not pass the CAHSEE are ELL/ELD or students with disabilities. Special Education teachers believe they have a solid program. They have made improvements over the last two years. The resource special education (RSP) students are in reading and math improvement classes and regular education classes. The student's IEPs are closely examined and followed. Special education students use some of the same materials and text, but go at slower pace.

There are tutoring classes for the ELL/ELD students, but these classes do not seem to be meeting their needs.

For math, students were identified early in the school year. CAHSEE math study booklets were distributed to these students and the math department set up an intensive tutoring program.

What is being done to remediate students who did not pass the CAHSEE?

In math, students are identified and provided with the CAHSEE study booklets. The math department has an intensive optional tutoring program. There were a very large number of students attending the program, which was being taught by several teachers. Before the tutoring started, students were pulled and given a 30- to 40-minute presentation on the importance of the CAHSEE. The math department also has a math topics course for students who did not pass the CAHSEE. Scores for kids who took the course increased almost four times the increase for those who did not take the course. The ELA department has students assigned to teachers to set up tutoring sessions for them. ELA tutoring was not organized at the school level, but left up to teachers. Students were not provided the CAHSEE study booklets for ELA. Tutoring sessions were after school, three days a week for about an hour and a half.

What is being done for the ELL students?

The school has a large number of predominantly Hispanic ELL students. EL teachers have to re-teach the California content standards that are taught in the students' English and math classes everyday. EL students are assigned extra tutoring and help. The teachers follow the student's IEP.

ELL has a one-hour, for-credit class for mostly sophomores. Entry is based on English proficiency level on the CELDT. The class is composed of predominantly EL students with about 25 percent special education students, and almost two-thirds of the students are low income, Most of these students are Hispanic. There also is an English topics class for students who did not pass the CAHSEE and a reading class to help students focus on their reading skills. However, some feel that shelter and other courses have too many students in them, making it difficult to individualize instruction.

Middle school ELD teacher indicated that more attention should be focused on ELD program at this school. With more focused attention, MS ELD teacher felt that more ELD students would be able to pass the CAHSEE. Currently, ELD does not appear to be the administration's focus. A grant and AVID have helped, but that is very recent.

What is being done for the special education students?

Special Education teachers believe they have a solid program. They have made improvements over the last two years. The RSP students are in reading and math improvement classes and regular education classes. The student's IEPs are closely examined and followed. Special education students use some of the same materials and text, but go at slower pace.

Are there programs that have been implemented that should have an impact?

The focus now is on math at this school (appears to be department-initiated emphasis that received administrative support). This is an after-school intensive seven-week tutoring program in the 10th Grade. Math topics (kind of CAHSEE prep) courses are offered for juniors and seniors. ELA is lagging. Big issue is ELL/ELD students.

How has the student preparation at the feeder schools changed?

When CAHSEE was delayed, middle school administrator stated middle school pulled back from unique programs to support it. Middle school is doing articulation, but it is not driven by CAHSEE. Middle school administration feels that once CAHSEE is implemented, the middle school will see some top-down changes to include: articulation meetings, course alignment, emphasis on areas where students are not performing adequately, and summer programs. Middle school principal rates students as woefully unprepared judging from when they were at this school. However, the middle school has improved over the last couple years. Describes previous status as: curriculum was not focused enough, teachers were not concentrating on deficiencies, no seriousness that CAHSEE would be a reality, and the content standards were not as defined as now. Middle school math and language arts teachers say that they are focused on standards, that CAHSEE standards are highlighted in lesson plans, and that district-wide test is based on state content standards and CAHSEE. However, most students are not ready for Algebra in the 8th grade—lacking basics. Currently, over 50 percent of students are not passing 8th Grade Algebra. AVID and honors students are grouped together in middle school. They will make it. However, they are the minority at the school. Teachers say that not enough is being done to help low-achieving students, especially EL students. Middle school teachers are looking for more information on test (old test questions) and study guides.

Are students in the Class of 2006 ready to be held accountable to the CAHSEE graduation requirement?

Administrators – most “yes”
Math teachers – most “yes”
ELA teachers - most “yes”
EL teachers – most “no”
Special education teachers – split

School #33

School Size	Medium (450-700 students)
Hispanic Percentage	Medium (20-60%)
African American Percentage	Large (>10%)
Economically Disadvantaged Percentage	Large (>60%)
EL Percentage	Large (>27%)
SD Percentage	Large (>10%)
CAHSEE ELA pass rate – Spring 2005	Low (>50-75%)
CAHSEE Math pass rate – Spring 2005	Very Low (<=50%)

The research team interviewed the following types of staff/faculty:

- administrators,
- math teachers,
- ELA teachers,
- EL teachers, and
- special education teachers.

Interview Summary

Have students been given the opportunity to learn? (Coverage of California Academic Content Standards)

There is an increased awareness of the standards, but staff is still working on total implementation. The standards must be posted. Not all teachers in agreement as far as what constitutes mastery.

What actions has the school taken to prepare at-risk students for the CAHSEE?

An elective CAHSEE course is offered. Lunchtime and after-school tutoring are available. School has a teacher-student mentoring program.

What is being done to remediate students who did not pass the CAHSEE?

An elective CAHSEE course is offered. An algebra course is offered specifically to students who failed CAHSEE. Remediation courses are offered before and after school.

What is being done for the ELL students?

Bilingual tutors are placed in classrooms. Modifications are made to instruction, but it sounds like more training needs to be offered to teachers on how to work with ELL students.

What is being done for the special education students?

Special education sections of courses are offered. Pull-out sessions are held with a resource teacher. An after school special education class for CAHSEE is offered, but it is too large and would benefit from an additional teacher.

Are there programs that have been implemented that should have an impact?

With some modifications, existing programs may be more successful. Also, more may need to be done for ELL students.

How has the student preparation at the feeder schools changed?

Not much change; students still lacking preparation.

Are students in the Class of 2006 ready to be held accountable to the CAHSEE graduation requirement?

Administrators – most “yes”
Math teachers – most “yes”
ELA teachers - most “yes”
EL teachers – most “no”
Special education teachers – split

School #34

School Size	Medium (450-700 students)
Hispanic Percentage	Medium (20-60%)
African American Percentage	Large (>10%)
Economically Disadvantaged Percentage	Medium (20-60%)
EL Percentage	Medium (6-27%)
SD Percentage	Medium (7-10%)
CAHSEE ELA pass rate – Spring 2005	Low (>50-75%)
CAHSEE Math pass rate – Spring 2005	Low (>50-75%)

The research team interviewed the following types of staff/faculty:

- administrators,
- math teachers,
- ELA teachers,
- EL teachers, and
- special education teachers.

Interview Summary

Have students been given the opportunity to learn? (Coverage of California Academic Content Standards)

This school isn't necessarily in sync with its district in terms of standards implementation, but it is being worked on. Teachers are still in the process of discussing the standards and working on selecting materials that are aligned. Full implementation has not yet been achieved.

What actions has the school taken to prepare at-risk students for the CAHSEE?

There is a summer bridge course for incoming students who are identified as at-risk. A literacy class, Literacy Lab, and Applied Algebra are offered, as is after-school CAHSEE prep.

What is being done to remediate students who did not pass the CAHSEE?

A CAHSEE remedial class is offered for students who have failed the CAHSEE at least once. Most programs for at-risk students double as remediation programs as well.

What is being done for the ELL students?

This school doesn't have a separate ELL department. Pull-out tutoring is offered with retired master teachers. ELL students are double-enrolled in English. Bilingual assistants are present in general education courses. Lunchtime and after-school tutoring are available. Portfolios are kept on all students.

What is being done for the special education students?

Pull-out tutoring is offered with retired master teachers. IEPs are standards aligned.

Are there programs that have been implemented that should have an impact?

Some good programs seem to be available for at-risk/failing students. Perhaps more attention needs to be paid to special education students specifically.

How has the student preparation at the feeder schools changed?

Incoming students remain poorly prepared in terms of content, and attitudes seem to have worsened.

Are students in the Class of 2006 ready to be held accountable to the CAHSEE graduation requirement?

Administrators – most “no”
Math teachers – most “yes”
ELA teachers - most “yes”
EL teachers – most “no”
Special education teachers – split

School #35

School Size	Medium (450-700 students)
Hispanic Percentage	Small (<20%)
African American Percentage	Medium (2-10%)
Economically Disadvantaged Percentage	Small (<20%)
EL Percentage	Small (<6%)
SD Percentage	Medium (7-10%)
CAHSEE ELA pass rate – Spring 2005	High (>90%)
CAHSEE Math pass rate – Spring 2005	High (>90%)

The research team interviewed the following types of staff/faculty:

- administrators,
- math teachers,
- ELA teachers,
- EL teachers, and
- special education teachers.

Interview Summary

Have students been given the opportunity to learn? (Coverage of California Academic Content Standards)

Departments hold regular meetings on the standards and work on vertical teaming. A Beginning Teacher Support group is in place to provide mentoring on the standards.

What actions has the school taken to prepare at-risk students for the CAHSEE?

Student Study Teams (SSTs) identify and address the needs of at-risk students. CAHSEE intervention and preparation classes are in place. Tutoring is available and CAHSEE study guides are provided to all students.

What is being done to remediate students who did not pass the CAHSEE?

CAHSEE remediation is offered to students who have failed, though these numbers are low (high pass rate at this school).

What is being done for the ELL students?

An intense standards-focused summer program is offered. Student Study Teams (SSTs) identify and address the needs of at-risk ELL students. CLAD certification is required. A CAHSEE Intervention class in Math and ELA is offered before school.

What is being done for the special education students?

A CAHSEE remediation class for special education students is offered. The “Language!” program is being used. Intervention classes and CAHSEE prep are also offered.

Are there programs that have been implemented that should have an impact?

This is not too much of an issue, due to the high pass rate. Properly implemented remediation programs should be successful in helping students who have failed.

How has the student preparation at the feeder schools changed?

ELL and ELA better prepared overall, though math preparation has suffered due to movement of Algebra 1 to 8th grade curriculum. This school is building a closer relationship with its feeder school.

Are students in the Class of 2006 ready to be held accountable to the CAHSEE graduation requirement?

Administrators – most "yes"
Math teachers – most "yes"
ELA teachers - most "yes"
EL teachers – most "yes"
Special education teachers – most "yes"

School #36

School Size	Small (<450 students)
Hispanic Percentage	Medium (20-60%)
African American Percentage	Large (>10%)
Economically Disadvantaged Percentage	Medium (20-60%)
EL Percentage	Medium (6-27%)
SD Percentage	Large (>10%)
CAHSEE ELA pass rate – Spring 2005	Low (>50-75%)
CAHSEE Math pass rate – Spring 2005	Low (>50-75%)

The research team interviewed the following types of staff/faculty:

- math teachers,
- ELA teachers,
- EL teachers, and
- special education teachers.

Interview Summary

Have students been given the opportunity to learn? (Coverage of California Academic Content Standards)

There were department-wide testing programs and guidance and assessments required by the district. There was a push to ensure that standards were being taught.

The math teachers say that each lesson is based on content standards. However, most math teachers also say that they use a CA state-adopted textbook, the materials are based on CA standards, and that the students take the tests from the book. All math courses across the school take standardized tests created by the school's math department. After school tutoring is offered for any student desiring extra help.

The English teachers have benchmarks of what they have to cover in their classes, district guides, a summary-reference sheet, school assessments, and district assessments. The teachers use CA state-adopted textbooks. The English teachers indicate that there is no school-wide support for CAHSEE other than passing out the CAHSEE booklet. However, individual teachers offer support to students needing assistance. There was a CAHSEE practice session conducted in 10th grade English classes.

What actions has the school taken to prepare at-risk students for the CAHSEE?

While most math teachers indicated that there is no CAHSEE preparation/remediation course at this time, one math teacher stated that he taught Algebra B which is exactly those students—mostly juniors and seniors who had not passed the CAHSEE. The math department has a two-week class just prior to the CAHSEE where they review what is on the test. They pass out the CAHSEE preparation books for this class. After school tutoring is offered for any student desiring extra help.

The English department has a special reading class for the lower-performing 9th grade students. This reading class is in addition to their normal English class. This reading class uses *High Point* materials. This program will be extended to 10th graders next year. The EL and special education students are not in this class, but rather receive a similar service through the EL or special education programs. An after-school tutoring program is available, as well as a student mentoring program for students wanting more help.

What is being done to remediate students who did not pass the CAHSEE?

While most math teachers indicated that there is no CAHSEE preparation/remediation course at this time, one math teacher stated that he taught Algebra B which is exactly those students—mostly juniors and seniors who had not passed the CAHSEE. The math department has a two-week class just prior to the CAHSEE where they review what is on the test. They pass out the CAHSEE preparation books for this class. After school tutoring is offered for any student desiring extra help.

What is being done for the ELL students?

There is no special effort to assist ELL students in the regular math classes. There are ELL and ELD classes. The CAHSEE requirements are discussed in these classes. Efforts are being made to ensure that ELL and ELD classes are aligned with the standards.

What is being done for the special education students?

There is no special effort to assist special education students in the regular math classes. The teachers do make accommodations in accordance with IEPs.

The special education teachers have redesigned the curriculum for RSP and are teaching more content classes using the regular textbooks and materials from the mainstreamed classes. The special education teachers indicated that they need more textbook support. However, they indicated that they are using all mainstream education or content standards curriculum now versus their own curriculum. They indicated that they are on the way to being fully implemented. All IEPs are now standards based. One special education teacher indicated that maybe as many as 95 percent of these RSP students should be able to pass the CAHSEE.

For special-day students, there is a new crop of teachers who are credentialed, know the standards, and have been trained. Special education teacher said that there have been big jumps in the scores.

Are there programs that have been implemented that should have an impact?

The school has implemented very few school-wide programs. The special 9th grade reading program should have some impact. Programs within the special education department also show promise.

How has the student preparation at the feeder schools changed?

Most math and English teachers rate the student preparation at the feeder school currently about 2.5 on a 1 to 5 scale, but general showing some improvement over the last two years.

Are students in the Class of 2006 ready to be held accountable to the CAHSEE graduation requirement?

Math teachers – most “yes”
ELA teachers - most “yes”
EL teachers – most “yes”
Special education teachers – split

School #37

School Size	Small (<450 students)
Hispanic Percentage	Large (>60%)
African American Percentage	Medium (2-10%)
Economically Disadvantaged Percentage	Medium (20-60%)
EL Percentage	Small (<6%)
SD Percentage	Small (<7%)
CAHSEE ELA pass rate – Spring 2005	Moderate (>75-90%)
CAHSEE Math pass rate – Spring 2005	Moderate (>75-90%)

The research team interviewed the following types of staff/faculty:

- administrators,
- math teachers,
- ELA teachers, and
- special education teachers.

Interview Summary

Have students been given the opportunity to learn? (Coverage of California Academic Content Standards)

There is agreement on the standards at the department level, and teachers use the same standards-aligned and meet regularly to work on alignment across the grade levels. The standards are posted.

What actions has the school taken to prepare at-risk students for the CAHSEE?

A CAHSEE prep course is offered in mathematics. This is essentially a pre-algebra course. Funding is lacking and the teacher had to purchase materials with his own money. Tutoring and summer classes are also offered.

What is being done to remediate students who did not pass the CAHSEE?

A short, specifically focused exit exam class and a weeklong review before the test are offered for students who have failed. After-school tutoring is also available. No ELA remediation is offered, but extra teachers are on staff.

What is being done for the ELL students?

No real mention of ELL services. They seem to be lumped in with the rest of the student population.

What is being done for the special education students?

No regular special education classes are offered. The special education resource teacher works closely with the regular education teachers to create the best support for students. Tutoring and practice testing for CAHSEE are offered.

Are there programs that have been implemented that should have an impact?

Programs are in place, especially in math, to address students' needs. Properly implemented programs should work.

How has the student preparation at the feeder schools changed?

Basic math skills are lacking and students have general motivational issues.

Are students in the Class of 2006 ready to be held accountable to the CAHSEE graduation requirement?

Math teachers – split
ELA teachers - most “yes”
Special education teachers – most “yes”

School #38

School Size	Medium (450-700 students)
Hispanic Percentage	Medium (20-60%)
African American Percentage	Large (>10%)
Economically Disadvantaged Percentage	Large (>60%)
EL Percentage	Medium (6-27%)
SD Percentage	Medium (7-10%)
CAHSEE ELA pass rate – Spring 2005	Low (>50-75%)
CAHSEE Math pass rate – Spring 2005	Low (>50-75%)

The research team interviewed the following types of staff/faculty:

- administrators,
- math teachers,
- ELA teachers,
- EL teachers, and
- special education teachers.

Interview Summary

Have students been given the opportunity to learn? (Coverage of California Academic Content Standards)

Materials are aligned and the standards are posted, but curriculum and instructional alignment seem to be a fairly recent phenomenon.

What actions has the school taken to prepare at-risk students for the CAHSEE?

CAHSEE study guides are distributed and CAHSEE prep classes are being offered for the first time this year. A school-within-the-school is also offered for at-risk students. Staff constantly emphasizes the importance of the CAHSEE to students.

What is being done to remediate students who did not pass the CAHSEE?

CAHSEE support/remediation classes and after-school tutorials are offered. This school has a high rate students not passing CAHSEE.

What is being done for the ELL students?

CLAD certification is required. Some after school help is offered, but it sounds like more could be done to properly serve ELL students at this school.

What is being done for the special education students?

CAHSEE classes for special education students are offered.

Are there programs that have been implemented that should have an impact?

This school seems to need a more focused effort, considering the high rate of failure.

How has the student preparation at the feeder schools changed?

Concerns were expressed over math skills and motivation among ELL students.

Are students in the Class of 2006 ready to be held accountable to the CAHSEE graduation requirement?

Math teachers – most “yes”
ELA teachers - most “yes”
EL teachers – most “yes”
Special education teachers – most “no”

School #39

School Size	Medium (450-700 students)
Hispanic Percentage	Medium (20-60%)
African American Percentage	Medium (2-10%)
Economically Disadvantaged Percentage	Medium (20-60%)
EL Percentage	Medium (6-27%)
SD Percentage	Medium (7-10%)
CAHSEE ELA pass rate – Spring 2005	Low (>50-75%)
CAHSEE Math pass rate – Spring 2005	Low (>50-75%)

The research team interviewed the following types of staff/faculty:

- administrators,
- math teachers,
- ELA teachers,
- EL teachers, and
- special education teachers.

Interview Summary

Have students been given the opportunity to learn? (Coverage of California Academic Content Standards)

This school is teaching to the standards. A system is in place to make sure that the standards are the focus.

What actions has the school taken to prepare at-risk students for the CAHSEE?

Teachers are available for during-lunch and after-school tutoring. Student Study Teams (SSTs) have been implemented, in which all teachers of a particular student, along with the student and parents, meet to discuss the student's needs. CAHSEE study guides are distributed to all students.

What is being done to remediate students who did not pass the CAHSEE?

A CAHSEE remediation course is planned for next year. After-school tutoring is available.

What is being done for the ELL students?

CLAD certification is required for all staff. Monthly EL workshops are held for teachers and students. EL-specific tutoring is available.

What is being done for the special education students?

IEPs are standards-based. Instruction focuses on standards as opposed to life skills.

Are there programs that have been implemented that should have an impact?

Pass rate is fairly high, but programs in place should help students still at risk.

How has the student preparation at the feeder schools changed?

There wasn't a clear consensus, though it seems that the belief is that students are in the process of improving their level of preparation.

Are students in the Class of 2006 ready to be held accountable to the CAHSEE graduation requirement?

Administrators – most "yes"
Math teachers – most "yes"
ELA teachers - most "yes"
EL teachers – most "yes"
Special education teachers – most "no"

School #40

School Size	Medium (450-700 students)
Hispanic Percentage	Large (>60%)
African American Percentage	Medium (2-10%)
Economically Disadvantaged Percentage	Medium (20-60%)
EL Percentage	Large (>27%)
SD Percentage	Small (<7%)
CAHSEE ELA pass rate – Spring 2005	Low (>50-75%)
CAHSEE Math pass rate – Spring 2005	Low (>50-75%)

The research team interviewed the following types of staff/faculty:

- administrators,
- math teachers,
- ELA teachers,
- EL teachers, and
- special education teachers

Interview summary

Have students been given the opportunity to learn? (Coverage of California Academic Content Standards)

Curriculum and instruction and aligned to the standards, but work is still being done on materials-alignment. Outdated materials are still being used by some (ELL and special education specifically).

What actions has the school taken to prepare at-risk students for the CAHSEE?

A reading improvement class is offered for incoming 9th graders who are below grade level in their skills. Tutoring is available before and after school. Contact with parents is made early on to inform them of the importance of CAHSEE.

What is being done to remediate students who did not pass the CAHSEE?

A CAHSEE remediation class is just getting started, using the PLATO program. After-school and Saturday programs will be implemented next year.

What is being done for the ELL students?

All staff required to be appropriately certified. Student-tutoring, writing intervention and the High Point program were all mentioned.

What is being done for the special education students?

Team teaching and collaborative classrooms were mentioned. Special education students had been using the 'Language!' program, but will soon be switching to SRA. Students' IEPs are aligned with the standards.

Are there programs that have been implemented that should have an impact?

Many seemed to agree that more could be done.

How has the student preparation at the feeder schools changed?

Students are prepared in terms of content, but lack the necessary study skills and motivation.

Are students in the Class of 2006 ready to be held accountable to the CAHSEE graduation requirement?

Administrators – most “no”
Math teachers – most “yes”
ELA teachers - most “yes”
EL teachers – split
Special education teachers – split

School #41

School Size	Medium (450-700 students)
Hispanic Percentage	Medium (20-60%)
African American Percentage	Medium (2-10%)
Economically Disadvantaged Percentage	Large (>60%)
EL Percentage	Large (>27%)
SD Percentage	Medium (7-10%)
CAHSEE ELA pass rate – Spring 2005	Low (>50-75%)
CAHSEE Math pass rate – Spring 2005	Low (>50-75%)

The research team interviewed the following types of staff/faculty:

- administrators,
- math teachers,
- ELA teachers,
- EL teachers, and
- special education teachers.

Interview Summary

Have students been given the opportunity to learn? (Coverage of California Academic Content Standards)

Classrooms now post standards and curriculum is standards aligned. Teachers collaborate on the standards.

What actions has the school taken to prepare at-risk students for the CAHSEE?

An 8th period study class was added to the schedule. CAHSEE prep courses and mandatory tutorials were also mentioned. College students were brought in to work with low performing students, and an adopt-a-student teacher intervention program was implemented.

What is being done to remediate students who did not pass the CAHSEE?

Pullout CAHSEE tutorials and a special CAHSEE math class have been implemented for students who have failed CAHSEE. Respondents reported fairly low pass rates within their classrooms, though no overall pass rate was reported.

What is being done for the ELL students?

CLAD certification is required. Peer work groups, sheltered courses and extended time were all mentioned as techniques for working with ELL students.

What is being done for the special education students?

Teachers receive training and professional development related to special education students. Respondents also mentioned offering extended time and small group/individual work.

Are there programs that have been implemented that should have an impact?

Properly implemented programs should be effective.

How has the student preparation at the feeder schools changed?

Majority of respondents expressed that student preparation has dropped, particularly in the area of basic skills.

Are students in the Class of 2006 ready to be held accountable to the CAHSEE graduation requirement?

Administrators – most “no”
Math teachers – most “yes”
ELA teachers - most “yes”
EL teachers – most “no”
Special education teachers – split

School #42

School Size	Medium (450-700 students)
Hispanic Percentage	Small (<20%)
African American Percentage	Medium (2-10%)
Economically Disadvantaged Percentage	Small (<20%)
EL Percentage	Small (<6%)
SD Percentage	Small (<7%)
CAHSEE ELA pass rate – Spring 2005	High (>90%)
CAHSEE Math pass rate – Spring 2005	High (>90%)

The research team interviewed the following types of staff/faculty:

- administrators,
- math teachers,
- ELA teachers, and
- special education teachers.

Interview Summary

Have students been given the opportunity to learn? (Coverage of California Academic Content Standards)

Staff members work with standards and data. Standards are displayed and walkthroughs are used to monitor use of standards. There was a mention of old materials that may not be aligned to the standards, being used for special courses.

What actions has the school taken to prepare at-risk students for the CAHSEE?

An after-school CAHSEE prep program is offered, using the CAHSEE study guides. Poor performers are monitored and scheduled into extra support classes for elective credit.

What is being done to remediate students who did not pass the CAHSEE?

An after-school workshop is offered just before test time for those who previously failed. Remediation classes are also offered.

What is being done for the ELL students?

Teachers are CLAD certified and a CLAD-like program is being used.

What is being done for the special education students?

Special education training is conducted with all teachers, along with regular collaboration between general education and special education teachers.

Are there programs that have been implemented that should have an impact?

Not many programs are in place, due to the high pass rate. Properly implemented programs should be successful.

How has the student preparation at the feeder schools changed?

There seems to be varying perception of the level of preparation among students, though more agreed that students are improving.

Are students in the Class of 2006 ready to be held accountable to the CAHSEE graduation requirement?

Administrators – most “yes”
Math teachers – most “yes”
ELA teachers - most “yes”
Special education teachers – most “yes”

School #43

School Size	Small (<450 students)
Hispanic Percentage	Medium (20-60%)
African American Percentage	Large (>10%)
Economically Disadvantaged Percentage	Medium (20-60%)
EL Percentage	Small (<6%)
SD Percentage	Medium (7-10%)
CAHSEE ELA pass rate – Spring 2005	Moderate (>75-90%)
CAHSEE Math pass rate – Spring 2005	Moderate (>75-90%)

The research team interviewed the following types of staff/faculty:

- administrators,
- math teachers, and
- ELA teachers.

Interview Summary

Have students been given the opportunity to learn? (Coverage of California Academic Content Standards)

Curriculum and instruction are aligned to the standards. “Focus walks” are conduct to verify exposure to the standards within the classroom.

What actions has the school taken to prepare at-risk students for the CAHSEE?

The AVID program is in use and is targeted to underperforming students. An after-school CAHSEE prep course has been offered. A club was formed specifically targeted to African American students and their parents, which provided core subject tutoring and support.

What is being done to remediate students who did not pass the CAHSEE?

Many students who have not yet passed CAHSEE are considered close to passing. After school support is offered to students who have not yet passed.

What is being done for the ELL students?

SADAIE strategies are used, and many teachers are CLAD certified. Group work is emphasized. Some block classes are offered.

What is being done for the special education students?

Special programs include Verbalizing and Visualizing, Reading Naturally, and LIPS (phonics). Pull out sessions allow for more individualized attention. Some block classes are offered.

Are there programs that have been implemented that should have an impact?

Properly implemented programs should succeed in impacting student performance.

How has the student preparation at the feeder schools changed?

Opinions vary at this school. There seems to be a range of preparation levels among entering students. Some concern expressed over basic skills.

Are students in the Class of 2006 ready to be held accountable to the CAHSEE graduation requirement?

Administrators – most “yes”
Math teachers – most “yes”
ELA teachers - most “yes”

School #44

School Size	Small (<450 students)
Hispanic Percentage	Medium (20-60%)
African American Percentage	Small (<2%)
Economically Disadvantaged Percentage	Medium (20-60%)
EL Percentage	Small (<6%)
SD Percentage	Medium (7-10%)
CAHSEE ELA pass rate – Spring 2005	Moderate (>75-90%)
CAHSEE Math pass rate – Spring 2005	Moderate (>75-90%)

The research team interviewed the following types of staff/faculty:

- administrators,
- math teachers,
- ELA teachers,
- EL teachers, and
- special education teachers.

Interview Summary

Have students been given the opportunity to learn? (Coverage of California Academic Content Standards)

Curriculum is aligned with the standards. High expectations are held for all students.

What actions has the school taken to prepare at-risk students for the CAHSEE?

Help is provided on an individual, as needed basis.

What is being done to remediate students who did not pass the CAHSEE?

Mandatory remediation and tutoring is provided for students who have failed any portion of CAHSEE.

What is being done for the ELL students?

Sheltered classes are offered for ELL students. Most EL students are fairly fluent and do not need additional support. Special teams are in place to develop intervention strategies for poorly performing students.

What is being done for the special education students?

Strong collaboration exists between special education and general education teachers. Special education department utilizes a research-based approach and relies heavily on CAHSEE prep materials provided by the state. All teachers are trained on special education issues.

Are there programs that have been implemented that should have an impact?

Special programs are not really an issue given the expected passing rate at this school.

How has the student preparation at the feeder schools changed?

Junior high is now better at preparing students for high school math.

Are students in the Class of 2006 ready to be held accountable to the CAHSEE graduation requirement?

Administrators – most “yes”
Math teachers – most “yes”
ELA teachers - most “yes”
EL teachers – most “yes”
Special education teachers – most “yes”

School #45

School Size	Small (<450 students)
Hispanic Percentage	Small (<20%)
African American Percentage	Small (<2%)
Economically Disadvantaged Percentage	Small (<20%)
EL Percentage	Small (<6%)
SD Percentage	Small (<7%)
CAHSEE ELA pass rate – Spring 2005	High (>90%)
CAHSEE Math pass rate – Spring 2005	High (>90%)

The research team interviewed the following types of staff/faculty:

- administrators,
- math teachers, and
- ELA teachers.

Interview Summary

Have students been given the opportunity to learn? (Coverage of California Academic Content Standards)

Full standards alignment has been implemented, including textbooks, curriculum and instruction. Teachers have all been trained in AVID strategies.

What actions has the school taken to prepare at-risk students for the CAHSEE?

Math and English labs are open in the mornings and afternoons for students in need of assistance. An after-school program was offered for freshman and sophomores who had a C or below in math. Freshman invited to participate in CAHSEE preparatory class if felt to be at risk of failing.

What is being done to remediate students who did not pass the CAHSEE?

Math intervention class was offered.

What is being done for the ELL students?

Only small percentage of ELL students at this school, and they are at a higher level of fluency. No specific ELL teachers.

What is being done for the special education students?

No special education students at this school, though some receive accommodations.

Are there programs that have been implemented that should have an impact?

Special programs are not much of an issue at this school because of the extremely high pass rate.

How has the student preparation at the feeder schools changed?

The perception is that students are more prepared.

Are students in the Class of 2006 ready to be held accountable to the CAHSEE graduation requirement?

Administrators – most “yes”
Math teachers – most “yes”
ELA teachers - most “yes”

School #46

School Size	Large (>700 students)
Hispanic Percentage	Large (>60%)
African American Percentage	Small (<20%)
Economically Disadvantaged Percentage	Large (>60%)
EL Percentage	Large (>27%)
SD Percentage	Medium (7-10%)
CAHSEE ELA pass rate – Spring 2005	Low (>50-75%)
CAHSEE Math pass rate – Spring 2005	Low (>50-75%)

The research team interviewed the following types of staff/faculty:

- administrators,
- math teachers,
- EL teachers, and
- special education teachers.

Interview Summary

Have students been given the opportunity to learn? (Coverage of California Academic Content Standards)

Emphasis within this school seems to be on professional development. Gallery walks allow teachers to share best practices through systematic observation of each other's classes. Standards are posted and periodic assessments used to monitor student mastery of standards.

What actions has the school taken to prepare at-risk students for the CAHSEE?

Specialized course and tutoring programs are offered. Efforts are made to motivate students and parents. A tutoring-assistance program identifies underperforming students. CAHSEE study guides are provided to all 10th grade students. After-school tutoring is offered. The math department is identifying students for potential failure of Algebra 1 in the first 8 weeks of school.

What is being done to remediate students who did not pass the CAHSEE?

Students who are not passing CAHSEE are pulled for intervention. A tutoring-assistance program is offered as a Saturday class, as well as a one-week crash course. After-school tutoring is offered. One comment suggested that space in remedial classes was limited.

What is being done for the ELL students?

ELL teachers have received necessary certifications/credentials. Focus groups have been conducted to discuss needs of ELL students. CAHSEE-focused remedial programs are offered during 7th period. Most teachers in the school are bilingual. Peer sharing groups have been implemented, along with other group learning strategies.

What is being done for the special education students?

Tutoring programs are offered for students targeted during IEP review. Teachers from the special education department follow students' progress. Professional

development, including a mainstreaming course, and staff training regarding special education are provided.

Are there programs that have been implemented that should have an impact?

Attendance at weekend/after-school programs may be an issue for low-SES students, however properly implemented programs should have a positive impact.

How has the student preparation at the feeder schools changed?

Level of student preparation as increased overall, though student vary widely in their level of preparation. Middle schools have worked with students on basic skills and elementary schools are ensuring that teachers really teach math.

Are students in the Class of 2006 ready to be held accountable to the CAHSEE graduation requirement?

Administrators – most “yes”
Math teachers – most “yes”
ELA teachers - most “yes”
EL teachers – most “no”
Special education teachers – split

School #47

School Size	Medium (450-700 students)
Hispanic Percentage	Small (<20%)
African American Percentage	Large (>10%)
Economically Disadvantaged Percentage	Small (<20%)
EL Percentage	Small (<6%)
SD Percentage	Medium (7-10%)
CAHSEE ELA pass rate – Spring 2005	High (>90%)
CAHSEE MATH pass rate – Spring 2005	Moderate (>75-90%)

The research team interviewed the following types of staff/faculty:

- administrators,
- math teachers,
- ELA teachers,
- EL teachers, and
- special education teachers.

Interview Summary

Have students been given the opportunity to learn? (Coverage of California Academic Content Standards)

Curriculum and instruction are standards focused. However, differences among teachers exist in terms of defining mastery of standards. There is some concern over the level of preparation of students and their ability to keep pace with the standards throughout the year.

What actions has the school taken to prepare at-risk students for the CAHSEE?

Literary Block classes for students at lowest skill level, SD and ELL. CAHSEE study/practice booklets are distributed. Semester finals are modeled after CAHSEE. Study skills and additional English classes are offered.

What is being done to remediate students who did not pass the CAHSEE?

An after-school CAHSEE course and after-school tutoring are offered.

What is being done for the ELL students?

Professional development and appropriate certification/credentials (CLAD, SADAIE) among staff. Efforts are being made to address the lack of parental involvement. Upper- and lower-level students are paired for tutoring. Literacy Block course has been dropped because of lack of results. Algebra Exploration still available for students with lower level math skills. CAHSEE prep and after-school classes are also available.

What is being done for the special education students?

Collaboration exists between special education and general education teachers, though some expressed that there should be more. Study skills courses and additional time in English classes are offered. Aides work with students on an individual basis.

Test scores are monitored. A course in work-related skills is offered for those students who will be unable to pass CAHSEE.

Are there programs that have been implemented that should have an impact?

Because of high initial pass rate, the creation of special programs does not seem to be an area of great concern. Additional help that is being offered, if implemented correctly, should have a positive impact.

How has the student preparation at the feeder schools changed?

There is a wide range in terms of preparation because there are many different feeder schools. Overall, there has been a decrease in preparation because of a decline in the level of focus on basic skills. Level of preparation is seen as related to student demographics such as SES.

Are students in the Class of 2006 ready to be held accountable to the CAHSEE graduation requirement?

Administrators – most “yes”
Math teachers – most “yes”
ELA teachers - most “yes”
EL teachers – split
Special education teachers – most “no”

Appendix G: District Executive Summaries

HUMAN RESOURCES RESEARCH ORGANIZATION
66 Canal Center Plaza, Suite 400
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
(703) 549-3611 Fax (703) 549-9025
(800) 301-1508

CAHSEE 2005 Instruction Study
Executive Summary Guidelines
DEADLINE: May 27th or end of school ~~April 8th~~, 2005

Your Executive Summary is an opportunity for you to indicate—in your own words—what your district has done to ensure that its curriculum and instruction offer your students the opportunity to learn the material assessed in the CAHSEE, and to make parents and students aware of the importance of meeting the CAHSEE requirement for students to receive a high school diploma. The summary will be reported anonymously. Although we ask for your name and the district name when you submit the summary to us, they will not be included when the summary appears in an addendum to HumRRO's final report. We ask that in the text of your executive summary you try not to include any identifiable information. We will make every effort to remove such information before the summaries are reported.

We do not want to be overly formulaic or rigid in the Executive Summary format. However, we provide the following guidelines to ensure a certain level of consistency across the hundreds of California districts providing such a document. Also, to clarify the sorts of information we are seeking we have attached sample questions that are being asked on the 2005 Instruction Study surveys for district and school personnel. In your own style, please be sure to:

- Title your document:

  CAHSEE 2005 Instruction Study
  [Enter Your DISTRICT NAME]
  [Enter Superintendent's Name]
  Spring 2005

- Limit the document to two (2) pages.
- Address the following questions clearly:
  1. *Awareness* (How has the district informed students and parents of content expectations and the new exit exam requirement? How often and by what methods does this communication take place?)
  2. *Curriculum Validity* (What actions has the district taken to adopt the California Content Standards expectations into the curriculum and to integrate them across all grades and subjects? How does the district consider required content expectations when selecting textbooks and curriculum materials?)
  3. *Instructional Validity* (To what extent are all students in your district being taught the required content expectations, especially for the content on the required exit exam? How does the district or school principal ensure that all students (including students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students) receive classroom instruction—that is, both regular and remedial instruction—that is well-aligned with state content standards? To what extent is your response the same for the following groups: students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students?) What criteria do you use to identify at-risk students before they take the CAHSEE?
  4. *Student Remediation* (To what extent are all students in your district who initially do not pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE given the opportunity to be re-tested and to receive additional instruction tailored to their demonstrated needs? Does your district have procedures in place to track these students over time as they get closer to the graduation date to verify that they are participating in appropriate remedial instruction?)

The executive summary should be saved on the provided diskette and included in the package you return to HumRRO. We would prefer to receive the report in MS Word format, but we would accept another word processor format or simply a printed copy. At a minimum, please include a printed copy of the Executive Summary.

Please feel free to contact the HumRRO 2005 Instruction Study Director, Dr. Carolyn Harris [1-800-301-1508, (703) 706-5620 or charris@humrro.org] if you have any questions about the content or format of this Executive Summary.

Sample Questions Being Asked of District and School Personnel

In order to clarify the sorts of information we are seeking in the executive summary, we provide here a sample of survey questions we are asking of district and school personnel. Your district-level ELA Coordinator and Mathematics Coordinator are being surveyed. In addition, if high school(s) were selected within your district as part of the state sample, the high school principal, ELA high school department head, Math high school department head, and a sample of ELA and Math teachers (as well as comparable representatives of a feeder middle school) are also being surveyed. The survey questions address these same themes of awareness, curricular validity, instructional validity, and remediation.

The samples provided here address ELA courses; similar questions are asked regarding mathematics courses.

District ELA Curriculum Head

- What proportion of students who did not pass the ELA portion of the CAHSEE by spring 2004 subsequently enrolled in a remedial summer school course?
- What proportion of students in the ELA-related summer school course passed the ELA portion of the CAHSEE in July or September 2004?

High School Principal

- 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?
- What proportion of the teachers at your school participated in ELA-related professional development designed to help them teach the California Content Standards associated with CAHSEE?
- Do you have regular articulation meetings with your feeder middle schools?

ELA High School Department Head

- How many teachers in your department work with an appropriate ELA subject area credential?
- To what extent, in general, are teachers in your department experienced in teaching the California Content Standards associated with the CAHSEE requirements?
- To what extent would you characterize your ELA course offerings as being demanding courses for students?

Teacher (Describing a single course)

- To what extent do the following factors limit the overall effectiveness of this course? (Response options include student attendance, student motivation, low student English proficiency, parental support, lack of materials/resources, limitations in my own knowledge or experience, my own difficulty in engaging these students.)
- If you use a textbook, provide the exact title of the current textbook. Approximately how much of it do you use?
- If you use supplemental materials, what is the primary reason you use them?
- What is your most advanced degree?
- What teaching credential(s) do you hold?

District Executive Summaries—Content Analysis

The following sections provide results of the content analysis for the four areas on which district superintendents were asked to respond. There were 104 districts that responded to all the areas and one district that responded to just the first three areas. This summary of results is followed by the actual executive summaries as submitted by the districts. They are numbered sequentially for reference purposes, but they were entered randomly into the file.

Awareness

How has the district informed students and parents of content expectations and the new exit exam requirement? How often and by what methods does this communication take place?

All districts reported that they repeatedly informed students and parents of content expectations and the new exit exam requirement throughout the year. Students and parents receive written notification of the CAHSEE requirements and the content standards. Some districts provide multiple language versions of the written notification.

- Sixty-eight percent (71 of 104) of districts inform parents and students of the CAHSEE standards and the content standards via direct mailing. For example, some districts send direct mails on the requirement to pass the CAHSEE and the schedule for testing the CAHSEE, at the beginning of each school year and/or prior to the administration of the CAHSEE.

- Fifty-four percent (56 of 104) of districts make parents and students aware of the CAHSEE requirements and state standards via various kinds of information pamphlets and packets. For example, “parents are given ELA and Math standards booklets”. The requirement to pass the CAHSEE is stated in the program/school planning guide, parent/student handbook, etc. The parent information packet and registration packet also includes information on the requirement of the CAHSEE.

- Forty percent (42 of 104) of districts use district newsletters or school newsletters to communicate to parents and students the CAHSEE requirements and content expectations. The frequency of sending out newsletters varies from district to district.

- Sixteen percent (17 of 104) of districts distribute study guides to students through their English and math classes to inform students of which standards are tested, and how to prepare for the test.

Districts also verbally communicate to parents and students the requirement to pass the CAHSEE and the state content standards through various meetings and conferences.

- Fifty-six percent (58 of 104) of districts reported that their counselors and/or teachers discuss with students, either in groups or in class, or individually, the content standards of the CAHSEE, the importance of passing the test, as well as how to prepare for it.

- Eleven percent (11 of 104) of districts reported that their counselors and/or teachers discuss with students the requirement of the CAHSEE in various students' meetings (e.g., student orientation, class meetings, etc.).

- Forty-seven percent (49 of 104) of districts reported that their school administrators, counselors, and teachers discuss with parents the structure, content, and importance of the CAHSEE in parent meetings.

- Twenty-five percent (26 of 104) of districts reported they use back-to-school night to discuss the CAHSEE requirements.

In addition, 14 percent (15 of 104) of districts post the CAHSEE requirement and the state content standards on their websites. Nine percent (9 of 104) of districts use an automated phone system that announces test dates and locations to students and parents.

Curriculum Validity

What actions has the district taken to adopt the California Content Standards expectations into the curriculum and to integrate them across all grade levels and subjects? How does the district consider required content expectations when selecting textbooks and curriculum materials?

All districts provided evidence that they have adopted or integrated state standards into ELA and math curricula, or have developed standards-based or standards-aligned curricula.

- Sixty-two percent (65 of 104) of districts stated that their curriculum has been aligned to state standards or is based on state standards. Some states reported that they take such steps and procedures as developing blueprints and pacing guides or a curriculum matrix around standards, and developing curriculum mapping to assure alignment with standards.

- Twenty-nine percent (30 of 104) of districts stated that they have adopted content framework and standards. Some districts reported that many of their teachers have the content standards posted in their classrooms.

- Eighteen percent (19 of 104) of districts stated that they have integrated the state standards into their curriculum.

The districts have taken the following actions to adopt the California Academic Content Standards into the curriculum:

- Twenty-five percent (26 of 104) of districts reported that they provide professional development to faculties and staffs around state standards and standards alignment to ensure that all standards are addressed and implemented in the curriculum.

- Twenty-four percent (25 of 104) of districts reported they develop and adopt standards-based assessment to support standards-based curriculum, as well as access students' progress towards mastery.

- Twenty percent (21 of 104) of districts reported they back-map the curriculum from assessment results. Specifically, these districts use the results of assessment to identify students' weakness in standards, review the coverage of standards, and adjust curriculum to be aligned with standards.

As for textbook selection, 83 percent (86 of 104) of districts reported that their selection and adoption of textbooks are based on standards alignment. Specifically, the districts take the following actions to ensure that the textbooks are standards-based, or standards-aligned:

- Thirty-seven percent (38 of 104) of districts reported that they use state-approved or state-adopted instruction materials.

- Twenty-two percent (23 of 104) of districts reported that instructors, department chairs, and curriculum or content specialists have reviewed textbooks.

- Ten percent (10 of 104) of districts reported that their selection of textbooks has been reviewed and approved by the school board or board of trustees.

Instructional Validity

To what extent are all students in your district being taught the required content expectations, especially for the content on the required exit exam? How does the district or school principal ensure that all students (including students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students) receive classroom instruction - that is both regular and remedial instruction – that is well aligned with state content standards? To what extent is your response the same for the following groups: students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students? What criteria do you use to identify at-risk students before they take the CAHSEE?

All districts provided input that they have incorporated state standards into ELA and math instruction, or have aligned their instruction with content expectations. Specifically, in regular education classes, students are ensured of receiving standards-based or standards-aligned instruction through:

- using benchmark assessment (40%; 42 of 104)—districts reported that they have developed and implemented standards-aligned assessments on a regular basis, to assess and benchmark students' performance, and to evaluate and adjust instruction;

- using test data (34%; 35 of 104)—districts reported that they or the schools regularly collect and analyze student achievement data, such as the CAHSEE or STAR data, to identify at-risk students, to evaluate students' progress, and to identify instructional strength and weakness;

- using state frameworks and the CAHSEE blueprints (33%; 33 0f 104)—districts reported they align their instruction to the content standards, state frameworks, and/ or content expectations outlined in the CAHSEE blueprints, STAR blueprint, or CST blueprint;

- using standards aligned textbooks (29%; 29 of 104)—districts reported they use standards-aligned or standards-based textbooks and instruction materials in ELA and math classes;

- providing professional development (23%; 24 of 104)—districts reported that they have provided professional development to teachers and principals on various topics including the math and English-language arts standards, the content of the CAHSEE, instructional strategies, and lesson planning to ensure that teachers present standards-aligned instruction, and that teachers have strategies needed to teach all students including students receiving special education services and English learners;

- monitoring instruction (18%; 19 of 104)—districts reported that the curriculum specialists and administrator monitor and observe classroom instruction and lesson planning to ensure that students receive instruction that is well-aligned to state content standards, and that all students including students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students are taught with appropriate strategies;

- using state testing and review materials (12%; 12 of 104)—districts reported that their teachers are given the CAHSEE study guides to inform their instruction, and students are given the state study guides to review in class and at home prior to the administration of the CAHSEE; and

- using curriculum maps (12%; 12 of 104)—districts reported that they or teachers create and implement curriculum maps, aligned to standards, to ensure that all teachers are covering the content standards in a timely manner.

Regarding instruction for students receiving special education services and English learners, the majority of districts reported that these students are exposed to the same standards as the regular education students. These students receive either the same instruction with additional support or appropriate modification as regular education students do, or the remedial instruction aligned to California content standards. A few districts reported that they tailored the instruction to the ability level and instructional level of the students with special needs. Districts reported that students receiving special education services and English learners receive instruction with:

- the same regular core content curriculum, with additional support provided (44%; 46 of 104)—students receiving special education services and English learners are mainstreamed into regular classes; support classes and additional instruction are provided where deficiencies or special needs are identified;

- modified classes aligned to state standards (30%; 31 of 104)—students receiving special education services and English learners in these districts receive instruction on the content standards in core classes with appropriate modifications (e.g., modified instructional strategies or pace of instruction, etc.) to address the identified needs, so that these students can learn the state standards, as well as the skills necessary for success on the CAHSEE;

- remediation classes aligned to state standards (24%; 25 of 104)—students receiving special education services and English learners are enrolled in standards-based remediation or intervention classes; and

- alternative classes (11%;11 of 104)—students receiving special education services and English learners receive parallel or alternative instructions tailored to their academic needs and instruction level, but not necessarily at grade level.

Several criteria were suggested to identify at-risk students before they take the CAHSEE:

- the STAR or CST test scores (51%; 53 of 104)—districts identify at-risk students with their scores on the STAR or the CST (e.g., some districts identified students who scored Below Basic or Far Below Basic on the STAR tests in ELA and/or mathematics as at-risk students);

- other assessment results (42%; 44 of 104)—districts use other assessment results such as standards-based benchmark assessment, as well as other district, school, and teacher assessment, and course grades, to identify at-risk students; and

- classroom behaviors and teacher recommendation (22%; 23 of 104)—identification for at-risk students is based on their classroom behaviors such as attendance, and teachers' observations and recommendations.

Similar to students receiving special education services and English learners, identified at-risk students receive remediation or additional support. For example, 43 percent (45 of 104) of districts offer at-risk students such remediation opportunities as summer school, after-school programs, and the CAHSEE preparation classes. Twenty-six percent (27 of 104) of districts provide these at-risk students with additional support such as intensive instructions, shadow support, and individual meetings with teachers or counselors, etc. Four percent (4 of 104) of districts place at-risk students into alternative or parallel English and mathematics classes.

Student Remediation

To what extent are students in your district who initially do not pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE given the opportunity to be re-tested and to receive additional instruction tailored to their demonstrated needs? Does your district have procedures in place to track these students over time as they get closer to the graduation date to verify that they are participating in appropriate remedial instruction?

Fifty-three percent (55 of 103) of districts explicitly stated that all of students who initially do not pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE have the opportunity to re-take the test, as specified in the state designated timeline of testing and CDE regulation, which includes multiple opportunities at the 11th and 12th grades.

All districts provide additional support and remediation instructions to the students who do not pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE. The remediation opportunities include CAHSEE preparation courses and remediation courses tailored to the demonstrated needs of students such as after-school programs, Saturday classes, and summer school.

- Nineteen out of 103 (18%) districts provide CAHSEE preparation classes to students who have not passed the CAHSEE. Five of these 19 districts make the CAHSEE preparation course mandatory for those who have not passed.

All districts reported providing remediation instructions tailored to students' specific needs to pass the CAHSEE.

- Thirteen percent (14 of 103) of districts require students who do not pass CAHSEE to take remedial classes in addition to the regular math and/or ELA courses. For example, one district said, "seniors who have not passed the CAHSEE are required to take the appropriate remedial classes in addition to the regular core curriculum."

- Twenty-five percent (26 of 103) of districts place students who do not pass the CAHSEE into remediation classes or support classes held during regular school days.

- Other districts offer remedial instructions to students outside regular school day and school year. Specifically, 42 percent (44 of 103) offer summer school and 37 percent (38 of 103) offer after-school programs and/or Saturday classes.

- Eight (8%) districts stated that they use the CAHSEE Study Guides to assist with remediation for those students who do not initially pass the CAHSEE.

Twenty-five percent (26 out of 103) of districts offer students other forms of assistance and support for the CAHSEE remedial courses such as CAHSEE Intervention Plan to recommend remediation, regular contact with parents to review students' progress and to suggest appropriate interventions, and verbal and written notification of the CAHSEE re-testing dates.

As for tracking systems, 98 of the 103 (94%) districts have procedures in place to track the students over time as they get closer to the graduation date to verify that they are participating in appropriate remedial instruction.

- Among them, 25 percent (26 out of 103) of districts use student database, student information system, or student management system to track students' performance and monitor their progress over time; 9 districts use Edusoft, 4 use SASI, and 3 use AERIES.

- Six percent (6 out of 103) of districts generate a pass/no pass list of students for each school to provide appropriate placement in class, and tutorial and other support options.

- Nine of 103 (9%) districts reported that they have their director of testing, testing coordinator, or assessment director track students in regards to the CAHSEE status.

- In 26 percent (27 of 103) of the districts, counseling staff are responsible for tracking and monitoring students' performances and progress, for example, contacting parents and students, recommending and scheduling students into the appropriate placement and intervention, and maintaining a record of received remediation.

- In 7 percent (7 of 103) of districts, teachers are responsible for monitoring the students over time.

- In 8 percent (8 of 103) of districts administrators are responsible for tracking these students to verify that they receive appropriate remedial instruction.

District Executive Summaries

CAHSEE 2005 Instruction Study
District Executive Summary #1
Spring 2005

1. **Awareness:** *How has the district informed students and parents of content expectations and the new exit exam requirement? How often and by what methods does this communication take place?*

District provides staff, community/parents and students ongoing communication regarding the CAHSEE.

For staff, an in-depth training is given for all school site Testing Coordinators, ongoing data and analysis is presented at Principal meetings, and discussions are held at the Cabinet level.

For community and parents, CAHSEE notification is reported in school newsletters, the Superintendent includes information in his remarks to the [District] Board of Education, comprehensive data from the Assessment Department is shared with the [District] Board of Education, and CAHSEE pamphlets are mailed home to all tenth grade families.

For students, teachers review released CAHSEE test questions in their English and Math classes, KAPLAN CAHSEE preparation materials are reviewed, COE information is shared with students, and High School Counselors stress the importance of preparing for and passing the CAHSEE.

2. **Curriculum Validity:** *What actions has the district taken to adopt the California Content Standards expectations into the curriculum and to integrate them across all grade levels and subjects? How does the district consider required content expectations when selecting textbooks and curriculum materials*?

[District] is proud that we have purchased and implemented core standards based materials. [District] adopts materials that meet the State criteria in the five categories:

- Content/Alignment with Standards
- Program Organization
- Assessment
- Universal Access
- Instructional Planning and Support

3. **Instructional Validity:** *To what extent are all students in your district being taught the required content expectations, especially for the content on the required exit exam? How does the district or school principal ensure that all students (including students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students) receive classroom instruction - that is both regular and remedial instruction – that is well aligned with state content standards? To what extent is your response the same for the following groups: students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students? What criteria do you use to identify at-risk students before they take the CAHSEE?*

English and Math departments review CAHSEE Blueprints and textbooks to ensure standards tested are standards taught.

Some high schools offer parallel Math and/or English/language arts courses for students who haven't passed the CAHSEE and have scored at "Below Basic" on the CST's for STAR.

The Special Education Department is in the process of looking at the high school Resource Specialist teacher to more effectively utilize his/her support of the regular education teacher in order to support special education students in passing the CAHSEE.

English Language students have additional EL support classes, and at-risk students have different support systems in place depending on the high school. These include tutoring, Read to Achieve, and Math support classes.

4. **Student Remediation:** *To what extent are students in your district who initially do not pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE given the opportunity to be re-tested and to receive additional instruction tailored to their demonstrated needs? Does your district have procedures in place to track these students over time as they get closer to the graduation date to verify that they are participating in appropriate remedial instruction?*

Students in the graduating class of 2006 have been strongly encouraged to attend the appropriate CAHSEE prep summer school course. The intent is to offer a form of this course several weeks before each testing period.

Beginning with the graduating class of 2006, the MIS Technology Department is in the process of creating pass/no-pass lists for each school.

The ongoing challenge is to provide differentiated support to our students based on their needs and to offer consistent programs within the 5 comprehensive schools. This has become a major focus as 2005–2006 rapidly approaches.

CAHSEE 2005 Instruction Study
District Executive Summary #2
Spring 2005

1. **Awareness:** *How has the district informed students and parents of content expectations and the new exit exam requirement? How often and by what methods does this communication take place?*

At the beginning of each school year, all students and parents are informed in writing of the requirement to pass the California High School Exit Exam starting with the class of 2006. Each fall, parents are given ELA and Math standards booklets as part of our communication of expectations for students. Teachers of students in the class of 2006 and beyond also discuss this requirement with parents and students at the first quarter report card night.

2. **Curriculum Validity:** *What actions has the district taken to adopt the California Content Standards expectations into the curriculum and to integrate them across all grade levels and subjects? How does the district consider required content expectations when selecting textbooks and curriculum materials*?

The [Board] of Education adopted the California Content Standards in English-Language Arts and Mathematics in July 1998. In the subsequent year, all teachers were given copies of the standards and went through a process identifying alignment of instruction to these standards. They also identified the alignment and gaps in alignment with the curriculum materials in place at that time. All future selection and adoption of textbooks were based on standards alignment.

3. **Instructional Validity:** *To what extent are all students in your district being taught the required content expectations, especially for the content on the required exit exam? How does the district or school principal ensure that all students (including students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students) receive classroom instruction - that is both regular and remedial instruction – that is well aligned with state content standards? To what extent is your response the same for the following groups: students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students? What criteria do you use to identify at-risk students before they take the CAHSEE?*

All schools and teachers are accountable to the expectation that the Content Standards shall be taught throughout the school year. There has been a particular emphasis on English-Language Arts and Mathematics. Courses were realigned to ensure that all students received the content of Algebra no later than their sophomore year. English Learners and Special Education students receive a differentiated curriculum to meet their needs in English Language Development or remedial needs. They also have instruction in the Core Curriculum at grade level expectations. Students at risk of not passing the Exit Exam are identified for remediation beginning at grade seven. The basis for identification were students who scored Below Basic or Far Below Basic on the STAR tests in ELA and/or Mathematics.

4. **Student Remediation:** *To what extent are students in your district who initially do not pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE given the opportunity to be re-tested and to receive additional instruction tailored to their demonstrated needs? Does your district have procedures in place to track these students over time as they get closer to the graduation date to verify that they are participating in appropriate remedial instruction?*

All students who do not pass one or both parts of the Exit Exam are given all of the state designated opportunities to retake the examination. Special CAHSEE ELA and CAHSEE Math

remedial courses have been developed and implemented. Seniors who have not passed the CAHSEE are required to take the appropriate remedial classes in addition to the regular core curriculum. All students in the Class of 2006 and 2007 have been given the State developed Study Guides to prepare for the California High School Exit Examination. The district's Coordinator of Assessment identifies and monitors the number of students who have passed or not passed the Exit Exam upon every receipt of the results from Educational Testing Service. This data is then given to district curriculum specialists, high school principals, high school counselors, appropriate teachers.

CAHSEE 2005 Instruction Study
District Executive Summary #3
Spring 2005

1. **Awareness:** *How has the district informed students and parents of content expectations and the new exit exam requirement? How often and by what methods does this communication take place?*

Students are informed about the Exit Exam through individual and group guidance sessions; group guidance sessions include 8th grade scheduling and 10th-grade counseling workshops. The requirement is stated in the Program Planning Guide, which includes a comprehensive listing of graduation requirements. Parents are informed through 8th Grade Parent Orientation Meetings and 10th Grade planning meetings as well as via regular communications such as the school-to-parent newsletter. Early in the 10th grade, parents receive direct mailings about the requirement and the schedule for testing as well as make-up opportunities. Resource Specialists advise parents of students in the Special Education through IEP meetings.

2. **Curriculum Validity:** *What actions has the district taken to adopt the California Content Standards expectations into the curriculum and to integrate them across all grade levels and subjects? How does the district consider required content expectations when selecting textbooks and curriculum materials?*

The district follows a regular process of curriculum review: the California Content Standards have been studied and incorporated in the core subject areas. High school departments use the standards as guides, along with other references, when courses are revised or when new courses are added to the curriculum. Departments study the results of standardized testing (STAR) to further review coverage against student performance. It is expected when new textbooks are proposed that alignment with the standards will addressed and reported out when approval is requested by the Board of Education.

3. **Instructional Validity:** *To what extent are all students in your district being taught the required content expectations, especially for the content on the required exit exam? How does the district or school principal ensure that all students (including students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students) receive classroom instruction - that is both regular and remedial instruction – that is well aligned with state content standards? To what extent is your response the same for the following groups: students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students? What criteria do you use to identify at-risk students before they take the CAHSEE?*

Since all students are main-streamed, all students are engaging in the core content and are being held accountable for academic performance against the standards (see above). Special Education students and English Learners receive remediation from their support teachers, who use the Exit Exam preparatory materials as well as core curriculum content to practice skills. Section 504, Special Education students and English Learners are identified as at-risk potentially for the CAHSEE as well as students whose grade reports and standardized test results indicate they are struggling, either in content areas or in overall performance.

4. **Student Remediation:** *To what extent are students in your district who initially do not pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE given the opportunity to be re-tested and to receive additional instruction tailored to their demonstrated needs? Does your district have procedures in place to track these students over time as they get closer to the graduation date to verify that they are participating in appropriate remedial instruction?*

Students who do not pass are provided the regularly scheduled opportunities to re-test. As much as possible, they are given individualized instruction in their Resource classroom, in the EL classroom and in after-school tutoring to remediate. The high school counseling staff closely monitors student performance and interfaces with support teachers to ensure building success with the examination. Initially our experience is that students are passing the exam by the end of their junior year.

CAHSEE 2005 Instruction Study
District Executive Summary #4
Spring 2005

1. **Awareness:** *How has the district informed students and parents of content expectations and the new exit exam requirement? How often and by what methods does this communication take place?*

Every effort has been made to notify students and parents about the CAHSEE. A letter sent at the beginning of the year to all students about the CAHSEE. Those juniors who have not passed both parts of the test are sent a letter prior to the fall test dates. Reminders are given to students (juniors) in a variety of classes about the upcoming tests. The tests are announced in school bulletins multiple times. Prior to the census testing for sophomores, tutoring opportunities are provided to students after school on a volunteer basis. A positive incentive is offered for all students taking the test.

2. **Curriculum Validity:** *What actions has the district taken to adopt the California Content Standards expectations into the curriculum and to integrate them across all grade levels and subjects? How does the district consider required content expectations when selecting textbooks and curriculum materials*?

The District has adopted the California Content Standards in all core classes. Textbook selection is made based on standards-aligned curriculum offered in the text. The district has worked with staff to develop pacing guides, aligned to the standards, for each of the core classes. There are district-wide quarterly assessments, designed by staff, and aligned to the standards in Algebra A, Algebra B, Algebra l, Geometry, Advanced Algebra, English 9, and English 10, These test scores are part of a comprehensive review of curriculum. They are aligned to the California Standards Test (STAR) blueprint and include many of the standards tested on the CAHSEE.

3. **Instructional Validity:** *To what extent are all students in your district being taught the required content expectations, especially for the content on the required exit exam? How does the district or school principal ensure that all students (including students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students) receive classroom instruction - that is both regular and remedial instruction – that is well aligned with state content standards? To what extent is your response the same for the following groups: students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students? What criteria do you use to identify at-risk students before they take the CAHSEE?*

The English courses have incorporated the standards into the adopted curriculum. Teachers use the Study Guides provided by the state department of education for all 10th grade students as review material. Prior to the test dates, teachers prepare reviews for the students. They investigate test taking strategies and practice writing responses. All Special education courses provide the same curriculum and opportunities for their students.

4. **Student Remediation:** *To what extent are students in your district who initially do not pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE given the opportunity to be re-tested and to receive additional instruction tailored to their demonstrated needs? Does your district have procedures in place to track these students over time as they get closer to the graduation date to verify that they are participating in appropriate remedial instruction?*

Alt students enrolled in Algebra A and Algebra B (a two-year Algebra course) receives remediation on the standards for the CAHSEE exam, in addition to the algebra standards of the course. There are after school tutoring programs, a Saturday school program and an in-school math lab course for students to receive mediation. All students who have failed the math portion of the CAHSEE must be enrolled in a math course, even if they have met the Algebra graduation requirement

CAHSEE 2005 Instruction Study
District Executive Summary #5
Spring 2005

1. **Awareness:** *How has the district informed students and parents of content expectations and the new exit exam requirement? How often and by what methods does this communication take place?*

District students and their families have received information on the CAHSEE requirement continuously from both the district and site level since 2000. The district has communicated the requirement through a variety of information vehicles including; use of the district's website, direct mailings, the Annual Parent Information Packet, as well as our district's printed newsletter, "Inside Our Schools". District high schools have utilized their student handbooks, course selection materials/meetings, Back to School Night, parent education seminars, and parent association newsletters. The frequency of communication varies depending on the source. Annual Parent Information, student handbooks and course selection materials provide annual notification as well as any changes that might occur such as the postponement of the requirement from 2004 to 2006. Other communication takes place either in static fashion, such as on the website, or on an as needed basis through specific correspondence, either written or spoken, such as direct CAHSEE information mailings or parent education seminars.

2. **Curriculum Validity:** *What actions has the district taken to adopt the California Content Standards expectations into the curriculum and to integrate them across all grade levels and subjects? How does the district consider required content expectations when selecting textbooks and curriculum materials*?

The district has taken steps to transition to a standards based system at both the elementary and secondary levels. The process was initiated beginning in 1996, first with district standards in core subject areas and more recently, with state content standards based instruction and assessment. The district assessment program includes annual fall and spring writes, which are scored by district teachers using the English/language arts standards. At the elementary level a standards based electronic report card has been developed to assure curricular inclusion of state content standards. At the secondary level, transition towards standards-based instruction and assessment serves as a means to review existing curriculum and assist with the development of new courses. District and site administrators engage in monthly professional development around standards-based instruction, transferring the professional development to the site level. Administrators and teachers are utilizing STAR test data to make informed decisions regarding curriculum and instruction. Additionally, the district's teacher evaluation process is predicated on the California Standards for the Teaching Profession. Decisions regarding selection of textbooks and acquisition of instructional materials are made at the site and district levels, with Board approval, based on linkage to standards.

3. **Instructional Validity***: To what extent are all students in your district being taught the required content expectations, especially for the content on the required exit exam? How does the district or school principal ensure that all students (including students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students) receive classroom instruction - that is both regular and remedial instruction – that is well aligned with state content standards? To what extent is your response the same for the following groups: students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students? What criteria do you use to identify at-risk students before they take the CAHSEE?*

District students receive instruction on the academic content covered by the CAHSEE throughout the district, at both the middle and high school levels. Access to the core curriculum is provided to all students including special needs, English learners, and other identified at-risk students. The identification process may include review of special needs students' Individualized Education Plans, including assessments; English learners' CELDT data, as well as STAR test data and classroom grades. School counselors program student schedules to assure that IEP goals are addressed and that students receive classroom instruction in the content areas. English learners and CLAD certified teachers are matched, and English learners may be scheduled into SDAIE courses when appropriately called for. In-coming ninth grade students who performed below basic on STAR in middle school are identified as at-risk by the high school. These students are scheduled with consideration to identified performance deficits, allowing for access to the content through alternative course offerings or placements.

4. **Student Remediation:** *To what extent are students in your district who initially do not pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE given the opportunity to be re-tested and to receive additional instruction tailored to their demonstrated needs? Does your district have procedures in place to track these students over time as they get closer to the graduation date to verify that they are participating in appropriate remedial instruction?*

District students who do not initially pass one or both sections of the CAHSEE are notified of their performance and informed of the schedule of opportunities to retake the test. Initially, remediation strategies are implemented at the site level, which may include work in an existing class, or an additional class offered within or outside of the regular school day, to help prepare students for the area of the test where the student was not successful. The district has also offered special Saturday morning courses to assist students from the three comprehensive high schools, the continuation school, and the independent study school who are preparing to retake the test. Summer school is also utilized as a remediation opportunity for students prior to re-taking the exam. Participation and performance data from the test, as well as intervention documentation is recorded by district and site staff in the SASIxp student information system. This information includes data on those students who successfully complete the CAHSEE.

CAHSEE 2005 Instruction Study
District Executive Summary #6
Spring 2005

1. **Awareness**: *How has the district informed students and parents of content expectations and the new exit exam requirement? How often and by what methods does this communication take place?*

The [District] regularly communicates information regarding district/state/federal requirements for students on multiple levels. These include but are not limited to the following:

- Articles written by district leaders (Superintendent, Associate Superintendent for Curriculum & Instruction, Administrator – Secondary Curriculum) appear annually in our district newspaper *[District] Today*, which is mailed to homes of all 35,000 students once each month. Articles on CAHSEE have appeared annually for the past 4–5 school years.
- High schools send out newsletters communicating requirements and expectations for student achievement and graduation. These are done on a quarterly basis during the year.
- [District] and local high school websites carry information for students and parents to access.
- [District] annually publishes a course description catalog available to all high school students and parents that details academic and high stakes testing requirements for all students to graduate.
- High school counselors meet with all students at least once each year to discuss their individual four-year plan which includes academic and testing requirements.
- Results with explanation of mandated tests are mailed home to all parents.

2. **Curriculum Validity:** *What actions has the district taken to adopt the California Content Standards expectations into the curriculum and to integrate them across all grade levels and subjects? How does the district consider required content expectations when selecting textbooks and curriculum materials?*

All core curriculum offerings have courses of study which are board approved at the high school level. Every grade level from K–12 has adopted standards-based curriculum documents which list all state standards, district objectives from those standards, and essential questions. Each core course has a standards-based pacing calendar as well.

The district offices of elementary and secondary curriculum coordinate all textbook adoptions and approval of supplementary materials for all courses. These materials must be aligned with state content standards in order to be considered for approval.

3. **Instructional Validity***: To what extent are all students in your district being taught the required content expectations, especially for the content on the required exit exam? How does the district or school principal ensure that all students (including students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students) receive classroom instruction - that is both regular and remedial instruction – that is well aligned with state content standards? To what extent is your response the same for the following groups: students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students? What criteria do you use to identify at-risk students before they take the CAHSEE?*

All students in [District] receive the same required core content curriculum and instruction based upon their individual four-year plan at the high school level that guides them through their high

school requirements for post secondary options. All students in K–12 receive instruction in standards aligned courses.

Principals meet with their Area Superintendents twice each month to discuss student achievement and in turn have regular weekly/monthly meetings with their leadership teams and grade level/subject area teachers focused on student progress and achievement. At risk students are identified based upon both mandated tests (STAR) and formative tests [District] that are conducted in core content areas based upon a district assessment calendar. Teachers administer these tests utilizing EduSoft web-based software that allows them to collect data longitudinally during the year. This allows teachers, site administrators, and curriculum specialists at the district level to identify students for remediation/intervention services. All formative assessments are written with itemized state content standards identified, thus allowing for specific re-teaching focus for all teachers. This approach is utilized for all students (special education, English learners or at-risk).

4. **Student Remediation:** *To what extent are students in your district who initially do not pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE given the opportunity to be re-tested and to receive additional instruction tailored to their demonstrated needs? Does your district have procedures in place to track these students over time as they get closer to the graduation date to verify that they are participating in appropriate remedial instruction?*

[District] has established an annual Assessment Calendar that lists all tests administered K–12. The CAHSEE dates are established annually, printed and sent to school sites, publicized in our district and school newspapers, and posted on our [District] Website. Schools are responsible for tracking the progress of all students who take the CAHSEE, and identifying for additional remediation and intervention, those who do not pass one or both parts of the exam. Intervention courses exist within the school day (counts as an elective choice) and are offered outside the school day as well (after school/Saturday School). Counselors are responsible for annually monitoring, contacting parents and students, and scheduling students into the appropriate courses to support their growth and passage of the CAHSEE. In addition, those students deemed at risk of non-graduation due to not passing the CAHSEE, are strongly encouraged to enroll in summer school, where additional intervention classes are taught to prepare them to pass the CAHSEE. Students are provided with 7 opportunities commencing with the initial 10th grade test to pass the CAHSEE and earn a check-off for graduation.

CAHSEE 2005 Instruction Study
District Executive Summary #7
Spring 2005

1. **Awareness:** *How has the district informed students and parents of content expectations and the new exit exam requirement? How often and by what methods does this communication take place?*

The first level of dissemination of information regarding the CAHSEE occurs in the district Parent Handbook. This document is distributed to all parents and guardians of children grades K–12 in the first day packet, and is available through the district web page. High school sites also include information regarding the CAHSEE in their site course handbooks. In addition to written notification, informational meetings are held during the day and evening to provide an orientation for parents on the structure, content, and importance of the CAHSEE for the Class of 2006 and beyond. Information regarding the CAHSEE is also shared by special education staff with parents as part of the Individual Educational Plan (IEP) process and the District English Learner Advisory Committee and the Migrant Parent Advisory Committee.

2. **Curriculum Validity:** *What actions has the district taken to adopt the California Content Standards expectations into the curriculum and to integrate them across all grade levels and subjects? How does the district consider required content expectations when selecting textbooks and curriculum materials*?

As the California State Board of Education adopts state-content standards, those standards are reviewed and adopted locally. All core high school courses have course outlines based on the California Content Standards. In the areas of Math and English/Language Arts, pacing guides and benchmark assessments support curriculum adoptions, K–12, that specifically address the California Content Standards. At the secondary level, middle school core courses use state-approved instructional materials and a local review for alignment to standards occurs for all locally adopted supplemental materials. At the high school and middle school levels, the California editions of the Prentice Hall Pre-Algebra and Algebra are used and supported by staff training available through AB 466. High school English/language arts courses use the California edition of the Holt, Rinehart, and Winston *Literature & Language Arts* series. This series is aligned to the California Content Standards, follows the same format as the state-adopted middle school program, and is also supported by AB 466 training. Locally adopted CAHSEE support materials from a variety of publishers have also been used for after school and in-class remediation and intervention activities.

3. **Instructional Validity:** *To what extent are all students in your district being taught the required content expectations, especially for the content on the required exit exam? How does the district or school principal ensure that all students (including students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students) receive classroom instruction - that is both regular and remedial instruction – that is well aligned with state content standards? To what extent is your response the same for the following groups: students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students? What criteria do you use to identify at-risk students before they take the CAHSEE?*

Instructional validity is achieved through the curriculum validity processes mentioned above, through instructional leadership activities supported by AB 75 Principal Training, and through standards-intensive training such as AB 466 Content Area Training in math and language arts. Through the use of content-aligned curriculum at the middle and high school level, site instructional leaders such as principals and vice principals, can evaluate the delivery of

instruction to ensure that the classroom activities reinforce the skills necessary for success on the CAHSEE. As soon as instructionally appropriate, special population students are provided access to the core materials and activities with appropriate Universal Access modifications, so that the EL, SPED, and other special population students can learn the skills necessary for success on the CAHSEE.

In an effort to provide early identification and assistance for students at risk of failing the CAHSEE, multiple measure indicators such as benchmark assessments, the California Standards Tests, and grades in core classes are used to identify struggling students so that a referral will be made to in-class, after school, or summer intervention activities in grades K–12. Special emphasis is placed on CAHSEE assessed skills beginning in sixth grade, when students in danger of retention are referred to an intensive summer remediation program. Also, both at middle and high school levels, students identified as needing extra assistance (through multiple measures) are referred to in-class reading and math intervention programs.

4. **Student Remediation:** *To what extent are students in your district who initially do not pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE given the opportunity to be re-tested and to receive additional instruction tailored to their demonstrated needs? Does your district have procedures in place to track these students over time as they get closer to the graduation date to verify that they are participating in appropriate remedial instruction?*

As stated above, CAHSEE-focused remediation activities begin in earnest during middle school and early high school grades. In-class, after school, and summer activities are designed to address skills deficiencies that could lead to students not passing the CAHSEE. Once a student attempts the CAHSEE in their sophomore year, their results are posted in our district's student management system. By posting results in the student management system, site personnel have the ability to query the assessment results and develop lists of students who need additional assistance in math or English. After school tutorial is provided for all 11th grade students who have not passed one or both sections of the CAHSEE. The after school tutorial course is structured to provide specific skill assistance by strand, so that students have the opportunity to attend the session or sessions that meet their specific needs. In the senior year, the members of the class of 2006 who have not passed one or both sections of the CAHSEE have been recruited for a summer intervention class and a mandatory elective that will be offered in the fall of 2005 of their senior year.

CAHSEE 2005 Instruction Study
District Executive Summary #8
Spring 2005

1. **Awareness:** *How has the district informed students and parents of content expectations and the new exit exam requirement? How often and by what methods does this communication take place?*

At the beginning of the school year, a packet of information is mailed to parents/guardians Included in this mailing is a page devoted to CAHSEE. We explain that State law now requires students in public schools to pass CAHSEE in order to graduate and be eligible for a high school diploma; the two components of the test; the number of opportunities students will receive to pass the test; the test variations allowed for English language learners and Special Education students, and provide the CDE's CAHSEE website.

Two weeks prior to each administration of CAHSEE, a mailer goes out to all parents/guardians of students needing to take and pass CA-ISEE. This mailer includes the State law and the dates and times of the test.

Ten weeks after each administration of CAHSEE, a letter to parent/guardians of students who took the CAHSEE goes out along with their students' results. The letter once again states the State law and primary purpose of CAHSEE. It encourages parents/guardians to contact their students' school counselor if they have any questions regarding CAHSEE. It also indicates their students' results and any additional instruction needed to help their students pass CAHSEE.

2. **Curriculum Validity:** *What actions has the district taken to adopt the California Content Standards expectations into the curriculum and to integrate them across all grade levels and subjects? How does the district consider required content expectations when selecting textbooks and curriculum materials*?

All courses are based upon the California State Content Standards for that subject. District teachers have selected power standards using the CAHSEE blue prints for such a selection. All courses of study are written to the content standards.

All textbooks are CA content standards based and are approved by the Board of Trustees on that basis. We have just adopted Basic Math, Pre-Algebra, and Algebra text books that are State Board adopted and adhere to the standards.

3. **Instructional Validity:** *To what extent are all students in your district being taught the required content expectations, especially for the content on the required exit exam? How does the district or school principal ensure that all students (including students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students) receive classroom instruction - that is both regular and remedial instruction – that is well aligned with state content standards? To what extent is your response the same for the following groups: students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students? What criteria do you use to identify at-risk students before they take the CAHSEE?*

All courses, regardless of the level (general, college prep, honors, GATE, Special Education, English language development) have a course of study based upon the CA content standards.

Teachers are expected to adhere to the course of study that is based upon CA content standards. Additionally, the teacher evaluation document contains one section which refers to adherence to standards.

While instructional strategies may differ for specific groups of students, nonetheless all students are exposed to the same standards.

In order to identify at risk students, we look at their junior high schoolteacher recommendations, grades, CST scores, and CAHSEE scores.

4. **Student Remediation:** *To what extent are students in your district who initially do not pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE given the opportunity to be re-tested and to receive additional instruction tailored to their demonstrated needs? Does your district have procedures in place to track these students over time as they get closer to the graduation date to verify that they are participating in appropriate remedial instruction?*

All students who do not pass one or both portions of the CAHSEE are informed of that situation. They are also informed of the next administration.

Every school offers specifically designed CAHSEE ELA and math courses for students who have not passed that section of the exam. These courses are available both during the regular school year and in the summer. Additionally, supplemental hourly after school programs are available, and students are encouraged to enroll. District resource teachers in English and mathematics work with small groups of students at various sites in areas of specific needs. Practice CAHSEE exams, designed by these resource teachers, are available to students.

Sites track student progress over time to ensure that those who have not passed one or both portions of the CAHSEE are enrolled in proper courses and receiving remediation services.

CAHSEE 2005 Instruction Study
District Executive Summary #9
Spring 2005

1. **Awareness:** *How has the district informed students and parents of content expectations and the new exit exam requirement? How often and by what methods does this communication take place?*

Awareness of the CAHSEE requirement as well as specific standards measured through the test has been provided at both the school site and District level. The summer mailing, sent by the sites but containing site and District information informs all students of the CAHSEE requirement as well as what is covered in the test. At the District level, letters are sent to all eleventh grade students informing them about the requirement and to all twelfth grade students reminding them that they must take the test and pass both parts if they fail to graduate by the end of 2005. The District and sites also use an automated phone system that announces upcoming test dates and locations for all students taking the test. Information about the tests and requirements has been provided to the public at Board meetings and District Advisory Council meetings.

2. ***Curriculum Validity*:** What actions has the district taken to adopt the California Content Standards expectations into the curriculum and to integrate them across all grade levels and subjects? How does the district consider required content expectations when selecting textbooks and curriculum materials?

Core classes in the [District] are all standards-based and accepted by the [University] and [University] for credit. Meetings with core area department chairs and District representatives occur regularly and at these meetings course modifications or new courses are considered. In 2004–05, remediation courses for students who failed one or both parts of the CAHSEE were developed and implemented in both the daily and after-school program. Both of these classes are based on the tested standards of the CAHSEE tests and offer students who failed one or both parts of the test solid remediation prior to retaking the tests. Because [District] takes the test in March with make up testing in May, data is not available on tenth grade student scores until after summer school is enrolled. Consequently, students who fail one or both parts of the exam are not remediated during summer. At all high school sites though remediation is offered in after school classes and on Saturdays in the fall prior to the November test. As [District] only offers standards-based classes in English and math, all students are exposed to the tested curriculum in these subjects. The District textbook adoption process involves department chairs and practitioners in all academic subjects and is organized around subject area standards. Student achievement data collected and posted on the Data Quest web site is used at the District level to evaluate effectiveness of the site programs. As all comprehensive high schools in the District have improved at or beyond the rate required by both API and AYP, and our CAHSEE pass rate exceeds both the [County] and California State averages, we have performance data that supports the effectiveness of our educational program. Two of the three high schools in the District have been selected as Title I Achieving Schools this year and one as a California Distinguished School, further supporting the rigor and alignment of their educational programs.

3. **Instructional Validity***: To what extent are all students in your district being taught the required content expectations, especially for the content on the required exit exam? How does the district or school principal ensure that all students (including students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students) receive classroom instruction - that is both regular and remedial instruction – that is well aligned with state*

content standards? To what extent is your response the same for the following groups: students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students? What criteria do you use to identify at-risk students before they take the CAHSEE?

Instructional validity is measured at the District level through the annual collection, disaggregation and analysis of student achievement data. For this process, the District retains a data analyst who discusses and collects student achievement data at the sites during a one-day data collection meeting in the spring. This meeting includes site administrators, department chairs and District personnel. The analyst continues the process and culls through District records to provide student achievement data at the follow-up data sharing meeting in the fall. [District] has successfully used this process for a number of years and has found that the spring and fall meetings are productive opportunities to look at how students are meeting the standards. As all data is disaggregated by language fluency, gender, ethnicity and special education status, the effectiveness of the various educational programs is evaluated by the site practitioners with the help of the District Office. Some of the following programs have been developed as a result of this data collection and analysis. The first of these is an 8th to 9th grade summer bridge program for at-risk of retention students. These students are identified through low performance on CAT 6, CST and student grades in grade eight. The summer program for these students is six weeks of summer school with half the day devoted to CAHSEE preparation in math and the other half of the program given to CAHSEE preparation in English/Language Arts. English learner students are given summer enrichment through extended English Language Development classes that are standards-based and last the entire summer day. Special Education students with appropriate IEPs are given summer enrichment in the areas of math and English/Language Arts with CAHSEE standards-based materials. Pre ninth grade Special Education students without the IEP mandate are often enrolled in the summer bridge program. Additionally, summer school provides makeup opportunities for students who have failed core classes. These summer classes in English and math are also standards-based and help students prepare for the CAHSEE.

4. **Student Remediation**: *To what extent are students in your district who initially do not pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE given the opportunity to be re-tested and to receive additional instruction tailored to their demonstrated needs? Does your district have procedures in place to track these students over time as they get closer to the graduation date to verify that they are participating in appropriate remedial instruction?*

[District] currently offers the CAHSEE to grade 10 students in March with make up testing in May. Students who fail one or both parts of the CAHSEE are tested in May and November. As March results are not available until July, no opportunities are available for summer remediation unless students have failed a class, are incoming ninth grade students or are English Learners. Prior to the November test, the sites provide a series of Saturday study sessions in September, October and early November. During second semester of this school year, CAHSEE remediation classes were offered inside and outside of the school day at our comprehensive high school sites in preparation for the May test. District high schools will also provide Saturday instruction as was provided prior to the November test. The process of recording remediation attempts is also being instituted. Site Counselors are now required to maintain a record of CAHSEE scores for each student and maintain a log of remediation attempts if the test is failed.

CAHSEE 2005 Instruction Study
District Executive Summary #10
Spring 2005

1. **Awareness:** *How has the district informed students and parents of content expectations and the new exit exam requirement? How often and by what methods does this communication take place?*

- We, along with our 8 feeder districts, have established an Educational Services Division Articulation Council which has met monthly for years. Since the inception of the CAHSEE, the Council has discussed academic issues as well as district responsibilities for the test, with parental notifications and meeting academic standards taking priority.
- Our counselors visit 8th grade programs annually and carry the message to incoming 9th graders. Counselors also meet with students once the test has been administered to counsel students who do not pass, explaining remedial options and future testing opportunities. Letters are also sent home once the test has been taken informing parents about test results and additional remedial opportunities for students who do not pass.
- Our high schools have 9th grade parent information nights, and our principals review graduation requirements with parents including the CAHSEE requirement.
- Our principals send monthly newsletters home, and CAHSEE is a frequent topic.
- At Back-To-School night, the CAHSEE is a topic of discussion.
- Our local media publishes several CAHSEE news articles per year.
- At each IEP, for appropriate students, CAHSEE is discussed and written into the IEP along with accommodations and modifications
- Each of our high schools has a freshman Boot Camp. The importance of passing the CAHSEE is emphasized with students. Supplemental learning opportunities are also discussed.
- At our ELAC and DELAC meetings, the CAHSEE is a topic of discussion for Spanish speaking parents
- Our district and site web pages refer to assessment requirements including CAHSEE.
- Classroom teachers receive staff development related to the CAHSEE.
- Two local Spanish speaking radio stations host topics, which include the CAHSEE requirement.
- Ed-line, parent information software that houses pertinent information, is available at 5 of 7 school sites and addresses CAHSEE. Ed-line will be in place at all schools next year.
- Our district sends a summer mailing to all families, and the CAHSEE requirement is reviewed. A telephone notification system is also being installed which will carry important assessment messages to all parents in the District.
- Daily school site bulletins and announcements occur at each school site.
- Our schools conduct small group meetings at the beginning of the sophomore year. All students receive one-on-one information on the test itself along with testing strategies. This is also motivational for students. It is a significant challenge, but the schools believe it is making a difference for students.

2. **Curriculum Validity:** *What actions has the district taken to adopt the California Content Standards expectations into the curriculum and to integrate them across all grade levels and subjects? How does the district consider required content expectations when selecting textbooks and curriculum materials?*

Our district began adopting and integrating content standards into our curriculum in 1998, parallel to the state adoption process. When the CAHSEE blueprints became available, and the entire CAHSEE issue was state adopted, our curriculum specialists made the CAHSEE a priority. We are a [District], and our goal is to move our students through Algebra as freshmen, but for those who are not prepared for Algebra, we have developed a CAHSEE prep course, which focuses on the skills necessary to pass the test. Our SDC students have a separate course addressing the skills they need to pass the test. This course is assigned in addition to a regular math class. There are after school tutoring sessions for any student who needs help to meet the CAHSEE standards. We also practice vertical teaming whereby teachers from similar core subjects review expectations for students in math and ELA. We have also developed a math intervention class for next year, which will be a combination of ELA and math support for students who are at risk. One of our curriculum specialists wrote a program called, “CAHSEE Question

of the Day", which availed 10th grade teachers of a daily prep question intended to keep CAHSEE in the forefront prior to the census.

We use a committee of teachers, parents and students to select textbooks for the district according to our board policy and administrative regulations. Specific criteria for selection is established in accordance with the State frameworks, and the inclusion of standards is the priority for all courses at all grade levels. Our ELA and math texts were selected with AB 466 in mind. We consider staff development to be a priority.

3. **Instructional Validity***: To what extent are all students in your district being taught the required content expectations, especially for the content on the required exit exam? How does the district or school principal ensure that all students (including students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students) receive classroom instruction - that is both regular and remedial instruction – that is well aligned with state content standards? To what extent is your response the same for the following groups: students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students? What criteria do you use to identify at-risk students before they take the CAHSEE?*

Our assessment results would suggest that a greater number of sophomores are passing the CAHSEE each year.

Our principals consider staff development as a priority. AB 466 in Algebra and ELA have been offered for two years. Our administrators have participated in AB 75. Our math and ELA departments have established curriculum maps with midterm assessments, which are then reviewed during collaboration time. Our curriculum specialists, instructional coaches, and administrators are in classrooms every day monitoring instruction. Our RSP students are all integrated into mainstream classrooms, and data is reviewed to ensure that these students are making academic progress. Our ELD Coordinator has taken our ELD standards and linked them with CAHSEE standards to ensure that all ELD students have access to the curriculum that will help them pass the test the first time.

Students are considered to be at risk if they score less than proficient on either the math or ELA CST the prior year. Our middle schools also use this same definition.

Our District has reduced the number of out-of-subject-area teacher mis-assignments in the last several years. We know that our best teachers must teach our freshmen and sophomores so that our students are more successful as juniors and seniors. This also helps to ensure that more of our sophomores pass the CAHSEE during the census.

Our administrators and coaches are in the classrooms as much as possible observing and documenting instructional strategies. We use Hand-Held Palm Pilots to document classroom visitations. This process has been very effective and helps to ensure instructional validity.

4. **Student Remediation:** *To what extent are students in your district who initially do not pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE given the opportunity to be re-tested and to receive additional instruction tailored to their demonstrated needs? Does your district have procedures in place to track these students over time as they get closer to the graduation date to verify that they are participating in appropriate remedial instruction?*

We are fortunate to have a district data technician who works specifically with assessment data. We have over 22,000 students, and to monitor progress is a full time assignment. Students who pass either part of the CAHSEE have their results documented in SASI, and the transcript documents progress. Our site data technicians along with the district technician communicate on a regular basis. Administrators are taught how to generate lists of students who need to take advantage of CAHSEE tutorials and CAHSEE remedial classes. Through SASI, interventions can be queried for students who are struggling to pass this high stakes exam. We also have a program called Edusoft, into which district assessment results are saved. Edusoft provides access to state test data and is a powerful disaggregation tool. Our goal is to intervene sooner than later so that we can continue to see an increased number of students passing the CAHSEE during the census.

CAHSEE 2005 Instruction Study
District Executive Summary #11
Spring 2005

1. **Awareness:** *How has the district informed students and parents of content expectations and the new exit exam requirement? How often and by what methods does this communication take place?*

As soon as legislation authorizing the CAHSEE as a graduation requirement, information was provided to counselors. The counselors informed parents and students. A letter is mailed annually to parents notifying them of the new graduation requirement of successful passage of the high school exit exam. An academic intervention counselor monitors students. Those who do not pass one or both parts of the exam are enrolled in support classes. A CAHSEE information night for parents is held annually. An inclusive PowerPoint that details content of the exam is provided for parents along with other handouts. Counselors talk to parents at grade level parent information nights. Study guides are distributed to all students through their English and math classes. Information about the exam is included in the PTSA Newsletter, which is mailed to homes of all high school students. Information is also provided on the school's website. Presentations are made at the middle school to parents and students in order to heighten their awareness of the CAHSEE.

2. **Curriculum Validity:** *What actions has the district taken to adopt the California Content Standards expectations into the curriculum and to integrate them across all grade levels and subjects? How does the district consider required content expectations when selecting textbooks and curriculum materials*?

When the mathematics and ELA academic content standards were established by the State of California, all curriculums were reviewed. All grades and subject area curricula were rewritten to align with the California Academic Standards. Textbooks are not considered for adoption and purchase unless they are aligned with the California Academic Content Standards.

3. **Instructional Validity:** *To what extent are all students in your district being taught the required content expectations, especially for the content on the required exit exam? How does the district or school principal ensure that all students (including students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students) receive classroom instruction - that is both regular and remedial instruction – that is well aligned with state content standards? To what extent is your response the same for the following groups: students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students? What criteria do you use to identify at-risk students before they take the CAHSEE?*

All curricula have been rewritten to align with the California Academic Content Standards. Teachers have copies of the standards and the expectation is that they will develop their lessons in order to be aligned to the standards. Parents are provided copies of the standards for each academic area. The curricula for special education and ELD learners have been aligned to the California Academic Content Standards. CAHSEE standards have been emphasized and discussed as a priority for the instructional program to ensure that students have instruction in the targeted content standards to support them successful passage of CAHSEE. "At Risk" students are identified through grades, CST scores, and teacher recommendation. Once identified, students are programmed into support classes before school, during the day, and after school. Students who do not pass one or both sections of the CAHSEE are all provided opportunities to retake that portion of portions of the exam. They work with the academic intervention counselor to receive additional instructional support. They are assigned support

classes before school, during the day, or after school. This support is provided for all students whether they are special education students, English learners, at-risk students, or regular Ed students. The goal of the instructional program is that ALL students will pass both portions of the CAHSEE successfully.

4. **Student Remediation:** *To what extent are students in your district who initially do not pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE given the opportunity to be re-tested and to receive additional instruction tailored to their demonstrated needs? Does your district have procedures in place to track these students over time as they get closer to the graduation date to verify that they are participating in appropriate remedial instruction?*

The Academic Intervention Counselor tracks students who have not passed one or both parts of the CAHSEE. Students are placed in appropriate instructional support classes. The Counselor closely monitors the students to be sure they are receiving the support required to help them successfully pass the CAHSEE. Examples include:

- Special education students and English learners who need additional support in ELA participate in intensive Read 180 classes.
- Students who need additional support in ELA might be programmed into a double block language arts class, thus providing two periods of intense ELA instruction each day.
- Those who have not passed one or both parts of the CAHSEE are placed in an intensive language arts or math class which is held before school.
- Classroom teachers are made aware of those students who have not passed one or both portions of the CAHSEE and adjust their instruction accordingly.
- The Academic Intervention Counselor meets with students who need to pass one or both portions of the CAHSEE and give them “pep talks” to encourage them and help them have a positive attitude toward the CAHSEE.

CAHSEE 2005 Instruction Study
District Executive Summary #12
Spring 2005

1. **Awareness:** *How has the district informed students and parents of content expectations and the new exit exam requirement? How often and by what methods does this communication take place?*

The district has yearly communicated to all parents the necessity of taking and passing CAHSEE as a graduation requirement. This began with the class of 2005 and has continued to date. Parents are notified in the eighth grade, beginning of 9th grade, and at the end of each semester. Notifications are completed in grade level presentations, mailers, and student binders.

2. **Curriculum Validity:** *What actions has the district taken to adopt the California Content Standards expectations into the curriculum and to integrate them across all grade levels and subjects? How does the district consider required content expectations when selecting textbooks and curriculum materials*?

The district has had a standards-based instructional focus for six years. All materials are standards aligned with instruction and assessments being standards-based. Instructional materials are not adopted by the Board of Education unless they are standards-based. This process has been in place as well for six years.

3. **Instructional Validity:** *To what extent are all students in your district being taught the required content expectations, especially for the content on the required exit exam? How does the district or school principal ensure that all students (including students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students) receive classroom instruction - that is both regular and remedial instruction – that is well aligned with state content standards? To what extent is your response the same for the following groups: students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students? What criteria do you use to identify at-risk students before they take the CAHSEE?*

The district has incorporated standards-based instruction aligned to the state frameworks and the CAHSEE blueprints as well as the CST blueprints in each of the available content areas. All students have access to the core curriculum which is standards-based along with all of the instructional materials. Students receive additional instruction in the identified area of remediation and remain in an intervention course for a minimum of one semester. Summer school is also mandatory for those students not showing signs of progression towards the attainment of a proficient score on CAHSEE.

4. **Student Remediation:** *To what extent are students in your district who initially do not pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE given the opportunity to be re-tested and to receive additional instruction tailored to their demonstrated needs? Does your district have procedures in place to track these students over time as they get closer to the graduation date to verify that they are participating in appropriate remedial instruction?*

The district offers before and after school academic assistance to assist with attaining a proficient score on CAHSEE Summer school is a mandatory program for those students who have repeatedly failed to meet proficiency on *CAHSEE.* Students may take CAHSEE five times during their 10th, 11th, and 12th grade years in high school. Students are monitored through the student data base and contacts with the student, parent and counselor are documented.

CAHSEE 2005 Instruction Study
District Executive Summary #13
Spring 2005

1. **Awareness:** *How has the district informed students and parents of content expectations and the new exit exam requirement? How often and by what methods does this communication take place?*

In the District we notify parents and students in a number of ways about the CAHSEE. First, parents receive a twenty-page *Annual Notification to Parents/Guardians* in the fall which outlines many important policies and information. Parents are informed that each student must pass the CAHSEE to receive a high school diploma. It describes how often the student may take the test and the specific dates on which the tests are given. Additionally, each high school sends a letter to each tenth grade student and parent outlining the requirement to take the test and the dates on which the tests will be given. At the middle school, the counselor tells 8th graders about the CAHSEE when they go in for counseling. Middle and high school administrators talk about the CAHSEE at parent meetings, and middle and high school teachers mention the CAHSEE as they are teaching standards that will be tested on the CAHSEE.

2. **Curriculum Validity:** *What actions has the district taken to adopt the California Content Standards expectations into the curriculum and to integrate them across all grade levels and subjects? How does the district consider required content expectations when selecting textbooks and curriculum materials*?

The Board of Education of the District has adopted the California Content Standards. That means that all of the Content Standards are incorporated into District curriculum in all grade levels. Textbooks are selected from the state adopted list for grades K–8, and teachers and administrators only select high school textbooks that align with the standards. Standards matrices are created for each textbook that is adopted to ensure that every standard for that course is covered in the textbook. Supplemental materials are chosen to assist teachers in teaching topics that are part of the Content Standards or are state requirements (such as AIDS prevention education) but are not well covered in the textbooks.

3. **Instructional Validity:** *To what extent are all students in your district being taught the required content expectations, especially for the content on the required exit exam? How does the district or school principal ensure that all students (including students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students) receive classroom instruction - that is both regular and remedial instruction – that is well aligned with state content standards? To what extent is your response the same for the following groups: students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students? What criteria do you use to identify at-risk students before they take the CAHSEE?*

Staff development is presented for teachers to ensure that they are teaching all of the required standards for their grade level or course. Benchmark assessments have been created in English/Language Arts and Mathematics in grades K–8 to ensure that students are mastering the Content Standards. Common end of semester assessments have been written and are being implemented in grades 6–12 in five core content areas: English/Language Arts, mathematics, social science, science, and Spanish. The exams in ELA and math assess the Content Standards that are required on the CAHSEE. Teachers in all levels of ELA and math (Special Education and ELD) are given the CAHSEE Teacher Guides and released questions to use to inform their instruction. Students are given the state study guides to help them prepare

for the exam. The criteria the high schools use to identify at-risk students before they take the CAHSEE include the students' STAR scores and course grades in ELA and math.

4. **Student Remediation:** *To what extent are students in your district who initially do not pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE given the opportunity to be re-tested and to receive additional instruction tailored to their demonstrated needs? Does your district have procedures in place to track these students over time as they get closer to the graduation date to verify that they are participating in appropriate remedial instruction?*

Power clinics are offered after school to middle school students who are in need of remediation in math and ELA. In addition, students who are identified as at-risk in reading are put into a Linguistics class at the middle and high school level in lieu of another elective. Those courses use the program *Language!* High school students who are in the two-year algebra course and need extra assistance are put into a math support class in lieu of an elective. During that course, students are given a preview of the concepts that will be taught in their algebra class, assistance with algebra homework, and instruction on the essential standards which include standards tested on the CAHSEE. The District offers a CAHSEE ELA and CAHSEE Math course in summer school for students who have failed either portion of the test or for those students who will be entering the 10th grade and want to prepare for the CAHSEE. The curriculum has been created by District teachers and is entirely based on the CAHSEE standards. The math department at the high schools publishes a monthly assistance calendar that is posted in all the classrooms, so students know when and where help is available in math. The District has procedures in place to track these students over time as they get closer to the graduation date to ensure that they have taken and passed the CAHSEE. All offers of assistance and remediation are documented in the AERIES student information system. Not all students have been placed in additional remedial instruction.

CAHSEE 2005 Instruction Study
District Executive Summary #14
Spring 2005

1. **Awareness:** *How has the district informed students and parents of content expectations and the new exit exam requirement? How often and by what methods does this communication take place?*

Every year, each site sends out a packet of information to each of its' registered students and their parents. This information packet includes information about the state mandated testing programs and how a student's performance on the CAHSEE will affect that student's graduation eligibility.

In addition to the "summer mailer," site administrators are directed to make announcements at parent meetings throughout the year and to send letters home prior to each testing administration. Counselors also provide continuous reminders to students and parents with whom they meet about the importance of these testing administrations and which content areas students need to focus on in order to enable success on the CAHSEE. Therefore, parents and students are notified at least 3 times throughout the year by mail, and have the opportunity to receive the message several more times throughout the year.

2. **Curriculum Validity:** *What actions has the district taken to adopt the California Content Standards expectations into the curriculum and to integrate them across all grade levels and subjects? How does the district consider required content expectations when selecting textbooks and curriculum materials*?

The focus of professional development, over the last three years, has been standards-based instruction. Teachers and administrators were provided with several days of collaboration time at which like-content area teachers worked together to align the course outlines to the state content area standards. Teachers also used this time to evaluate and share standards based activities.

Educational Services personnel meet with curriculum specialists and department chairs when considering new textbook adoptions. This team of experts, with input from all teachers at each site, reviews various course-specific textbooks over the course of a year and selects the one that is determined to be both grade-level appropriate and most accurately aligned to the state standards.

3. **Instructional Validity:** *To what extent are all students in your district being taught the required content expectations, especially for the content on the required exit exam? How does the district or school principal ensure that all students (including students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students) receive classroom instruction - that is both regular and remedial instruction – that is well aligned with state content standards? To what extent is your response the same for the following groups: students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students? What criteria do you use to identify at-risk students before they take the CAHSEE?*

As part of the standards-aligned curriculum development, teachers were given copies of the CST and CAHSEE blueprints and were instructed to ensure that students are exposed to, and have mastery of, those key standards. All 10th grade students were given a CAHSEE diagnostic test, created by district office personnel, aligned to the blueprint, in the Fall of 2004. Teachers were then given collaboration time to evaluate their student's performance on each standard,

and to discuss best practices. Students were also given a pre-CST diagnostic exam in Spring 2005. These diagnostic exams allowed teachers to identify, and subsequently focus on, the most challenging standards. These interventions occurred in the weeks prior to the respective exams. *All* students in grade 10 were given the CAHSEE diagnostic and *all* students enrolled in a CST-aligned course were given the CST diagnostics. These diagnostic exams, in conjunction with attendance and classroom grade data, enabled each site to identify and provide the most at-risk of failing students Saturday and before- and after-school intervention courses.

4. **Student Remediation:** *To what extent are students in your district who initially do not pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE given the opportunity to be re-tested and to receive additional instruction tailored to their demonstrated needs? Does your district have procedures in place to track these students over time as they get closer to the graduation date to verify that they are participating in appropriate remedial instruction?*

All students who do not pass the CAHSEE during the 10th grade are given two attempts in the 11th grade and two again in the 12th grade (as of 05–06), until they pass both parts (as per state regulation). We have used the November and May administration dates for the 11th (and 12th grade) make-up opportunities. Prior to the test dates, site administration identify those students requiring additional testing opportunities and engage them in after school and Saturday remediation classes. Students have the opportunity to participate in remediation until they pass both portions of the CAHSEE.

CAHSEE 2005 Instruction Study
District Executive Summary #15
Spring 2005

1. **Awareness:** *How has the district informed students and parents of content expectations and the new exit exam requirement? How often and by what methods does this communication take place?*

Students and parents have been informed about the CAHSEE in the following ways.

- Four Year Planning Sessions with parents and students of incoming ninth graders each spring.
- Sophomore Counseling Sessions with groups of parents and students each spring.
- Individual counselor meetings with parents and at-risk students.
- Counselor Junior Credit Checks with individual students each spring.
- Counselor Senior Credit Checks with individual students each fall and spring.
- Information in newsletters to parents four times each year.
- Information in the Parent/Student Handbook distributed to all students each year.
- Information in the Course Description Book provided to each student.
- Letters home to all sophomore parents about the February testing each year.
- Letters home to parents of juniors who have not passed one or both parts of the CAHSEE in November and March.
- Letters home to the parents of sophomore students who were absent for the February testing each year.
- The district mails CAHSEE reports home after each testing.

2. **Curriculum Validity:** *What actions has the district taken to adopt the California Content Standards expectations into the curriculum and to integrate them across all grade levels and subjects? How does the district consider required content expectations when selecting textbooks and curriculum materials?*

The curriculum for all courses is reviewed through an annual process. Departments review the curriculum in light of standards alignment, student achievement, standardized test results, and research-based programs. Recommendations for changes are made to the site assistant principal for curriculum. The site assistant principal reviews the recommendations and forwards those that are approved to the district level curriculum director. The district director reviews the recommendation and presents them to the Board of Education for approval. All courses are standards aligned. All teachers have degrees in English or mathematics.

Textbooks are selected after both a site curricular and district legal compliance review. Only textbooks that are California standards-based with standards or correlation maps are purchased.

3. **Instructional Validity:** *To what extent are all students in your district being taught the required content expectations, especially for the content on the required exit exam? How does the district or school principal ensure that all students (including students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students) receive classroom instruction - that is both regular and remedial instruction – that is well aligned with state content standards? To what extent is your response the same for the following groups: students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students? What criteria do you use to identify at-risk students before they take the CAHSEE?*

Instructional Validity in English:

- All freshman and sophomore students take the same college prep English courses with freshman at 20 to 1.
- Junior and senior students chose from composition and literature courses.

- English learners have two periods of English instruction taught at their CELDT determined ELD level.
- Depending on ability level, special education students are enrolled in regular education English courses or parallel special education English courses as determined by an I.E.P.
- At-risk students are assigned a Reading Skills elective in addition to their regular English class based on STAR test results.
- At-risk juniors and seniors are assigned a remedial Composition Fundamentals class.
- An after-school independent study English courses meets once a week for additional English instruction.

Instructional Validity in Mathematics:

- Students are enrolled into the appropriate level mathematics course depending on their abilities, STAR test results, and prior mathematics success.
- Pre-algebra is the lowest level mathematics class offered.
- Algebra is taught in a three-semester course with ninth graders at 20 to 1.
- Sophomore students who have not passed algebra are grouped together and emphasize CAHSEE content.
- Juniors and seniors who have not passed algebra are enrolled in an individualized instruction program with computer components.
- At-risk students are enrolled in an elective Algebra Fundamentals course.
- An after-school independent study mathematics course meets five days a week for additional mathematics instruction beyond the school day.
- Struggling special education students are enrolled in special education courses in pre-algebra and algebra with very small class sizes as determined by an I.E.P.

4. **Student Remediation:** *To what extent are students in your district who initially do not pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE given the opportunity to be re-tested and to receive additional instruction tailored to their demonstrated needs? Does your district have procedures in place to track these students over time as they get closer to the graduation date to verify that they are participating in appropriate remedial instruction?*

    - All sophomores are tested in February with a make-up in May for those absent.
    - Juniors who have not passed one or both parts of the exam are tested in November and March.
    - All teachers have classroom access to their students test scores for STAR and CAHSEE on our district records system.
    - STAR and CAHSEE test results are printed out for all students in each teacher's classroom. Teachers use the data to plan lessons, group students, and assist students.
    - Tutoring is available in the library four afternoons a week.
    - After-school independent study programs provide remediation for at-risk students in mathematics and English.
    - Counselors meet with at-risk students individually to appropriately place them in courses and independent study programs. A transcript profile and credit check form are the basis for academic discussion. At-risk students are identified as those who are behind in credits and/or who have not passed the CAHSEE.
    - Counselors meet with groups of students with Ds and/or Feeder School and mail home letters recommending intervention strategies and cautioning them about success on the CAHSEE.
    - Struggling students are referred to alternative education programs to improve skills in settings with smaller class size and more individualized instruction.
    - The district Zangle records computer program easily identifies students who have not passed the CAHSEE or the algebra graduation requirement.

CAHSEE 2005 Instruction Study
District Executive Summary #16
Spring 2005

The students and parents of the [District] are informed of the State and District requirements for earning a high school diploma beginning in the students' elementary school years. At parent conferences in later elementary school grades, within the content of the algebra and functions strands in mathematics instruction, teachers inform parents about the algebra *course requirement* as well as the algebra *performance requirement* on the CAHSEE, which must be passed to earn a high school diploma.

Middle school English and math teachers, as well as middle school counselors, again emphasize the coursework and CAHSEE requirements for a high school diploma. Over 90% of the [District] eighth grade students are enrolled in the grade-level math class for eighth grade, which is algebra. When the high school counselors come to the middle schools to register the eighth graders for the freshman year, students receive copies of the [District] High School Planning Guide, *which* lists all high school course offerings and course prerequisites, schedule planning for university and community college-bound students, and District requirements for a [District] diploma - including both coursework and the CAHSEE.

In high school, students and parents are kept apprised of their status towards earning a diploma by high school counselors, especially noted during the students' individualized tenth grade counseling appointment. English and math teachers focus their instruction on the California Content Standards, with emphasis on the key standards identified in the Blueprint for the CST exams. Beginning in the sophomore year, students arc administered the CAHSEE. If a student is unsuccessful in achieving a passing score on either the English or math portions of this test, repeated opportunities to take the CAHSEE are available in the student's junior and senior years. For additional support, [District] offers semester and year-long intensive courses, CAHSEE Math and CAHSEE English, during the regular school year and also during summer school. These courses may be repeated for elective credit. During the student's junior and senior years, counselors closely monitor students to ensure the completion of both the algebra requirements and their ultimate success on the CAHSEE.

CAHSEE 2005 Instruction Study
District Executive Summary #17
Spring 2005

1. **Awareness:** *How has the district informed students and parents of content expectations and the new exit exam requirement? How often and by what methods does this communication take place?*

The district has informed students and parents of content expectations and the CAHSEE requirement in numerous ways. Student support services staff meet with grade eight students for pre-registration and discuss course requirements, CA content standards (general) in core areas, CAHSEE requirement, and Algebra requirement. The same information is covered by student services personnel at 8th grade parent nights, Back-to-School Nights, Open House, 10th Grade counseling sessions, and various PTA, PAC, and site council meetings. In addition, written notification is provided in various publications such as registration manuals, student agendas, principals newsletters, etc. The Connect-Ed automatic dialer is utilized to notify parents/students of CAHSEE test dates.

2. **Curriculum Validity:** *What actions has the district taken to adopt the California Content Standards expectations into the curriculum and to integrate them across all grade levels and subjects? How does the district consider required content expectations when selecting textbooks and curriculum materials*?

The district has been extremely proactive in working with all school sites to ensure that the California Content Standards are taught and regularly assessed in every core content area. Bi-monthly meetings by core area have been on going for the past five years. A content area specialist from each school sits on a core area committee with district representatives, which meets bi-monthly to develop standards-based course outlines, curriculum, benchmark assessments (every six weeks), pacing plans, and student study guides. This content specialist format has promoted teamwork and consistency among the schools and development of the aforementioned materials has been a district wide effort with buy in from each school. A site administrator attends each meeting with their site specialist to provide administrative support. Department, grade level, and/or subject specific meetings follow at each site to ensure that each teacher is following the developed program. Further, the specialists analyze data following each benchmark to determine what adjustments need to be made and what interventions are to be instituted to help students succeed. Some examples are before and after school tutorials, "shadow" classes, CAHSEE prep classes, reading advancement courses, and more. Finally, site administrators work with district staff and core departments to perform item analysis, strand analysis, etc. to determine validity of benchmark questions, pacing plan reliability, etc. These same specialists and administrators collaboratively review texts and supplemental materials prior to purchase to ensure standards alignment, user-friendly text structure, and accompanying assessment instruments. Content specialists and site and district administrators consistently attempt to work with feeder school and district staff members. This is a difficult process as our district has four feeder district and ten feeder schools.

3. **Instructional Validity:** *To what extent are all students in your district being taught the required content expectations, especially for the content on the required exit exam? How does the district or school principal ensure that all students (including students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students) receive classroom instruction - that is both regular and remedial instruction – that is well aligned with state content standards? To what extent is your response the same for the following groups:*

students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students? What criteria do you use to identify at-risk students before they take the CAHSEE?

Since all core courses have been standards-aligned due to the work of the content specialist groups, all students are, therefore, enrolled in standards-aligned courses with accompanying assessments, pacing plans, and study guides. English learners are also served since the English Language Development teachers are also in a content specialist group. At three of the schools, special education students are mainstreamed and the special education teachers work collaboratively with the general education teachers. At the other three schools, this collaborative model is scheduled to be phased in over the next three years (one school per year). In addition, the previously mentioned tutorials, shadow classes, and CAHSEE prep classes are available. The district also provides a comprehensive summer school program to assist students in building their foundational skills. At-risk students are identified in a variety of ways that include reading level, math placement testing, 8th grade teacher recommendations, previous teacher recommendations, CELDT scores, CST scores, benchmark scores, GPA, IEP's, and more.

4. **Student Remediation:** *To what extent are students in your district who initially do not pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE given the opportunity to be re-tested and to receive additional instruction tailored to their demonstrated needs? Does your district have procedures in place to track these students over time as they get closer to the graduation date to verify that they are participating in appropriate remedial instruction?*

Students who do not pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE are afforded every opportunity to retake the exam within the testing cycle timelines. As previously stated, students are afforded support opportunities through tutorials, CAHSEE prep courses, summer school, "shadow" classes and/or reading advancement course. Counselors and teachers are diligent in identifying students in need of support and channeling them into appropriate support settings. Parents are contacted regularly and a customized student profile is generated for each family and reviewed with each student. These contacts continue to be made through the senior year, if needed.

CAHSEE 2005 Instruction Study
District Executive Summary #18
Spring 2005

1. **Awareness:** *How has the district informed students and parents of content expectations and the new exit exam requirement? How often and by what methods does this communication take place?*

[District] sends home a letter once each year to all high school students and their parents informing them of the testing times and dates of the CAHSEE and the requirement that students must pass it to receive a high school diploma in 2006. The requirement has been written in our Board Policy and it is stated twice annually during the televised Board meetings focusing on student achievement; one presentation is given by the district office and the second given by high school staff. The information is also written in the high school handbook that is provided to all incoming freshman, all new students and available to all returning students.

2. **Curriculum Validity:** *What actions has the district taken to adopt the California Content Standards expectations into the curriculum and to integrate them across all grade levels and subjects? How does the district consider required content expectations when selecting textbooks and curriculum materials*?

The district has formally adopted the California Content Standards at a Board meeting in November, 2001. The CAHSEE assessment is not a reflection of ninth and tenth grade information only, rather it reflects an ongoing spiral of instruction and learning that begins in elementary school. We have facilitated both vertical and horizontal articulations to ensure the standards are taught in all grade levels. DATA WORKS was hired as a consultant to the entire district for understanding the assessments required by the state and also brought in the work with secondary teachers on curriculum calibration in the areas of mathematics and English Language Arts. In addition, district curriculum maps and benchmark assessments in English Language Arts, writing and mathematics have been developed K–5 and administered 3 times annually. We are currently creating them at the secondary level. In addition, the district has just entered a contact with Edusoft and of primary importance is to ensure the benchmarks we are used are tightly aligned to the standards and to use their item bank to create assessments at the secondary level that reflect the skills and competencies necessary for successful completion of the CAHSEE. Teachers currently use teacher made tests, publisher tests, and the test in mathematics created by California State University, Fullerton. K–8 textbooks are purchased from the adopted lists, and supplemental materials are selected based upon teacher analysis of the content with district concurrence that the materials meet the CA Content Standards. Textbooks and materials purchased 9–12 are based upon teacher analysis of the alignment between the information presented in the books and the content standards. Teachers are given hours during the summer to continue embedding the standards in the taught curriculum. Departments also meet during the school year to work on standards alignment and assessments.

3. **Instructional Validity:** *To what extent are all students in your district being taught the required content expectations, especially for the content on the required exit exam? How does the district or school principal ensure that all students (including students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students) receive classroom instruction - that is both regular and remedial instruction – that is well aligned with state content standards? To what extent is your response the same for the following groups: students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students? What criteria do you use to identify at-risk students before they take the CAHSEE?*

Students receive instruction on the content standards in all core classes. The pace of instruction varies depending upon the specific learning needs of students (special education, ELD.) Algebra is frequently taught over multiple years allowing students to absorb the content at a slower rate.

Students in the middle schools are identified for an additional class each day based upon grades and CST scores. The additional class is provided within the bells in ELA or mathematics and it is designed to close the achievement gap between how the students are currently performing and what they will need to perform at to be successful learners. [School] also offers after school interventions in grades 6–8 and summer school in grades K–12 for all students who are not meeting with academic success. ELD students at middle schools use High Point and ELD students at [School] have recently been supported in their ELD class with Longman's, "A Sense of Wonder" and "Write Ahead." ELD students are targeted based on their prior performance on the CAHSEE. Teachers of special education students and regular education students recently attended a conference titled CAHSEE Preparation and Getting Ready for Algebra. The focus of the conference was on the teaching the skills necessary to pass the CAHSEE. The district purchased 6 sets of curriculum for teachers to utilize with their at risk students.

4. **Student Remediation:** *To what extent are students in your district who initially do not pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE given the opportunity to be re-tested and to receive additional instruction tailored to their demonstrated needs? Does your district have procedures in place to track these students over time as they get closer to the graduation date to verify that they are participating in appropriate remedial instruction?*

Students are provided a minimum of 6 opportunities to take the CAHSEE exam. They may take the exam three times as seniors. The district attempted to provide an intervention class after school in ELA and mathematics for those students who are currently juniors and who have not passed one or both sections. Students received a letter and phone calls home regarding the necessity of participating in the CAHSEE class. Unfortunately, we did not have enough participation to warrant the continuance of the classes. In addition, each summer a CAHSEE intervention class is offered during summer school to those students who have not passed one or more sections of the exam. Students are tracked over time by the district. A six-hour testing technician is employed at the high school. She accounts for all incoming transfer students and contacts pervious schools for student test results. Additionally, she tracks all students and updates the database as result come in.

As the STAR results are received district personnel disaggregates the data based upon student performance and scale scores and provides the data to the high school personnel. This data is then used to invite students to the various interventions facilitated at the school site

CAHSEE 2005 Instruction Study
District Executive Summary #19
Spring 2005

1. **Awareness:** *How has the district informed students and parents of content expectations and the new exit exam requirement? How often and by what methods does this communication take place?*

Secondary site school personnel are required to inform students and parents of content expectations in English language arts and mathematics a minimum of two times a year through letters home, course syllabi and /or counselor/parent/student planning meetings.

Middle school students and their parents are reminded continually through meetings, memos, and newletters that the curriculum in middle school English language arts and mathematics is the foundation for the student to pass the California High School Exit Examination (CAHSEE). A student who has successfully completed middle school should have the necessary prerequisites to successfully pass the CAHSEE. Beginning in grade nine, students and their parents/ guardians receive written notice of the CAHSEE requirement from their school site administrators and the school district. This notice is first issued at the beginning of the ninth grade school year and repeated at the beginning of the tenth grade school year.

2. **Curriculum Validity:** *What actions has the district taken to adopt the California Content Standards expectations into the curriculum and to integrate them across all grade levels and subjects? How does the district consider required content expectations when selecting textbooks and curriculum materials*?

<u>English Language Arts</u>
The District has adopted standards-aligned textbooks, grades 6 through 8 in English/language arts. The District has developed instructional guides that are standards-based and articulate a consistent and coherent instructional vision for English language arts instruction district-wide. These guides include standard sets, standards-based reading selections and effective practices to support standards-based instruction. The District has also integrated standards-based periodic assessments for grades 6 through 10 in English/language arts. The District follows State guidelines for the selection of instructional materials (textbooks).

<u>Mathematics</u>
The CAHSEE is first administered in the 10th grade after most students have completed Algebra 1. They are retested in the eleventh and twelfth grades to ensure passage of the CAHSEE. The District Mathematics Plan provides for the successful passage of CAHSEE. The regular sixth and seventh grade curriculum is California standards-based. The District Mathematics Programs has restructured its two-year Algebra course so that it reteaches grades six and seven standards plus the essential Algebra 1 standards. The District mathematics program also provides a copy of the "ETS Pathwise Instructional Strategies for Student Achievement" for every student enrolled in Algebra. This booklet is targeted to the CAHSEE standards. Every student receives the above support including the special needs child, English Learner and other at-risk students.

3. **Instructional Validity:** *To what extent are all students in your district being taught the required content expectations, especially for the content on the required exit exam? How does the district or school principal ensure that all students (including students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students) receive classroom instruction - that is both regular and remedial instruction – that is well aligned with state content standards? To what extent is your response the same for the following groups:*

students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students? What criteria do you use to identify at-risk students before they take the CAHSEE?

English Language Arts

The CAHSEE exam content is integrated into the instructional guides developed by the District in English language arts, grades 6–10. Both the instructional guides and the corresponding periodic assessments are aligned to the content expectations outlined in the CAHSEE blueprints. All students enrolled in grade level English/language arts courses, including students with special needs and those receiving special education services, have access to standards-based instruction and materials. The instructional materials, instructional guides and the periodic assessments are well aligned with state content standards in order to ensure that all students have access to a rigorous standards-based instructional program.

The District identifies students at-risk through multiple measures. These include mandated state assessments, other District selected standardized assessments, grade reports, and counselor/ teacher identification. Students enrolled in some language acquisition courses receive instruction focused on identified learning needs.

Mathematics

All students are taught the CAHSEE standards (spiraled throughout the courses in Algebra, Geometry and Algebra two) for both the ninth grade and the tenth grade. The District trained teachers to target the CAHSEE mathematics standards then offers the Essential Standards Mathematics course for intersession and summer school for high school students who needed to pass the CAHSEE mathematics. Our intervention programs offer special courses by KAPLAN, Larson Learning, etc to address the CAHSEE. Local school sites provide targeted drives (e.g. homeroom study sessions, after-school tutorials) in addition to the above. Finally CAHSEE scores are tracked by grade level counselors and mathematics teachers to ensure that no child is left behind.

4. **Student Remediation:** *To what extent are students in your district who initially do not pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE given the opportunity to be re-tested and to receive additional instruction tailored to their demonstrated needs? Does your district have procedures in place to track these students over time as they get closer to the graduation date to verify that they are participating in appropriate remedial instruction?*

The District has an extensive intervention program designed to assist students who do not pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE. All of these students have the opportunity to be re-tested and to receive additional instruction. Local school sites have procedures in place to track students who do not pass the CAHSEE and to verify that they are participating in appropriate instructional support.

Additionally, the District's English language arts and mathematics instructional guides, periodic assessments and related professional development address the issue of student intervention and support, in the following ways:

- Focus classroom instruction on grade level California English language arts and mathematics standards.
- Guide instruction by providing frequent feedback that will help teachers target specific standards-based knowledge and skills that students need to acquire at a given grade level.
- Create a coherent system for aligning the curriculum, instruction and assessments to the state English language arts and mathematics standards.
- Provide a vehicle for reporting to parents/students ongoing information regarding student progress toward proficiency of grade level standards.

CAHSEE 2005 Instruction Study
District Executive Summary #20
Spring 2005

1. **Awareness:** *How has the district informed students and parents of content expectations and the new exit exam requirement? How often and by what methods does this communication take place?*

Our alternative education students are very aware of the need to pass the CASHEE before they can graduate. Our math and English curriculums are based in part on the content standards needed to pass the CAHSEE. We offer incentives for students to pass the tests and provide extra instruction during the school year. Classroom teachers are the main avenue of communication to the students.

Being an alternative school, it is difficult to maintain the level of communication with parents that we would like to. We have Back-to-School nights, Ice Cream Socials for Students of the Quarter, and Open Houses. We send out monthly newsletters and daily progress reports.

2. **Curriculum Validity:** *What actions has the district taken to adopt the California Content Standards expectations into the curriculum and to integrate them across all grade levels and subjects? How does the district consider required content expectations when selecting textbooks and curriculum materials*?

For the last three years, our curriculum director has guided our staff in developing our Blueprint. This document has taken the content standards for 7th through 12th grade and determines which standards will be taught in what month. We established home groups and focus groups for the WASC review we went through. These groups continue to meet with the home groups assessing student work and the focus groups continuing to map the curriculum. We are using the Backwards Mapping Process of Wiggins and McTighe and are working towards common assessments.

Books and instructional materials are aligned with the curriculum and standards before purchasing.

3. **Instructional Validity:** *To what extent are all students in your district being taught the required content expectations, especially for the content on the required exit exam? How does the district or school principal ensure that all students (including students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students) receive classroom instruction - that is both regular and remedial instruction – that is well aligned with state content standards? To what extent is your response the same for the following groups: students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students? What criteria do you use to identify at-risk students before they take the CAHSEE?*

Our school is an alternative school and by definition all of our students are at-risk students. The Blueprint described above is required to determine the curriculum of all of our students. Fifty nine percent of our students meet the criteria for Title I of reading below the sixth grade level or testing below seventh grade in math or both. We also have English learners and special education students at our sites.

We are in the process of using Edusoft software to ensure that all of our teachers have up-to-date assessment information on their students.

4. **Student Remediation:** *To what extent are students in your district who initially do not pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE given the opportunity to be re-tested and to receive additional instruction tailored to their demonstrated needs? Does your district have procedures in place to track these students over time as they get closer to the graduation date to verify that they are participating in appropriate remedial instruction?*

Our math curriculum is designed to give the students two strands of instruction each math period. The students receive instruction and practice in the standards tested on the CAHSEE for half of the period and during the other half they receive individualized instruction. Depending on the student, the individualized instruction may be at grade level, acceleration, or remediation. If needed, students receive remediation during summer school sessions

CAHSEE 2005 Instruction Study
District Executive Summary #21
Spring 2005

1. **Awareness:** *How has the district informed students and parents of content expectations and the new exit exam requirement? How often and by what methods does this communication take place?*

   - High schools provide packets on CAHSEE for students, parents, and teachers (i.e., study guides, teacher guides, released test questions, assistance packets, sample documents).
   - During eighth grade orientations at the high school, content expectations and exit exam requirements are reviewed with students and parents.
   - Class level assemblies are held to highlight pertinent information related to CAHSEE.
   - Annual Parent/Teacher Night events provide information related to CAHSEE content and expectations.
   - Newsletters are sent home which include information on CAHSEE, focusing on requirement and dates of administration.
   - Content teachers use the CAHSEE English/language arts and math blueprints in preparing their lessons.
   - High school English/language arts and math instructors speak to their students about exit exam requirements on a regular basis.
   - High school English/language arts and math instructors use CAI-ISEE sample questions and assessments.

2. **Curriculum Validity:** *What actions has the district taken to adopt the California Content Standards expectations into the curriculum and to integrate them across all grade levels and subjects? How does the district consider required content expectations when selecting textbooks and curriculum materials*?

   - Revised and new course descriptions and outlines are standards based. All content professional development focuses on standards-based instruction. Each teacher is expected to know course standards well and teach to those standards.
   - Regular structured teacher planning time allows teachers to work and plan together in their content areas, analyze student assessment results, and develop lessons and instructional strategies to meet the needs of students not achieving mastery.
   - Evaluation tools include ways to measure implementation of content standards
   - K–8 grade level textbooks are all SBE adopted and aligned to state standards.
   - High school curriculum committees recommend textbooks and instructional materials based on coverage of state standards and other criteria using a WestEd-developed model.
   - The district hired an outside agency to assess the SBE-adopted, district-approved core textbooks for alignment to the state standards. Where inadequate coverage exists, district curriculum committees and/or outside service providers have written lessons to fill in the gaps.
   - Pacing guides created by teachers and those that come with the textbooks are used to ensure that state standards are addressed thoroughly and in a timely manner.
   - Curriculum maps are aligned to standards.
   - With consultant support, essential standards have been identified for English/language arts and math.

- Benchmarks assessments for English/language arts and math are given three to four times per year through grade 10.

3. **Instructional Validity:** *To what extent are all students in your district being taught the required content expectations, especially for the content on the required exit exam? How does the district or school principal ensure that all students (including students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students) receive classroom instruction - that is both regular and remedial instruction – that is well aligned with state content standards? To what extent is your response the same for the following groups: students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students? What criteria do you use to identify at-risk students before they take the CAHSEE?*

   - Each core course is aligned to the state standards, with emphasis on content requisite for success on the CAHSEE.
   - Each site's Academic Plan for Student Achievement (APSA), specifically Section 9*: Academic Achievement - Core Content* Areas (Reading/Language Arts, Mathematics, Science and Social Science), addresses the following improvement strategies:
   - Alignment of instruction with content standards and improvement of programs, curricula, instructional strategies and materials for ALL students-GATE, English language learners, Economically Disadvantaged, Migratory (if applicable) and Students with Disabilities.
   - Defined protocols are used for proper placements into intervention programs at middle and high school or into specialized support classes in algebra, pre-algebra, reading, and language arts.
   - These students are identified with multiple measurements: California Standard Test results (Below Basic, Far Below Basic), a reading diagnostic, a math diagnostic provided by California State University at Fullerton. District Wide Assessments given three to four times per year depending on the grade level, embedded assessments in English/language arts textbooks, and academic performance in class.

4. **Student Remediation:** *To what extent are students in your district who initially do not pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE given the opportunity to be re-tested and to receive additional instruction tailored to their demonstrated needs? Does your district have procedures in place to track these students over time as they get closer to the graduation date to verify that they are participating in appropriate remedial instruction?*

   - Each site's Academic Plan for Student Achievement includes the component-*Extended learning time for underperforming students* that specifies how the site will provide interventions and/or remediation for all student groups as cited above.
   - Students who do not pass the English/Language arts portion of the CAHSEE are placed in CAHSEE support classes and reading classes, appropriate; students who do not pass the math portion of the CAHSEE are placed in Algebra support or Geometry support classes.
   - Students are provided the opportunity to be re-tested on scheduled dates.
   - Instruction in the CAHSEE support courses acknowledges gaps based on CST scores, district wide assessments, and other measures noted above.
   - High school counselors monitor student academic performance to ensure appropriate placement in specialized classes and intervention programs.

CAHSEE 2005 Instruction Study
District Executive Summary #22
Spring 2005

1. **Awareness:** *How has the district informed students and parents of content expectations and the new exit exam requirement? How often and by what methods does this communication take place?*

[District] informs parents and students each year in the summer mailing that is sent home to each student. Schools inform students in 9th grade counseling sessions and 8th graders are informed in the 8th grade meetings in which high school counselors visit the middle school. Annually, [District] has a STAR parent meeting in which we provide parents with all the District test scores and how parents can help students prepare for the testing period. Further, [District] has a web site that informs parents of testing. The Communicator is the District's mailer that also informs students and parents of what is happening in the District as well as with testing. All information is made available in Spanish and Chinese, our two most prominent languages in the District.

2. **Curriculum Validity:** *What actions has the district taken to adopt the California Content Standards expectations into the curriculum and to integrate them across all grade levels and subjects? How does the district consider required content expectations when selecting textbooks and curriculum materials*?

[District] has adopted the California State Standards and has further developed Power Standards for all curricular areas including Physical Education, Modern Languages, The Arts, and School to Career. The Power Standards are considered the most critical standards for students to know and be able to do. The goal is for students to master the Power Standard by the end of the school year. The Power Standards were aligned vertically and horizontally in grades K–12. Cross over skills were looked at more in depth at the high school to find ways in which Modern Languages, Special Education, Physical Education, etc…could assist the core curricular classes. For example, measurement is taught in a German class and Physical Education uses measurement to discuss weight, etc. Data is analyzed at all schools and schools determine class goals, grade level goals, school goals and District goals based on strengths and weaknesses on the standards.

Textbooks must be standards based. The standards are used when teams of teachers begin selecting texts prior to piloting the texts. Check marks indicated the coverage of the standard and whether or not the text will allow for mastery and not simply coverage of a specific standard. Teachers determine how much supplemental materials will be needed to support the text and how technology can be used to assist all students but especially special education, GATE and English Learners.

3. **Instructional Validity:** *To what extent are all students in your district being taught the required content expectations, especially for the content on the required exit exam? How does the district or school principal ensure that all students (including students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students) receive classroom instruction - that is both regular and remedial instruction – that is well aligned with state content standards? To what extent is your response the same for the following groups: students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students? What criteria do you use to identify at-risk students before they take the CAHSEE?*

Students may be identified as “At Risk” in the elementary grades. This information is transmitted to the next grade level or school through our [Data base] system. At the 8th grade, we have developed a bridge program to assist students at risk in the transitions to high school. Counselors operate under the National Counseling Standards and teach lessons in classrooms and work with students who are at-risk. The High School teaches an AVID class for selected students and remedial reading classes are taught at the 9th grade level.

At Risk students are identified as those students who score below basic in either English Language Arts or Mathematics CSTs, score below the 39th percentile on the CAT-6 total reading and/or total math, or students who are recommended by teachers. We also look at students how receive double F’s in ELA and or Math.

Both the High School and Middle School use Silent Sustained Reading and have found increases in student test scores. Classrooms have classroom libraries for students to select texts. The Middle School uses Accelerated Reader.

Accelerated Reader and Math are used in the Special Education classes. Special Education teachers participate in staff development with the schools as well as through the Special Education Department.

English Learners are enrolled in English Language Development classes at both the Middle and High Schools. [College] offers classes on the High School campuses and English Language Development is also offered through Adult School. Our entire focus as a staff was on special needs populations last year. All staff development centered on the needs of GATE, ELD and SE students. [Staff] and [staff] were the highlights last year to assist with the understanding of the English Language Development Standards and how they fit with the English Language Arts standards.

4. **Student Remediation:** *To what extent are students in your district who initially do not pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE given the opportunity to be re-tested and to receive additional instruction tailored to their demonstrated needs? Does your district have procedures in place to track these students over time as they get closer to the graduation date to verify that they are participating in appropriate remedial instruction?*

Students at all grade levels may participate in summer school for remediation. 8th graders who are AT Risk may be selected for the Bridge program, the District is using the preparation books sent to us by CDE to assist students during class time hours. Letters are sent to parents for students to come to assistance classes and attendance rosters are kept to track student attendance. Parents are called if students do not attend the classes. Classroom teachers focus on the standards that students have weaknesses-based on analysis of data, classroom goals, departmental goals and school goals. Teachers are provided with student data in the beginning of the school year so they are aware of how to remediate students.

[District] has an excellent performance rate on the CAHSEE- of the current 11th grade class, only 40 students have not passed the exam.

CAHSEE 2005 Instruction Study
District Executive Summary #23
Spring 2005

1. **Awareness:** *How has the district informed students and parents of content expectations and the new exit exam requirement? How often and by what methods does this communication take place?*

Efforts have been made to inform parents and students not only of the requirement to pass the CAHSEE, but also the content expectations for passing the exam. Notification is sent out at the beginning of each year to all families in each school's newsletter. Information about the CAHSEE requirement is also included in each school's Curriculum Guide. After each round of testing, newspaper articles describe the CAHSEE program along with giving a summary of students' performance. When the score reports are sent out to parents, a letter is included from the Director of Curriculum and Assessment explaining the requirement and offering recommendations for remediation if the student did not pass one or both sections.

2. **Curriculum Validity:** *What actions has the district taken to adopt the California Content Standards expectations into the curriculum and to integrate them across all grade levels and subjects? How does the district consider required content expectations when selecting textbooks and curriculum materials*?

The District has worked to align curriculum in core subjects to the State Content Standards. During the 2003/04 school year, teams of teachers worked to organize the "essential standards" and created pacing guides to assist teachers with covering the content. In addition, district benchmark tests were developed to be administered each quarter to assess students' progress towards mastery. English Learners and Students with Disabilities participate in the benchmark testing, with accommodations, and their teachers follow the pacing guide to the extent that is practical. Insuring that Students with Disabilities and English Learners have access to a standards-aligned curriculum is a focus for this year, but there is still a lot of work to be done in this area. After each round of benchmark testing, the District has set aside a minimum day for students so that teachers can meet as departments to study their school's benchmark testing data for their subject. These opportunities for teachers to collaborate to improve achievement have been very valuable. Supplementary textbooks that allow students with special needs to access content have been purchased during the last two years. Alignment to the State Standards is a number one consideration when selecting instructional materials.

3. **Instructional Validity:** *To what extent are all students in your district being taught the required content expectations, especially for the content on the required exit exam? How does the district or school principal ensure that all students (including students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students) receive classroom instruction - that is both regular and remedial instruction – that is well aligned with state content standards? To what extent is your response the same for the following groups: students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students? What criteria do you use to identify at-risk students before they take the CAHSEE?*

Students whose benchmark scores indicate that they need more help than can be offered during class time are referred to after school intervention. The intervention teacher receives information regarding the specific English or math standards that the student needs help with. The intervention program has been very successful for the students who attend, but only about 25% of the students referred to the program actually participate. Students in junior high who are identified as being at risk for not passing CAHSEE based on scoring Below Basic or Far Below

Basic on the English Language Arts and/or math CSTs are scheduled into parallel English and/or math classes whenever possible. While each junior high offers a few of these additional periods of math and/or English for the most at-risk students, current staffing makes it difficult to offer as many sections as are needed. Some students who could benefit from the additional math and/or English class do not have the opportunity or are unwilling to give up one of their other classes to take the parallel math and/or English. It is a District goal to make these support classes available to all students who need them, but that is not currently the case. A new class, Strategic Reading, has been developed and will be offered beginning next year to students at risk for not passing the English portion of CAHSEE or for students who have taken this part and failed.

4. **Student Remediation:** *To what extent are students in your district who initially do not pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE given the opportunity to be re-tested and to receive additional instruction tailored to their demonstrated needs? Does your district have procedures in place to track these students over time as they get closer to the graduation date to verify that they are participating in appropriate remedial instruction?*

Students who fail to pass one or both portions of CAHSEE as sophomores are given additional opportunities to take the test as allowed by law. A letter goes home with the score reports that strongly encourages students who did not pass to attend special summer school programs tailored to help with the content necessary to pass CAHSEE. Saturday "review clinics" are also offered to 11th graders who have not passed CAHSEE. Counselors meet with every 11th grader who has not passed CAHSEE and fill out a "CAHSEE Intervention Plan" that gives recommendations for special courses, summer school, after school intervention, etc. A copy of the plan is sent home for the parents to review and sign.

To date, only about 10% of the District's juniors have failed to pass CAHSEE. The great majority of these students are in the Special Education Program. Up until two years ago, it was not uncommon for students in the Special Day Class program to be using different instructional materials from their peers in general education classes, and most of the instruction did not focus on grade level standards, but concentrated on basic skills. While the District's efforts for the last two years have emphasized the teaching of grade level standards, with accommodations, many of the students enter the District (in grade 7) performing at the 3rd or 4th grade level. These are the students who will not pass CAHSEE, even with the remediation programs that the District has instituted.

CAHSEE 2005 Instruction Study
District Executive Summary #24
Spring 2005

1. **Awareness:** *How has the district informed students and parents of content expectations and the new exit exam requirement? How often and by what methods does this communication take place?*

The district and its constituent high schools have gone to considerable effort to make students and parents aware that passage of the California High School Exit Exam (CAHSEE) is a graduation requirement for the class of 2006 and beyond. There have also been efforts to inform students and parents of the content expectations of CAHSEE.

- *School Based Efforts*- At the start of each school year a copy of the parent/guardian brochure published by the California Department of Education (CDE) it sent home as part of the back to school packet. CAHSEE content expectations are among the topics discussed at Freshman Orientation sessions, Back to School nights, and guidance counseling sessions. Once during the school year a Parent Information Meeting at each high school is devoted to CAHSEE. The CDE published CAHSEE Study Guides have been given to each student in the class of 2006 and 2007. Prior to each CAHSEE administration, an informational bulletin is sent home, and one school utilized the district's automated telephone messaging system to convey the importance of the March 2005 administration to parents and guardians. In less formal communications, principals, vice principals, counselors, and teachers take every opportunity to talk to students and parents about CAHSEE.

- *District Based Efforts*- Information about CAHSEE is included in the district's quarterly news letter. District Staff attend state and county sponsored information sessions and connect schools with the latest available information and resources. A letter to parents and guardians from the district's Chief Academic Officer is included with the CAHSEE score report mailed out from the district.

2. **Curriculum Validity:** *What actions has the district taken to adopt the California Content Standards expectations into the curriculum and to integrate them across all grade levels and subjects? How does the district consider required content expectations when selecting textbooks and curriculum materials*?

A California Content Standards aligned, State approved text series is used at all grade levels across the district in English Language Arts and Mathematics. A pacing guide for each grade level has been prepared to ensure that that all essential standards for the grade level are taught during the year. When selecting supplemental curricular materials, the first consideration standards alignment.

3. **Instructional Validity:** *To what extent are all students in your district being taught the required content expectations, especially for the content on the required exit exam? How does the district or school principal ensure that all students (including students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students) receive classroom instruction - that is both regular and remedial instruction – that is well aligned with state content standards? To what extent is your response the same for the following groups: students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students? What criteria do you use to identify at-risk students before they take the CAHSEE?*

The district pacing calendars serve to ensure that standards are taught in a systematic and logical sequence. An extensive, district wide assessment program aligned with state standards and the district pacing calendars is in place to allow the district and principals to measure student progress toward standards mastery. Results from these assessments are analyzed at both the district and school level. Principals meet with the school's Academic Senate to address curriculum alignment issues. Principals and assistant or vice principals lead teachers in grade level planning sessions to analyze individual student and aggregate results and formulate an instructional response. Particular attention is paid to special populations, including, Limited English Proficient, at-risk students, and IWENS. The high schools identify at risk students using the grade 7 STAR results and grade 8 attendance data upon entry in grade 9. Grades, attendance, grade 9 STAR results, and teacher observations are used to monitor the at-risk students leading up to the first CAHSEE administration. Also, a CASHEE pre-test is administered to all entering 9th graders, and results are analyzed to the cluster level to identify areas of instructional strength and need.

4. **Student Remediation:** *To what extent are students in your district who initially do not pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE given the opportunity to be re-tested and to receive additional instruction tailored to their demonstrated needs? Does your district have procedures in place to track these students over time as they get closer to the graduation date to verify that they are participating in appropriate remedial instruction?*

Students who do not pass one or both sections of CAHSEE on the first attempt are provided with structured remediation. There is a variety of remediation options available to students, including in class remedial support, parallel courses, intensive summer intervention classes, and after school tutoring. Counselors meet with parents to determine which remedial course of action is most appropriate for each individual student. A spreadsheet is kept by the school site to document each student's CAHSEE status and the remedial efforts offered and attempted to date. At the district level, student CAHSEE status is also monitored to ensure students are correctly identified for remediation.

CAHSEE 2005 Instruction Study
District Executive Summary #25
Spring 2005

1. **Awareness:** *How has the district informed students and parents of content expectations and the new exit exam requirement? How often and by what methods does this communication take place?*

Parents are informed (by letter) as to the requirements for passing the CAHSEE each time their child is going to be tested. The sites will provide better information on this subject.

2. **Curriculum Validity:** *What actions has the district taken to adopt the California Content Standards expectations into the curriculum and to integrate them across all grade levels and subjects? How does the district consider required content expectations when selecting textbooks and curriculum materials*?

Several years ago, [District] adopted the California Content Standards as our district standards. We threw out other standards that had been considered district standards. Our district requires that all textbooks be state-board approved, which means they are aligned to the California Content Standards. We are allowed to use supplemental materials that are not on the state matrix, but all core curriculums must be state approved.

Our school board appoints outstanding teachers to our textbook adoption committees. There are district mandated forms that require the textbook adoption committees to examine which standards are taught, with what frequency, and how the standards are taught.

3. **Instructional Validity:** *To what extent are all students in your district being taught the required content expectations, especially for the content on the required exit exam? How does the district or school principal ensure that all students (including students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students) receive classroom instruction - that is both regular and remedial instruction – that is well aligned with state content standards? To what extent is your response the same for the following groups: students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students? What criteria do you use to identify at-risk students before they take the CAHSEE?*

For the last three years, [District] has worked to implement a rigorous benchmark exam schedule. The benchmarks test students on their mastery of the California Content Standards in all core academic areas. Students are tested every three weeks in order to make sure that all focus standards (or essential content standards) are taught prior to STAR testing. Many of the tests have been written at the secondary level with a special emphasis on the CAHSEE. CAHSEE standards, whether on grade level or not, are spiraled in to the core exams for 10th grade students in order to refresh what the students may have learned in middle school. All students in all core classes take these benchmark exams. The scores are part of their grades and parents are given regular progress reports on their student's benchmark achievement.

4. **Student Remediation:** *To what extent are students in your district who initially do not pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE given the opportunity to be re-tested and to receive additional instruction tailored to their demonstrated needs? Does your district have procedures in place to track these students over time as they get closer to the graduation date to verify that they are participating in appropriate remedial instruction?*

Students who do not pass CAHSEE are given the opportunity to take the test again twice in their eleventh grade year, twice in the twelfth grade year, and once in the September following the completion of their regular courses. The students are enrolled in summer school and given the opportunity to tutorials after school and on Saturdays.

Our district uses Edusoft to monitor and track our data. We monitor students who have not passed CAHSEE as well as students who do not pass benchmarks and may be in danger of not passing CAHSEE.

CAHSEE 2005 Instruction Study
District Executive Summary #26
Spring 2005

1. **Awareness:** *How has the district informed students and parents of content expectations and the new exit exam requirement? How often and by what methods does this communication take place?*

Middle School math and English-Language arts teachers tell students about the CAHSEE graduation requirement. They inform students that the middle school math and English curricula prepare students to pass the CAHSEE. Parents of middle school students are informed of the CAHSEE graduation requirement and the link between middle school coursework and the CAHSEE at middle school Back to School Night and in middle school parent newsletters mailed to their homes. The CAHSEE graduation requirement and the relation between middle school success and passing the CAHSEE is explained to parents and low achieving students by school staff during Student Study Meetings.

High School students and parents are informed of the CAHSEE graduation requirement in a large group setting during 9th grade orientation. The CAHSEE graduation requirement is again explained to students in a small group setting during 9th grade course registration. Parents of high school students are informed of the CAHSEE graduation requirement and the link between Algebra I and English 9 and 10 coursework and the CAHSEE in high school parent newsletters mailed to their homes. The CAHSEE graduation requirement, courses which prepare students to pass the exams, and after school and summer school opportunities to prepare for the CAHSEE are discussed by school staff when they meet individually with parents and students to develop a 4-year plan during the 9th or 10th grades.

2. **Curriculum Validity:** *What actions has the district taken to adopt the California Content Standards expectations into the curriculum and to integrate them across all grade levels and subjects? How does the district consider required content expectations when selecting textbooks and curriculum materials?*

The district Board has adopted the California Content Standards in math and English-Language Arts. Middle school and high school teachers of math and English have articulated course curricula to these standards. Articulation of courses in other disciplines is not yet complete. Standards-based reports cards have been are being piloted in middle grades, with plans to implement in fall 2005. Before purchasing new instructional materials, the Board reviews and approves a matrix submitted by staff that shows how content standards are addressed by the new materials.

3. **Instructional Validity:** *To what extent are all students in your district being taught the required content expectations, especially for the content on the required exit exam? How does the district or school principal ensure that all students (including students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students) receive classroom instruction - that is both regular and remedial instruction – that is well aligned with state content standards? To what extent is your response the same for the following groups: students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students? What criteria do you use to identify at-risk students before they take the CAHSEE?*

Teachers review and use the CAHSEE blueprints and released questions as supplementary materials to ensure exit exam content is addressed in math and English courses. As part of the district's teacher evaluation process, principals observe classroom instruction and lesson

planning to ensure that all students, including Special Education students, English Learners and at-risk students, receive instruction that is well-aligned to state content standards. Professional development is being provided to all teachers to improve skills in planning lessons that address the math and ELA standards and CAHSEE content. A strong effort is being made among all teachers across the middle and high school grades, including those serving special student populations, to address these issues.

At the middle grades, grade level teams of teachers review student academic progress on a monthly basis. Formal Student Study Meetings are held with students, parents and school staff for all students working below grade level. Remedial and intervention plans are developed and implemented to help students attain grade level performance. At grades 9–12, guidance counselors and administrators meet with parents and students who are failing or at risk of failing classes to develop improvement plans. At both middle and high school grades, remedial and intervention services are available after school and during summer school.

4. **Student Remediation:** *To what extent are students in your district who initially do not pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE given the opportunity to be re-tested and to receive additional instruction tailored to their demonstrated needs? Does your district have procedures in place to track these students over time as they get closer to the graduation date to verify that they are participating in appropriate remedial instruction?*

Guidance counselors track students who have not passed exit exams after the initial testing. Counselors meet with these students individually before each subsequent testing to review preparation strategies, provide CAHSEE instructional materials, and encourage success. Students who do not initially pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE are counseled regarding their performance. These students are encouraged to take advantage of after school and summer school remedial programs. A 4-week CAHSEE after school prep series is offered to these students before subsequent testing. A Study Skills class, which will help students develop test-taking skills and will remediate deficiencies in CAHSEE content areas will be added to the high school course offerings for 2005–06.

CAHSEE 2005 Instruction Study
District Executive Summary #27
Spring 2005

1. **Awareness:** *How has the district informed students and parents of content expectations and the new exit exam requirement? How often and by what methods does this communication take place?*

The district holds a parent night for incoming freshmen in the spring prior to the ninth grade at every campus. At these parent nights, called Course Fairs, the school shares content expectations and information about the Exit Exam with families. The schools also present content expectations and information about the Exit Exam at Back-to-School Night in October and at Open House in the spring. All campuses provide Parent Institute for Quality Education in several languages; and present information about content expectations and the new Exit Exam requirement to the Citizens' Advisory Committee, the School-Based Coordinating Council, and to the Bilingual Advisory Committee. Information about the content standards and the Exit Examination are printed in course catalogs which are given to all students, and in the School Accountability Report Cards, as well as in the College and Scholarship Guide for the district. The district website also features this information.

2. **Curriculum Validity:** *What actions has the district taken to adopt the California Content Standards expectations into the curriculum and to integrate them across all grade levels and subjects? How does the district consider required content expectations when selecting textbooks and curriculum materials*?

The district has adopted all available bodies of California content standards as their own, with some additions and amplifications. Course guides and pacing calendars have been developed which reflect the standards for every course affected by them. Also, common assessments have been developed for courses with standards, especially in the areas reflected on the High School Exit Exam and on the CST; these common assessments have been correlated to the California Standards Test. Students' answers to these common assessments are recorded in Edusoft and used to display areas of needed attention in student achievement. When selecting textbooks and curriculum materials, the district selects state-adopted materials, as appropriate, for students working at the eighth-grade level or below; and where possible, similar titles are adopted for students working at the high school level. When a textbook is selected, teachers must use a rubric which reflects each of the standards for that subject matter and must assess the text for its capacity to assist the teacher in teaching each standard with rigor.

3. **Instructional Validity:** *To what extent are all students in your district being taught the required content expectations, especially for the content on the required exit exam? How does the district or school principal ensure that all students (including students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students) receive classroom instruction - that is both regular and remedial instruction – that is well aligned with state content standards? To what extent is your response the same for the following groups: students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students? What criteria do you use to identify at-risk students before they take the CAHSEE?*

All students in the district receive a standards-based curriculum, especially in the areas of English Language Arts and mathematics. The district and the schools use the Eight-Step Process, which is adapted from a model used in Brazosport, Texas, where schools raised their pass rate on the Texas version of the Exit Exam from around 28% at its lowest performing school to at least 92% at all schools, with no gaps in achievement between ethnic groups. This

process involves disaggregation of data, pacing and alignment of instruction, focusing on weak standards across the school, providing tutorial and enrichment as needed, monitoring and assessing, and adjusting instruction accordingly. Principals and district subject matter specialists provide support to teachers through a variety of professional development methods, including AB 466, and AB 75 training for administrators. Special Education students, English Learners, and at-risk students all use State-adopted and/or Board-adopted materials that are aligned to the standards and selected using a rubric which reflects the State standards. Students are diagnosed with appropriate assessments for their level of functioning and assigned materials that are appropriate for their needs. Students have access to accelerated coursework where they have skill deficiencies. For example, if a student reads below the sixth-grade level, he receives three hours of reading intervention a day until he reaches the sixth-grade level, at which time he continues to receive two hours of instruction a day until they reach grade level. Many students are able to close their achievement gaps within the space of one year and one summer in this manner. Extended hours of instruction for students with special needs are provided for students in other areas as well. English Learners receive four hours of English language instruction daily, in addition to sheltered coursework in other core subjects, still aimed at the standards. Diagnostic assessments which accompany our intervention programs, as well as the Gates McGinitie, the WIAT, the CAT-6, and other assessments are used to assist us in identifying student needs. Students who have not yet passed the CAHSEE are blocked continuously into an extra hour of instruction either in English or in math as needed, or both, until they have passed the exam. This extra hour of instruction is specifically targeted at the standards reflected on the CAHSEE.

4. **Student Remediation:** *To what extent are students in your district who initially do not pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE given the opportunity to be re-tested and to receive additional instruction tailored to their demonstrated needs? Does your district have procedures in place to track these students over time as they get closer to the graduation date to verify that they are participating in appropriate remedial instruction?*

Special CAHSEE preparation classes have been designed and are mandatory for all students who are performing in the bottom quintile and/or have not yet passed the CAHSEE. Students arriving as freshmen are placed in CAHSEE prep based on their performance in standardized testing during junior high school. Students who have had the opportunity to try the CAHSEE are placed in CAHSEE prep depending on whether or not they have passed. Enrollment in CAHSEE prep courses is not optional. These courses are also offered in the summer, and all available State testing opportunities for students who have not yet passed the CAHSEE are offered.

CAHSEE 2005 Instruction Study
District Executive Summary #28
Spring 2005

1. **Awareness:** *How has the district informed students and parents of content expectations and the new exit exam requirement? How often and by what methods does this communication take place?*

   - A **letter** informing parents and students of the CAHSEE requirement is sent out every fall.
   - **Reminders** about testing and requirements are done periodically throughout the year.
   - **Counselors** discuss this with students at the beginning of the year and with parents at Back-to-School Night.
   - Schools are sent **lists of students** needing to pass either or both sections of the CAHSEE.
   - Parents and counselors meet with students who have not passed by the end of 10th grade to **set goals** for the coming school year.

2. **Curriculum Validity:** *What actions has the district taken to adopt the California Content Standards expectations into the curriculum and to integrate them across all grade levels and subjects? How does the district consider required content expectations when selecting textbooks and curriculum materials?*

   - The California Content Standards direct **all teaching of all math and English courses.**
   - Textbooks and curriculum materials are adopted for their **alignment** to content, skill and cognitive level to state standards.

3. **Instructional Validity:** *To what extent are all students in your district being taught the required content expectations, especially for the content on the required exit exam? How does the district or school principal ensure that all students (including students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students) receive classroom instruction - that is both regular and remedial instruction – that is well aligned with state content standards? To what extent is your response the same for the following groups: students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students? What criteria do you use to identify at-risk students before they take the CAHSEE?*

   - Teachers plan instruction to teach the **content, skill and cognitive level** of state standards.
   - Teachers are aware of which standards are **key standards** according to the **California framework** and **blueprints**.
   - Standards are **keyed for their frequency on CST and CAHSEE**.
   - For all students – instruction and textbooks are aligned to the standards so that instruction **teaches the intent of the standards**.
   - Students receive **remedial instruction** based on **classroom performance** and **performance on CST and CAHSEE**.
   - **CAHSEE instructional resources** are used in remedial classes and provided to parents for use at home.
   - Teachers use **Released Items** from CST and CAHSEE to model test taking strategies for all students including EL and Special Education.
   - Regular **articulation meetings** with the middle school math and English teachers are used to identify key standards that provide foundation skills for the CAHSEE.

4. **Student Remediation:** *To what extent are students in your district who initially do not pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE given the opportunity to be re-tested and to receive additional instruction tailored to their demonstrated needs? Does your district have procedures in place to track these students over time as they get closer to the graduation date to verify that they are participating in appropriate remedial instruction?*

   - **Data processing** provides **strand and item analysis** of CAHSEE results so that teachers provide remediation by strand for students who have not passed the CAHSEE.
   - Student performance on each CAHSEE administration is **tracked over time** to ensure targeted remediation for successful passing of the CAHSEE.
   - **Supplementary courses** are provided within the school day and outside the school day.
   - Students and their parents are contacted by teachers and their counselors to encourage enrollment in supplemental classes.
   - **Summer school** offers opportunities for review.
   - Students can also augment skills for CAHSEE prep by attending classes at the **Adult School** and the **local community college**.
   - **State CAHSEE instructional materials** as well as **Kaplan materials** are used to target specific student needs.

CAHSEE 2005 Instruction Study
District Executive Summary #29
Spring 2005

1. **Awareness:** *How has the district informed students and parents of content expectations and the new exit exam requirement? How often and by what methods does this communication take place?*

Parents have been informed of the content expectations and the new exit exam in a variety of ways. Every high school has a parent newsletter sent out at least quarterly, and as often as 6 times a year for some sites, to keep parents informed of upcoming schedules, school events, and testing cycles. The district newsletter sent to the homes of all parents in the district also contains general information about testing. In February 2004 a letter was sent to every parent/guardian of a 10th grade student in the class of 2006 informing them of the upcoming CAHSEE and the requirement to pass both the ELA and the math component in order to earn a high school diploma. An October 2004 mailing was sent to the parents of students in the class of 2006 who had not passed one or both parts of CAHSEE informing them of the November test for their student. The CDE website was noted in the letter as a resource for the study guide and released test questions. A district-wide mailing to the parents of all 10th grade students, the class of 2007 was mailed in February 2005 to inform them of the March exam. A basic description of the test was provided as well as the CDE website as a resource for additional information. Parents of students in the class of 2006, who had not passed one or both parts of CAHSEE, were invited to an evening presentation about CAHSEE. They were asked to sign a contract outlining their support in ensuring that their student would take part in available remediation efforts that include intensive remediation prior to the May test as well as summer remediation offerings prior to their next administration schedule for Fall 2005.

Students are informed through the instructional process. Information about CAHSEE is shared with students at they enter the 9th grade through English/Language Arts (ELA) and math classes. In many cases, teachers make reference to classroom instruction based on standards identified for CAHSEE. In the fall, the California Department of Education CAHSEE Study Guides for ELA and math are distributed to every 10th grade student.

2. **Curriculum Validity:** *What actions has the district taken to adopt the California Content Standards expectations into the curriculum and to integrate them across all grade levels and subjects? How does the district consider required content expectations when selecting textbooks and curriculum materials*?

The district has adopted and integrated the California Content Standards district-wide in all curricular areas. Through the curriculum facilitators blue prints for CAHSEE and CSTs have been provided to each school as well as the released test questions. Schools have aligned courses to the content standards and have made curriculum modifications to ensure that standards are included in the instruction. All textbooks and curriculum material are standards aligned as required by the K–12 Instructional Material Program Allowance.

3. **Instructional Validity:** *To what extent are all students in your district being taught the required content expectations, especially for the content on the required exit exam? How does the district or school principal ensure that all students (including students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students) receive classroom instruction - that is both regular and remedial instruction – that is well aligned with state content standards? To what extent is your response the same for the following groups: students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students? What criteria do you use to identify at-risk students before they take the CAHSEE?*

CAHSEE blueprints have been distributed to all schools for distribution to teachers who teach 9th and 10th grade math and ELA classes. The CAHSEE Study Guides are distributed to every 10th grade students in the fall prior to their first CAHSEE administration. School administration monitor course alignment through conferences at the beginning of the year as goals and objectives are reviewed. At most sites, in a conference prior to formal observations, administrators ask which standards are being covering during instruction. Several site principals have asked teachers to reference in the classroom the standards presented in class. Test data is provided to teachers regarding their current classes through the student data management system and in hard copy at the beginning of each year for review.

Teachers providing instruction to special education students and English Learners are teaching coursework that is aligned to the standards. Across the district special education teachers meet with core department to be involved in curriculum alignment discussions. Teachers for English Learners have received training in writing strategies to address the specific needs of English Learners. A new standards-aligned textbook was recently purchased for ELL, and the teachers have established benchmarks to monitor student progress on state standards, specifically those to support the skills and knowledge needed to pass CAHSEE.

Students who are reading below grade level are assigned to the appropriate reading class. Reading classes are on a continuum that begins with basic decoding skills and moves to improving comprehension skills. CAHSEE test prep and test taking strategies are included in reading classes. Students whose math skills have gaps may be placed in the Essential of Algebra class that offers algebra instruction at a slower pace to help students grasp and apply concepts. A program newly designed for identified at-risk 9th grade students supports their transition to high school. Intensive support in an academy class includes a focus on test-taking strategies.

4. **Student Remediation:** *To what extent are students in your district who initially do not pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE given the opportunity to be re-tested and to receive additional instruction tailored to their demonstrated needs? Does your district have procedures in place to track these students over time as they get closer to the graduation date to verify that they are participating in appropriate remedial instruction?*

All students who initially do not pass one or both parts of CAHSEE are given the opportunity to be retested. Remediation tutoring, intensive coursework in CAHSEE support classes, and summer school offerings are provided for students. We encourage parents to support our efforts in assisting students by requiring their student to take advantage of the support opportunities. A letter was sent in August 2004 to parents of students in the class of 2006 who had not passed the CAHSEE math component informing them that their students would be enrolled in a CAHSEE support class for the fall semester of the 2004/2005 school year. For those yet to pass, at an evening meeting in April 2005, parents of students in the class of 2006 were asked to sign contracts acknowledging that their student had not passed one or both sections of CAHSEE, a requirement to earn a high school diploma. Parents were asked to agree to have their students' participation in at least one of the remediation opportunities offered. Data were provided to tutors and teachers on each campus to show where students have been successful and where students may need intensive work to help acquire the skills and knowledge needed to pass. The contract and follow-up to the contract provides a way to verify student participation in remediation. Enrollment records and grades in courses and summer school offering also provide information to help track students who have yet to pass CAHSEE as they get closer to graduation.

CAHSEE 2005 Instruction Study
District Executive Summary #30
Spring 2005

1. **Awareness:** *How has the district informed students and parents of content expectations and the new exit exam requirement? How often and by what methods does this communication take place?*

The District sends out a letter to all parents of high school students starting in the 9th grade year. The letter informs parents of graduation requirements, the content expectations and the requirement of passing the CAHSEE in order to earn a diploma. The current Junior Class (Class of 2006) has received a letter at the beginning of each year and will also receive a letter in the beginning of their senior year. Last year, our district prepared a Tri-fold brochure (In English and Spanish) on the CAHSEE that included the requirements and mailed these out to all homes for students in grades 9–11. In addition, each high school has included CAHSEE requirements in the school newsletters to parents and community members.

2. **Curriculum Validity:** *What actions has the district taken to adopt the California Content Standards expectations into the curriculum and to integrate them across all grade levels and subjects? How does the district consider required content expectations when selecting textbooks and curriculum materials?*

The California Curriculum Content Standards have been adopted and integrated into each class in the district. Textbooks with Standards have been purchased and integrated into each of the classes with standards on the CAHSEE. Much time has been spent with the Blueprints for the CAHSEE and staff development in the areas of Mathematics and English have included the need for teacher attention to the required content standards. California Department of Education sent us Study Guides for the class of 2006 two years ago. Each school used them with students in class to review the CAHSEE Content and gave them to each student to take home. This year, we duplicated those Study Guides and gave them again to the grade 10 and 11 students (who had not yet passed) and also used a new shipment that arrived to mail home to every grade 9 student with a letter to the parents telling them that students were responsible for passing the CAHSEE for a High School Diploma. This was a timely and costly project, but we believe the communication with the parents and students was necessary.

3. **Instructional Validity:** *To what extent are all students in your district being taught the required content expectations, especially for the content on the required exit exam? How does the district or school principal ensure that all students (including students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students) receive classroom instruction - that is both regular and remedial instruction – that is well aligned with state content standards? To what extent is your response the same for the following groups: students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students? What criteria do you use to identify at-risk students before they take the CAHSEE?*

The first piece of Instructional Validity comes with highly qualified teachers. Under NCLB, Teacher Certification has been verified and all schools in the district can claim a rate of 98% or higher for teachers certified in the field in which they are teaching. It is the role of the School Principal to observe teachers in classrooms and to conduct evaluations on classroom instruction which includes teaching to the standards. Schools have spent time working on aligning the curriculum and instruction with the content standards and staff development time has been dedicated to this purpose. Discussion about the instruction needed for mastery begins in Middle School, where many students complete Algebra in Grade 8. The CAHSEE Blueprints and

Released Items have been shared with the Intermediate and High School teachers in the District. Our district has an English Learner Progress Portfolio that has ELD Standards integrated with ELA Standards and student growth is charted on these curricular standards. Student's scaled score and Cluster Reports from the California Standards Test in English and Math in Grades 8 and 9 can contain indicators that students may be "at-risk" of not passing the CAHSEE. This is good information to analyze to prepare students in their quest for success on the CAHSEE in Grades 10 or later.

4. **Student Remediation:** *To what extent are students in your district who initially do not pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE given the opportunity to be re-tested and to receive additional instruction tailored to their demonstrated needs? Does your district have procedures in place to track these students over time as they get closer to the graduation date to verify that they are participating in appropriate remedial instruction?*

Students who do not pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE are given the opportunity to re-test twice a year. The Board of Education has approved a CAHSEE Remediation Class and workbook that has been offered each summer for the past three years. When the results of the March test arrive (usually at the beginning of June) students are notified of their status in a letter home and it is recommended they sign up for the summer CAHSEE Preparation Class. The Assessment Office prepares lists for schools of student performance on the individual clusters on the CAHSEE. These are shared with schools and they are able to share this information with students, staff and parents. This information also assists the school in helping individual students in their tutorial sessions, conducted after school at several of the high schools. Individual student conferences have been held with counselors, students and administration all meeting together to discuss student remediation and individual needs for tutorial help.

- We are currently discussing together the need to automatically enroll these students in the CAHSEE Preparation Class for the summer of 2005, and it has been proposed we send home a letter to parents whereby parents would have to sign if they want their student to NOT ATTEND the class.
- We are also currently discussing the need for a CAHSEE Preparation Class section in Math and English for each high school next year, during the school day, in order to assist those seniors who have still been unsuccessful.

In summary, this provides some of the information from our District in the areas of: Awareness, Curriculum Validity, Instructional Validity and Student Remediation. As each new school year begins, and again with the advent of the 2006 school year, the district, schools, administration and staff will make every effort to address the areas of: district-school-home communications; the required curriculum and instruction; and the remediation that is most important to assist students in being successful on the California High School Exit Exam.

CAHSEE 2005 Instruction Study
District Executive Summary #31
Spring 2005

1. **Awareness:** *How has the district informed students and parents of content expectations and the new exit exam requirement? How often and by what methods does this communication take place?*

The district has informed students and parents of content expectations and new exit exam requirement by:

- Letter to all parents of ninth through twelfth grade students each school year.
- School site written and oral communications about CAHSEE to students provided by guidance specialists and administrators.
- High school program course description and program planning guide and high school educational planning guide published annually for parents and students contains CAHSEE information.
- Teachers of ninth and tenth grade students inform parents at Back to School Night and individual parent conferences and inform students in their classes of CAHSEE content through their instruction.
- Annual notification to parents at registration time includes CAHSEE graduation requirement information.

2. **Curriculum Validity:** *What actions has the district taken to adopt the California Content Standards expectations into the curriculum and to integrate them across all grade levels and subjects? How does the district consider required content expectations when selecting textbooks and curriculum materials?*

The district has taken the following actions:
- [District's] Board of Education adopted state-aligned academic content standards in English/Language Arts and Mathematics.
- All high school course outlines include California Content Standards expectations.
- Textbook selection criteria includes alignment to Content Standards and Textbook
- Adoption Committee is required to complete the State of California Content Standards maps validating standards alignment prior to recommending textbooks for adoption.

3. **Instructional Validity:** *To what extent are all students in your district being taught the required content expectations, especially for the content on the required exit exam? How does the district or school principal ensure that all students (including students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students) receive classroom instruction - that is both regular and remedial instruction – that is well aligned with state content standards? To what extent is your response the same for the following groups: students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students? What criteria do you use to identify at-risk students before they take the CAHSEE?*

- Teachers are using district-approved standards in alignment of textbooks in all English/Language Arts and Mathematics courses with all students, including special education, English Language Learners, and at risk students.
- Teachers are provided with CAHSEE data for each student in their class including their overall score and their percentage of questions answered correctly in each cluster area and writing score.

- In addition to receiving test results for individual students, teachers also receive English/Language Arts and Mathematics California Standards Test results and identify at risk student's score in performance levels of Below Basic and Far Below Basic.
- Teachers use the CAHSEE Study Guides in English/Language Arts and Mathematics with all students before they take the CAHSEE.

4. **Student Remediation:** *To what extent are students in your district who initially do not pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE given the opportunity to be re-tested and to receive additional instruction tailored to their demonstrated needs? Does your district have procedures in place to track these students over time as they get closer to the graduation date to verify that they are participating in appropriate remedial instruction?*

- All students who initially do not pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE are given the opportunity to be re tested on state appointed testing dates.
- The district has a database that monitors the students that have not yet met the CAHSEE requirement. This database is available to teachers and administrators to identify individual students and collectively students at each grade level who have not passed the CAHSEE.
- Individual school sites develop appropriate remediation activities that happen within the classroom and additional remediation offered to students outside the regular school day and regular school year.

CAHSEE 2005 Instruction Study
District Executive Summary #32
Spring 2005

1. **Awareness:** *How has the district informed students and parents of content expectations and the new exit exam requirement? How often and by what methods does this communication take place?*

The district informs students, parents, and the community about the CAHSEE via multiple means: district and site newsletters, Open house and Back to School events, Curriculum Handbook given to *every* parent and student, counseling sessions, 10th grade parent night, Curriculum Steering Committee meetings, etc. A personal letter is mailed to the homes of all 10th graders and 11th graders who have not passed. Communication takes place at least five times a year.

2. **Curriculum Validity:** *What actions has the district taken to adopt the California Content Standards expectations into the curriculum and to integrate them across all grade levels and subjects? How does the district consider required content expectations when selecting textbooks and curriculum materials*?

Teachers have attended hours of staff development to study the content standards and to complete a standards map to identify and ensure that all standards are addressed in the curriculum. The pre-algebra and algebra courses, as well as English I for ninth grades ensure that all the standards assessed on the CAHSEE are incorporated into the curriculum. Textbooks are selected after they have been compared to a standards map and weaknesses identified. Textbooks are not approved unless they are standards-based and are proven to cover the standards.

3. **Instructional Validity:** *To what extent are all students in your district being taught the required content expectations, especially for the content on the required exit exam? How does the district or school principal ensure that all students (including students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students) receive classroom instruction - that is both regular and remedial instruction – that is well aligned with state content standards? To what extent is your response the same for the following groups: students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students? What criteria do you use to identify at-risk students before they take the CAHSEE?*

All students are scheduled for Algebra A, B, C, or D for math and English I or ELD for English. All of these courses are aligned to the state content standards. For the rare student who simply cannot perform at these levels, the individual assistance is geared toward bringing the student up to these levels. These students are on IEPs and a large amount of time and effort is spent to help these students succeed. Based on reading scores, we recently adopted READ 180 to further help students who do not read at grade level. All students are taught a standards-based curriculum that ensures the standards assessed on the CAHSEE are addressed within the ninth grade curriculum.

4. **Student Remediation:** *To what extent are students in your district who initially do not pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE given the opportunity to be re-tested and to receive additional instruction tailored to their demonstrated needs? Does your district have procedures in place to track these students over time as they get closer to the graduation date to verify that they are participating in appropriate remedial instruction?*

Once the CAHSEE results are in, every student is notified. Students who do not pass are sent a special letter encouraging them to enroll in the appropriate summer courses. Students and their parents who do not pass the CAHSEE are notified at least three times a year regarding testing dates and intervention courses. Two months prior to test dates, after-school intervention classes are held for all students who have not passed. While these after-school intervention classes are voluntary, 80% of the students who did not pass attend. Next year, if we still have seniors who have not passed the CAHSEE at the semester, we will place them in intervention courses during the day that are specifically designed to help students pass the CAHSEE.

CAHSEE 2005 Instruction Study
District Executive Summary #33
Spring 2005

The [District] uses a variety of methods to inform students, parents and the community of the content and requirements of the California High School Exit Exam (CAHSEE).

1. **Awareness:** *How has the district informed students and parents of content expectations and the new exit exam requirement? How often and by what methods does this communication take place?*

The most direct method is through the communication at the two comprehensive high schools and the continuation high school in the district. At the high schools, teachers and counselors engage with students individually and in small groups specifically about the requirements of the CAHSEE. The Freshman Seminar course, which is required for incoming 9th grade students, includes a unit on the CAHSEE that presents the content standards measured on the test, the requirements to pass the test and the number of opportunities available for students to take the test before they graduate. This information is also presented to parents at the 9th Grade Orientation, Back To School Night and at the Parent Conference Night. The information is sent to all parents written in the home language in the student registration packets and through the traditional communication avenues such as the Principal's Newsletters and on the school and district web sites.

2. **Curriculum Validity:** *What actions has the district taken to adopt the California Content Standards expectations into the curriculum and to integrate them across all grade levels and subjects? How does the district consider required content expectations when selecting textbooks and curriculum materials*?

The district has adopted all curriculum materials in grades K–12 to align with the California Content Standards. Textbooks are adopted by the district following the state adoption schedule. Publishers provide an in depth analysis of curriculum alignment with the state standards and only state adopted materials are previewed for consideration. The district uses a curriculum alignment rubric to evaluate all materials, and includes teachers, parents, administrators and support personnel on the selection committees.

3. **Instructional Validity:** *To what extent are all students in your district being taught the required content expectations, especially for the content on the required exit exam? How does the district or school principal ensure that all students (including students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students) receive classroom instruction - that is both regular and remedial instruction – that is well aligned with state content standards? To what extent is your response the same for the following groups: students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students? What criteria do you use to identify at-risk students before they take the CAHSEE?*

The standards-based instruction model is used district wide with formative and summative assessments used to drive instruction. All courses are aligned with the content standards and ninth and tenth grade English and math courses emphasize the essential standards from the CAHSEE Blueprints and material from released questions of previous CAHSEE tests. Students receiving special education services, English learners and at-risk students receive instruction using the grade appropriate, aligned instructional materials. These special needs students receive additional academic support as specified on their IEP's and/or needs identified through CELDT scores.

4. **Student Remediation:** *To what extent are students in your district who initially do not pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE given the opportunity to be re-tested and to receive additional instruction tailored to their demonstrated needs? Does your district have procedures in place to track these students over time as they get closer to the graduation date to verify that they are participating in appropriate remedial instruction?*

The district and schools monitor whether or not each student passes one or both parts of the CAHSEE. Counselors meet individually with students who did not pass one or both sections of the test to recommend intervention programs and placement in the CAHSEE Preparation Class. This class is available during the school year as well as a summer school offering to prepare students for the exam the following school year. Students are advised of the CAHSEE schedule for subsequent years and the number of times available to pass the test. Graduation Plans are reviewed with every student each year and the CAHSEE score is noted on the Plan. The parents receive the formal letter of notification of the score sent by the California Department of Education and letters from the respective Principals specifying the intervention opportunities, summer school options and the testing schedule of the CAHSEE.

CAHSEE 2005 Instruction Study
District Executive Summary #34
Spring 2005

1. **Awareness:** *How has the district informed students and parents of content expectations and the new exit exam requirement? How often and by what methods does this communication take place?*

Media releases, School Accountability Report Cards, High Schools' Newsletters, student/parent assemblies and Back-To-School-Nights are some of the communications used to inform parents and students. We began when initial legislation first passed and continue to current with latest testing in mid-May. Content expectations are communicated along with testing urgency and impacts.

2. **Curriculum Validity:** *What actions has the district taken to adopt the California Content Standards expectations into the curriculum and to integrate them across all grade levels and subjects? How does the district consider required content expectations when selecting textbooks and curriculum materials*?

Our Board of Education has adopted California State Standards as district standards, our Strategic Plan mandates alignment of curriculum and assessments to Standards. To the point where teachers daily post on white board the Standard being addressed. Textbooks are purchased only if they are aligned to California Standards. Any gaps are filled in with supplemental materials. Teachers receive professional development on 'unpacking the standards'.

3. **Instructional Validity:** *To what extent are all students in your district being taught the required content expectations, especially for the content on the required exit exam? How does the district or school principal ensure that all students (including students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students) receive classroom instruction - that is both regular and remedial instruction – that is well aligned with state content standards? To what extent is your response the same for the following groups: students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students? What criteria do you use to identify at-risk students before they take the CAHSEE?*

Student's instruction is aligned to Standards, i.e. textbooks and supplemental materials are aligned. Math and ELA teachers understand the critical need for students to pass the CAHSEE. Semester grades at end of 9th grade are used to front load students into CAHSEE math and/or CAHSEE English prior to taking test in tenth grade. Those students are scheduled into regular tenth grade math, as well as CAHSEE math, or English depending on the need. Our major concern is the number of English learners in our district.

4. **Student Remediation:** *To what extent are students in your district who initially do not pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE given the opportunity to be re-tested and to receive additional instruction tailored to their demonstrated needs? Does your district have procedures in place to track these students over time as they get closer to the graduation date to verify that they are participating in appropriate remedial instruction?*

Each high school has procedures in place to track, counsel, meet with students and schedule into CAHSEE math/ELA. In addition, summer school and after school day interventions are in place. Students are retested at next available testing.

CAHSEE 2005 Instruction Study
District Executive Summary #35
Spring 2005

1. **Awareness:** *How has the district informed students and parents of content expectations and the new exit exam requirement? How often and by what methods does this communication take place?*

Annual Notification to Parents mailed in August; Annual student registration materials such as course request forms, course catalogs; parent meetings held at district and at sites multiple times each year; academic probation letters mailed to parents a minimum twice per year; student handbooks sent home annually, student assemblies several times per year, annual meetings with school counselors.

2. **Curriculum Validity:** *What actions has the district taken to adopt the California Content Standards expectations into the curriculum and to integrate them across all grade levels and subjects? How does the district consider required content expectations when selecting textbooks and curriculum materials*?

District has adopted all California Standards. District has adopted SBE approved adoptions in K–8 core adoptions. Textbooks and curriculum is evaluated by site and district level curriculum committees, aligning content to standards. Governing Board approves curriculum and materials. All teachers have state standards in their classrooms. Standards have also been provided in poster format.

3. **Instructional Validity:** *To what extent are all students in your district being taught the required content expectations, especially for the content on the required exit exam? How does the district or school principal ensure that all students (including students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students) receive classroom instruction - that is both regular and remedial instruction – that is well aligned with state content standards? To what extent is your response the same for the following groups: students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students? What criteria do you use to identify at-risk students before they take the CAHSEE?*

All students (with exception of CAPA tested students) receive a standards-based curriculum. Our courses align with state content standards at all grade levels. Students not performing at grade level, especially those performing on the California Standards Tests at below basic and far below basic are put in intervention programs. Special education, ELL and at-risk are also enrolled in standards aligned courses, with SBE approved materials.

4. **Student Remediation:** *To what extent are students in your district who initially do not pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE given the opportunity to be re-tested and to receive additional instruction tailored to their demonstrated needs? Does your district have procedures in place to track these students over time as they get closer to the graduation date to verify that they are participating in appropriate remedial instruction?*

Students not performing at basic or above at grade level are provided intervention opportunities. High school counselors and administrators carefully track students who have not passed the CAHSEE and enroll them in “forced” electives that address language arts and mathematics areas of deficiency.

CAHSEE 2005 Instruction Study
District Executive Summary #36
Spring 2005

1. **Awareness:** *How has the district informed students and parents of content expectations and the new exit exam requirement? How often and by what methods does this communication take place?*

The district takes seriously the task of informing high school parents and students about content expectations and the high school exit exam requirements. All high school English and math classes are standards based. Classrooms, where instruction in these classes is conducted, display the course/grade standards. Students enrolling in these classes are provided with a course description that delineates the content expectations and grading procedures. Parents of students enrolling in a district high school are counseled regarding the need to pass the CAHSEE as a part of high school graduation requirements. The parent guide and high school course guide both contain a description of the requirement to pass CAHSEE for graduation.

2. **Curriculum Validity:** *What actions has the district taken to adopt the California Content Standards expectations into the curriculum and to integrate them across all grade levels and subjects? How does the district consider required content expectations when selecting textbooks and curriculum materials*?

The core programs in English language arts, mathematics, science and social science are all based on California Content Standards. In grades K–8, all instructional material is on the state approved list of standards based material. At high school, all instructional material is reviewed prior to adoption to ensure that a close match to California's Content Standards exists.

3. **Instructional Validity:** *To what extent are all students in your district being taught the required content expectations, especially for the content on the required exit exam? How does the district or school principal ensure that all students (including students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students) receive classroom instruction - that is both regular and remedial instruction – that is well aligned with state content standards? To what extent is your response the same for the following groups: students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students? What criteria do you use to identify at-risk students before they take the CAHSEE?*

All students receive instruction in courses that are designed to cover the content expectations required in CAHSEE. High school students are enrolled in core English courses in grades 9–11 that cover the content standards for those grades. Students who do not pass the English language arts portion of CAHSEE are provided additional intervention through a CAHSEE language arts class, reading classes, after school tutorial programs and summer school programs. The validity of content for special education students and English learners with low reading proficiency is monitored through classroom observations and analysis of student achievement data, but not to the extent that schools can ensure that these groups have had access to all content expectations required by CAHSEE.

The district's mathematics program provides students access to content expectations required by CAHSEE beginning with pre-algebra (7th grade math). Entering high school students who have not taken Algebra in 8th grade receive instruction in Algebra beginning in 9th grade. All teachers instructing students in pre-algebra and algebra use pacing charts that cover and assess all CAHSEE required content. Students who do not pass the mathematics portion of CAHSEE are provided additional intervention through a CAHSEE math class, after school

tutorial programs and summer school programs. The validity of content for special education students and English learners is monitored through classroom observations and analysis of student achievement data, but not to the extent that schools can ensure that these groups have had access to all content expectations required by CAHSEE.

Grades and STAR test results for 5th–9th grade are used to identify students at-risk of not passing the CAHSEE. These students are encouraged to participate in intersession classes (year-round calendar), summer school (tradition calendar), and intervention programs.

4. **Student Remediation:** *To what extent are students in your district who initially do not pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE given the opportunity to be re-tested and to receive additional instruction tailored to their demonstrated needs? Does your district have procedures in place to track these students over time as they get closer to the graduation date to verify that they are participating in appropriate remedial instruction?*

All students who do not pass the CAHSEE during their 10th grade year are encouraged to take advantage of the two test dates during 11th grade and the three test dates during 12th grade. All students who do not pass the CAHSEE during the 10th grade administration are counseled into various intervention programs.

Parents of high school students who have not yet passed both components of the CAHSEE receive a letter encouraging them to enroll their students in a summer school program for language arts and/or math. Students not having success passing Algebra are counseled into summer school, interventions, and the district's CAHSEE support class. If reading skills are identified as a problem, students are counseled into a reading support class and reading interventions.

The district monitors student progress in passing the CAHSEE. A list of students who have not yet passed the CAHSEE is generated each semester and reviewed by guidance staff to ensure that students are receiving appropriate placement in classes.

The most difficult part of monitoring student progress and course placement is associated with the large number of highly mobile students entering and exiting the district. CAHSEE results and high school transcripts do not easily follow these students making placement in appropriate courses more difficult.

CAHSEE 2005 Instruction Study
District Executive Summary #37
Spring 2005

1. **Awareness:** *How has the district informed students and parents of content expectations and the new exit exam requirement? How often and by what methods does this communication take place?*

The [District] regularly informs all students and parents of the content expectations of each course and the State of California requirement of passing the California High School Exit Examination (CAHSEE) as a part of the requirements for graduation. Each year the district publishes student handbooks, which clearly list the content standards for each course and the requirements for graduation. Further all new students and parents are invited to attend orientation sessions where course content standards, graduation requirements, and the CAHSEE ore discussed.

2. **Curriculum Validity:** *What actions has the district taken to adopt the California Content Standards expectations into the curriculum and to integrate them across all grade levels and subjects? How does the district consider required content expectations when selecting textbooks and curriculum materials*?

Over the past 5 years the [District] has worked with content area teachers to develop standards based curriculums for every course offered. Teachers were directly involved in activities which reviewed standards, developed standards based curriculums, created benchmark assessments to identify student success in learning the standards and district wide end of level examinations which guarantee that every teacher addresses the content standards and every student is exposed to the content standards for each course.

New textbooks go through a thorough adoption process before recommendation to the board of trustees for approval. As texts are adopted committees of teachers who are experts in the curriculum of a particular course review the text to validate that the content standards are thoroughly covered. The book is then recommended to the Subject Area Council, which reviews the text again. After approval by the Subject Area Council the text is then recommended to the District Educational Planning committee for its approval before being taken to the board. All middle school texts selected by the district are on the state approved textbook list.

3. **Instructional Validity:** *To what extent are all students in your district being taught the required content expectations, especially for the content on the required exit exam? How does the district or school principal ensure that all students (including students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students) receive classroom instruction - that is both regular and remedial instruction – that is well aligned with state content standards? To what extent is your response the same for the following groups: students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students? What criteria do you use to identify at-risk students before they take the CAHSEE?*

Because course curriculum is developed around the California State Standards all students are taught the required content expectations. In order to prepare students who are at risk of possibly failing the CAHSEE the districts identifies Students as scoring at the below basic and far below basic levels on the previous years STAR assessment and require them by Board of Trustee policy to enroll in support classes in Math or English or both in addition to their regular Math and English class. Students scoring Far Below Basic and Below Basic on English CST must take a

linguistics course based on the "Language!" language curriculum that focuses on literacy skills necessary to pass the CAHSEE. Students scoring Far Below Basic and Below Basic on the Math CST must take a district developed supplemental math course entitled "Math Support." This course is designed to reinforce CAHSEE math skills and uses the Prentice Hall Skills and Intervention program materials to support instruction. In addition to these required courses for students scoring below the district expectation there will also be offered a courses in CAHSEE math and English skills which will be required for students who fail the CAHSEE. These courses also address the standards covered in the CAHSEE.

In the past year the district has also adopted the Highpoint text series for English Language Learners, which is based on the skills identified in the CAHSEE. Student in the ELL program are also enrolled in linguistics courses as needed. All resource students in the [District] are mainstreamed into regular courses and are assigned to support courses as needed.

4. **Student Remediation:** *To what extent are students in your district who initially do not pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE given the opportunity to be re-tested and to receive additional instruction tailored to their demonstrated needs? Does your district have procedures in place to track these students over time as they get closer to the graduation date to verify that they are participating in appropriate remedial instruction?*

The [District] currently offers the CAHSEE four times annually and will be increasing the opportunities to five in the 2005–06 school year. Students identified as failing one or both portions of the exam will be contacted by counselors and placed in CAHSEE skills courses appropriate to the areas identified. Classes will be offered during school and after school. Efforts will be made to maintain lower teacher to student ratios in these courses in order to provide as close to one on one assistance as possible.

CAHSEE 2005 Instruction Study
District Executive Summary #38
Spring 2005

1. **Awareness:** *How has the district informed students and parents of content expectations and the new exit exam requirement? How often and by what methods does this communication take place?*

The [District] utilizes a multitude of communication channels to inform students and parents of the new California High School Exit Exam requirement and the content expectations of the assessment. Communication is ongoing and consistent. Informational letters are mailed to parents and students. These efforts are documented to ensure that all stakeholders require proper notification. School newsletters contain frequent reminders about the new California High School Exit Exam. Additional information is shared at assemblies, school announcements, parent forums, and during counselor classroom visitations.

2. **Curriculum Validity:** *What actions has the district taken to adopt the California Content Standards expectations into the curriculum and to integrate them across all grade levels and subjects? How does the district consider required content expectations when selecting textbooks and curriculum materials*?

The [District] has adopted the California Content Standards for all core content areas. All adopted textbooks and curricular materials support the California Content Standards.

[District] communicates to all faculty the expectation that standards-based instruction is to be used in all classrooms at all times. Teachers receive professional development and follow-up support in how to write standards-based lesson plans, and how to implement standards-based instructional strategies in the classroom. Teachers meet regularly to collaborate on standards-based instruction and to write goals to improve student achievement. Teachers post standards in the classroom as a constant reminder to students that the focus of curriculum and instruction is the set of standards that is applicable to the student's particular grade level or course. [District] has implemented pacing guides and district-wide assessments that cover the standards in all content areas.

[District] uses the California guidelines for selecting instructional materials. These include evaluating texts for standards-alignment, content, organization, assessment, universal access, and instructional planning and support. The process of text selection begins with a panel of teachers, representing appropriate school sites, evaluating books using the criteria listed above. The committee selects first and second choice texts that are sent to school sites so other teachers may view the books. Books are put on public display and discussed at board sub-committee meetings before the final board approval and official district adoption.

3. **Instructional Validity:** *To what extent are all students in your district being taught the required content expectations, especially for the content on the required exit exam? How does the district or school principal ensure that all students (including students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students) receive classroom instruction - that is both regular and remedial instruction – that is well aligned with state content standards? To what extent is your response the same for the following groups: students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students? What criteria do you use to identify at-risk students before they take the CAHSEE?*

All diploma track students are taught the required content standards for all core curricular areas. Content Standards form the basis for instruction for special education, English learners, and at-risk students. Both remedial and regular education are aligned to the state standards.

All students undertake courses that are aligned to the standards. The extent to which they are being *effectively taught* the required expectations varies from teacher to teacher. Extensive professional development, especially targeting 7th grade teachers, has been provided over the last three years. (The majority of the exam consists of 7th grade standards.) This professional development has focused on research-based instructional strategies and lesson-planning. Other components include, but are not limited to, data analysis, common assessment-writing, differentiated instruction, technology, and teacher-coaching.

All students receive a standards-based instructional program in English Language Arts. All students, grades 7–12, have multiple opportunities to produce the six Writing Applications with their ELA class. The California High School Exit Exam requires students not only to know and understand the testable standards, but in addition, requires that they are prepared to respond to any of the six Writing Applications.

The district office provides professional development for principals to help support their understanding of the ELA and Mathematics Content Standards. District personnel, along with site administrators, conduct site-based observations to gauge the status of standards-based instruction in all ELA and mathematics classrooms. All teachers are held accountable for maintaining a rigorous standards-based instructional program.

4. **Student Remediation:** *To what extent are students in your district who initially do not pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE given the opportunity to be re-tested and to receive additional instruction tailored to their demonstrated needs? Does your district have procedures in place to track these students over time as they get closer to the graduation date to verify that they are participating in appropriate remedial instruction?*

Before the tenth grade year, students are identified as “at-risk of not passing the CAHSEE” by their proficiency levels on the California Standards Test for English Language Arts (CST/ELA) and Mathematics, the California English Language Development Test (CELDT), district assessment scores, and grades. Students who do not initially pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE are given the opportunity to be re-tested and receive additional academic support through math and language arts workshop classes, before and after-school intervention classes, and weekend CAHSEE workshops. For the 2005–06 school year, students who have not yet passed the test will be enrolled in a workshop course focused on the skills needed to be successful on the exit exam.

CAHSEE 2005 Instruction Study
District Executive Summary #39
Spring 2005

1. **Awareness:** *How has the district informed students and parents of content expectations and the new exit exam requirement? How often and by what methods does this communication take place?*

[District] high schools follow CDE protocol in annual notifications of the California High School Exit Exam (CAHSEE) requirement. The notifications are part of the annual registration packets. The freshman notification requires parent signature and return, which is kept on file in the student cum folder. Parents are also noticed in IEP meetings, during the 10th grade counseling conference, at Back to School, during SSC and ELAC meetings, and at the end of grade 8 in District middle schools. With exams occurring three times annually, all students and parents have multiple opportunities to ask questions. Finally, information regarding the exam, including passing rates and sample questions, are posted on the District website.

2. **Curriculum Validity:** *What actions has the district taken to adopt the California Content Standards expectations into the curriculum and to integrate them across all grade levels and subjects? How does the district consider required content expectations when selecting textbooks and curriculum materials?*

The [District] is a young district, transforming from a small elementary district in 1987 to a large unified school district. This year we will graduate our 11th High School class. Adopting the core academic standards K–12 in 1999 and hiring staff who were knowledgeable about the standards has allowed us to start as a standards - based District in grades K–12. Old habits and systems were not in place. We initially developed all core content areas using the State standards in development (and now revisions) in course outlines. Subject matter without State Board approved standards utilizes the CDE standards posted in frameworks and at the CDE website (i.e. health and PE).

All core subjects administer district designed End of Course Exams that were designed using the CST and CAHSEE blueprints in test design.

All textbooks at the High School level must be evaluated against the state standards, using a district designed standards based rubric, and would be considered only if there was at least 80% alignment to the standards. The only coursework that uses additional standards are Advanced Placement courses which use the College Board blueprints.

3. **Instructional Validity:** *To what extent are all students in your district being taught the required content expectations, especially for the content on the required exit exam? How does the district or school principal ensure that all students (including students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students) receive classroom instruction - that is both regular and remedial instruction – that is well aligned with state content standards? To what extent is your response the same for the following groups: students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students? What criteria do you use to identify at-risk students before they take the CAHSEE?*

All students, including students with disabilities, are taught the state standards in courses that are Board approved. Courses cannot be approved unless the course was designed using the State Standards as the blueprint. All common finals (End of Course Exams / ECE) are written using the same blueprint that was used in the creation of the California Standards Tests

(CST's). The middle school math ECE for grade 8 (Algebra ECE and Algebra Concepts ECE) uses the CST and CAHSEE blueprint for test design.

Even though the CAHSEE requirement is not in effect until 2006, the current and all previous graduating classes were required to pass a District Exit Exam that also used the CAHSEE blueprint in design.

IEP's are written by IEP teams using state standards and the CAHSEE blueprint. Students not passing the CAHSEE are enrolled in a mandatory CAHSEE remedial course until a passing score is achieved.

Criteria used to identify at risk students includes the performance on the District exams (ECE's) and performance on the California Standards Tests. Scores in common content areas (mathematics and English Language Arts) are then plugged into a compensatory matrix and generates a performance level based on a five point scale ranging from far below basic (FBB/1) to below basic (BB/2) then basic (B/3), proficient (MGLS/4) and ending at advanced (ADV/5). Students who are at the 1 or 2 level (FBB and BB) are identified as at risk and enrolled in remedial coursework. This occurs in all grades K–11 with mandatory retention, if growth does not occur, in grades 2–5 and 8.

Currently, this plan has resulted in a 91% district wide passing rate on CAHSEE in both math and ELA.

4. **Student Remediation:** *To what extent are students in your district who initially do not pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE given the opportunity to be re-tested and to receive additional instruction tailored to their demonstrated needs? Does your district have procedures in place to track these students over time as they get closer to the graduation date to verify that they are participating in appropriate remedial instruction?*

All 10th grade students take the CAHSEE during March at the census administration. Once the results are returned, the ETS provided CD is downloaded into our student information system (Aries) and *passing, not passing,* or *not taken* notations are made on every student transcript. This allows us to easily track all students and whether they need to take or retake the complete, or portions of the exam.

From this data, we are also able to generate all students who must enroll in the CAHSEE preparation course which is scheduled during the regular school day. This class will require the student to forgo a desired elective class, but with our 250 credit and 7 period day, has not adversely affected the timeline to graduate.

Once enrolled in the CAHSEE preparation course, assessments are used to diagnose specific weaknesses and prescribed interventions are implemented. Materials that are used include the CDE produced CAHSEE study guides and publisher material such as Kaplan *CAHSEE Success*.

CAHSEE 2005 Instruction Study
District Executive Summary #40
Spring 2005

1. **Awareness:** *How has the district informed students and parents of content expectations and the new exit exam requirement? How often and by what methods does this communication take place?*

The District informs students and parents in an annual notification letter mailed home at the beginning of the school year. The letter notifies parents and students of the exam dates (depending on their grade in school), exit exam graduation requirement, subjects and standards included in the exam, and the passing score information. In addition, parents and students are informed about multiple opportunities to test if they do not successfully pass one or both parts of the exam and that their school will provide additional instruction, if needed, to ensure their child's success on the exam.

Upon receipt of student results, the District prepares a letter, translated into multiple languages, and sends it out to parents through the mail. The school also receives a copy of the results for the student cumulative file. This particular letter is sent out after each CAHSEE administration. The details include the above mentioned information once again.

The CDE created a mathematics and English language arts study guide for students. One copy per subject is distributed to each grade 10 student in all high schools. Both guides discuss which standards are tested and why that is important for the students to know.

2. **Curriculum Validity:** *What actions has the district taken to adopt the California Content Standards expectations into the curriculum and to integrate them across all grade levels and subjects? How does the district consider required content expectations when selecting textbooks and curriculum materials*?

When adopting K–8 instructional materials, [District] will review materials listed on the SBE K–8 Instructional Materials Matrix. For high schools, all instructional materials considered for adoption are reviewed for their alignment to SBE content standards and for the educational needs of our students.

3. **Instructional Validity:** *To what extent are all students in your district being taught the required content expectations, especially for the content on the required exit exam? How does the district or school principal ensure that all students (including students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students) receive classroom instruction - that is both regular and remedial instruction – that is well aligned with state content standards? To what extent is your response the same for the following groups: students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students? What criteria do you use to identify at-risk students before they take the CAHSEE?*

All mathematics and English-Language Arts instructional materials used in our classrooms are standards aligned. Almost all of our PreAlgebra and Language Arts teachers in our middle schools have attended AB466 training for their content.

Students requiring additional support in mathematics and language arts are provided with additional class periods during the day to focus on targeted instruction on skills needed to master grade level standards.

For English learners, students are provided English Language Development instruction using an SBE approved program that is aligned to English-Language Arts content standards. In middle and high schools, students are enrolled in ELD courses that instruct students at levels that accompany their language development.

Criteria used to determine whether students are at-risk of not passing the CAHSEE include CST data and curriculum embedded assessments.

4. **Student Remediation:** *To what extent are students in your district who initially do not pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE given the opportunity to be re-tested and to receive additional instruction tailored to their demonstrated needs? Does your district have procedures in place to track these students over time as they get closer to the graduation date to verify that they are participating in appropriate remedial instruction?*

Students are provided supplemental instruction to assist them in passing the CAHSEE if they do not pass the first time. Supplemental instruction includes classes offered during the school year. Some schools offer Saturday review classes in addition to after school tutoring.

The Small Learning Communities structure at the high schools play an important part in tracking the progress of students who have not passed the CAHSEE. Through the SLC monitoring, students are provided additional opportunities for remediation. No formal district tracking is in place this time. However, processes are currently being developed to create lists of students who have not passed multiple times. These lists will be generated upon receipt of the March 2005 Grade 11 results and distributed to the schools. Intervention plans will be created at the school sites to ensure the proper remediation is taking place for each student in need.

CAHSEE 2005 Instruction Study
District Executive Summary #41
Spring 2005

1. **Awareness:** *How has the district informed students and parents of content expectations and the new exit exam requirement? How often and by what methods does this communication take place?*

Our district has worked to improve awareness of the exit exam requirements over the past several years. Annually, students and parents are informed through the publication, *Parent & Student Handbook*. Additionally, high schools include information about the exam in terms of the graduation requirement in their registration packets. Counselors, in their interaction with students, reinforce the message. Prior to each testing session, letters are mailed home to parents of eligible students, reminding them of the dates of testing and the importance of the exam. When scores are returned to students, the exam requirement is reinforced in a letter accompanying the scores, which also includes information on intervention and extra support.

2. **Curriculum Validity:** *What actions has the district taken to adopt the California Content Standards expectations into the curriculum and to integrate them across all grade levels and subjects? How does the district consider required content expectations when selecting textbooks and curriculum materials?*

All textbook adoptions are based first on alignment to California content standards. In K–8, text materials on the current adoption matrix are the only ones in use. As high school texts are identified for purchase, priority is given to those which have either been developed for California or explicitly address the state standards. Texts are piloted and rated according to the extent to which they meet expectations in the following areas: Content Standards, Program Organization, Assessment, and Universal Access. While the balance between the four areas differs somewhat, Content Standards is weighted heavily and is most often used as the tiebreaker. All text adoptions are approved using representative district committees, some of whom pilot the text being considered, to maximize continuity among our schools.

For older adoptions, teacher committees developed standards maps to assist teachers in addressing all content standards appropriate for a given course. Where content standards were not addressed to an extent considered necessary, supplementary materials or lessons were identified. Teachers then integrated these into their curriculum.

3. **Instructional Validity:** *To what extent are all students in your district being taught the required content expectations, especially for the content on the required exit exam? How does the district or school principal ensure that all students (including students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students) receive classroom instruction - that is both regular and remedial instruction – that is well aligned with state content standards? To what extent is your response the same for the following groups: students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students? What criteria do you use to identify at-risk students before they take the CAHSEE?*

Initially, the district and individual school sites identified the courses in which the content standards on the exit exam were taught, and when mastery was expected. A priority was established to ensure that all students were given access to these core courses. In the cases where the content is delivered in a 'sheltered' format, either for English learners or special education students, the content map of the class begins with the core standards from the exam, and expands from that point. District-developed pacing guides facilitate teacher planning.

Principals support adherence to the pacing guides through collaborative discussions with teachers and teams. In selected grades and subjects, district-wide assessments are also used to benchmark student performance based on key standards.

Students who are served in intervention classes are removed from core programs for no more than one year, beginning with 7th grade. A system of support, through additional instruction, is used in lieu of removing a student from a core class. In the case of math, which remains a leveled program, all students are scheduled to complete pre-algebra in middle school. While most students surpass this goal, it has established pre-algebra as the only remedial high school class, with most ninth graders enrolling in a 1-year or 2-year Algebra I program or a more advanced math class.

Schools offer a variety of services to at-risk students prior to their taking the exit exam for the first time. A transition summer class is offered between 8th and 9th grade which addresses the skills that support the 9th and 10th grade English standards on the exam. The target students for this class are those who score Far/Below Basic on the annual state standards tests, on classroom assessments, and students recommended by teachers who need additional reading assistance. Likewise, a transition math class is offered, directed at students who struggled to complete pre-algebra or are scheduled to repeat it in the fall.

A summer class transitioning from 9th to 10th grade has been attempted in prior years. However targeted students often had a need to do remedial work in other areas and failed to sign up for the class. A number of schools offer CAHSEE prep classes for a period up to 4 weeks prior to testing. Attendance is voluntary, but teachers encourage students who are likely to struggle on the exam to attend the prep classes.

4. **Student Remediation:** *To what extent are students in your district who initially do not pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE given the opportunity to be re-tested and to receive additional instruction tailored to their demonstrated needs? Does your district have procedures in place to track these students over time as they get closer to the graduation date to verify that they are participating in appropriate remedial instruction?*

Currently remediation for those not passing the exit exam occurs primarily in summer school. A class directly addressing the standards on the math exam has been developed and is offered to students who have not yet passed the exam. The class is designed to address the 5 strands in the exam and the instructors work from a matrix showing student strengths and weaknesses in prior testing. Currently, remediation for students in English-language arts occurs only within summer extended-year classes for special education students and in non-native English courses for English learners, as they are usually the groups not passing the exam.

Counselors, vice principals, and classroom teachers receive a list of students who need to retake one or more parts of the exam. These students are directed toward any preparation programs in place at the site, as well as scheduling for testing. Re-testing is not optional, unless a student is absent from school on the day of the test. Counselors meet with juniors who did not earn a passing score in March testing to enroll them in summer classes and match them up with other services which will improve their scores.

CAHSEE 2005 Instruction Study
District Executive Summary #42
Spring 2005

1. **Awareness:** *How has the district informed students and parents of content expectations and the new exit exam requirement? How often and by what methods does this communication take place?*

The [District] has informed parents and students of content expectations and the CAHS Exit Exam requirements in the following manner. All 2004–05 10th grade students and parents were notified of the opportunity to participate in a national study conducted by TestEdge through a program called HeartMath. [School] was selected to serve in the controlled study. This study presented lessons to students designed to reduce stress during test taking situations. All parents of 10th grade students received a letter notifying them of participation in the study. Follow up phone calls were made to families that did not provide written consent for student participation in the study. The results of the 10th graders on the California High School Exit Exam will serve as the data measure to gage improved student performance using the variable of the HeartMath program.

Parent Connection Newsletter articles appearing three times a year are directly related to student assessment and the California High School Exit Exam: December, March and May.
Workshops for parents on assessment and the California High School Exit Exam were held for parents of English Learners and the general population in September 2004.

All teachers of English and mathematics are provided the California Content Standards for their appropriate subject and Blueprints for the California High School Exit Exam. Superintendents of the elementary school districts were provided with these standards in 2004 to better prepare students for the California High School Exit Exam at the middle school level. Teachers incorporate the Content Standards within their courses. A new format for course outlines with the publication of essential standards for each subject is being developed to be distributed to students as a course syllabus. Once this is developed, students will have a listing of the essential content standards for their daily reference. Some teachers daily display the content standards for the lesson.

2. **Curriculum Validity:** *What actions has the district taken to adopt the California Content Standards expectations into the curriculum and to integrate them across all grade levels and subjects? How does the district consider required content expectations when selecting textbooks and curriculum materials*?

Course curriculum is reviewed on a cyclical basis. Mathematics courses have been reviewed and rewritten to assure that course standards for mathematics are taught within the curriculum at the appropriate time to ensure that students have opportunity to learn standards prior to taking the CAHSEE. These reviews and rewrites occurred during the 2003–04 school year for Algebra. Textbooks recommended for adoption are required to incorporate the California State Content Standards. New Algebra textbooks have been adopted for the 2005–06 school year.

The Pre-Algebra course was revised in 2000–2001. This course is being replaced by a two-year college preparation Algebra course for the 2005–06 school year. The Math Proficiency course used for development of math basic skills was reviewed in June 2002.

The Geometry course was realigned with state standards in June 2002 along with the adoption of a new textbook.

The English Language Arts course for the 9th grade is currently being revised. Teachers are matching Content Standards with current course guides and are developing a course outline that includes the standards with a check off area for students to record when they have learned each standard. This course outline format will be adopted for all courses. Ninth grade English Language Arts books are being adopted for the 2005–06 school year. The 10th grade English Language Arts course and textbooks were recently reviewed and adopted for use in 2003–04. New textbooks for English Language Development are being adopted for the 2005–06 school year. Reading Course 10 was revised March 2002 and is

currently being re-evaluated. Reading Course 9 is also being reviewed with a program adoption scheduled for 2005–06. The English Language Development courses were last reviewed in 1998. This is a high priority for curriculum development in 2005–06.

3. **Instructional Validity:** *To what extent are all students in your district being taught the required content expectations, especially for the content on the required exit exam? How does the district or school principal ensure that all students (including students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students) receive classroom instruction - that is both regular and remedial instruction – that is well aligned with state content standards? To what extent is your response the same for the following groups: students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students? What criteria do you use to identify at-risk students before they take the CAHSEE?*

All students in the general and special education programs take English 9 and 10, courses that have been or are being aligned with the State Content Standards for ninth and tenth graders. English Learners take English Language Development courses that are being aligned with the State Content Standards.

The teacher evaluation instrument adopted for the 2004–05 school year includes a component within Standard III: "Ensuring Progress of Pupils toward the State Adopted Academic Content Standards as measured by State Adopted Criterion Referenced Assessments through the Understanding and Organization of Subject Matter for Learning." All teachers on the evaluation cycle for 2004–05 are evaluated against this evaluation standard. The evaluation instrument assists in administrative monitoring of the actual teaching in the classroom of the Content Standards. Different teachers will be evaluated on the 2005–06 cycle and all first and second year teachers are evaluated yearly.

Students who have not passed the CAHSEE in the 10th grade are provided with a support class in either math or reading to assist with their learning of the content standards. These courses are available within the summer program and during the school year. This support is provided for all students, regardless of their identification as Special Education or English Learners. District Board Policy 6162.53 allows for a waiver for student with disabilities to successfully pass the CAHSEE with modifications within specific parameters.

The criteria used to identify students who need extra support prior to taking the CAHSEE are based on student achievement on the STAR test. Students who score below basic and far below basic are placed in proficiency classes in addition to their appropriate math and English Language Arts classes. Board Policy requires students who are not meeting grade level standards to take a 7th class to assist in increasing their skills. This class is either a math or reading proficiency course. Placement into these courses is based on student performance on the STAR tests.

4. **Student Remediation:** *To what extent are students in your district who initially do not pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE given the opportunity to be re-tested and to receive additional instruction tailored to their demonstrated needs? Does your district have procedures in place to track these students over time as they get closer to the graduation date to verify that they are participating in appropriate remedial instruction?*

Students who have not passed the CAHSEE in 10th grade have the opportunity to retest twice during their junior year and twice during their senior year. There is no testing opportunity during the summer. School administrators are aware of which students have not passed the CAHSEE. During the 2005 summer, proficiency courses, specifically geared to the content standards on the CAHSEE are offered to students, in math and English Language Arts and in the evening for Migrant students.

Specific remediation during 2004–05 school year was not provided for students who failed the Exit Exam. Procedures were not in place to verify that students are participating in appropriate remedial instruction during the 2004–05 school year. However, procedures are in place for the 2005–06 school year to support the graduating class of 2006, the first graduating class required to pass the CAHSEE.

CAHSEE 2005 Instruction Study
District Executive Summary #43
Spring 2005

1. **Awareness:** *How has the district informed students and parents of content expectations and the new exit exam requirement? How often and by what methods does this communication take place?*

The District has informed every parent of the requirement of students passing the high exit exam as a condition of graduation. This notification is included in each student registration packet for each year. The notification letter includes the test dates, opportunities for retaking the test sections that are not passed, and a brief summary of the elements included in the Language Arts and Mathematics sections. The letter is signed by the parent and returned to the school as proof that the parent has received this information. Each 10th grade student receives a CAHSEE study guide provided by the state in the fall prior to the March testing.

2. **Curriculum Validity:** *What actions has the district taken to adopt the California Content Standards expectations into the curriculum and to integrate them across all grade levels and subjects? How does the district consider required content expectations when selecting textbooks and curriculum materials*?

The District has adopted the state standards in English/Language Arts (1998), Mathematics (1999), Social Science and Science (1999). Each high school in the district selects their textbooks. All textbooks that are purchased have standards maps that indicate that they address the state content standards. All of the high schools use the same Algebra textbooks. The content of the core academic courses is consistent with the content standards. Some school have looked at the concept of " power " or "essential" standards to make sure that key standards are given sufficient emphasis. Mathematics and Social Science courses have district wide exit exams to make sure that the key concepts are addressed. Data is generated by each school and district wide for each of the questions so that improvements can be made for future content emphasis and instruction. A district wide writing rubric has been developed for use in the schools. Some schools have used the rubric to increase writing knowledge and proficiency across subject areas.

3. **Instructional Validity:** *To what extent are all students in your district being taught the required content expectations, especially for the content on the required exit exam? How does the district or school principal ensure that all students (including students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students) receive classroom instruction - that is both regular and remedial instruction – that is well aligned with state content standards? To what extent is your response the same for the following groups: students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students? What criteria do you use to identify at-risk students before they take the CAHSEE?*

To a great extent**,** all students are in classes that teach those content standards that are on the required exit exam and are reflected in our graduation requirements. All students take Algebra courses with some students having an additional period of math tutorial to assist them in meeting the requirements of the Algebra coursework. We have a unique mastery program in mathematics that requires students to meet specific proficiencies in Algebra each quarter before moving to the subsequent quarter. Students repeat the quarter course until they reach the appropriate proficiency. Special Education students receive the core curriculum in conjunction with the requirements of the Individual Education Plan. The level at which the special education students are working is dependent upon their progress. All students receive instruction in

Algebra and writing which helps them toward successfully passing the CAHSEE. English Learners receive instruction aligned to English Language Development and English Language Arts standards and are transitioned into our regular program as soon as they have mastered the skills required for success. A small number of ELs who have had little or no academic experience in their primary language may be placed in classes stressing literacy and numeracy prior to entering Algebra classes. At-risk students are identified by previous tests and grades from their 8th grade years. These students have an opportunity to attend summer programs prior to 9th grade to assist them in mathematics, literacy and study skills. Our Title I high schools utilize Focus lessons for English and math based on students previous needs as identified by STAR test data.

4. **Student Remediation:** *To what extent are students in your district who initially do not pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE given the opportunity to be re-tested and to receive additional instruction tailored to their demonstrated needs? Does your district have procedures in place to track these students over time as they get closer to the graduation date to verify that they are participating in appropriate remedial instruction?*

Students who do not pass the CAHSEE in mathematics take a course that addresses the content standards of the test including content from 6th and 7th grade mathematics. The course called “Foundations of Algebra and Geometry” was developed based on the objectives contained in the exam. Instruction for English takes place in the regular English courses. There are reading courses that can assist a student in increasing his skills in order to pass the test. It is easier to develop a specific course in mathematics to address content from the exam than it is to develop such English coursework. Reading courses along with the writing that takes place in Standard English and core academic courses are of help to students. Counselors track the progress of students in their caseload that have not passed the CAHSEE and schedule them into appropriate coursework. Title I schools utilize funds to provide tutoring after school for students with academic problems. One of our schools has supplemental support providers for students requiring assistance.

CAHSEE 2005 Instruction Study
District Executive Summary #44
Spring 2005

1. **Awareness:** *How has the district informed students and parents of content expectations and the new exit exam requirement? How often and by what methods does this communication take place?*

Parents and students are notified of the CAHSEE graduation requirement in several ways. First, written notification is given to all parents and students when first enrolling to attend any district high school. Written notification is also included in yearly registration packets for all high school students. Second, details on who is required to take the CAHSEE, what is covered on the exam, and sample test questions are included on the district's website. Third, the district provides all tenth grade students with copies of *Preparing for the CAHSEE: An English-language Arts Study Guide* and *Preparing for the CAHSEE: A Mathematics Study Guide* once each year.

2. **Curriculum Validity:** *What actions has the district taken to adopt the California Content Standards expectations into the curriculum and to integrate them across all grade levels and subjects? How does the district consider required content expectations when selecting textbooks and curriculum materials*?

District curriculum guides, pacing guides, and courses of study have been aligned to the California Content Standards in all core areas. Non-core subjects are aligned to state and/or national standards as available. CAHSEE blueprints and released items are made available to all content area teachers, and content standards and CAHSEE blueprints are components of all of district English and mathematics professional development. The district has in place a textbook adoption policy that requires all textbooks to be evaluated for alignment to content standards and supplementary materials to be evaluated according to their support of standards-based instruction.

3. **Instructional Validity:** *To what extent are all students in your district being taught the required content expectations, especially for the content on the required exit exam? How does the district or school principal ensure that all students (including students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students) receive classroom instruction - that is both regular and remedial instruction – that is well aligned with state content standards? To what extent is your response the same for the following groups: students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students? What criteria do you use to identify at-risk students before they take the CAHSEE?*

Teachers are provided with and expected to follow district curriculum guides, pacing guides, and courses of study that have been aligned to the content standards and the high school exit exam. CAHSEE blueprints and released questions are also used to guide instruction. Principals do regular classroom walkthroughs to follow-up on implementation of the district curriculum. District office program specialists and coordinators also do walkthroughs with site administrators and debrief on the implementation of the standards. All students, including special education, English learners, and those at risk, receive standards-based instruction in the core subjects. Students are identified as at-risk through standardized test scores, and instruction is scaffolded in all courses to support students as they strive to achieve mastery of the standards. Students are identified for support classes by CST scores, grades, and teacher recommendation.

4. **Student Remediation:** *To what extent are students in your district who initially do not pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE given the opportunity to be re-tested and to receive*

additional instruction tailored to their demonstrated needs? Does your district have procedures in place to track these students over time as they get closer to the graduation date to verify that they are participating in appropriate remedial instruction?

The District maintains a record of the CAHSEE passing status of all high school students, and this information is available to school sites through a couple of ways. First, after each CAHSEE administration's scores are available, the district sends each high school a list of results for all students who tested. These lists are used by the schools to determine which students should be enrolled in intensive instruction classes or referred to after school tutoring or other support options. Second, schools have access to students' CAHSEE testing histories through the district's student information system. Site counselors and administrators use this information when meeting with students to discuss their progress toward graduation. Third, prior to each CAHSEE make-up administration, the district gives each high school a spreadsheet that lists their students needing to retake the exam. Schools then use the list to notify students and their parents and teachers of the importance of retesting during the upcoming CAHSEE administration dates.

CAHSEE 2005 Instruction Study
District Executive Summary #45
Spring 2005

1. **Awareness:** *How has the district informed students and parents of content expectations and the new exit exam requirement? How often and by what methods does this communication take place?*

Each site informs students and parents of content expectations and the new exit exam in a variety of ways. At Orientation, and Back to School night, information regarding state standards, promotion and retention, the CAHSEE, and graduation requirements are presented. Articles are included in parent newsletters at the beginning of the school year. In addition, the requirements are outlined in student handbooks. Counseling offices send out separate letters to parents of students at risk of not meeting promotion requirements after each grading period. One month before CAHSEE administration, tenth grade parents receive a packet of test blueprints and a letter of explanation, in both Spanish and English. As each test administration approaches, parents receive phone calls and additional letters. Parents of special education students are also advised during IEP meetings.

2. **Curriculum Validity:** *What actions has the district taken to adopt the California Content Standards expectations into the curriculum and to integrate them across all grade levels and subjects? How does the district consider required content expectations when selecting textbooks and curriculum materials*?

In order to adopt the California Content Standards and integrate them into the curriculum, the district has taken several steps. Materials are reviewed and selected according to state adoption or recommendation and adherence to state standards. All materials used for inclusion classes are grade level and standards based. In addition, Essential Learnings, based on state standards, have been established at each grade level in English language arts, mathematics, science, and social science. Quarterly instructional calendars and accompanying interim assessments based on these essentials are in use.

3. **Instructional Validity:** *To what extent are all students in your district being taught the required content expectations, especially for the content on the required exit exam? How does the district or school principal ensure that all students (including students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students) receive classroom instruction - that is both regular and remedial instruction – that is well aligned with state content standards? To what extent is your response the same for the following groups: students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students? What criteria do you use to identify at-risk students before they take the CAHSEE?*

Although inclusion is practiced at all school sites to varying degrees, a district focus is to make it the prevalent practice at all sites during the 2005–2006 school year. All students, including special education, English learners, and at-risk students, receive grade level standards based instruction in core classes. The district essential learnings, calendars, and interim assessments, which guide instruction in the core classes, were developed to align with both the CST and CAHSEE.

Algebra I or Algebra I-A is the core math class for all eighth graders. Students may receive support towards gaining standards mastery of grade level content through remediation and /or intervention classes. Such classes are offered to all students within the regular school day, as well as during extended day (both before and after school) classes. Students identified as being

at-risk by CST scores or IEPs are immediately scheduled into such support classes. At the middle school, remedial or intervention instruction is targeted to gaps in learning and is based on standards not mastered, identified by CST scores, grades, entry exams, and on-going classroom assessments. Due primarily to more complex issues in scheduling and credit issues, such targeted instruction has not been fully implemented at the high schools.

4. **Student Remediation:** *To what extent are students in your district who initially do not pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE given the opportunity to be re-tested and to receive additional instruction tailored to their demonstrated needs? Does your district have procedures in place to track these students over time as they get closer to the graduation date to verify that they are participating in appropriate remedial instruction?*

School counselors keep records of which students pass or fail the CAHSEE. A data base is kept at the district as well as at school sites. Counselors discuss individual test results with students unsuccessful in passing, to identify areas in need of remediation. These students may be enrolled in remedial language skills and Mathquest classes during the regular and/or extended day and may attend Saturday Academy CAHSEE review and preparation sessions prior to the next testing date. CAHSEE test dates are posted and announced at the beginning of and throughout the school year. A proficiency file in order to more accurately track students and provide targeted assistance is needed, and planned for development.

CAHSEE 2005 Instruction Study
District Executive Summary #46
Spring 2005

1. **Awareness:** *How has the district informed students and parents of content expectations and the new exit exam requirement? How often and by what methods does this communication take place?*

   - [School] informs parents and students of the content expectations and the new exit exam requirements by doing the following activities and events.
   - [School] has a 10th grade orientation day in which one of the topics. discussed was the CAHSEE specifics (dates, passing scores, number of opportunities to take the exam, and preparation.)
   - [School] announces on the marquee the date for the upcoming CAHSEE.
   - [School] sends letters to parents regarding the upcoming dates and the state requirements.
   - [School] sends flyers regarding the CAHSEE to the student's home at the beginning of the year in student packets.
   - The CAHSEE was discussed
   - with parents at all parent night events, (back to school night, and open house.)
   - at all counselor meetings, parent events, and classroom visits.
   - at all information assemblies where 10–11th graders were present.
   - at the 9th grade day where 9th graders came to visit our school
   - in the classrooms where teachers gave an awareness session to all students
   - at all individual educational plan (IEP) meetings

2. **Curriculum Validity:** *What actions has the district taken to adopt the California Content Standards expectations into the curriculum and to integrate them across all grade levels and subjects? How does the district consider required content expectations when selecting textbooks and curriculum materials*?

Over the past two years the secondary teachers have met to discuss the California Content Standards, determine the "essential standards", and "unwrap" the standards in their particular content area. Teachers developed and refined their content curriculum maps with benchmark assessments for each course taught in the four curricular areas: science, social studies, English/language arts and mathematics. Any additional supplementary instructional materials are scrutinized for their adherence to content standards. Teachers are expected to teach to the standards using our standards-based instructional materials. Standards are expected to be posted in the classroom.

3. **Instructional Validity:** *To what extent are all students in your district being taught the required content expectations, especially for the content on the required exit exam? How does the district or school principal ensure that all students (including students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students) receive classroom instruction - that is both regular and remedial instruction – that is well aligned with state content standards? To what extent is your response the same for the following groups: students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students? What criteria do you use to identify at-risk students before they take the CAHSEE?*

[School] has the expectation that all teachers will teach to the standards. Students received a CAHSEE study guide from their English/language arts and mathematics teacher. The expectation was that all students would review the study guides in their math and English classrooms and at home. There are practice math tests available on the website. This is available for all students to take on [link] test prep. There is an after school intervention program for students to prepare for their

CAHSEE. Teachers were given each student's STAR scores from the previous years. Each teacher was asked to meet with individual students in second period and discuss their scores, ask them how they could do better, and group them accordingly. Teachers were asked to write a plan on what they were going to do differently with the STAR data than they did last year. Additional materials are available for teachers to utilize in practicing the English/language arts and mathematics skills with students including Standards Plus, Mountain Mathematics, and Mountain Language Arts.

Special Ed students:

In the DIS Support Center, preparation for the CAHSEE begins the first week of school when district Special Education assessment tests are administered to determine the grade level of each student in reading comprehension and math. Using the data from these tests, lessons are developed to cover the areas of highest need as determined by a frequency chart. The district and school have supplied each teacher with Mountain Math (Pre-Algebra and Algebra), Mountain Language, Standards Plus in Math and Language Arts, the CDE-Preparing for the CAHSEE, and a Globe-FearonWorkbook: Meeting the California Challenge. Each day, the Support Center class is divided into groups of 5–10 students who work thirty minutes on each of these areas: general education homework/long term projects, language arts remediation and math remediation. In late May, the same reading and math assessments are administered to determine the efficacy of the materials and system used. All test data is shared with parents at the yearly IEP meetings and IEP objectives are set using the pre-post test data. When the core departments finished the curriculum maps last year, the Director of Student Services invited each special day teacher to an all-day inservice to review the maps and create lessons which follow the outlined standards. Support Center teachers attended training on a different day where they reviewed English, Math, History and Science curriculum maps and created a set of modifications and supports for special education students.

English Learner students:

English Learner students receive content instruction in all academic areas in addition to English language development activities. Reading comprehension is aimed at testing proficiency. Students are involved in writing activities everyday at various levels of English proficiency. The English language tutors provide support to the students in their native language. The academic teachers utilize instructional strategies that focus on a student's English language development level in delivering the content curriculum. The teachers work with the students utilizing the CAHSEE study guides along with core curriculum and additional supplementary materials.

4. **Student Remediation:** *To what extent are students in your district who initially do not pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE given the opportunity to be re-tested and to receive additional instruction tailored to their demonstrated needs? Does your district have procedures in place to track these students over time as they get closer to the graduation date to verify that they are participating in appropriate remedial instruction?*

Students were provided with an after school tutoring program for math on Mondays and language arts on Wednesdays. All students received the state study guides for the CAHSEE. Teachers were directed to go over the information on the study guides on a daily basis. Students were given opportunity to visit the website and take practice math tests for the CAHSEE. They can retest each year for the portion of the test that was not passed. Students are tracked by a list of students who have not yet passed the CAHSEE. The Assistant Principal arranged for a conference during which time the area of need is discussed. If the student is a DIS or special Ed student the case carrier is involved in the meeting. A list of students is developed from a query on AERIES program. These students receive letters at home regarding their status.

CAHSEE 2005 Instruction Study
District Executive Summary #47
Spring 2005

1. **Awareness:** *How has the district informed students and parents of content expectations and the new exit exam requirement? How often and by what methods does this communication take place?*

Parents and students are notified of CAHSEE requirement through: school handbook, parent newsletters, special mailings (district and school), student intercom announcements and counselor meetings. These information pieces are conducted throughout the school year.

2. **Curriculum Validity:** *What actions has the district taken to adopt the California Content Standards expectations into the curriculum and to integrate them across all grade levels and subjects? How does the district consider required content expectations when selecting textbooks and curriculum materials*?

We have backwards mapped, curriculum mapped, calibrated and created district assessments that are aligned to the California Content Standards. We continually articulate with our feeder schools especially in the content areas of ELA and Math. All of our district textbook adoptions in ELA, Math, Science and Social Studies are evaluated and selected through CDE guidelines and expectations. Any supplemental materials that we order are also aligned.

3. **Instructional Validity:** *To what extent are all students in your district being taught the required content expectations, especially for the content on the required exit exam? How does the district or school principal ensure that all students (including students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students) receive classroom instruction - that is both regular and remedial instruction – that is well aligned with state content standards? To what extent is your response the same for the following groups: students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students? What criteria do you use to identify at-risk students before they take the CAHSEE?*

Our students are taught subject matter that is aligned to California Content Standards. We also utilize blueprints and released test questions from CDE. Our junior highs utilize any excess CAHSEE Study Guides that we receive. Our junior highs and high schools offer CAHSEE review and remediation classes in the summer. We also offer intervention classes during the school year. All at-risk, special education and second language students are offered and have access to CAHSEE remediation. Some of the curriculum may he modified but it is still standards aligned. At-risk students are identified through state and district assessments, credit and grade checks and teacher observation.

4. **Student Remediation:** *To what extent are students in your district who initially do not pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE given the opportunity to be re-tested and to receive additional instruction tailored to their demonstrated needs? Does your district have procedures in place to track these students over time as they get closer to the graduation date to verify that they are participating in appropriate remedial instruction?*

Per CAHSEE designated test dates, all of our students have access to taking the CAHSEE and then, subsequently, taking the CAHSEE makeups. All students are in our CAHSEE data base and the high schools utilize this data to schedule their classes and intervention needs. We continually monitor these students throughout their high school careers.

CAHSEE 2005 Instruction Study
District Executive Summary #48
Spring 2005

1. **Awareness:** *How has the district informed students and parents of content expectations and the new exit exam requirement? How often and by what methods does this communication take place?*

Our district has informed students and parents of content expectations and the new exit exam requirements in a variety of ways: Newsletter; direct letters to parents; communication upon student intake; individual teacher communication. This communication is ongoing, but specifically occurs in the two-month period prior to an exit exam examination period.

2. **Curriculum Validity:** *What actions has the district taken to adopt the California Content Standards expectations into the curriculum and to integrate them across all grade levels and subjects? How does the district consider required content expectations when selecting textbooks and curriculum materials*?

All content has been aligned to the California Content Standards in all grades in all subjects. For older textbooks that are not aligned, we have added supplements covering the gaps. In choosing new textbooks and materials, we only select those whose publishers have provided clear, concise standards maps.

3. **Instructional Validity:** *To what extent are all students in your district being taught the required content expectations, especially for the content on the required exit exam? How does the district or school principal ensure that all students (including students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students) receive classroom instruction - that is both regular and remedial instruction – that is well aligned with state content standards? To what extent is your response the same for the following groups: students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students? What criteria do you use to identify at-risk students before they take the CAHSEE?*

Exit exam content is imbedded in the curriculum for Math and English. In addition, we do CAHSEE review of standards prior to major testing periods. We make CAHSEE prep books provided by CDE available to individual students as well as classrooms and teachers. Students who fail one or both portions are remediate in a variety of ways: through regular course work; through tutorial using CAHSEE prep materials; through individual teacher instruction; through classroom review of specific standards. All students *have* access to instruction and remediation regardless of status. In some cases, special education students/parents have received remediation suggestions and materials during their annual IEP's.

4. **Student Remediation:** *To what extent are students in your district who initially do not pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE given the opportunity to be re-tested and to receive additional instruction tailored to their demonstrated needs? Does your district have procedures in place to track these students over time as they get closer to the graduation date to verify that they are participating in appropriate remedial instruction?*

Please see #3 above for remediation options. The Academic Director tracks all students in regards to CAHSEE status, and if necessary, implements individual remediation for seniors not passing the test.

CAHSEE 2005 Instruction Study
District Executive Summary #49
Spring 2005

1. **Awareness:** *How has the district informed students and parents of content expectations and the new exit exam requirement? How often and by what methods does this communication take place?*

The [District] informs parents about the CAHSEE in several ways. All parents receive a copy of district graduation requirements from their home school each year, including information on the CAHSEE. The Curriculum Department sends letters home to parents of students who initially fail one or both parts of the test to let them know about CAHSEE prep opportunities. Seniors who have not passed must enroll in either or both Math 12 and Academic English, full year CAHSEE prep classes. The Testing and Evaluation Office sends letters to parents and students prior to the beginning of the school year about CAHSEE and testing dates, before each test administration, after each administration to parents whose students were absent or refused to test, and after each set of results is received at the district. Principals include testing dates and information about the test in their newsletters. Counselors talk about CAHSEE with their students and enroll them in various CAHSEE prep classes. All site and district parent groups receive extensive information about CAHSEE, which they then disseminate through conversations with other parents.

2. **Curriculum Validity:** *What actions has the district taken to adopt the California Content Standards expectations into the curriculum and to integrate them across all grade levels and subjects? How does the district consider required content expectations when selecting textbooks and curriculum materials?*

Five years ago the [District] undertook a major curriculum writing effort in all core subject areas. District teacher leaders were trained to backward map the curriculum from grades 12–7 and from the external exams students must take. The new curriculum is standards based and includes the learnings necessary for success on the CAHSEE. Teachers at all grade levels have some degree of responsibility for CAHSEE; while the burden is most felt in ELA and math, CAHSEE tested content standards and objectives are integrated into some science and social science courses as appropriate. Textbooks and materials are selected from the state approved lists for core subjects in grades 7 and 8, and are thus standards aligned; grades 9–12 use the district content standards and objectives to guide their selection of appropriate, standards-aligned texts. All sites use the same curriculum and primary text for each course, assuring equity and access to a rigorous, standards based education at all our schools.

3. **Instructional Validity:** *To what extent are all students in your district being taught the required content expectations, especially for the content on the required exit exam? How does the district or school principal ensure that all students (including students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students) receive classroom instruction - that is both regular and remedial instruction – that is well aligned with state content standards? To what extent is your response the same for the following groups: students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students? What criteria do you use to identify at-risk students before they take the CAHSEE?*

All curriculum guides for core subjects are tightly aligned to the CAHSEE, as well as to other external exams. All teachers are expected to use the curriculum guides, as well as the adopted texts, to direct their teaching. Teachers have received AB466 training in REACH, High Point, and Holt (over [number] of our English teachers grades 7–12 have been Holt trained) to support

our programs. Middle school math teachers will receive AB 466 training for the first time this summer. Principals and other site administrators are responsible for monitoring the successful delivery of that curriculum through frequent classroom walkthroughs as well as longer observations. All principals have received AB75 training in the math and ELA adopted texts and in Walkthroughs that focus on deriving the curriculum objective. Area Superintendents have also been trained and work with their principals to make certain the monitoring is occurring. Our curriculum for special education classes and English language learners is also standards based; the differences occur in the delivery and the extended amount of time over which the curriculum is delivered in some cases. Prior to taking the CAHSEE as tenth graders, all students receive a two-week district written structured CAHSEE review in their math and English classes. This includes special education and ELD students. The frontloading helps reduce the number of students who fail the test on the first try.

4. **Student Remediation:** *To what extent are students in your district who initially do not pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE given the opportunity to be re-tested and to receive additional instruction tailored to their demonstrated needs? Does your district have procedures in place to track these students over time as they get closer to the graduation date to verify that they are participating in appropriate remedial instruction?*

All students who do not pass initially are targeted for CAHSEE prep or review. Students are offered opportunities to work on their skills based on their initial score. As can be seen from the attached support pathways, students have numerous courses and reviews open to them. Again depending on their initial score, some students are enrolled in semester or year-long courses to remediate basic skills. EL students and RSP students are placed in these same courses depending on scores. Other special education students receive extensive review as appropriate in their regular classes and summer workshops. As described above, parents and students are routinely notified of these opportunities by both the site and the district. The district documents student notification of opportunities and ultimately mandates participation in a CAHSEE review class during the school day if the student continues to fail.

California High School Exit Examination Support Paths 2004-2006
For MATH

Two Year Support Paths	*Summer school or Inter-session* Based on February test results taken during 10th grade	11th Grade First Semester _____ *Consider most recent CAHSEE results*	11th Grade Second Semester _____ *Consider most recent CAHSEE results*	*Summer school or Inter-session* Based on March test results taken during 11th grade	12th Grade First Semester _____ *Consider most recent CAHSEE results*	12th Grade Second Semester _____ *Consider most recent CAHSEE results*
Test schedule		Retest In November	Retest In March		Retest In November	Retest In March
Scored 330-349	No intervention at this time	Recommended *CAHSEE Math Module (20-hour module)* To be delivered before or after school, Saturdays, or intersession	Mandatory (for those who did not attend first semester) *CAHSEE Math Module (20 hour module)* To be delivered before or after school, Saturdays, or intersession	*CAHSEE Math Essentials (60 hours – one semester elective credit)*	Mandatory *Math 12* *(one-year course, earns two semesters of math credit)*	Mandatory *Math 12* *(one-year course, earns two semesters of math credit)*
Scored 300-329	*CAHSEE Math Prep (60 hours)*	Mandatory *CAHSEE Math Essentials (one semester course)* *(MUST complete during first or second semester of junior year)*	Mandatory *CAHSEE Math Module (20-hour module)* To be delivered before or after school, Saturdays, or intersession	*a) CAHSEE Math Essentials** *OR* b) *CAHSEE Math Prep* (*If not taken previously)	Mandatory *Math 12* *(one-year course, earns two semesters of math credit)*	Mandatory *Math 12* *(one-year course, earns two semesters of math credit)*
Scored Below 300	*Students in this category have more severe mathematical content deficiencies. If they are enrolled in Special Education math courses, CAHSEE remediation will take place within those courses. If they are not, they may attend the options listed for the (300-329) score range but will probably need additional support. For suggested resources, contact [name] at the Office of Curriculum and Instruction.*				Mandatory *Math 12 (possibly through the Special Education Department)* *(One year course, earns two semesters of math credit)*	Mandatory *Math 12 (possibly through the Special Education Department)* *(One year course, earns two semesters of math credit)*

Description of Resources to be used with each intervention:

1. <u>CAHSEE Math Prep</u>: 60-hour course for summer school or intersession – elective credit. Curriculum Dept. will provide a course guide to accompany the text "Meeting the California Challenge," by Globe-Fearon.

2. <u>CAHSEE Math Essentials</u>: 60-hour course for regular school day or summer school/intersession – elective credit. SDCOE "CAHSEE Prep" materials will be used. No text required; student materials will need to be duplicated.

3. <u>CAHSEE Math Module</u>: 20-hour module for after-school hours program – no credit. KAPLAN'S Advantage units will be used. Class set of student materials and one set of teacher materials will be required. **Students will not be allowed use the units as consumables.**

4. <u>Math 12:</u> One year course – 2 semesters math credit. Curriculum Dept. will provide a course guide to accompany the text "Conquering the CAHSEE," by Math Teacher's Press. RSP and SDC teachers will use the same text, modifying when necessary.

California High School Exit Examination Support Paths 2004-2006
FOR ENGLISH / LANGUAGE ARTS

Two Year Support Paths	*Summer school or Inter-session* Based on February test results taken during 10th grade	11th Grade First Semester *Consider most recent CAHSEE results*	11th Grade Second Semester *Consider most recent CAHSEE results*	*Summer school or Inter-session* Based on March test results taken during 11th grade	12th Grade First Semester *Consider most recent CAHSEE results*	12th Grade Second Semester *Consider most recent CAHSEE results*
Test schedule		Retest In November	Retest In March		Retest In November	Retest In March
Scored 330-349	Optional: *CAHSEE English Essential*	Recommended *CAHSEE English Modules* (Two 20-Hour Modules) (Should complete one (1) of two 20-hour Modules after-school sessions or during Inter-session) Resources: KAPLAN 's *Advantage* modules	Recommended *CAHSEE English Modules* (Two 20-hour Modules) (Should complete one (1) of two 20-hour Modules after school sessions or during inter-session) Resources: KAPLAN's *Advantage* modules	*a) CAHSEE English Module (Total: 40 hour Modules)* Resources: KAPLAN's *Advantage* modules b) Writing Workshop: Advanced (if 2 or lower on last CAHSEE essay)	Mandatory *Academic English - 1*	Mandatory *Academic English - 2*
Scored 300-329	*a) CAHSEE English Essential* **CAHSEE English Prep (Advanced Reading Across the Content Areas) (60 hours)* **PENDING DEVELOPMENT*	Recommended *CAHSEE English Essential (one semester course)* *(Should complete during first, second, or summer semester of junior year))*	Mandatory *CAHSEE English Module* (Two 20-hour Modules) (Should complete one (1) of two 20-hours Modules after school sessions or during Inter-session) Resources: KAPLAN's *Advantage* modules	*a) CAHSEE English Essential* b) *CAHSEE English Prep (Advanced Reading Across the Content Areas) c) Writing Workshop: Advanced (if 2 or lower on last CAHSEE essay) (*If not taken previously)	Mandatory *Academic English - 1*	Mandatory Academic English – 2
Scored Below 300	*a) Reading Workshop* *b) Writing Workshop: Basic* *c) Appropriate Special Ed or EL (including TITLE III) Intervention Program*	*a) REACH System: Comprehension B1 / Reasoning & Writing Extension C* *b) Appropriate Special Ed, EL, or TITLE III class & intervention*	*a) REACH System: Reasoning & Writing E* And Reasoning & Writing Extensions D & E (If needed Decoding C) *b) Appropriate Special Ed, EL, or TITLE III class & intervention*	*a) Writing Workshop: Basic or Advanced* *b) Appropriate Special Ed or EL (including TITLE III Intervention Program*	Mandatory *a) CAHSEE English Prep* *b) Appropriate Special Ed, EL, or TITLE III class & intervention*	Mandatory a) *CAHSEE English Modules (Total: 40 hour Modules)* Resources: KAPLAN's *Advantage* modules *b) Appropriate Special Ed, EL, or TITLE III class & intervention*

Title	General Description
#1 CAHSEE English Modules (2) After-school /Inter-session (two 20-hour modules) Non-Credit unless 60 hours completes (Two E/LA 20-hour modules & One Math Module) (No elective number)	Short, intense work on one topic at a time Targets JUNIORS and SENIORS who are close to passing CAHSEE (preferably 330-349) After-school, Inter-session, or Saturday hourly workshops (can be 1-4 hours up to 20 hours per module) Individual strands include topics such as *Reading Between the Lines, Reading Non-Fiction Passages, Reading Literary Passages, Strategies for Multiple-Choice Questions, Writing an Expository Essay, Writing a Persuasive Essay, Practice Test* Commercially developed material by KAPLAN, Inc. – *CAHSEE ADVANTAGE* modules
#2 CAHSEE English Prep (Advanced Reading Across Content Areas) * Non-Credit unless 60 hours completes (3 –20 hour modules) Elective Course #1682	General skills review for CAHSEE targeted for intersession and summer school – to be developed Targets JUNIORS below 330 who are struggling to demonstrating proficiency on CAHSEE Intended to develop six key skills recursively through the curriculum Curriculum* developed from one text: *Six-Way Paragraphs in the Content areas - Middle level* [*Curriculum parallels *Reading in the Content Areas* (TITLE III Intervention Modules) based on Introductory Level of same text]
#3 CAHSEE English Essentials (one semester course) Elective Course #1703	Offers longer integrated engagement with general skills review for CAHSEE – Pilot Spring Semester 2005 Intended as ONE semester course for JUNIORS (preferably scoring between 329-300) Curriculum developed for core texts: *America Today and Tomorrow*
#4 Readers' Workshop: *REWARDS* (& *Reading in the Content Areas* (primarily summer school or inter-session) Elective Course # 1597	Intended as literacy intervention for struggling students scoring below 300 on most recent CAHSEE *REWARDS* program built on 20-lessons to develop stronger skills in decoding multi-syllabic words and fluency (often used to accelerate CR Decoding C students) *REWARDS* can be a two-hour daily class in inter-session or summer school when augmented with *Reading in the Content Area*: *Level A* *Reading in the Content Areas (Level A)* – Text developed to help students learn and apply a variety of reading strategies with varied genres for stronger independent reading and comprehension
#5 Writers' Workshop: a) Basic *(Step Up to Writing)* (Summer school or Inter-session) Elective Course #1416 b) Advanced * (No elective number)	Intended for students who (scoring 2 or below on CAHSEE essay) BASIC: *STEP UP TO WRITING* program (60-hour course will be divided into three 20-hour modules and intended for students who are NOT successful with a "traditional" approach to teaching writing ADVANCED*: three 20-hour modules, each dealing with three CAHSEE genres (i.e., Response to literature, biographical narrative, & persuasive) NOTE: In SENIOR YEAR, workshop can be delivered as a semester course or an After-school or Saturday module sessions

Title	General Description
#6 REACH System: *CR Comprehension B-1 , Reasoning & Writing Level E and Extensions C, D, & E:* (Two semesters) *Elective Courses	Intended as mandatory literacy intervention for struggling students especially JUNIORS scoring below 300 on CAHSEE [if intervention not previously completed] Materials are systematic and based on direct instruction delivery to accelerate students reading between 3rd –6th grade levels Curriculum is SRA-developed course materials worked through over two semesters *Course numbers vary with level (check Course Catalogue) NOTE: *High Point Program* may be an alternate literacy intervention choice.
#7 Academic English (AE) 1 and 2: AE 1: Elective Course #1664 AE-2: Elective Course # 1665	Intended as mandatory for SENIORS scoring between 300-349 on most recent CAHSEE unless in EL and/or EL Intervention Program Year's curriculum developed from American Book Company texts: *CA Reading Review and CA Writing Review* and KAPLAN's text, *CAHSEE SUCCESS*

CAHSEE 2005 Instruction Study
District Executive Summary #50
Spring 2005

1. **Awareness:** *How has the district informed students and parents of content expectations and the new exit exam requirement? How often and by what methods does this communication take place?*

The [District] has implemented various procedures to make students, parents, teachers and administrators aware of the CAHSEE requirements, the test administration dates and the standards assessed.

Opening of School. At the Middle and High school level every student receives each year at the opening of school a Student Handbook in which the CAHSEE requirements and test administration dates are outlined. This information is also published in the District's Academic Calendar that is provided to each parent in the district. Additionally, every Grade 10 student receive copies of the state's CAHSEE Guides "Preparing for the California High School Exit Examination" for English Language Arts and Mathematics. The guides are reviewed in class and then brought home to the parents. At the same time, high school teachers receive copies of the guides and also a district-developed compilation of the standards and released items for the CAHSEE strands.

Before CAHSEE Administrations. Prior to each CAHSEE administration, students and parents are informed of the graduation requirement and the test dates through a letter that is available in English and five major languages.

After CAHSEE Administrations. When the results are available, students and parents receive a CAHSEE report and the high schools are given rosters of student results for each test and each strand. Additionally, schools receive a history report outlining each student's current CAHSEE status. For students not meeting the requirements, an individualized CAHSEE Intervention Report is produced. This report highlights the various content strands comparing the student to the cut point proficient student and displays the student's CAHSEE history. Additionally the Intervention Report contains three years of California Standards Tests: ELA and Mathematics results as well as California English Language Development Test (CELDT) scores for English Learners.

2. Curriculum Validity: What actions has the district taken to adopt the California Content Standards expectations into the curriculum and to integrate them across all grade levels and subjects? How does the district consider required content expectations when selecting textbooks and curriculum materials?

[District] uses a materials selection process for selecting K–12 instructional materials that evaluates each program against a set of established criteria and reviews the materials for alignment to state standards. A committee of teachers reviews each set of materials against the criteria. A vertical alignment to standards across grades and a horizontal alignment within a grade are conducted to ensure that the set of materials will assure that each student has access to the standards at his/her grade level. The district selects from one of the state adopted programs for K–8. For high school instructional materials, an additional step in the process is the mapping of the instructional materials against the state standards before completing the committee's recommendation to the board for adoption. The key standards from the California Blueprint for mathematics and for English are mapped back from the exit exam standards to fourth grade to ensure greater student success on the CAHSEE.

3. **Instructional Validity:** *To what extent are all students in your district being taught the required content expectations, especially for the content on the required exit exam? How does the district or school principal ensure that all students (including students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students) receive classroom instruction - that is both regular and remedial instruction – that is well aligned with state content standards? To what extent is your response the same for the following groups: students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students? What criteria do you use to identify at-risk students before they take the CAHSEE?*

The standards-aligned mathematics and English materials are the core instructional material for each course or grade. Instructional materials are provided for each student, special and general education as well as English Language Learners. All teachers, including special education, English Language Development, participate in professional development on site and centrally at the initial adoption of the mathematics and English materials. English and mathematics department chairs continue to direct the implementation of the course content at school sites. Monthly meetings of department chairs with a district staff provide opportunities for sharing of strategies and resolving placement and implementation challenges.

Students in [District] have multiple opportunities to learn the standards of the exit exam by building on the grade level standards and having support structures for students who need extra support at each grade. Beginning in fifth grade, students take an end of year placement test for 6th grade in English and mathematics to better assess students proficiency with grade level standards. Students at each grade receive instruction in the grade level standards. Those targeted for an additional period for strategic support using an intervention reading program. Students in sixth through eighth grades receive accelerated instruction from the intervention program, High Point or REACH. At the end of each semester, students are tested to determine if students can exit the program.

For mathematics, each middle school develops a plan for additional mathematics support for 6th & 7th grade students either within the school day or in afterschool or tutorial programs. Eighth grade students take the University of California Algebra Readiness test. Those who do not place into algebra will take a general eighth grade mathematics class. The content of the course is focused on a review of the critical standards from the exit exam. Students who are two or more years below level are tested for an intervention mathematics program. At each grade in middle school, the district has developed benchmark assessments for each 6–8 weeks of instruction. A pacing schedule provides teachers with a guide for teaching all the grade level standards within the year. The frequent assessments provide opportunities to remediate during the next period of instruction.

Ninth and tenth grade students who are proficient with grade level standards will continue to take the core courses. Students who continue to demonstrate a need for interventions in mathematics and English will take both a core and an intervention class for mathematics and/or English. Administrators at middle schools and department chairs in high schools monitor the instruction and student progress in the core and intervention programs to ensure that students receive instruction from the standards in the exit exam and the accelerated instruction needed to bridge the skill gaps.

Students who are below and far below basic receive letters to attend summer school. The summer school curriculum focuses on the specific content clusters based on student data. English Language Learners (ELL) and special education students receive access to the same core and intervention support and instructional materials in middle and high school in preparation for the exit exam. However, instruction and pacing are modified for the special needs of each student or for the English level of the ELL.

4. **Student Remediation:** *To what extent are students in your district who initially do not pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE given the opportunity to be re-tested and to receive additional instruction tailored to their demonstrated needs? Does your district have procedures in place to track these students over time as they get closer to the graduation date to verify that they are participating in appropriate remedial instruction?*

All students, general and special education, who fail the CAHSEE take CAHSEE intervention classes within the school day in mathematics and/or English until they pass the exit exam. Students in mathematics use the online mathematics program, ALEKS, which specifically addresses the individual needs of students as identified by the exit exam and the diagnostic test from the program. English students receive instruction on the skill areas identified by the exit exam.

Summary

The [District] has established systems which inform students and parents, monitor student performance, provide standards-based instruction with the CAHSEE in mind, and offer appropriate intervention/remediation to students at risk of not meeting the CAHSEE requirements.

CAHSEE 2005 Instruction Study
District Executive Summary #51
Spring 2005

1. **Awareness:** *How has the district informed students and parents of content expectations and the new exit exam requirement? How often and by what methods does this communication take place?*

The district informs students and parents of content expectations and the exit exam requirements in the following ways:

- Provide all students with course standards and expectations at a school wide back-to-school event prior to the beginning of the school year. There is a general assembly with presentations by the principals and department leaders. Parents and students then meet with teachers to review course content standards and requirements.
- The annual calendar is distributed in the parent/student handbooks and is posted on the district and school websites that include dates for CAHSEE and other testing.
- The school distributes the CAHSEE Student/Parent Study Guides to all students in grade 10 and all those who did not pass the CAHSEE ELA or Math previously.
- Students who did not pass the CAHSEE previously are advised by guidance counselors prior to scheduled make-up testing and are placed in courses designed to prepare students to pass the ELA and/or Math sections of the CAHSEE.
- Prior to the regular grade 10 March administration, parents and students are informed of the schedule via the school newsletter. All ELA and Math courses for grade 10 students are aligned to standards and requirements for CAHSEE and students are informed of the skills needed to pass the exams.

2. **Curriculum Validity:** *What actions has the district taken to adopt the California Content Standards expectations into the curriculum and to integrate them across all grade levels and subjects? How does the district consider required content expectations when selecting textbooks and curriculum materials*?

The district and schools have taken the follow steps:

- As a unified school district, adopted curriculum standards for all grades 5–12 indicate if each ELA and/or Math standard is required on the CAHSEE. Course content and instruction are designed to prepare students to master the skills assessed on CAHSEE.
- Professional development occurs district wide, school wide, and in grade level/department meetings to articulate standards and instruction throughout the school year. English and math departments at all high schools have developed extensive curriculum mapping to assure standards alignment with CAHSEE in regular and remedial courses.

3. **Instructional Validity:** *To what extent are all students in your district being taught the required content expectations, especially for the content on the required exit exam? How does the district or school principal ensure that all students (including students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students) receive classroom instruction - that is both regular and remedial instruction – that is well aligned with state content standards? To what extent is your response the same for the following groups: students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students? What criteria do you use to identify at-risk students before they take the CAHSEE?*

The district and schools have taken the following steps:

- Opportunity ELA and Math courses are provided for all students including special education, English learners, and at-risk students. The special education teachers and the Newcomer/intermediate level English learner teachers align course content with the district core curriculum and CAHSEE requirements and address the unique academic and language needs of their students.
- The district provides reports for each high school counselor, using customized software (SOAR), that identifies students at-risk of not passing the CAHSEE using multiple criteria including, 1) grade 11 students who did not pass CAHSEE in grade 10, 2) students with grades of D or F in Opportunity/remedial ELA and/or math courses prior to taking the grade 10 CAHSEE, and 3) students who have failed the ELA and/or math sections more than once.

4. **Student Remediation:** *To what extent are students in your district who initially do not pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE given the opportunity to be re-tested and to receive additional instruction tailored to their demonstrated needs? Does your district have procedures in place to track these students over time as they get closer to the graduation date to verify that they are participating in appropriate remedial instruction?*

The district and schools monitor the data and respond to students who do not pass one or more parts of the CAHSEE:

- The district Information Technology Services (ITS) maintains a data base of students who do not pass the CAHSEE at any of the regular grade 10 administrations or grade 10–12 make-ups. The district schedules make-ups in November, February, and May and the regular grade 10 in March. Students who were absent or failed to pass any section of the CAHSEE, are given the opportunity to participate in make-ups.
- Each school has a CAHSEE Site Coordinator that works closely with ITS and the district assessment office to assure that booklets are ordered for students and notify counselors of the students who will be participating. All logistical arrangements are made at the site level for testing and the district arranges to order booklets, and when possible, the Pre-ID documents. When a Pre-ID is not possible, the district arranges for staff to complete all demographic information on the answer documents with data provided by ITS.

CAHSEE 2005 Instruction Study
District Executive Summary #52
Spring 2005

1. **Awareness:** *How has the district informed students and parents of content expectations and the new exit exam requirement? How often and by what methods does this communication take place?*

At the beginning of each school year, the district sends a letter to all students in grades 9–12 informing them of the requirement to pass the CAHSEE in order to receive a high school diploma. The notification letter includes an information flyer about when the test will be given, the content of the test, the preparation that students receive for the test and a contact phone number if there are any questions. Each school site writes a letter to students and parents two weeks prior to each test administration. Finally a cover letter repeating the CAHSEE requirement is sent with each Student and Parent Report of the CAHSEE results.

2. **Curriculum Validity:** *What actions has the district taken to adopt the California Content Standards expectations into the curriculum and to integrate them across all grade levels and subjects? How does the district consider required content expectations when selecting textbooks and curriculum materials*?

In the past five years, the district has aligned the content of all core academic courses to the California Content Standards. All textbooks adopted within the past five years have had to be aligned to the Content Standards.

3. **Instructional Validity:** *To what extent are all students in your district being taught the required content expectations, especially for the content on the required exit exam? How does the district or school principal ensure that all students (including students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students) receive classroom instruction - that is both regular and remedial instruction – that is well aligned with state content standards? To what extent is your response the same for the following groups: students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students? What criteria do you use to identify at-risk students before they take the CAHSEE?*

The district requires that all district students, including ELs and special education students, by the end of their sophomore year, complete 1) an English class that addresses the grade 9/10 ELA standards and 2) a first-year algebra class. Incoming ninth grade students may be placed in developmental reading or algebra support classes, in addition to their English and/or algebra I class, based on a district placement tests and feeder school teacher recommendations. Grade 10 students who score far below basic, below basic and basic on the STAR English or math CST are eligible for CAHSEE tutorials. In addition, the district has instituted district-wide common assessments, that are standards-based for all district courses for which there is a corresponding CST in STAR.

4. **Student Remediation:** *To what extent are students in your district who initially do not pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE given the opportunity to be re-tested and to receive additional instruction tailored to their demonstrated needs? Does your district have procedures in place to track these students over time as they get closer to the graduation date to verify that they are participating in appropriate remedial instruction?*

The majority of district special education students and English learners are in mainstream English and math classes; however, teachers working with these students in stand-alone

classes have received in-service training on the math and ELA standards addressed on the CAHSEE. For summer 2005, the district has initiated a summer school CAHSEE review class in both English and math for any student who did not pass either section of the CAHSEE. In fall 2005, grade 12 students who have still not passed a section of the CAHSEE are required to enroll in a CAHSEE intervention class that is held during the regular school day. The CAHSEE intervention classes are staffed by teachers credentialed in English and math.

CAHSEE 2005 Instruction Study
District Executive Summary #53
Spring 2005

1. **Awareness:** *How has the district informed students and parents of content expectations and the new exit exam requirement? How often and by what methods does this communication take place?*

[District] values and includes all stakeholders in all facets of the educational process. To encourage participation, [District] maintains a system of open two-way communication and employs a variety of ways to increase stakeholder communication. Not only are all expectations, test results, and information regarding the CAHSEE posted on the District's website, but all pertinent information, including test content expectations and test results are also available to parents on each school's website, in the Principal's Newsletters (which are written in English, Spanish, and Vietnamese), and in all parent night functions.

2. **Curriculum Validity:** *What actions has the district taken to adopt the California Content Standards expectations into the curriculum and to integrate them across all grade levels and subjects? How does the district consider required content expectations when selecting textbooks and curriculum materials?*

The District has aligned curriculum, instruction, and assessment with content standards to promote standards mastery. Using the backwards mapping strategy, Subject Area Coordinators have gathered input from each site's teachers to select essential standards (divided into skills and topics), develop curriculum maps, align instructional resources, implement research-based instructional strategies, develop assessment tools (including rubrics), and collect "best practices" exemplars that align with the State's content and performance standards and the CAHSEE and STAR blueprints.

Using research-based criteria, the District has adopted and uses only State approved, standards-aligned content area texts and standards-aligned supplementary materials that are reading level appropriate to assessed needs. Before any instructional materials are submitted to the District's Instructional Policies Committee for approval, they must be aligned with the State Standards and frameworks, State approved for the grade-specific course, include materials that reflect the diversity of all students, and be piloted by teachers for one year.

3. **Instructional Validity:** *To what extent are all students in your district being taught the required content expectations, especially for the content on the required exit exam? How does the district or school principal ensure that all students (including students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students) receive classroom instruction - that is both regular and remedial instruction – that is well aligned with state content standards? To what extent is your response the same for the following groups: students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students? What criteria do you use to identify at-risk students before they take the CAHSEE?*

In order to ensure that all students are being taught the required State content expectations, curriculum maps have been developed, all instructional materials are aligned to the standards, and all teachers have been trained in the use *of* research-validated best practices instructional strategies. In addition, the District provides structured, supplementary classes and extended day opportunities for students who score below the proficient level on State and local assessments. Designed to address students' remedial needs without compromising the

standards based curriculum offered in their core classes, these support classes and extended day opportunities are helping students to overcome the academic deficits they have accrued throughout their first 9 years (K–8) of school. To ensure that all students (including students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students) have access to the content they need to pass the CAHSEE, aggregate, disaggregated, school-wide, subject specific, teacher, and individual student data are used to monitor instruction, programs, and progress towards achieving the standards; inform decisions regarding human, physical, and monetary resource allocations; and make program modifications in a timely manner. Data is also used to identify and target "at-risk" students so that interventions and support structures can be provided to address the assessed needs. Students are deemed "at-risk" if they are performing in the Below Basic and/or Far Below Basic Quintiles of the California Standards Tests and if they have not passed the CAHSEE.

Despite the curricular alignment, data-driven instruction, and aligned assessment strategies, many [District] students are "at risk". In ongoing analysis of STAR, CELDT, *CAHSEE,* the District's Writing Assessment, data from the Northwest Evaluation Association assessment, and other local measures representing both formative and summative assessments, the District has surfaced serious literacy-based needs. The data show that the ***majority*** of students in the District are scoring below grade level in literacy, math, and content area standards. Not only are a majority of students ***entering*** [District] significantly below grade average, but many students, from ***all*** language proficiency populations, are also entering high school without basic phonemic recognition skills. Moreover, there are approximately 56 different languages spoken by students in the District, and many of the Limited English Proficiency students lack the Cognitive Academic Linguistic Proficiency (CALP) in their native language to transfer their learning to English. Combined with dwindling funds, an inordinately large population of students with autism, and an exceptionally large student population of below grade level students and English Learners that requires ongoing support to meet the State's standards, the district is faced with a formidable challenge.

4. **Student Remediation:** *To what extent are students in your district who initially do not pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE given the opportunity to be re-tested and to receive additional instruction tailored to their demonstrated needs? Does your district have procedures in place to track these students over time as they get closer to the graduation date to verify that they are participating in appropriate remedial instruction?*

Students who do not initially pass the CAHSEE are immediately targeted for curricular interventions, CAHSEE support classes, and extended day opportunities. Not only are student class selections modified to address the assessed need, but students are also targeted for summer school and one-on-one tutoring. Students are encouraged and given every opportunity to retest to pass the exam. Parents, teachers, and counselors are contacted and alerted regarding extended day learning opportunities, school year CAHSEE support classes, summer school CAHSEE support classes, test requirements, test dates, and test taking strategies. After every CAHSEE administration, student data is shared with district administrators, principals, counselors, teachers, parents, and individual students. Students who do not pass the CAHSEE are deemed "at risk" and are monitored closely.

Despite the District's efforts, many students will not pass the CAHSEE. Perhaps if the High School Exit Exam were renamed to reflect the appropriate designation "**K–12** Exit Exam"; K–8 standards were reconfigured to infuse the same level of rigor (process skills, higher level thinking skills) as the high school standards (instead of the basic K–8 acquisition of knowledge standards); and K–8 schools were held to the same accountability as the high schools (8th grade graduation exam), then more students would be able to pass the CAHSEE.

CAHSEE 2005 Instruction Study
District Executive Summary #54
Spring 2005

1. **Awareness:** *How has the district informed students and parents of content expectations and the new exit exam requirement? How often and by what methods does this communication take place?*

Parents of 10th grade students receive a letter from the Superintendent at the beginning of the school year explaining the purpose of the CAHSEE and the requirements for passing. At the site level, requirements and information about the CAHSEE are included in parent newsletters and in a formal letter from the principal to 10th grade students and students in the 11th and 12th grades who have not passed all or part of the CAHSEE.

2. **Curriculum Validity:** *What actions has the district taken to adopt the California Content Standards expectations into the curriculum and to integrate them across all grade levels and subjects? How does the district consider required content expectations when selecting textbooks and curriculum materials*?

Every 7–12 course outline is based solely on the California Content Standards and is approved by the Board of Education. In addition, common finals are given at the end of each semester in the four core academic areas. These common finals, written by teacher committees, are based solely on the content standards.

Textbook and curriculum material selection is focused on those texts and materials that imbed the content standards. Most textbooks offered for sale in California are written around the state standards (7–12 Holt English, for instance).

3. **Instructional Validity:** *To what extent are all students in your district being taught the required content expectations, especially for the content on the required exit exam? How does the district or school principal ensure that all students (including students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students) receive classroom instruction - that is both regular and remedial instruction – that is well aligned with state content standards? To what extent is your response the same for the following groups: students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students? What criteria do you use to identify at-risk students before they take the CAHSEE?*

All students, including special education, English learners, and at-risk students receive instruction based on course outlines aligned with the California Content Standards. Instruction is frequently monitored by the site administration through direct observation, review of common assessment and interim assessment results, and *through* regular department meetings that focus on instructional issues.

Each 7–12 site develops action plans that focus on specific areas of need and emphasis in each of the four core academic areas. Teachers regularly provide examples of student activities that support the action plans and the content standards. These examples are reviewed on a regular basis by the Director of Secondary Education and the site administration.

At-risk students are identified through a review of academic progress, attendance, and behavior.

4. **Student Remediation:** *To what extent are students in your district who initially do not pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE given the opportunity to be re-tested and to receive*

additional instruction tailored to their demonstrated needs? Does your district have procedures in place to track these students over time as they get closer to the graduation date to verify that they are participating in appropriate remedial instruction?

Extensive remediation opportunities are available for students who do not pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE. The District follows the re-test guidelines developed by the State. Extended Summer School (offered during the school year) and Summer School classes that focus on CAHSEE remediation are offered at each site. High School counselors track students who have parts or all of the CAHSEE to pass and verify they are participating in appropriate remedial instruction.

CAHSEE 2005 Instruction Study
District Executive Summary #55
Spring 2005

1. **Awareness:** *How has the district informed students and parents of content expectations and the new exit exam requirement? How often and by what methods does this communication take place?*

   - All 10th grade students meet with counselors, along with their parents, to discuss CAHSEE requirements
   - All students are given a study guide for CAHSEE in language arts and math
   - Letters are sent to all parents notifying testing dates and requirements
   - CAHSEE dates requirements are sent to parents through newsletters
   - CAHSEE dates requirements are posted on site web pages

2. **Curriculum Validity:** *What actions has the district taken to adopt the California Content Standards expectations into the curriculum and to integrate them across all grade levels and subjects? How does the district consider required content expectations when selecting textbooks and curriculum materials*?

   - California Content Standards are adopted throughout our district as the curricular program
   - Sites have developed curriculum/pacing guides, K–12, to assure consistent instruction of standards throughout the grades
   - Textbooks are selected which are state-approved and address content standards

3. **Instructional Validity:** *To what extent are all students in your district being taught the required content expectations, especially for the content on the required exit exam? How does the district or school principal ensure that all students (including students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students) receive classroom instruction - that is both regular and remedial instruction – that is well aligned with state content standards? To what extent is your response the same for the following groups: students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students? What criteria do you use to identify at-risk students before they take the CAHSEE?*

   - All students are instructed with curriculum based on content standards
   - Classes are offered to assure remediation, as needed. Classes include: REACH, Pro Math, Math/English Review, CAHSEE classes, and double dosing of classes for those students who need to "catch up."
   - Criteria used to determine student need include: CST results, benchmark tests, and grades

4. **Student Remediation:** *To what extent are students in your district who initially do not pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE given the opportunity to be re-tested and to receive additional instruction tailored to their demonstrated needs? Does your district have procedures in place to track these students over time as they get closer to the graduation date to verify that they are participating in appropriate remedial instruction?*

   - Students not passing CAHSEE are provided the opportunity for remediation through CAHSEE classes and individualized support in the regular instructional program.

- Students are given the opportunity to retest throughout the year, according to CAHSEE guidelines.
- Student performance on CAHSEE is tracked through our student information system, Aeries.

CAHSEE 2005 Instruction Study
District Executive Summary #56
Spring 2005

1. **Awareness:** *How has the district informed students and parents of content expectations and the new exit exam requirement? How often and by what methods does this communication take place?*

[District] has taken numerous steps to provide students and parents with vital information about both the requirements for passing the exam and it content and structure. We have utilized existing district and site avenues for communication and we have created additional means by which to inform and education our school community about the exam. Specifically we have utilized official **site documents** including parent newsletters, student planning guides, course directories and handbooks, websites and parent mailings. Site leadership has included information about the CAHSEE in **parent and student orientation event**s and during **individual counseling sessions** held on high school campuses. We have included information about the CAHSEE on **the district website**. In addition, the district provides a **formal notification** to all parents regarding the CAHSEE, local and state assessment measures, and the requirements for graduation from a [District] High School.

Information about the CAHSEE is also included in school documents K–8 and staff consistently relays information about the exit exam to students and parents.

2. **Curriculum Validity:** *What actions has the district taken to adopt the California Content Standards expectations into the curriculum and to integrate them across all grade levels and subjects? How does the district consider required content expectations when selecting textbooks and curriculum materials*?

[District] began the process of curriculum alignment to the California Content Standards in 2000 by convening teacher teams by grade level and discipline. The outcome of this work included the development of a written curriculum in the form of District Curriculum Guides for ELA and math, the publication of Essential Standards and benchmarks, and the systematic revision of common course outlines for grades 7–12. Throughout this on-going work, teacher leaders work collaboratively with site and district leadership to ensure that the *board approved* curriculum for our students is appropriately rigorous and is clearly aligned to state expectations as they are guided by the content standards. As a part of this alignment process, staff developed documents reflecting the alignment of the [DISTRICT] Essential Standards and Benchmarks to the CAHSEE standards in grades Pre–K through 10. Standards documents are available on the district website for staff, parents, and students.

Curriculum work over the past two years has also centered on the development of common course end exams for the core content areas (grades 7–12) aligned to the California standards for each content area and course. Teams of teachers have also created benchmark exams (aligned to grade level/content standards) in 7th grade mathematics and Algebra.

The district has also invested in the Curriculum Mapping process and has purchased appropriate technology to support mapping and standards pacing by individual teachers in grade 7–12. The mapping process extends to all curriculum areas and includes support plans for ELA and math in co-curricular programs.

District policy requires that textbooks and materials approved for use in [District] schools align with state and district adopted content standards. Textbooks are adopted according to state

guidelines and are approved by our school board. Supplemental materials are also board approved through the approval of course outlines in grades 7–12.

Our school board has also adopted specific goals making student success the top priority in the [District]. In addition, our board also adopted goals that continue to support and strengthen our focus on standards-based instruction.

3. **Instructional Validity:** *To what extent are all students in your district being taught the required content expectations, especially for the content on the required exit exam? How does the district or school principal ensure that all students (including students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students) receive classroom instruction - that is both regular and remedial instruction – that is well aligned with state content standards? To what extent is your response the same for the following groups: students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students? What criteria do you use to identify at-risk students before they take the CAHSEE?*

Ensuring that every student in [District] is provided a standards aligned curriculum is the collective responsibility of all educators in our district. Professional development activities at both the district and site levels focus on standards-based instruction and effective teaching practice and include teachers of special needs populations. No courses are offered in our district that are not aligned to the content standards and that do not support student success on grade level work and on high stakes tests like the CAHSEE. Additionally, the district has move to an “algebra for all” approach at the middle schools and has developed systems for teacher collaboration across grade levels in ELA and math. Teachers fully understand their professional obligation to teach to the standards and to provide additional time to work with students struggling to meet those expectations. Site administration, teacher leaders, and district support staff assist teachers in planning and organizing curriculum around the standards. Site administration monitors the delivery of instruction to students.

Numerous interventions are in place both within the school day and outside of the regular school day in the form of Extended Day, after-school tutorials, Saturday Academies and Extended Year (Summer School). Student targeted for intervention classes are identified through local assessment measures and teacher recommendation. Such reviews of student achievement data assists in the identification of students in need of assistance prior to taking the CAHSEE in their sophomore year and steps are taken to provide the additional instruction necessary for future success.

4. **Student Remediation:** *To what extent are students in your district who initially do not pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE given the opportunity to be re-tested and to receive additional instruction tailored to their demonstrated needs? Does your district have procedures in place to track these students over time as they get closer to the graduation date to verify that they are participating in appropriate remedial instruction?*

See above

Any student who fails to pass the CAHSEE is provided the opportunity to re-test (as required by law) and to participate in specific intervention programs designed to provide the additional instruction and support needed for student success on the exit exam. The district has implemented additional CAHSEE intervention as a part of the middle school extended year program and will review the high school curriculum for CAHSEE intervention course during the summer of 2005. In addition, new courses are in development to support freshmen in reaching content standards in ELA and math.

CAHSEE 2005 Instruction Study
District Executive Summary #57
Spring 2005

1. **Awareness:** *How has the district informed students and parents of content expectations and the new exit exam requirement? How often and by what methods does this communication take place?*

Semi-monthly principal's newsletters keep parents abreast of all state testing requirements. Any changes are conveyed through newsletters and back-to-school nights. Because the core curriculum is standards-based, students are made aware of state standards in their classes. Through course work in math and English, they are prepared for the CAHSEE.

2. **Curriculum Validity:** *What actions has the district taken to adopt the California Content Standards expectations into the curriculum and to integrate them across all grade levels and subjects? How does the district consider required content expectations when selecting textbooks and curriculum materials*?

The District has adopted the California State Content Standards in English and Mathematics at all grade levels.

The district follows a cycle for curriculum and textbook review. When a discipline is in a task force year, the members are charged with the task of revising curricula to reflect standards, and departments review and adopt new texts that have been aligned with state standards.

3. **Instructional Validity:** *To what extent are all students in your district being taught the required content expectations, especially for the content on the required exit exam? How does the district or school principal ensure that all students (including students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students) receive classroom instruction - that is both regular and remedial instruction – that is well aligned with state content standards? To what extent is your response the same for the following groups: students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students? What criteria do you use to identify at-risk students before they take the CAHSEE?*

All students are being taught the required content expectations, but it is true that we track. Our offerings, for example in sophomore English, range from honors to special education English 2. But at every level, students have access to the standards because we know that every student must pass the CAHSEE if he or she one day expects to earn a diploma from our school.

When students in their freshman year fail to meet grade level expectations, we enroll them in basic math review courses and remedial reading and writing courses.

4. **Student Remediation:** *To what extent are students in your district who initially do not pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE given the opportunity to be re-tested and to receive additional instruction tailored to their demonstrated needs? Does your district have procedures in place to track these students over time as they get closer to the graduation date to verify that they are participating in appropriate remedial instruction?*

The results of the 10th grade census administration are immediately entered into our student data system. We can then query the names of students who have not passed or not yet taken the CAHSEE. These students are given every opportunity available to take the CAHSEE until they have passed. Students who have not yet passes the CAHSEE continue to participate in

grade-level and remedial standards-based courses. Academic counselors are responsible for tracking individuals to ensure that they are enrolled in courses that prepare them for passing the CAHSEE.

CAHSEE 2005 Instruction Study
District Executive Summary #58
Spring 2005

1. **Awareness:** *How has the district informed students and parents of content expectations and the new exit exam requirement? How often and by what methods does this communication take place?*

   - Content expectations
     - Annual Individual Education Program (IEP) Meetings for every student
     - K–8 Semester Standards-Based Report Cards

   - CAHSEE requirements
     - Annual IEP Meetings for every student
     - Parent letters and/or brochures are sent home 1 or more times per year (Grade 9 and above)
     - Brochures are also available in the High School Department and the Career Center
     - School Accountability Report Card information

2. **Curriculum Validity:** *What actions has the district taken to adopt the California Content Standards expectations into the curriculum and to integrate them across all grade levels and subjects? How does the district consider required content expectations when selecting textbooks and curriculum materials*?

   - Adoption of California Standards
     - Staff received training on the California Standards
     - Some staff attend subject area conferences that focus on implementation of the state standards
     - Complete revision of K–8 Standards-Based School Report Cards

   - Selection of textbooks and curriculum materials (in compliance with students' IEPs)
     - [District] purchases grade level textbooks and curriculum material that are aligned with California Content Standards
     - [District] purchases appropriate grade level textbooks and curriculum materials that support students whose IEPs indicate they need a program that is based on modified state standards
     - [District] purchases appropriate grade level textbooks and curriculum materials that support severely delayed students whose IEPs indicate they need a program that is based on an alternate curriculum
     - [District] purchases instructional materials to support the development of American Sign Language skills

3. **Instructional Validity:** *To what extent are all students in your district being taught the required content expectations, especially for the content on the required exit exam? How does the district or school principal ensure that all students (including students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students) receive classroom instruction - that is both regular and remedial instruction – that is well aligned with state content standards? To what extent is your response the same for the following groups: students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students? What criteria do you use to identify at-risk students before they take the CAHSEE?*

- Extent to which all students are receiving required content
  - All [District] students are English Learners and have IEPs, which document the student's appropriate instructional need (based on student's reading and math level). The student will progress via one of the following curriculums:
  - General curriculum based on grade level state standards
  - Modified curriculum based on state standards (majority)
  - Alternate curriculum (Special Needs students)

- Criteria used to identify those students at risk before they take the CAHSEE
  - Students educational background (reading and math levels when entering [District] from local school districts
  - Parents' ability to communicate with students (majority of parents are not fluent in American Sign Language)
  - Classroom observation and assessment
  - State standardized assessments
  - School standardized assessments
  - Stanford Achievement Test-10th edition which has been normed on [student populations]
  - Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests
  - Triennial assessment

4. **Student Remediation:** *To what extent are students in your district who initially do not pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE given the opportunity to be re-tested and to receive additional instruction tailored to their demonstrated needs? Does your district have procedures in place to track these students over time as they get closer to the graduation date to verify that they are participating in appropriate remedial instruction?*

   - Extent to which students not passing both CAHSEE parts are re-tested and remediated
     - All students who do not pass CAHSEE are given the opportunity to attend a CAHSEE preparation class during summer school during the summers after their 9th, 10th, and 11th grade years
     - 10th grade students are also provided with CDE CAHSEE study guides
     - The [District] High School Department tracks student remediation needs
     - The [District] Career Center tracks students progress toward meeting all graduation requirements, including the CAHSEE

CAHSEE 2005 Instruction Study
District Executive Summary #59
Spring 2005

1. **Awareness:** *How has the district informed students and parents of content expectations and the new exit exam requirement? How often and by what methods does this communication take place?*

Once the state decided to implement the new state graduation requirement of having high school students pass the CAHSEE, [District] immediately began to notify middle school and high school teachers, administrative staff, parents, and students of this new graduation requirement. Students and parents were informed about this new requirement both in writing through the mail annually and through information provided to students and parents about the content of the test by middle school and high school teachers. This new requirement of passing the CAHSEE was also adopted by our school board as a graduation requirement and is included each *year* in the high school programming handbooks that are given to high school students and parents (grades 9–12).

2. **Curriculum Validity:** *What actions has the district taken to adopt the California Content Standards expectations into the curriculum and to integrate them across all grade levels and subjects? How does the district consider required content expectations when selecting textbooks and curriculum materials*?

In 2000–01, the Board of Trustees of the [District] adopted the K–12 Mathematics Framework for California Public Schools and the Reading/Language Arts Framework for California Public Schools as the standards and curriculum for [District]. Curriculum staff then began working with K–12 teachers to align their math and English/language arts curriculum with these new state standards. The district's K–5 math and English/language arts curriculum guides and 6–12 course outlines were all revised to align with these new state standards. As new K–8 textbooks were published and adopted by the state, curriculum staff worked with teacher committees at K–5 and 6–8 to review and pilot the state adopted textbooks and to recommend math and English/language arts textbooks for district adoption. At the high school level, curriculum staff worked with math and English/language arts teachers to review and pilot published textbooks to determine which textbooks aligned with new state standards. After this review process, new 9–12 math and English/language arts textbooks were adopted by the district.

3. **Instructional Validity:** *To what extent are all students in your district being taught the required content expectations, especially for the content on the required exit exam? How does the district or school principal ensure that all students (including students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students) receive classroom instruction - that is both regular and remedial instruction – that is well aligned with state content standards? To what extent is your response the same for the following groups: students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students? What criteria do you use to identify at-risk students before they take the CAHSEE?*

All K–12 students in the [District] are being taught the math and English/language arts state standards because these state standards have become the district curriculum. All

students (including special education, EL and at-risk) in [District] receive this core math and English/language arts curriculum. As an example, all middle school students receive instruction in Algebra in a two year program. Special Education teachers and teachers of EL students are required to provide the core math and English/language arts standards and CAHSEE content to their students in their classes. In addition to the math and English/language arts state standards, teachers are given copies of the "blue prints" for the CAHSEE for both curricular areas to use as they work with students. Teachers have also developed assessments to use throughout the year to monitor their student progress toward the state standards and the standards included on the CAHSEE. Principals in all K–12 [Schools] have been provided with staff development on the math and English/language arts standards and the content of the CAHSEE. Principals use this knowledge as they observe classes and discuss student progress with teachers. Principals and teachers review the performance of students on the state CST tests and teacher assessments to determine which students are at risk in the areas of math and/or English/language arts on the CAHSEE before they take the test in 10th grade. Elective remediation classes are provided at the middle and high school levels for students who are not meeting grade levels standards in math and English/language arts and/or for students who are not proficient with the content on the CAHSEE. After school classes are also provided for K–12 students who are having difficulty meeting grade level standards and/or the content on the CAHSEE. Special supplemental materials have been purchased for teachers to use with these at risk students.

4. **Student Remediation:** *To what extent are students in your district who initially do not pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE given the opportunity to be re-tested and to receive additional instruction tailored to their demonstrated needs? Does your district have procedures in place to track these students over time as they get closer to the graduation date to verify that they are participating in appropriate remedial instruction?*

All students who do not pass the CAHSEE as a tenth grader in [District] are given the opportunity to retake the test again after they have received remediation on the test or tests they have not passed. Students who do not pass the CAHSEE on their second attempt are automatically enrolled in a remedial elective course (either focused on math or English/language arts) to prepare the student to retake the CAHSEE. [District] also has procedures in place at each high school to track any high school student over time who does not pass the CAHSEE in order that he/she is placed each year in a remediation course. This data is reviewed each year by the curriculum and assessment departments.

CAHSEE 2005 Instruction Study
District Executive Summary #60
Spring 2005

1. **Awareness:** *How has the district informed students and parents of content expectations and the new exit exam requirement? How often and by what methods does this communication take place?*

Students and parents are informed of the exit exam requirement since the beginning of 9th grade. Information goes home in the beginning of the year parent letter. Flyers are posted with exit exam dates. Exit exam requirement for graduation is in the board policy. Students are informed by teachers of the specific California content standards pertinent to the CAHSEE. Practice questions from CDE are completed. Students are each given study guides in Math and ELA prepared by CDE prior to taking the census administration of the exam.

2. **Curriculum Validity:** *What actions has the district taken to adopt the California Content Standards expectations into the curriculum and to integrate them across all grade levels and subjects? How does the district consider required content expectations when selecting textbooks and curriculum materials?*

California Content standards have been adopted by the district as the basis of their own standards. All textbooks are meticulously examined against those standards prior to purchase. Teacher review textbooks and publishers are required to provide districts with supporting documentation.

3. **Instructional Validity:** *To what extent are all students in your district being taught the required content expectations, especially for the content on the required exit exam? How does the district or school principal ensure that all students (including students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students) receive classroom instruction - that is both regular and remedial instruction – that is well aligned with state content standards? To what extent is your response the same for the following groups: students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students? What criteria do you use to identify at-risk students before they take the CAHSEE?*

All students in this small district are taught required content standards. Materials for EL, Special Education, and at-risk students are the same as regular students but taught with different instructional strategies.

4. **Student Remediation:** *To what extent are students in your district who initially do not pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE given the opportunity to be re-tested and to receive additional instruction tailored to their demonstrated needs? Does your district have procedures in place to track these students over time as they get closer to the graduation date to verify that they are participating in appropriate remedial instruction?*

Students are very carefully screened after the first census administration. Any student who does not pass is immediately informed of their next opportunity to take the exam and what remediation classes are available. Prior to the next administration students are required to take part in a two-week course to prepare them for the exam. Parents are notified and required to sign whether or not their students will participate in the extra tutoring sessions. Each time the exam is given the process for remediation gets more intense and the notifications to the parents are mailed home by certified mail. Tracking of each student and his/her success is very carefully monitored. Special education, EL. and at-risk students are given any accommodations that their individual plans specify.

CAHSEE 2005 Instruction Study
District Executive Summary #61
Spring 2005

1. **Awareness:** *How has the district informed students and parents of content expectations and the new exit exam requirement? How often and by what methods does this communication take place?*

At the freshmen orientation meeting, the counselor informs both parents and students of the requirements of the CAHSEE and that the exam tests the ELA and the Math state standards. Additionally, throughout the year, the high school English and Math teachers, who instructs 9th and 10th graders, inform their students of what standards the students are receiving instruction in and how that instruction relates to the CAHSEE. Lastly, through parent meetings the teachers also inform parents of these standards as applicable to this exam.

2. **Curriculum Validity:** *What actions has the district taken to adopt the California Content Standards expectations into the curriculum and to integrate them across all grade levels and subjects? How does the district consider required content expectations when selecting textbooks and curriculum materials?*

In 1997, the [District] Board of Trustees adopted board policy requiring teachers to integrate ELA and Math standards into their curriculum. In selecting textbooks and curriculum materials, the district requires that any selection of materials (K–12) be aligned with ELA/Math standards and content expectations. The district has a detailed process for selection and adoption of materials.

3. **Instructional Validity:** *To what extent are all students in your district being taught the required content expectations, especially for the content on the required exit exam? How does the district or school principal ensure that all students (including students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students) receive classroom instruction - that is both regular and remedial instruction – that is well aligned with state content standards? To what extent is your response the same for the following groups: students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students? What criteria do you use to identify at-risk students before they take the CAHSEE?*

Since the board's adoption of the ELA/Math standards in 1997, the administration requires that instruction adhere to these standards. Through the teacher observation and evaluation process, the administration confirms that instruction in these standards occurs for all students including special education students, English learners, and at-risk students. The administration expects teachers to make modifications (in addition to reteaching skills and reinforcing concepts) to reach these students. The criteria the high school uses to identify at-risk students is an analysis of CST scores since the 7th grade, middle school quarter grades, semester grades, and input from middle school teachers. In addition, the high school teachers continually assess the work of all students for weaknesses and provide additional instruction. Further identification of at-risk students is based on fall semester grades of the 9th grade year. In the spring of grade 9, retention meetings are held with the student, the parent, the counselor, the principal and the teachers.

4. **Student Remediation:** *To what extent are students in your district who initially do not pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE given the opportunity to be re-tested and to receive additional instruction tailored to their demonstrated needs? Does your district have*

procedures in place to track these students over time as they get closer to the graduation date to verify that they are participating in appropriate remedial instruction?

Early identification of students in need of remediation who are transitioning to the high school is reviewed during the course selection process for incoming 8th graders. 8th grade teachers recommend to the high school counselor course placements for English and Math. For students in need of remediation, the middle school teachers may recommend Applied English and Pre-Algebra in place of our regular 9th grade English and Algebra 1. After the sophomore year, the counselor identifies those students who have failed either portion or both parts of the CAHSEE. Through a certified letter and subsequent meeting, the counselor informs the student and parents of the results of the CAHSEE and describes the school's after school tutorial intervention program. The next testing opportunity is also discussed. The teachers and counselor strongly encourage students to attend the intervention program. The tutorial/intervention teachers maintain an attendance roster to help monitor participation of these students. (Note: by law attendance is not mandatory.) The counselor continues to track students (in conjunction with tracking credits towards graduation) until they have passed the entire exam.

CAHSEE 2005 Instruction Study
District Executive Summary #62
Spring 2005

1. **Awareness:** *How has the district informed students and parents of content expectations and the new exit exam requirement? How often and by what methods does this communication take place?*

The [District] is comprised primarily of highly computer literate families. All schools have electronic mailings that provide up-to-date curricular information to students and parents. Additionally, the superintendent's office electronically e-mails information and calendars to a massive address book. Students are routinely counseled concerning the importance of the CAHSEE, as well as its content. Please realize that the first-time pass rate of our students is approximately 98%. During their sophomore year, the CAHSEE is considered a major academic obstacle by less than twenty students.

2. **Curriculum Validity:** *What actions has the district taken to adopt the California Content Standards expectations into the curriculum and to integrate them across all grade levels and subjects? How does the district consider required content expectations when selecting textbooks and curriculum materials*?

The California Content Standards are imbedded in all district courses of study. In California, a district governing board must guarantee standards alignment by recommended textbooks at the time of their adoption. The [District] has a detailed process for the adoption of new textbooks, which incorporates an analysis of standards alignment of all proposed textbooks.

3. **Instructional Validity:** *To what extent are all students in your district being taught the required content expectations, especially for the content on the required exit exam? How does the district or school principal ensure that all students (including students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students) receive classroom instruction - that is both regular and remedial instruction – that is well aligned with state content standards? To what extent is your response the same for the following groups: students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students? What criteria do you use to identify at-risk students before they take the CAHSEE?*

Based on our students' performance on the CAHSEE, it is quite apparent that they are being taught the required content. For the small percentage of students not receiving special needs instruction, there are shadow support courses in English and math. Our special education students are provided with an additional course period to provide tutorial assistance. Only one of our high schools has an ELL program; these students also receive the benefit of an additional class period for tutorial assistance. The [District] is fortunate to have a highly supportive community that provides additional tutorial funding and extra periods of instruction via a parcel tax. Students are identified for intervention through an analysis of STAR results and teacher recommendations.

4. **Student Remediation:** *To what extent are students in your district who initially do not pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE given the opportunity to be re-tested and to receive additional instruction tailored to their demonstrated needs? Does your district have procedures in place to track these students over time as they get closer to the graduation date to verify that they are participating in appropriate remedial instruction?*

The small portion of our student body that does not pass during the initial examination is offered tutorial support, a structured support class, and a CAHSEE prep course in summer school. Since the number of unsuccessful test-takers is so small, the tracking of these students is quite easy.

CAHSEE 2005 Instruction Study
District Executive Summary #63
Spring 2005

1. **Awareness:** *How has the district informed students and parents of content expectations and the new exit exam requirement? How often and by what methods does this communication take place?*

Students and parents are generally aware as they enter high school that passage of the exit exam is required to receive a diploma. All of the students in [County] Office of Education programs come from districts in the county and benefit from communications they receive from their home districts, which are too numerous to list here. [County] Office of Education gave three exit exams this year, one for juniors only, one for sophomores only, and one for both. The results of these exams were reported in a parent report which was distributed to parents. In addition, study guides for mathematics and ELA were distributed twice this year to court, community, and special education programs.

2. **Curriculum Validity:** *What actions has the district taken to adopt the California Content Standards expectations into the curriculum and to integrate them across all grade levels and subjects? How does the district consider required content expectations when selecting textbooks and curriculum materials*?

The [School] Curriculum Matrix defines for the classroom teacher the California State Standards. This document is a practical reference that links instruction to the appropriate standard. It also allows for each classroom to cover all necessary curricular areas throughout the year, written as curricular objectives for each subject area defined in the 2004–2005 [County] Office of Education Curriculum Guide (updated annually). The district has adopted Standards Based, state approved (mathematics only) textbooks for its high school students. In California, secondary schools are given the option of "local adoption." and don't have to select from an approved list. Since California has a state approved Algebra I and pre-Algebra I textbooks for eighth grade, the district adopted those (Prentice Hall) for students in grades nine through twelve. A more standards aligned English Language Arts adoption is being considered for adoption for the 2005–2006 school year. The court and community schools, where a majority of are secondary students are served, has weekly "focus" group meetings where the results of standards adoption, curriculum alignment, and strategic planning are carried out.

3. **Instructional Validity:** *To what extent are all students in your district being taught the required content expectations, especially for the content on the required exit exam? How does the district or school principal ensure that all students (including students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students) receive classroom instruction - that is both regular and remedial instruction – that is well aligned with state content standards? To what extent is your response the same for the following groups: students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students? What criteria do you use to identify at-risk students before they take the CAHSEE?*

- The school day is arranged to accommodate all curricular areas. Every student participates in this overall program in either self-contained or departmentalized classrooms. Career education is a large part of the process with emphasis on setting goals, self assessment, career awareness, problem-solving decision making, communication (oral and written), peer mentoring, and career preparation.

- Upon entering institutions, the student self reports any special needs which are verified by the Resource Specialist (RS). The RS then begins planning for meeting the needs of the student including direct classroom support as well as pull out programs.

- English Language Learners are supported with the *High Point* curriculum. Teachers are trained in CLAD and SDAIE strategies for use in the classroom. Some instruction and materials are available in Spanish, the dominant first language of our EL population.

4. **Student Remediation:** *To what extent are students in your district who initially do not pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE given the opportunity to be re-tested and to receive additional instruction tailored to their demonstrated needs? Does your district have procedures in place to track these students over time as they get closer to the graduation date to verify that they are participating in appropriate remedial instruction?*

Since very few students are in our programs at school sites for longer than 90 days, tracking of exit exams results is difficult. There is no system in place to easily find whether a student has passed or not passed any portion of the exam in a prior school setting (Individual results are only reported to the home district). Therefore the district does not collect this information when a student enrolls. As a result, the [County] Office of Education administers the test to all who are supposed to be tested. If you are a sophomore, you take an exam in February and March. If you are a junior, you take a November and a March exam.

CAHSEE 2005 Instruction Study
District Executive Summary #64
Spring 2005

1. **Awareness:** *How has the district informed students and parents of content expectations and the new exit exam requirement? How often and by what methods does this communication take place?*

   - CAHSEE Parent Meetings take place annually at the high school to inform parents of the CAHSEE requirement and provide test information, including parent/ student study guides.
   - CAHSEE administration dates and other pertinent information is sent home four times per year in the school newsletter.
   - CAHSEE information is included in the Parent/Student handbook sent home at the beginning of every school year.
   - All tenth grade students receive a letter at home describing the standards-aligned curriculum and the CAHSEE requirement. Tenth graders and their parents are also informed of CAHSEE at the tenth grade counseling meeting.
   - Seniors are informed of the CAHSEE requirement during the annual senior meetings.

2. **Curriculum Validity:** *What actions has the district taken to adopt the California Content Standards expectations into the curriculum and to integrate them across all grade levels and subjects? How does the district consider required content expectations when selecting textbooks and curriculum materials*?

   - All core subject area textbooks at the middle schools are state-adopted and standards aligned. The high school textbooks are local board-adopted, with the majority being standards aligned. The high school recently switched from CPM math curriculum to McDougal Littell standards-aligned, state-adopted Concepts and Skills textbooks.
   - The district will follow the state textbook adoption cycle including the 2005 adoption and purchase of standards-aligned social studies textbooks at all grade levels for every student.
   - The high school has eliminated all non-college prep courses. All students are now enrolled in rigorous, standards-aligned, college prep courses. All core subjects have the state content standards posted and teachers are expected to post the standard that is being taught.
   - Elective courses at the high school integrate reading and writing standards into their curriculum. Training has been provided for elective teachers in reading and writing across the curriculum.
   - The district has purchased Edusoft and is providing training to allow all teachers access to state and local assessment data, including district-wide, standards-based benchmarks, which will drive instruction.

3. **Instructional Validity:** *To what extent are all students in your district being taught the required content expectations, especially for the content on the required exit exam? How does the district or school principal ensure that all students (including students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students) receive classroom instruction - that is both regular and remedial instruction – that is well aligned with state content standards? To what extent is your response the same for the following groups: students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students? What criteria do you use to identify at-risk students before they take the CAHSEE?*

- Teachers create and implement curriculum maps district wide to ensure that all teachers are covering the content standards in a timely manner.
- Teachers are observed and monitored to ensure that grade level content standards are being taught.
- District and site benchmarks are implemented on a regular basis to monitor student achievement.
- The high school is a full-inclusion school, with special education and EL students receiving additional support. Instructional assistants are available in the classroom to assist all students, including special education students. Notes for all classes are prepared and made available to special education students.
- Teachers consult with special education teachers regarding differentiated curriculum and accommodations. In addition, special education students are enrolled in an advisory period with their case managers to review academic progress towards passing the CAHSEE. Special Ed students are monitored carefully and placed in tutoring and other support programs if necessary.

4. **Student Remediation:** *To what extent are students in your district who initially do not pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE given the opportunity to be re-tested and to receive additional instruction tailored to their demonstrated needs? Does your district have procedures in place to track these students over time as they get closer to the graduation date to verify that they are participating in appropriate remedial instruction?*

- CAHSEE intervention workshops are available after school and on Saturdays. Students who have not passed the CAHSEE are required to participate in intervention workshops prior to taking the exam subsequent times.
- Summer school is mandatory for students who have not passed the CAHSEE. CAHSEE intervention courses in math and English language arts are offered during summer school.
- Any student scoring at or below the 35th percentile on the CAT6 is placed in Corrective Reading as a freshman to facilitate success on the CAHSEE.
- Math tutorials are available on Saturdays.
- The high school implements a twice-weekly tutorial during the school day for all students to ensure mastery of grade level standards.

CAHSEE 2005 Instruction Study
District Executive Summary #65
Spring 2005

1. **Awareness:** *How has the district informed students and parents of content expectations and the new exit exam requirement? How often and by what methods does this communication take place?*

   - Each year, Study Guides are sent home with students along with letters to students and parents describing the test and its contents.
   - Standards included in the exam are explicitly identified in classroom instruction.
   - An individual and personal conference was held with each junior year student who had not passed the exam in one or both parts. Parents were included in this conference. In the conference, the exam results were reviewed and students and parents were informed of the remediation opportunities that would be available.

2. **Curriculum Validity:** *What actions has the district taken to adopt the California Content Standards expectations into the curriculum and to integrate them across all grade levels and subjects? How does the district consider required content expectations when selecting textbooks and curriculum materials*?

   - Core curriculum teachers at each grade level went through a curriculum calibration exercise quarterly during the 2002–2003 school year. Teachers reviewed classroom assignments and identified whether they met California Content Standards expectations.
   - In 2003–2004, core curriculum teachers at each grade level once again reviewed the California Content Standards, and the released sample questions. Each grade level determined whether the state adopted curriculum appropriately instructed to the California Content Standards. Teachers identified alternative curriculum and resources that met the required content expectations.
   - In 2004–2005, teachers at each grade level developed curriculum maps identifying which Content Standards would be taught each quarter. Teachers developed benchmark exams that assessed these Standards quarterly. The district disaggregated the results for each teacher, identifying the students who had mastered each standard. Teachers adjusted their instruction accordingly.
   - Teachers examine all curriculum materials and measure their effectiveness by how they apply directly to the Content Standards. All Principals are required to document to the district that any purchased curriculum meets Content Standard expectations.

3. **Instructional Validity:** *To what extent are all students in your district being taught the required content expectations, especially for the content on the required exit exam? How does the district or school principal ensure that all students (including students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students) receive classroom instruction - that is both regular and remedial instruction – that is well aligned with state content standards? To what extent is your response the same for the following groups: students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students? What criteria do you use to identify at-risk students before they take the CAHSEE?*

   - Please see question 2. All core curriculum teachers must develop curriculum maps for the year. Benchmark exams are given and the data reviewed and disaggregated. Special education and EL students are identified, and instruction is adjusted.

- Students in grades 9–11 are identified as at-risk in English Language Arts if they score below basic or far below basic on the STAR exam.

4. **Student Remediation:** *To what extent are students in your district who initially do not pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE given the opportunity to be re-tested and to receive additional instruction tailored to their demonstrated needs? Does your district have procedures in place to track these students over time as they get closer to the graduation date to verify that they are participating in appropriate remedial instruction?*

   - All students who do not pass the test are immediately identified. These students are given the opportunity to attend after school remediation classes specifically focused on the CAHSEE Content Standards.
   - 10th grade at-risk students, and 11th grade students who have not passed the exam are also given an extra section of remediation in English Language Arts (Read 180).
   - Students who have not passed the exam are enrolled in summer remediation classes specifically focused on CAHSEE Content Standards.
   - All students who fail the exam are immediately identified to be re-tested.

CAHSEE 2005 Instruction Study
District Executive Summary #66
Spring 2005

1. **Awareness:** *How has the district informed students and parents of content expectations and the new exit exam requirement? How often and by what methods does this communication take place?*

In reference to the high school exit exam, district personnel have alerted students, trustees, parents, and community members regarding this new prerequisite for the past two years. All stakeholders were informed by one or more of the following methods, Board Meeting discussions, parent conferences, classroom discussions, district newsletter, school accountability report card, and exit exam results. Communications is on going especially in terms of the requirement that the 2005–06 seniors must pass the exam to receive a diploma.

2. **Curriculum Validity:** *What actions has the district taken to adopt the California Content Standards expectations into the curriculum and to integrate them across all grade levels and subjects? How does the district consider required content expectations when selecting textbooks and curriculum materials*?

The district has adopted the state standards in all core classes. Our staff integrates the standards into their daily lessons. Current textbook purchases are based on the state's textbook adoption cycle. All textbook purchases must include the state standards.

3. **Instructional Validity:** *To what extent are all students in your district being taught the required content expectations, especially for the content on the required exit exam? How does the district or school principal ensure that all students (including students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students) receive classroom instruction - that is both regular and remedial instruction – that is well aligned with state content standards? To what extent is your response the same for the following groups: students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students? What criteria do you use to identify at-risk students before they take the CAHSEE?*

In terms of ELA and Math, our small staff applies the content standards through the standards aligned textbooks; state testing and review materials as well as teacher designed lessons. The graduation requirement for English is four years; therefore, students taking the CAHSEE receive instruction. These students score well on the ELA however, math remains a dilemma. We begin with Pre-Algebra in the 8th grade followed by Algebra in grade 9. The course is now a two year program in an effort to cover the subject adequately. Instruction is also provided via a tutorial with those students having the most difficulty enrolled. Our district graduation requirements include passing Algebra and earning 30 math credits. Students with an IEP receive one-on-one assistance either in the math class or in the resource room. At risk students are enrolled in an alternative program and receive individual instruction either on Cyber High or instructional materials that cover basic content standards. We have found that many math textbooks cover too much information; students do better by breaking the standard into smaller chunks.

4. **Student Remediation:** *To what extent are students in your district who initially do not pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE given the opportunity to be re-tested and to receive additional instruction tailored to their demonstrated needs? Does your district have procedures in place to track these students over time as they get closer to the graduation date to verify that they are participating in appropriate remedial instruction?*

Our staff works with those students that do not pass the CAHSEE. Prior to the state exam requirement, we have had remedial classes for students that did not score above the 35th National Percentile. Currently, as mentioned above, our ELA requirement allows staff to remediate using small groups. This process also allows peer assistance, thus instruction and learning are enhanced for all. A math tutorial as well as after school instruction is provided for all students, not just those having difficulty. The district does not have a tracking system but does monitor student progress. It is possible for students to finish their Algebra requirement but not pass that portion of the CAHSEE. These students and his/her parents are notified that after school instruction will be offered for those needing to pass the CAHSEE.

CAHSEE 2005 Instruction Study
District Executive Summary #67
Spring 2005

1. **Awareness:** *How has the district informed students and parents of content expectations and the new exit exam requirement? How often and by what methods does this communication take place?*

Upon enrollment all new students and their parents or guardians are informed of the CAHSEE test dates and its mandates. They are asked to read and sign the "State Assessment Form" which details what the CAHSEE covers, requirements for passing the CAHSEE, graduation requirements and testing dates (see attached).Should they need further information, the CAHSEE website is posted on the "state Assessment Form". After enrollment, the students are informed by their teachers as to the next test date that they will be required to participate in the test. Notification of the CAHSEE occurs verbally several times throughout the year and specific lists are given to teachers with student names of those who need to take the test. Two weeks prior to the CAHSEE test date, our probation assistants deliver notification letters to the parents and/or guardians reminding them of the importance of the test and that their son or daughter must be present on the days of testing. Follow-up phone calls are also made by the probation assistants.

2. **Curriculum Validity:** *What actions has the district taken to adopt the California Content Standards expectations into the curriculum and to integrate them across all grade levels and subjects? How does the district consider required content expectations when selecting textbooks and curriculum materials*?

Our district is comprised of Special Education and Alternative Education. Traditionally, our students enter Alternative Education because they have been expelled from the regular school district or have not attended school and are SARB'd to us. A majority of students are more than two grade levels below their actual grade. Primarily, we offer interventions and core programs in reading and math, with other core subjects being studied through the student's contract work. For the past two years we have taken an aggressive stand to align our core subjects with our feeder districts, so that students will experience a smooth transition into and out of our program. Moreover, when purchasing textbooks and curriculum materials we strongly consider only the materials with required content expectations.

3. **Instructional Validity:** *To what extent are all students in your district being taught the required content expectations, especially for the content on the required exit exam? How does the district or school principal ensure that all students (including students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students) receive classroom instruction - that is both regular and remedial instruction – that is well aligned with state content standards? To what extent is your response the same for the following groups: students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students? What criteria do you use to identify at-risk students before they take the CAHSEE?*

We offer a variety of programs in which our students are taught the required content expectations. All students not at grade level in our Community Schools are placed in groups utilizing the REACH direct teaching curriculum for ELA and math. These students are required to participate in 3 hours of ELA and 1 hour of math daily. Grade level students are placed in state adopted core curriculum.

Special Ed students and English Learner students are offered additional tutoring with the special ed. aides and the Americorps staff.

In addition, we offer extra support through the computer program, PLATO. Our intervention programs are on the state adopted list for intervention appropriate materials/curriculum. Our core curriculum is also on the state approved adoption list for ELA and math. We also offer CAHSEE prep time to 10th and 11th grade students. The CAHSEE prep materials include the state CAHSEE prep books as well as Standards Plus curriculum.

The criteria that we use to identify at-risk students are the same for all students, whether or not they are taking the CAHSEE. The students' previous state test scores are reviewed and a local assessment is given to all Alternative Education students. The local assessment that we use is the MAP (a computer-based assessment) assessment. Students are assessed locally 3 times per year. Based on their scores, they are placed in appropriately leveled language arts groups.

4. **Student Remediation:** *To what extent are students in your district who initially do not pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE given the opportunity to be re-tested and to receive additional instruction tailored to their demonstrated needs? Does your district have procedures in place to track these students over time as they get closer to the graduation date to verify that they are participating in appropriate remedial instruction?*

Traditionally. our students are with us for an average of approximately 2 semesters. Upon enrollment, we obtain their previous test scores, if available. Student enrollment lists are updated monthly. Students who have not taken the initial CAHSEE or who have not passed are given the opportunities to take or re-take the test according to the state guidelines offered in the test calendar. Prior to each test date, our teachers offer instruction with test preparation for the CAHSEE. Those students needing to take the test are required to participate in the test prep. We make every effort possible to track the progress of our students who need to pass the CAHSEE.

CAHSEE 2005 Instruction Study
District Executive Summary #68
Spring 2005

1. **Awareness:** *How has the district informed students and parents of content expectations and the new exit exam requirement? How often and by what methods does this communication take place?*

The District has gone to extensive lengths to inform students and parents of CAHSEE content expectations through the regular use of newsletters, administrative and counselor led conferences, school board presentations, assemblies, and administrative and counselor led in class presentations. We also utilize annual back to school night and celebration of excellence night to discuss CAHSEE curricular implications.

2. **Curriculum Validity:** *What actions has the district taken to adopt the California Content Standards expectations into the curriculum and to integrate them across all grade levels and subjects? How does the district consider required content expectations when selecting textbooks and curriculum materials*?

The School board has formally adopted the use of California Content Standards in all core curricular areas. The school's strategic master plan focuses on the effective use and implementation of the standards. The District Partnership for Student Success plan details implementation strategies for all subject matter areas. All proposed textbook & supplemental support materials purchases are carefully scrutinized by departments and administration before adoption to ensure that the materials are standards based.

3. **Instructional Validity:** *To what extent are all students in your district being taught the required content expectations, especially for the content on the required exit exam? How does the district or school principal ensure that all students (including students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students) receive classroom instruction - that is both regular and remedial instruction – that is well aligned with state content standards? To what extent is your response the same for the following groups: students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students? What criteria do you use to identify at-risk students before they take the CAHSEE?*

Through a careful analysis of student data, curricular needs are developed to address the needs of all District students. Core curricular subjects focus on grade level prioritized standards. Non-core subject areas have adopted CAHSEE commitments in math and ELA. Standards-based intervention courses have been developed to meet the needs of strategic and intensive students as well as ELL & SPED students in math, ELA, and science. CAHSEE specific courses have been developed for math and ELA. Students are identified for intervention needs through the careful analysis of CST data, CAHSEE data, Common Assessment data, and teacher, student, or parent recommendations.

4. **Student Remediation:** *To what extent are students in your district who initially do not pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE given the opportunity to be re-tested and to receive additional instruction tailored to their demonstrated needs? Does your district have procedures in place to track these students over time as they get closer to the graduation date to verify that they are participating in appropriate remedial instruction?*

All students who do not pass the CAHSEE on the initial assessment are given multiple opportunities to take the test during their junior and senior years. There are procedures in place

to track these students and they are afforded the intervention opportunities detailed in the paragraph above. Parent contact is maintained throughout this process and all intervention attempts are documented.

CAHSEE 2005 Instruction Study
District Executive Summary #69
Spring 2005

1. **Awareness:** *How has the district informed students and parents of content expectations and the new exit exam requirement? How often and by what methods does this communication take place?*

The district has all information regarding exit exams for high school students and content standards listed on the district website. They have also appointed a district test coordinator who takes care disseminating information and materials related to the testing.

Teacher awareness and training sessions have been held by the district for language arts teachers and mathematics instructors. Each school sent representatives to those meetings and disseminated the information to their schools.

In addition, special education students are informed during IEP meetings and the requirements are discussed with parents. Any accommodations for special education students are entered as part of the IEP instructions and carried out/monitored by the teacher.

Students in the charter school receive content expectations, graduation requirements including exit exam requirements, at enrollment time and as part of the each course introduction. In addition, requirements are posted prominently in public areas and listed in the school handbook. Parents and students meet with their content area teachers quarterly and information is discuss regarding the CAHSEE.

2. **Curriculum Validity:** *What actions has the district taken to adopt the California Content Standards expectations into the curriculum and to integrate them across all grade levels and subjects? How does the district consider required content expectations when selecting textbooks and curriculum materials*?

Only state adopted textbooks which incorporate California Content Standards are used in all the schools except for the charter school. There the parents have some input into textbook selection and the school makes recommendations. If the desired materials do meet all the content standards, the teachers working with the parents supplement the resources to make sure that the standards are covered. Curriculum committees look and standards when they review textbooks for selection.

3. **Instructional Validity:** *To what extent are all students in your district being taught the required content expectations, especially for the content on the required exit exam? How does the district or school principal ensure that all students (including students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students) receive classroom instruction - that is both regular and remedial instruction – that is well aligned with state content standards? To what extent is your response the same for the following groups: students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students? What criteria do you use to identify at-risk students before they take the CAHSEE?*

State standards in our state are very high—almost unrealistic for students in the short term evaluation of students. For example, expecting all 8th graders to pass Algebra I is a noble goal but would take years of preparation to come close to meeting that goal. To the extent that schools can address the standards, they do. With large numbers of English learners and other students

who are considered at-risk, the lessons must be given at their instructional level. If you present materials that are much above their achievement level, only frustration occurs.

Part of the teacher evaluation process includes review of lessons that meet standards and classroom observations that monitor how instruction focuses on standards.

4. **Student Remediation:** *To what extent are students in your district who initially do not pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE given the opportunity to be re-tested and to receive additional instruction tailored to their demonstrated needs? Does your district have procedures in place to track these students over time as they get closer to the graduation date to verify that they are participating in appropriate remedial instruction?*

Students are given one chance in their sophomore year, two chances in their junior year, and two chances in their senior year to pass the CAHSEE test. When students do not pass one or both sections, they are given additional tutoring and materials to study for the test on their own. General classes spend class time reviewing for the test. The student data computer programs track their achievement as they pass parts of the test Transcripts record when they have passed the entire test.

CAHSEE 2005 Instruction Study
District Executive Summary #70
Spring 2005

1. **Awareness:** *How has the district informed students and parents of content expectations and the new exit exam requirement? How often and by what methods does this communication take place?*

The students and parents are informed of the expectation of passing the CAHSEE prior to graduation in order to earn a high school diploma. If the student does not pass the exam, a certificate of completion will be awarded. The first time this is done is during the freshman student/parent meeting with the counselor. It is also explained that the student will have five opportunities beyond the census administration to pass the exam. During the time in between the administrations, student has the opportunity to attend summer school, academic readiness classes, and/or seek tutoring. Students are given the English Language Arts and Mathematics Study Guides provided by the state department each year. The teachers explain to the students how to use the guide to help prepare them for the CAHSEE. Also, each time the students receive the test results they are given information regarding the next make-up date and extra help opportunities.

2. **Curriculum Validity:** *What actions has the district taken to adopt the California Content Standards expectations into the curriculum and to integrate them across all grade levels and subjects? How does the district consider required content expectations when selecting textbooks and curriculum materials*?

Our district has adopted all the California content standards in English Language Arts, Mathematics, Science, History, English Language Development, and Visual and Performing Arts. The teachers and departments work together on a consistent basis to plan curriculum integrating the standards in the instructional program. In California there are state adopted texts that we consider when selecting and purchasing for a particular subject area.

3. **Instructional Validity:** *To what extent are all students in your district being taught the required content expectations, especially for the content on the required exit exam? How does the district or school principal ensure that all students (including students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students) receive classroom instruction - that is both regular and remedial instruction – that is well aligned with state content standards? To what extent is your response the same for the following groups: students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students? What criteria do you use to identify at-risk students before they take the CAHSEE?*

Students and parents are provided the standards expected to be achieved by the end of the school year at our Back to School events. These are provided in lay terms for all to understand and in Spanish for our Hispanic population. The principals work with all teachers during Buy Back days before school begins and during the school year to ensure that the focus on standards in consistent in curriculum, instruction and assessment. The majority of our teachers have participated in extensive training in differentiated instruction and universal access for all students. This ensures that teachers have strategies needed to teach all students including GATE students, English learners, special education students, and at-risk students. The criteria used for identification of at-risk students prior to the CAHSEE are grades, attendance, whether they have accessed the extra support available, their last CAHSEE scores, and their scores on the California Standards Test.

4. **Student Remediation:** *To what extent are students in your district who initially do not pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE given the opportunity to be re-tested and to receive additional instruction tailored to their demonstrated needs? Does your district have procedures in place to track these students over time as they get closer to the graduation date to verify that they are participating in appropriate remedial instruction?*

All students not passing one or both parts of the CAHSEE are given the opportunity to retake the exam. They have five opportunities to participate. Students not passing the language arts part of the exam are placed in an academic readiness class to enhance their language and writing skills. Students not passing the math portion of the test are placed in an additional math lab class to work on the skills needed to pass the exam. Students are monitored each time the test is administered. If they do not pass a certain part, they are given more opportunities to receive extra academic support in that area. Students and parents are reminded at conferences that the requirement to receive a high school diploma includes passing the CAHSEE. It is also explained that if they do not pass the CAHSEE but have met the credit requirements for graduation, they will receive a Certificate of Completion.

[District] does not specifically offer remedial courses during summer school directly related to the CAHSEE. We do offer an English course during summer school for students that have failed the class during the regular school year.

CAHSEE 2005 Instruction Study
District Executive Summary #71
Spring 2005

1. **Awareness:** *How has the district informed students and parents of content expectations and the new exit exam requirement? How often and by what methods does this communication take place?*

[District] has communicated through monthly newsletters to the parents, updated website information, and site council meetings the expectations for graduates each year. Parents also read and sign course syllabi that detail each individual teachers expectations for course enrollment.

2. **Curriculum Validity:** *What actions has the district taken to adopt the California Content Standards expectations into the curriculum and to integrate them across all grade levels and subjects? How does the district consider required content expectations when selecting textbooks and curriculum materials*?

[School] has purchased textbooks that are aligned to California State Standards. English Department adopted and implemented Houghton Mifflin and High Point for remediation in the spring of 2004. The Math Department adopted Prentice Hall curriculum that will be implemented in the fall of 2005. After much consideration and deliberation, the departments felt these texts best aligned with standards based instruction on a daily basis.

Departmentally, all departments have met to develop standards based curriculum and assessments to evaluate student progress. We have articulated several times with the feeder middle school this year to strengthen communication and develop 7–12 goals.

3. **Instructional Validity:** *To what extent are all students in your district being taught the required content expectations, especially for the content on the required exit exam? How does the district or school principal ensure that all students (including students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students) receive classroom instruction - that is both regular and remedial instruction – that is well aligned with state content standards? To what extent is your response the same for the following groups: students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students? What criteria do you use to identify at-risk students before they take the CAHSEE?*

The site administration makes frequent visits to the classroom both scheduled and unannounced to insure quality standards based instruction is provided. The departmental goals are evaluated by administration to insure that instruction meets students' needs. Although our ESL population is small, we work to insure that they receive the support in High Point curriculum to bring them closer to grade level mastery. Staff development time is infrequent; average once a month for departments to meet a best.

4. **Student Remediation:** *To what extent are students in your district who initially do not pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE given the opportunity to be re-tested and to receive additional instruction tailored to their demonstrated needs? Does your district have procedures in place to track these students over time as they get closer to the graduation date to verify that they are participating in appropriate remedial instruction?*

Students who fail one or both parts of the CAHSEE will be enrolled the following year in a Math Lab or English Lab to work on the fundamentals that are missing in their development. Teachers

are apprised of who is having difficulties in each core area to work and encourage them to succeed. We currently do not have these classes or the ability to track these students over time. Finding time to meet individually with the students to review their areas of weakness remains a challenge.

CAHSEE 2005 Instruction Study
District Executive Summary #72
Spring 2005

1. **Awareness:** *How has the district informed students and parents of content expectations and the new exit exam requirement? How often and by what methods does this communication take place?*

We as a district, notify parents of the pending dates of the CAHSEE at the beginning of each school year. This notification goes to all parents, not just the parents of 10th grade students and those that need to retake the test. Students requiring retakes and 10th graders are then provided with more updated information as the test date approaches. English and math teachers are provided the sample workbooks to review in preparation for the exam.

2. **Curriculum Validity:** *What actions has the district taken to adopt the California Content Standards expectations into the curriculum and to integrate them across all grade levels and subjects? How does the district consider required content expectations when selecting textbooks and curriculum materials*?

The district has adopted curriculum standards that completely match the state standards in math and English/Language Arts. Grade level standards have been adapted to match these standards and all curriculum materials purchased and adopted by the district have been those programs that are supported by the state. The forced need to meet state standards established by the standardized testing has directed us into a mode to only use state approved curriculum resources and textbooks.

3. **Instructional Validity:** *To what extent are all students in your district being taught the required content expectations, especially for the content on the required exit exam? How does the district or school principal ensure that all students (including students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students) receive classroom instruction - that is both regular and remedial instruction – that is well aligned with state content standards? To what extent is your response the same for the following groups: students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students? What criteria do you use to identify at-risk students before they take the CAHSEE?*

Currently all instruction, including for Special Education and ELL students, is held accountable by the state testing results. This testing is much more comprehensive than the context of the CAHSEE and drives all curriculum decisions at the high school. Areas identified that students need intervention or remediation are covered and instructional materials are revised to meet student needs. These materials and instructional strategies are designed not only to insure student success toward the standards, but also ensure student success on the standardized tests.

4. **Student Remediation:** *To what extent are students in your district who initially do not pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE given the opportunity to be re-tested and to receive additional instruction tailored to their demonstrated needs? Does your district have procedures in place to track these students over time as they get closer to the graduation date to verify that they are participating in appropriate remedial instruction?*

Those students who are not successful are tracked individually. Since our 10th grade class only numbers forty students, this process is easy to implement. The math and English teachers are aware of what these students need to be successful and can modify their curriculum to meet

their needs. Other than Special Education students, we had only two regular education students who did not pass and we were able to work intensely with them to be successful in this second round of tests that were given in February 2005.

CAHSEE 2005 Instruction Study
District Executive Summary #73
Spring 2005

1. **Awareness:** *How has the district informed students and parents of content expectations and the new exit exam requirement? How often and by what methods does this communication take place?*

Students and parents are informed of content expectations and the CAHSEE requirement through the following:

- School handbook (middle and high school)
- Principal newsletter to parents (middle and high school)
- School Site Council meetings
- School site parent meetings
- Back-To-School night and Open House
- On-going school site communiqués to community
- Superintendent's message in school/community newsletter

2. **Curriculum Validity:** *What actions has the district taken to adopt the California Content Standards expectations into the curriculum and to integrate them across all grade levels and subjects? How does the district consider required content expectations when selecting textbooks and curriculum materials*?

The district has adopted all California Content Standards and they serve as the curriculum for each grade level and content area. Teachers are provided with multiple forms of grade-level content standards: e.g. posters, 8 1/2 X 11 laminated cardstock, and California Frameworks. Teachers are expected to post the appropriate standards in their classrooms and to monitor their coverage with students. Teachers also write the standard(s) in the form of daily objectives on the board to introduce lessons to students.

High school instructional materials are adopted through a process which includes thorough analysis of publisher's standards maps and textbooks. Only textbooks from the State approved lists are examined and adopted for grades K–8. All textbooks are scrutinized for alignment to California content standards.

3. **Instructional Validity:** *To what extent are all students in your district being taught the required content expectations, especially for the content on the required exit exam? How does the district or school principal ensure that all students (including students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students) receive classroom instruction - that is both regular and remedial instruction – that is well aligned with state content standards? To what extent is your response the same for the following groups: students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students? What criteria do you use to identify at-risk students before they take the CAHSEE?*

Along with the use of only standards-based instructional materials, the district has developed pacing guides, course outlines, and standards-based benchmark assessments to ensure all students have equal access to grade-level content standards. All teachers are required to utilize standards-based curriculum, textbooks, and assessments, including special education teachers and teachers of English learners. English learners are placed in classes according to their language proficiency level so they may receive Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English (SDAIE) to access grade-level core curriculum.

At-risk students are identified through the use of multiple measures, including both STAR data and district standards-based benchmark assessments.

4. **Student Remediation:** *To what extent are students in your district who initially do not pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE given the opportunity to be re-tested and to receive additional instruction tailored to their demonstrated needs? Does your district have procedures in place to track these students over time as they get closer to the graduation date to verify that they are participating in appropriate remedial instruction?*

All students who do not initially pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE are given multiple opportunities to be re-tested. Any student who does not pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE is enrolled in remedial courses (language arts and mathematics) to receive additional instruction tailored to meet their needs.

Academic counselors monitor students who have not passed parts of the CAHSEE to verify that they are participating in appropriate remedial instruction. Students are tracked via the district data base.

CAHSEE 2005 Instruction Study
District Executive Summary #74
Spring 2005

1. **Awareness:** *How has the district informed students and parents of content expectations and the new exit exam requirement? How often and by what methods does this communication take place?*

At the high school, a parent meeting is held in the fall with consultants from [County] Office of Education, Division of Parent Education. Parents are instructed in English and Spanish about exam dates and content in English and math that students are to expect on the CAHSEE. Parents are informed about what they can do to prepare students for the test on the day of the test (i.e. eating a good breakfast, getting enough sleep, and getting to school on time).

Two weeks before administration of the test, the Assistant Principal in charge of Curriculum and Instruction sends home a letter in both English and Spanish to inform all parents and students about the test. As at the parent meeting, topics covered are content to expect on the test as well as tips to test-taking success. The Assistant Principal's phone number is provided for further questions.

Two days before the first day of the test aid the night before the second day of the test, information about the test is given through the school's NTI/EdConnect phone system parents are reminded about the test.

The district continually informs parents about the CAHSEE through parent meetings including School Site Councils, English Learners Advisory Committees, District Advisory Committee, and District English Learners Advisory Committee.

2. **Curriculum Validity:** *What actions has the district taken to adopt the California Content Standards expectations into the curriculum and to integrate them across all grade levels and subjects? How does the district consider required content expectations when selecting textbooks and curriculum materials*?

The communication of the expectations has begun through the development of a standards-based report card at grade levels K–5. This report card is being piloted this year, and will be adopted for the following year. In order to create this report card, a task force of administrators and teachers met to determine the district's essential standards after studying the blueprints and the work of other districts. This effort will continue at the secondary level next year.

The content of the standards-based report card empower the teachers to focus on the standards and to assess if students have mastered the standards. In addition, this effort has helped teachers in their selection of instructional materials for adoption. The district also ensures that only state approved instructional materials are adopted.

In addition, the middle school teachers have identified where the standards are taught in their curriculum and have created a curriculum-mapping plan to facilitate the teaching of standards throughout the year. This effort will continue at the elementary level next year.

3. **Instructional Validity:** *To what extent are all students in your district being taught the required content expectations, especially for the content on the required exit exam? How does the district or school principal ensure that all students (including students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students) receive classroom*

instruction - that is both regular and remedial instruction – that is well aligned with state content standards? To what extent is your response the same for the following groups: students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students? What criteria do you use to identify at-risk students before they take the CAHSEE?

It is a district-wide expectation that all teachers will teach the standards to all students including special education, English learners, and at-risk students. Teachers' evaluation incorporates their use of a variety of instructional strategies in their approach to teaching the standards.

By ensuring that all teachers are aware of the importance of using standards in the classroom, the high school helps students understand the content of the CAHSEE. From the beginning of sixth grade, students are taught about the CAHSEE and the challenges it poses to each of them personally. Each skill tested on the CAHSEE is taught and reinforced to every 6th, 7th, and 8th grade student. When a California Standard is taught, if it is part of the CAHSEE, students are informed of that fact.

Intervention classes are provided for at-risk students. In grades 4–8, students are grouped by instructional level during language arts instruction to better meet their needs.

The California Standards Test, local assessments, and student performance are used to identify at-risk students before they take the CAHSEE.

4. **Student Remediation:** *To what extent are students in your district who initially do not pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE given the opportunity to be re-tested and to receive additional instruction tailored to their demonstrated needs? Does your district have procedures in place to track these students over time as they get closer to the graduation date to verify that they are participating in appropriate remedial instruction?*

At the high school, all students who do not pass the CAHSEE are given the chance to pass it as often as the state allows schools to give the test. At this time, there is no remediation in process other than using the study guide for lessons in English and math classes. These lessons are presented by some teachers as a warm-up activity at the beginning of class. Next year the high school will provide a year-long CAHSEE math class for any sophomore, junior, or senior who has not yet passed the math portion of the test. The high school hopes to implement CAHSEE summer classes in both math and English, with administration of the test at the end of the summer session.

At this time, there is no process in place to track these students over time as they near graduation to verify that they participate in appropriate remedial instruction.

CAHSEE 2005 Instruction Study
District Executive Summary #75
Spring 2005

1. **Awareness:** *How has the district informed students and parents of content expectations and the new exit exam requirement? How often and by what methods does this communication take place?*

The following measures are taken to ensure that parents and students are aware of the content expectations:

- The district developed brochures containing the content standards for each core subject area. Those brochures are available for parents at Open House and Back-to-School Night.
- The content standards are also posted in each classroom and many teachers write the standard for the daily instruction on the board.
- Each of the core subjects has a course outline that was developed by the department that references the standards and is used as a guide for the instruction.

The following measures are taken to ensure that parents and students are aware of the exit exam requirement:

- Students in grades 8–12 are advised by counselors on their schedules and the requirement for passing the exit exam as a requirement for graduation.
- Each year the elementary schools, the middle school and the high school provide a parent night to discuss the exit exam requirement.
- Prior to each administration of the exit exam, a letter is sent home to the parents of those students who will be taking the exam. A letter is also sent to each 10th student in their classes inviting them to take the exit exam.
- A letter is sent home to all 9–12 grade students advising parents of all testing requirements including CAHSEE.
- Information on CAHSEE is available to parents at Open House and the Back-to-school Night.

2. **Curriculum Validity:** *What actions has the district taken to adopt the California Content Standards expectations into the curriculum and to integrate them across all grade levels and subjects? How does the district consider required content expectations when selecting textbooks and curriculum materials*?

The district used the California Content Standards as the basis for the district content standards. These content standards are integrated into course descriptions in all core subjects, at all grade levels and for all populations. There are also pacing guides for each course that determine the length of time and sequence for instruction. Following the state's guidelines, textbooks are adopted per the textbook adoption schedule with titles for the elementary grades coming from the state adopted list. At the secondary schools, textbooks are evaluated by each department using a process developed by the Educational Services Department that includes completing a rubric for each textbook. Each textbook is evaluated on how well it meets the requirements for two – three standards. Each publisher must also provide a mapping of the standards to the content of the textbook. Supplementary materials are purchased using the same guidelines in a less formalized process.

3. **Instructional Validity:** *To what extent are all students in your district being taught the required content expectations, especially for the content on the required exit exam? How does the district or school principal ensure that all students (including students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students) receive classroom instruction - that is both regular and remedial instruction – that is well aligned with state content standards? To what extent is your response the same for the following groups: students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students? What criteria do you use to identify at-risk students before they take the CAHSEE?*

As mentioned above, pacing guides and adopted core materials are used to ensure that all students are being taught the required content. Departments meet annually to analyze testing data and modify curriculum when standards are not being met. There is a class size reduction program in courses where achievement gaps are high. Students receiving special education services and English learners receive instruction based on the same content standards with adjusted pacing and enhanced materials with smaller class sizes. SDAIE classes are also available for English learners in all core subject areas.

4. **Student Remediation:** *To what extent are students in your district who initially do not pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE given the opportunity to be re-tested and to receive additional instruction tailored to their demonstrated needs? Does your district have procedures in place to track these students over time as they get closer to the graduation date to verify that they are participating in appropriate remedial instruction?*

Each student who has been unsuccessful at passing the CAHSEE is sent a letter each time there is an opportunity to retake the exam. Currently, there is a math academy after school to provide intervention and in the next school year there will be an English academy as well. Any student who has earned a “D”, an “F” or has not passed the CAHSEE receives an invitation to attend the academy. This invitation also advises parents of the exit exam requirement. There is also an intervention who meets with all at-risk 10th grade students in September. In these one-on-one conferences CAHSEE is one of the topics. These counseling sessions occur before the CAHSEE is administered to students for the first time. An opportunity to attend summer school is offered to all students who have been unsuccessful in passing core classes including math and language arts. Summer school is available to all students from elementary school through high school, but at-risk students are identified at the middle school and high school and letters are sent home to parents of all at-risk students with the summer school invitation.

CAHSEE 2005 Instruction Study
District Executive Summary #76
Spring 2005

1. **Awareness:** *How has the district informed students and parents of content expectations and the new exit exam requirement? How often and by what methods does this communication take place?*

Students and parents are informed about the exit exam requirements annually through the district's fall communication and signature packet distributed to all families. Additionally, high school students are sent several (beginning of year and prior to CAHSEE testing) written communications about the testing. Lastly, each year every 10th grade family is called and invited to attend an information meeting held in English and Spanish where the CAHSEE requirements are discussed and the study guides are distributed.

2. **Curriculum Validity:** *What actions has the district taken to adopt the California Content Standards expectations into the curriculum and to integrate them across all grade levels and subjects? How does the district consider required content expectations when selecting textbooks and curriculum materials*?

All teachers are required to teach to the state curriculum standards. The board of education has adopted a vision and strategic goals that establish "standards based curriculum" as the norm. Teachers are evaluated, in part, based on their curriculum and instructional alignment with state standards. Following the state's adoption cycle, during the last five years all core content areas have adopted new standards based – aligned textbooks from the K–8 adopted lists. High schools texts, as required, have been adopted and approved by the Board of Education that are aligned to state standards.

3. **Instructional Validity:** *To what extent are all students in your district being taught the required content expectations, especially for the content on the required exit exam? How does the district or school principal ensure that all students (including students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students) receive classroom instruction - that is both regular and remedial instruction – that is well aligned with state content standards? To what extent is your response the same for the following groups: students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students? What criteria do you use to identify at-risk students before they take the CAHSEE?*

During the last four to five years, all staff development in the district has been focused on ensuring that teachers use instructional strategies to teach to the required standards. We have adopted a standards based elementary report card. We have established a district assessment system that evaluates students' performance on English Language Arts and Mathematics standards and utilizes these data to place students into appropriate programs. CELDT data and special education assessments are also utilized for the placement, assessment of student progress, and evaluation of programs. Middle and high school intervention programs (mathematics transitions, High Point, and Language!) have been established. Utilizing multiple criteria including prior year performance on California Standards Tests, as well as local district assessments and teacher assessments, students are identified for program and interventions. Ninth and tenth grade students, who have not completed Algebra I, are identified for a specialized mathematics course designed to prepare them to pass the CAHSEE.

4. **Student Remediation:** *To what extent are students in your district who initially do not pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE given the opportunity to be re-tested and to receive*

additional instruction tailored to their demonstrated needs? Does your district have procedures in place to track these students over time as they get closer to the graduation date to verify that they are participating in appropriate remedial instruction?

Students who do not pass the CAHSEE (one or both parts) are identified and tracked through our student information system (AERIES). High school counselors and administrators actively schedule these students into interventions and specialized courses (during the school year and in our summer programs) designed to remediate gaps to enable the students to achieve on the CAHSEE. Specific achievement data from the student reports are used by teachers to analyze gaps and design instruction and remediation/interventions. Data show that these systems are working as in each subsequent administration of the CAHSEE a greater percentage of students (currently 11th grade students) have passed both sections of the test. Currently, 80 percent of the class of 2006 has passed both tests. Those eleventh grade students who have not currently passed will be testing again in May 2005 and then twice in their senior year. Students not successful in May will be offered summer intervention courses based on their performance as well as specialized electives during their senior year.

CAHSEE 2005 Instruction Study
District Executive Summary #77
Spring 2005

1. **Awareness:** *How has the district informed students and parents of content expectations and the new exit exam requirement? How often and by what methods does this communication take place?*

Parents of students in [District] are informed annually of the CAHSEE requirement for graduation. This is done through letters, parent information meetings, and newsletters. Included in the communication to parents regarding the CAHSEE is information about the contents of the assessment. Often sample test items are used as examples and clarification. Beginning at the elementary level, parents are informed that the District's curriculum is based upon the California Content Standards and is provided throughout the grade levels to prepare students to successfully pass the exit exam.

2. **Curriculum Validity:** *What actions has the district taken to adopt the California Content Standards expectations into the curriculum and to integrate them across all grade levels and subjects? How does the district consider required content expectations when selecting textbooks and curriculum materials*?

[District] has adopted the California Content Standards at all grade levels in all subjects as the District curriculum. The sample contents of the exit exam are reviewed and by using the process of backward curriculum mapping, the staff at the grade levels below the tenth grade ensure that classroom instruction includes the standards that will be assessed on the exit exam. When [District] adopts textbooks and curriculum materials, the materials must align with and be based upon the content standards. Adoption teams are established and sample materials are reviewed by comparing the materials to the standards.

3. **Instructional Validity:** *To what extent are all students in your district being taught the required content expectations, especially for the content on the required exit exam? How does the district or school principal ensure that all students (including students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students) receive classroom instruction - that is both regular and remedial instruction – that is well aligned with state content standards? To what extent is your response the same for the following groups: students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students? What criteria do you use to identify at-risk students before they take the CAHSEE?*

All students receive instruction that is aligned with the California Content Standards for all subjects. English language learners, students receiving Special Education services, and students who may be at risk of failing the exit exam all receive instruction within the classroom and through supplemental services that is standards-based. Each of the site principals has been trained to identify instruction that is based on the content standards and hold their teachers accountable through observation and review of student achievement data.

4. **Student Remediation:** *To what extent are students in your district who initially do not pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE given the opportunity to be re-tested and to receive additional instruction tailored to their demonstrated needs? Does your district have procedures in place to track these students over time as they get closer to the graduation date to verify that they are participating in appropriate remedial instruction?*

For students who are unable to pass the California Exit Exam, supplemental courses are provided in both English/language arts and math. A special course is offered during the Summer School program to prepare students who have not passed previous administrations to pass the exam. Class size is kept relatively small and teachers provide individualized instruction. Each student is identified individual and monitored to ensure that all students are provided the opportunity to receive additional services and support as needed. Student achievement is monitored at the district and at the school site levels through the Student Information System.

CAHSEE 2005 Instruction Study
District Executive Summary #78
Spring 2005

1. **Awareness:** *How has the district informed students and parents of content expectations and the new exit exam requirement? How often and by what methods does this communication take place?*

The district and the school sites inform students and parents of the exit exam requirement in a number of ways. The information is provided in the district and school handbooks that are distributed at the beginning of each year and when new students enroll. A letter is sent to all students and parents prior to the 10th grade administration. All tenth grade students are provided with direct instruction about the test and strategies that will help them perform well on any test.

2. **Curriculum Validity:** *What actions has the district taken to adopt the California Content Standards expectations into the curriculum and to integrate them across all grade levels and subjects? How does the district consider required content expectations when selecting textbooks and curriculum materials?*

[District] adopted the California Content Standards for each of the core areas as the basis of the curriculum. The district has continually worked to insure all students' access to all of the standards at each grade level and to integrate then into all learning. This is an ongoing process. We believe that we have made good progress in implementing a standards-based instructional system, but realize that there is a great deal of work to be done. The content standards are the basis of our instructional materials evaluation tools and process. The district uses a collaborative process to evaluate and recommend instructional materials and it begins with establishing criteria that based upon the subject content standards and state frameworks.

3. **Instructional Validity:** *To what extent are all students in your district being taught the required content expectations, especially for the content on the required exit exam? How does the district or school principal ensure that all students (including students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students) receive classroom instruction - that is both regular and remedial instruction – that is well aligned with state content standards? To what extent is your response the same for the following groups: students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students? What criteria do you use to identify at-risk students before they take the CAHSEE?*

The development and use of pacing calendars and benchmark assessments have greatly increased access to essential content, especially on the content that is required for the exit exam, for all students. Additionally the district has implemented intervention curriculums for special education, English learners, and at-risk students during and beyond the regular school day. Each curriculum is state approved and teachers are provided with professional development and on-going support from coaches. Intervention programs are in place at all 6–8 and 9–12 school sites for each of the above mentioned groups. Identification for students in need of intervention is based upon a number of criteria; including performance on state content standard tests, student achievement, diagnostic and program placement assessments.

4. **Student Remediation:** *To what extent are students in your district who initially do not pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE given the opportunity to be re-tested and to receive additional instruction tailored to their demonstrated needs? Does your district have*

procedures in place to track these students over time as they get closer to the graduation date to verify that they are participating in appropriate remedial instruction?

If students do not pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE during the census administration in grade ten they have the opportunity to enroll in courses that target their area of need during summer school, the regular school day, or in specially designed supplemental instruction provided beyond the school day. The individual student CAHSEE reports are used to identify areas for additional instruction (i.e. the mathematics strand(s) or area of language arts). These students are monitored closely by school administrators and counselors to insure that they are receiving additional services to assist them in meeting the expectations of the exit exam and that they are present for additional administrations of the test.

CAHSEE 2005 Instruction Study
District Executive Summary #79
Spring 2005

1. **Awareness:** *How has the district informed students and parents of content expectations and the new exit exam requirement? How often and by what methods does this communication take place?*

The staff of the [District] informs students and parents of the content expectations aid the new exit exam requirements in several ways, and at a variety of points in time.

- [School] conducts parent information meetings about the content standards and the exit exam requirements at the start of each school year.
- Information is distributed to parents through the district and high school newsletters. The district newsletter is sent home quarterly and the high school newsletter is distributed every two months.
- The staff at [School] sends home informational letters to all 10th through 12th grader students who have not passed the CAHSEE.
- The staff at [School] conducts a parent orientation for students in their 8th grade year, which includes information about the content and CAHSEE standards.
- The staff at [School] and [School] conducts academic informational meeting with the students, part of which contains reminders about graduation and CAHSEE requirements.
- Tenth graders at [School] receive academic counseling that includes information about graduation and CAHSEE. Parents are invited to be involved.

2. **Curriculum Validity:** *What actions has the district taken to adopt the California Content Standards expectations into the curriculum and to integrate them across all grade levels and subjects? How does the district consider required content expectations when selecting textbooks and curriculum materials*?

The [District] has taken important steps to adopt and integrate the California Content Standards expectations in to the curriculum and across all grades and subjects.

- Since the creation of the standards, the staff in the [District] has made every effort to adopt instructional materials, including textbooks, which are aligned with the standards. With the recent adoption of language arts textbooks, including the current high school adoption, only textbooks that were aligned with the standards were considered, and then purchased.
- The district has established the Instruction and Curriculum Advisory Council (ICAC). One of its express purposes of this council is to establish and monitor curriculum alignment with the state's content standards in all academic subjects for which standards exist.
- For the past 2 years, staff development has focused on knowledge of and alignment with the Content Standards. The district's Buy Back staff development days for the 2004/2005 school year were completely focused on this topic. In 2003/2004, teachers at [School] went through training in Data Works, a program devoted to assisting teachers in aligning their instruction with the standards. This training included strategies such as the posting of the standards in each classroom, and strategics employed by teachers to make students aware of the standard (s) being taught in each lesson.

3. **Instructional Validity:** *To what extent are all students in your district being taught the required content expectations, especially for the content on the required exit exam? How does the district or school principal ensure that all students (including students receiving*

special education services, English learners, and at-risk students) receive classroom instruction - that is both regular and remedial instruction – that is well aligned with state content standards? To what extent is your response the same for the following groups: students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students? What criteria do you use to identify at-risk students before they take the CAHSEE?

The staff in the [District] is taking several steps to make sure that all students, including those in special education classes, are being taught the required content standards. In addition to the items listed in question 2 above, the staff members are taking the following, additional steps.

- At [School] each teacher in math and English/language arts is supplied with materials that specifically address the CAHSEE standards. This material is contained in the study guide entitled, Preparing for the California High School Exit Exam, produced by the California State Department of Education.
- The standards for the CAHSEE are used as the core subject matter for resource and special day classes.

4. Student Remediation: *To what extent are students in your district who initially do not pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE given the opportunity to be re-tested and to receive additional instruction tailored to their demonstrated needs? Does your district have procedures in place to track these students over time as they get closer to the graduation date to verify that they are participating in appropriate remedial instruction?*

The [District] staff provides students with many opportunities to take the CAHSEE. As designed, students first take the CAHSEE during the first half of their 10th grade school year. Those who do not pass are given a second opportunity to take the exam in the second half of 10th grade. For students who are not successful in passing the exam in 10th grade, the staff at [School] provides a CAHSEE prep class in math during summer school. Students can repeat this course during the summer if they have not passed the exam in their 11th grade year. Students receive additional instruction in the English/language arts portion of the exam within the content of their English/language arts courses in their I1th and 12th grade years.

Students who are not successful in passing the CAHSEE in 10th grade are given 2 opportunities to take and pass it again in 11th grade. Those still not successful in 11th grade are given 3 chances to do so in 12th grade, with additional opportunities being scheduled on an as needed basis, including testing provided after the end of the student's 12th grade school year.

CAHSEE 2005 Instruction Study
District Executive Summary #80
Spring 2005

1. **Awareness:** *How has the district informed students and parents of content expectations and the new exit exam requirement? How often and by what methods does this communication take place?*

Formally, parents and students made aware at beginning school year thru the registration process. Annually, the graduation requirements are sent to every parent explaining about the CAHSEE and that it is part of the requirements to receive a high school diploma.

Informally, students are made aware throughout school year in English and Math classes. The CAHSEE is mentioned in every IEP and conferences with counselors.

2. **Curriculum Validity:** *What actions has the district taken to adopt the California Content Standards expectations into the curriculum and to integrate them across all grade levels and subjects? How does the district consider required content expectations when selecting textbooks and curriculum materials?*

All classes utilize standards based instruction. The C.S.T. Blue Prints are emphasized through the curriculum. Textbooks and curriculum are all aligned to the Ca Standards.

The first class to take the CAHSEE had 90 % pass rate (on first attempt) in both math and English Language Arts.

3. **Instructional Validity:** *To what extent are all students in your district being taught the required content expectations, especially for the content on the required exit exam? How does the district or school principal ensure that all students (including students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students) receive classroom instruction - that is both regular and remedial instruction – that is well aligned with state content standards? To what extent is your response the same for the following groups: students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students? What criteria do you use to identify at-risk students before they take the CAHSEE?*

Teachers are made aware of students receiving special education or English Learner services. Those students not passing CAHSEE receive intervention in their English and/or Math classes.

The district purchased EduSoft program provides test results in detail as to students' strengths and weakness aligned to the standards. Teachers receive detail EduSoft reports on every student not passing ELA and / or math portions of the CAHSEE.

Core departments meet to discuss the strategies to assist these students.

4. **Student Remediation:** *To what extent are students in your district who initially do not pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE given the opportunity to be re-tested and to receive additional instruction tailored to their demonstrated needs? Does your district have procedures in place to track these students over time as they get closer to the graduation date to verify that they are participating in appropriate remedial instruction?*

Currently there are only a few students who have not passed one or both sections of the CAHSEE. These students have been given the CAHSEE study Guide. Their teachers will

continue to work with them and they will be re tested in May. Those who do not pass in May 2005 CAHSEE will be enrolled in a CAHSEE summer class where specific intervention strategies will be taught in English and Math. A majority of those students are special education students. Therefore, a special education teacher will be hired to teach the summer class.

Staff has created an accommodating CAHSEE test schedule for the 2005–06 school year which will allow students to take the CAHSEE up to five times. The schedule will allow 11th graders attending the summer intervention class to take the CAHSEE in September while the strategies are still fresh in their mind.

CAHSEE 2005 Instruction Study
District Executive Summary #81
Spring 2005

1. **Awareness:** *How has the district informed students and parents of content expectations and the new exit exam requirement? How often and by what methods does this communication take place?*

Students are notified at the beginning of the year at new student gatherings. Parents are notified in writing at the beginning of each year of the test, the purpose and importance of the test, the dates the test will be given, and the consequences of not passing the test. They are notified again at the time of the testing. Just prior to the testing period, the principal visits every classroom to remind students of the test and its importance. The test and its is referenced throughout the year by the staff.

2. **Curriculum Validity:** *What actions has the district taken to adopt the California Content Standards expectations into the curriculum and to integrate them across all grade levels and subjects? How does the district consider required content expectations when selecting textbooks and curriculum materials*?

Every teacher has a copy of the content standards for their particular subject area. Alternative education sites, because of a recent W ASC review, spent considerable amounts of time discussing standards for specific content areas. Because of a lack of staff development time, there are not extensive periods of time for more discussion. Current textbooks at Alternative Education sites are weakly linked to content standards. The principal and staff of those particular sites are in the process of previewing standards aligned textbooks that students will be able to access. This has been a concern for the staff for at least the past two years.

3. **Instructional Validity:** *To what extent are all students in your district being taught the required content expectations, especially for the content on the required exit exam? How does the district or school principal ensure that all students (including students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students) receive classroom instruction - that is both regular and remedial instruction – that is well aligned with state content standards? To what extent is your response the same for the following groups: students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students? What criteria do you use to identify at-risk students before they take the CAHSEE?*

Students are given every additional opportunity they are entitled to in order to allow them to pass CAHSEE. In addition, eleventh and this year, twelfth grade students, who have not passed are scheduled into one or more CAHSEE remediation classes. Students are told at the beginning of the year that these courses are designed to help them pass CAHSEE. There is a CAHSEE math class and a CAHSEE writing strategy class. Classes look at the needs of the students and use the CAHSEE blue prints in order to best meet the needs of the students. All instruction in these classes, by their very design, are aligned to content standards. All students, regardless of whether they are English learners, special education, or "at risk" are given the same opportunities to address their needs to allow them to pass CAHHEE at a subsequent offering.

Because of the very nature of alternative education, all students are identified as "at risk" from the moment they are enrolled. Students who are placed in the alternative education program have been placed because of law enforcement requirements or because they have been expelled from their district of residence.

4. **Student Remediation:** *To what extent are students in your district who initially do not pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE given the opportunity to be re-tested and to receive additional instruction tailored to their demonstrated needs? Does your district have procedures in place to track these students over time as they get closer to the graduation date to verify that they are participating in appropriate remedial instruction?*

Any student who does not pass CAHSEE has been given the maximum number of opportunities allowed to retake the test this past year. Those students who have still not passed, will be given up to three opportunities to pass the test during the 2005–06 school year. Prior to their being tested again, students who have not passed are placed in CAHSEE remediation classes for math and/or writing instruction. Those students are tracked by use of our school data base system and personally by the principals and/or counselors of the sites to ensure that they are enrolled and attending the correct classes for remedial instruction.

CAHSEE 2005 Instruction Study
District Executive Summary #82
Spring 2005

1. **Awareness:** *How has the district informed students and parents of content expectations and the new exit exam requirement? How often and by what methods does this communication take place?*

Parents and students receive information about CASHEE as part of their orientation to high school (meetings in 8th grade feeder schools, presentations at each high school). Student/Parent Handbooks include information. Prior to CASHEE administration, letters are sent to parents describing the test and providing information about where to get sample test items and practice materials. Teachers talk to students in English and Math classes about the test and incorporate practice items as appropriate. Student report cards include information about which of the high school graduation performance requirements have been met (including CASHEE).

2. **Curriculum Validity:** *What actions has the district taken to adopt the California Content Standards expectations into the curriculum and to integrate them across all grade levels and subjects? How does the district consider required content expectations when selecting textbooks and curriculum materials*?

The district has a regular cycle for revising courses of study. As they are revised, part of the process is to check against the current Content Standards for that particular course, if they exist, and/or the subject matter Framework. Explicit linkage to the Content Standards is required during this revision process. instructional materials are selected based upon the course of study to ensure content standard coverage.

3. **Instructional Validity:** *To what extent are all students in your district being taught the required content expectations, especially for the content on the required exit exam? How does the district or school principal ensure that all students (including students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students) receive classroom instruction - that is both regular and remedial instruction – that is well aligned with state content standards? To what extent is your response the same for the following groups: students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students? What criteria do you use to identify at-risk students before they take the CAHSEE?*

See #2 above. Teachers are expected to follow the adopted courses of study and use the Board-approved instructional materials. Each year, district-wide departments review the results of all assessments, including CASHEE to identify possible weaknesses in student achievement. This information is used to adjust instruction. Our district has had a very high pass rate on CASHEE at the tenth grade-first try by students. 97% passed the English/Language Arts and 95% passed the Math section. Among special education tenth graders, 75% passed English/Language Arts and 72% passed Math on their first try. Thus, the district's instructional program appears to be effective in preparing students for this assessment. English Learners tend to lag behind, but their curriculum is also aligned so by graduation most of them who have been in attendance more than one year are meeting the standard. At-risk students are instructed in the core academic heterogeneous classes, so they are not identified separately. Students at the continuation school often are the ones who have avoided taking the test. Our first priority is to get them to take the test so we can identify learning gaps.

4. **Student Remediation:** *To what extent are students in your district who initially do not pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE given the opportunity to be re-tested and to receive additional instruction tailored to their demonstrated needs? Does your district have procedures in place to track these students over time as they get closer to the graduation date to verify that they are participating in appropriate remedial instruction?*

Given the high initial pass rate, the district has been able to meet the needs of those students who have not passed one or both sections through a variety of approaches. First, their English and Math teachers are alerted to the need to work on the content being tested. Secondly, all students are invited to supplemental instruction workshops, scheduled after school, during summer school, and on teacher professional development days. These focused workshops are small group instruction with practice and feedback. They work best when strategically placed just prior to the next testing date. These students are encouraged to participate in every available testing date until *they* meet the standard. Progress is tracked via the student information system so staff can readily access lists of students, by grade level, who need additional support. Individual contacts are made and letters sent to parents informing them of the supplemental workshop opportunities.

CAHSEE 2005 Instruction Study
District Executive Summary #83
Spring 2005

1. **Awareness:** *How has the district informed students and parents of content expectations and the new exit exam requirement? How often and by what methods does this communication take place?*

Each year at the beginning of school, a letter is sent out to all students at the high school, advising parents of the requirements of CAHSEE, and how the school plans to implement the procedures for testing and preparing the students to be tested. It is sent out in both English and in Spanish.

2. **Curriculum Validity:** *What actions has the district taken to adopt the California Content Standards expectations into the curriculum and to integrate them across all grade levels and subjects? How does the district consider required content expectations when selecting textbooks and curriculum materials*?

The district has adopted California Content Standards, and has aligned their curriculum with the standards designed to make students successful. The district has integrated the subjects into all lessons according to state standards and district policy. We have aligned our tests with the standards and are testing across the curriculum accordingly.

3. **Instructional Validity:** *To what extent are all students in your district being taught the required content expectations, especially for the content on the required exit exam? How does the district or school principal ensure that all students (including students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students) receive classroom instruction - that is both regular and remedial instruction – that is well aligned with state content standards? To what extent is your response the same for the following groups: students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students? What criteria do you use to identify at-risk students before they take the CAHSEE?*

Instructional validity is measured through the testing of the material from within the structure of the state standards. We have aligned with the standards and are testing accordingly. We have several classes that are designed for the CAHSEE, with students who have not taken or have not passed enrolled in those classes. All students special education or EL or at risk receive the same instruction as regular education students. We do not differ; we align all classes including special education and EL to the state standards and test. We do not identify at risk prior to testing.

4. **Student Remediation:** *To what extent are students in your district who initially do not pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE given the opportunity to be re-tested and to receive additional instruction tailored to their demonstrated needs? Does your district have procedures in place to track these students over time as they get closer to the graduation date to verify that they are participating in appropriate remedial instruction?*

Any student, who fails the CAHSEE, will be given the chance to retake during the next offering. Students who need more help are placed into remedial classes during regular school year, and during summer school CAHSEE classes in Math and English are offered directed specifically at passing the CAHSEE. Our goal is that all of our students including special education, EL and at risk pass the CAHSEE.

CAHSEE 2005 Instruction Study
District Executive Summary #84
Spring 2005

1. **Awareness:** *How has the district informed students and parents of content expectations and the new exit exam requirement? How often and by what methods does this communication take place?*

Awareness through delivery of brochure regarding the CAHSEE requirements to all parents.

2. **Curriculum Validity:** *What actions has the district taken to adopt the California Content Standards expectations into the curriculum and to integrate them across all grade levels and subjects? How does the district consider required content expectations when selecting textbooks and curriculum materials*?

California Content Standards have been adopted. For grades K–8, we used adopted instructional materials. For high school we use materials that are aligned with standards as outlined in the standards matrixes required by CDE. We have the most difficult and challenging students in the county (Community School, Special Education, Opportunity Class), and due to this we often use materials for remediation.

3. **Instructional Validity:** *To what extent are all students in your district being taught the required content expectations, especially for the content on the required exit exam? How does the district or school principal ensure that all students (including students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students) receive classroom instruction - that is both regular and remedial instruction – that is well aligned with state content standards? To what extent is your response the same for the following groups: students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students? What criteria do you use to identify at-risk students before they take the CAHSEE?*

Small class size assures that students' individual needs are met. As stated above, we often use remedial materials to teach the basic facts. Most of our students are below grade level. We have had a number of students pass the CAHSEE, both Community School students as well as special education.

4. **Student Remediation:** *To what extent are students in your district who initially do not pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE given the opportunity to be re-tested and to receive additional instruction tailored to their demonstrated needs? Does your district have procedures in place to track these students over time as they get closer to the graduation date to verify that they are participating in appropriate remedial instruction?*

We re-test according to the state guidelines. The small classes guarantee that student needs are met on an individual basis. Those students in special education have IEPs that list goals to be attained, and these are reviewed periodically. We use the CAHSEE Study Guides to assist with remediation for those students who do not initially pass the CAHSEE.

CAHSEE 2005 Instruction Study
District Executive Summary #85
Spring 2005

1. **Awareness:** *How has the district informed students and parents of content expectations and the new exit exam requirement? How often and by what methods does this communication take place?*

The district and the school inform parents and students on an annual basis. The district sends home a letter at the beginning of each year with these requirements. The school meets with parents annually to discuss the graduation requirements. In addition, letters are sent home to 10th grade students informing them of the CAHSEE requirement. Students are reminded of their need to pass the test prior to each March testing, information is placed on a graduation requirement sheet, and informed again with the results of each test by mail.

2. **Curriculum Validity:** *What actions has the district taken to adopt the California Content Standards expectations into the curriculum and to integrate them across all grade levels and subjects? How does the district consider required content expectations when selecting textbooks and curriculum materials?*

The district has identified the key standards and they have been backward mapped to ensure teacher awareness and need to teach them for mastery at various grade levels. This has been most effective at the 6–10 grade levels. Elementary teacher awareness with the regard to algebra has been heightened.

3. **Instructional Validity:** *To what extent are all students in your district being taught the required content expectations, especially for the content on the required exit exam? How does the district or school principal ensure that all students (including students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students) receive classroom instruction - that is both regular and remedial instruction – that is well aligned with state content standards? To what extent is your response the same for the following groups: students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students? What criteria do you use to identify at-risk students before they take the CAHSEE?*

Students receive the required content throughout the secondary schools. Algebra instruction is emphasized throughout the elementary schools as per the standards to ensure student preparation. Classes are offered bilingually as appropriate at all schools. At the high school, Special Education teachers use a "push in" model and teach these skills in the math classes.

4. **Student Remediation:** *To what extent are students in your district who initially do not pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE given the opportunity to be re-tested and to receive additional instruction tailored to their demonstrated needs? Does your district have procedures in place to track these students over time as they get closer to the graduation date to verify that they are participating in appropriate remedial instruction?*

All students who do not pass the test are given an opportunity to retake the test. Classes have been added to the Master Schedule for the remediation of identified students. Staff has developed an ELA and Math curriculum to remediate and prepare students to pass the test. We have about 75% passage rate on CAHSEE for 10th grade students. Each remediation class is offered prior to each make-up test to give each student the best opportunity for passing. We also disseminate the scores to staff to identify students and determine the type of remediation as the data is disaggregated by each strand.

CAHSEE 2005 Instruction Study
District Executive Summary #86
Spring 2005

1. **Awareness:** *How has the district informed students and parents of content expectations and the new exit exam requirement? How often and by what methods does this communication take place?*

The district has informed students and parents of content expectations and the new exit exam requirements through on-going communications such as principal's newsletters which are typically sent out bi-monthly, on-going teacher conversations with their students regarding the CAHSEE requirements and how to prepare for the exam, letters sent directly to parents that inform them of the requirement to pass the CAHSEE in order to graduate from high school and the CAHSEE requirements are also discussed at the annual Parent Assessment Information Night. Students and parents are advised of graduation status during pre-registration, individually, during counselor class presentations, and through individual student conferences with counselors to conduct graduation progress checks.

Parents of students in 7th through 11th grade who are scoring Far Below Basic (FBB) and Below Basic (BB) on the California Content Standards Test for mathematics or language arts also receive a letter that informs the parent of the requirement to pass the CAHSEE and the concern that students scoring FBB or BB are not on track to pass the exam. This letter encourages parents to take advantage of the remediation classes and programs available at their school.

2. **Curriculum Validity:** *What actions has the district taken to adopt the California Content Standards expectations into the curriculum and to integrate them across all grade levels and subjects? How does the district consider required content expectations when selecting textbooks and curriculum materials*?

Our Board of Trustees has adopted the California Content Standards for language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies. We will be adopting the visual and performing arts and physical education standards by the fall of the coming year. Every language arts and math teacher in the district knows the content standards for their subject area and have a large poster on display in their classroom. As part of our informal observation process site administrators look for the posting of the standards and some teachers even label the standards that were taught when displaying student work on their bulletin boards.

We have adopted standards based instructional materials in grades K–8 for language arts, mathematics, and science. We are planning to adopt standards based materials for social studies by the spring of 2006 for implementation in the fall of 2007. All standards based K–8 materials are purchased from the state approved list of programs. Our 9–12 materials are standards aligned. Supplemental materials are used to fill in the gaps that are not well addressed in the adopted core materials.

All teachers are given a copy of the content standards that they teach and all full staff development sessions focus on standards based instruction in a specific content area.

In grades K–6 teachers teach all content standards for subject areas for their grade level. In grades 7–12 teachers teach their specific content area but also know that all teachers are responsible to help students learn how to read and write.

3. **Instructional Validity:** *To what extent are all students in your district being taught the required content expectations, especially for the content on the required exit exam? How does the district or school principal ensure that all students (including students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students) receive classroom instruction - that is both regular and remedial instruction – that is well aligned with state content standards? To what extent is your response the same for the following groups: students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students? What criteria do you use to identify at-risk students before they take the CAHSEE?*

English classes at the high schools utilize a standards-based instruction, assessment and grading system. The obstacle for high school students in trying to pass the ELA portion of the CAHSEE has been

writing skills. High school students' writing is evaluated using a rubric which aligns with grade level standards including the 10th grade which aligns with the CAHSEE. Through continuous practice and instruction, students writing skills are improving as evidenced by the CAHSEE scores. Instruction in reading, written language, and grammar are all standards-based. English language arts classes are assessed in grammar, with scores given by standard (as opposed to a single score for the whole assessment). Reading is assessed through the STAR/Accelerated Reader system which provides continuous assessment which provides the current reading grade level at any one point.

Mathematics classes are beginning to use PLATO Learning Systems with the specific purpose of preparing students for the CAHSEE. The computer-based learning program is aligned to CAHSEE standards and can be used for daily assessment. Each pre-algebra, algebra and geometry class has established standards which must be met in order to pass the course. The standards have been aligned to the CAHSEE and CST math tests by the mathematics teachers using the CDE standards blueprints. Teachers then utilize the STAR/Accelerated Math Systems to regularly and frequently assess students according to the standards and monitor progress towards mastery of the standards.

Students attending our Community Education Center (CEC) schools are administered the Test of Adult Basic Education to assess specific areas of academic need. Adult students are also assessed with the CASAS to conduct academic item analysis and benchmark gains or losses. CEC teachers analyze individual student scores and have implemented specially-designed instruction with new supplemental materials purchased to assist teachers in preparing students to fill in the achievement gaps and to ensure higher passage rates on the CAHSEE.

The schools also use the CAHSEE Preparation Guides for English language arts and mathematics for distribution to all 10th grade students each year. The guides for 2004–2005 were distributed to the students during class and teachers used them with their students as part of regular instruction.

All students, English learners, special education, and at-risk students receive instruction that is appropriate for their special needs and will help them meet the challenging content standards. Our students with special needs receive additional support and when possible an accelerated curriculum that will help them to master the standards at an appropriate rate. Students are determined to be at risk of not passing the CAHSEE if they score Far Below Basic (FBB) or Below Basic (BB) on the CST for math and/or language arts.

Our district has begun the vertical team process where teachers from our elementary, middle school, and high school meet to develop a well-aligned and articulated curriculum K–12.

4. **Student Remediation:** *To what extent are students in your district who initially do not pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE given the opportunity to be re-tested and to receive additional instruction tailored to their demonstrated needs? Does your district have procedures in place to track these students over time as they get closer to the graduation date to verify that they are participating in appropriate remedial instruction?*

All students and parents of those students in grades 7–11 scoring FBB, BB, or B on the California Content Standards Test are notified that they are at risk of not passing the CAHSEE if they do not take remediation classes or participate in remediation programs. All students and parents are notified that students must pass the CAHSEE in order to graduate. Their parents must sign the letter to show that they have been notified and aware of the consequences of not passing and then a copy is placed in their permanent record. Once a student has taken the CAHSEE and did not pass one or more sections of the exam then they are invited to participate in Intercession Remediation Classes held each winter and spring break as well as Summer School. Starting 2003 tutoring services were offered after school twice a week and a new 21st Century After School Program is also available to them. Students who have not passed both language arts and math are invited to attend an after school remediation program called Extreme Learning which is offered by an outside Supplemental Service Provider as per the Program Improvement requirements for year two participants. We carefully track students who have not passed the CAHSEE to be sure that they are aware of all services available to them and to encourage them to take advantage of these services.

CAHSEE 2005 Instruction Study
District Executive Summary #87
Spring 2005

1. **Awareness:** *How has the district informed students and parents of content expectations and the new exit exam requirement? How often and by what methods does this communication take place?*

School has sent a letter to the parent/guardian/surrogate of each student in 11th grade. Beginning the 2005–06 school year when they enter the school as high school students, a letter will be sent to the student's home. Thereafter, educational rights holders are made aware of the CAHSEE requirement at the student's IEP. Students are informed at their IEPs and in the classroom when they enter the 9th grade that the Exit Exam is a requirement to earn a high school diploma.

2. **Curriculum Validity:** *What actions has the district taken to adopt the California Content Standards expectations into the curriculum and to integrate them across all grade levels and subjects? How does the district consider required content expectations when selecting textbooks and curriculum materials?*

Some schools in the district are in the process of adopting new curriculum to better align with the state standards and the local education agency's curriculum. Schools have purchased curriculum that is in line with required courses, but at a remedial level. All students' academic IEP goals are based on the essential state standards.

Other schools in the district conform to the Standards, as well as to the goals and objectives outlined in the student's IEPs. In addition to the State Frameworks, *the Handbook of Goals & Objectives Related to Essential State of California Content Standards will,* be particularly helpful. It promises to guide not only the school's development of curriculum, but the crafting of IEP goals. (When selecting textbooks, it is helpful when the publisher guarantees compliance with Standards.)

3. **Instructional Validity:** *To what extent are all students in your district being taught the required content expectations, especially for the content on the required exit exam? How does the district or school principal ensure that all students (including students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students) receive classroom instruction - that is both regular and remedial instruction – that is well aligned with state content standards? To what extent is your response the same for the following groups: students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students? What criteria do you use to identify at-risk students before they take the CAHSEE?*

Instruction is adjusted to the appropriate educational/instructional level of each student. Each student's academic IEP goals are aligned with the state/CAHSEE standards appropriate to his instructional level. Curriculum and materials are selected with both the standards and the students' need for remediation in mind. All students have IEPs and are at-risk, but all are English "proficient." Lessons are modified to address the diverse skill levels of the student population. Individual progress is tracked, and remediation is addressed as necessary.

Teacher response: Math curriculum includes *KeyMath;* consumables published by Key Curriculum Press (Emeryville, CA); Silver, Burdett, Ginn texts; and other supplemental texts. Texts are supplemented by computer software.

Reading curriculum includes novels, plays, poetry, and essays in anthologies (Globe Featon, Prentice Hall, and McDougal Littell), *Beyond* Basics: *4 Developmental Reading Program* (Jamestown Publishers), and *Building Basic Reading Skills* (Continental Press). The hope is to purchase SRA's *Corrective Reading.*

Writing curriculum includes *Basic English Composition* (AGS). *Easy Way Spelling and vocabulary Program. Writing to Persuade* (Fearon Teacher Aids), *Elements of Writing* (Holt, Rinehart, and Winston). *The Writer's Solution* (Prentice Hall), and *English Workout* (Life Learning Books).

Finally, in anticipation of CAHSEE administration, practice sessions that address the test's content are held. Resources: State-published handbooks and on-line materials.

Educational Levels of Teachers: Emergency Credentials, Special Ed/MS Credentials
Limitations: student apathy, the seemingly insurmountable history of academic failure.

4. **Student Remediation:** *To what extent are students in your district who initially do not pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE given the opportunity to be re-tested and to receive additional instruction tailored to their demonstrated needs? Does your district have procedures in place to track these students over time as they get closer to the graduation date to verify that they are participating in appropriate remedial instruction?*

All *high* school students are afforded two to three opportunities a year to take the CAHSEE based on their grade level. If scores for a particular student are received prior to his exit from the program, his instruction is tailored to meet his needs in deficient areas based on his CAHSEE results. Often students have left the facility before scores are received and rarely do high school students come with detailed results from the Exit Exam.

One school has had two female students fail to pass (narrowly) one or both parts of the CAHSEE. Subsequent IEPs alluded to the areas in *which* weakness was evident. This did not happen by design, but by chance. In the future, perhaps something could be written into the IEP. That's assuming it would be timely to do so. Otherwise, remediation that addresses individual needs would continue to be appropriate, as would practice test sessions.

CAHSEE 2005 Instruction Study
District Executive Summary #88
Spring 2005

1. **Awareness:** *How has the district informed students and parents of content expectations and the new exit exam requirement? How often and by what methods does this communication take place?*

Beginning in fifth grade, students are made aware that successfully completing Algebra 1 by the end of 8th grade is the desirable district benchmark. Those students wishing to participate in summer school prior to entrance into 9th grade are enrolled in an English Lab and/or a Math Lab which are Exit Exam test prep courses which earns them elective class credits. All 9th grade students participate in Smaller Learning Community houses for their four core classes; tutoring in English/Language Arts and math are offered during lunch and after school for all students including English Learners and Special Education students. The same tutorial programs are offered to 10th grade students as well.

2. **Curriculum Validity:** *What actions has the district taken to adopt the California Content Standards expectations into the curriculum and to integrate them across all grade levels and subjects? How does the district consider required content expectations when selecting textbooks and curriculum materials?*

The California Content Standards have been adopted in all core classes in grades K–12 by the [District]. The State Board of Education provides an approved list of textbooks and instructional materials that have been aligned to the content standards in grades K–8. In order to participate in the Instructional Materials Funding program, districts must select their textbooks and instructional materials from this list. Currently, the state does not provide such a list of approved materials to purchase instructional materials for grades 9–12; however, our instructors examine textbooks and other instructional materials to ensure that the standards are embedded into the curriculum.

3. **Instructional Validity:** *To what extent are all students in your district being taught the required content expectations, especially for the content on the required exit exam? How does the district or school principal ensure that all students (including students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students) receive classroom instruction - that is both regular and remedial instruction – that is well aligned with state content standards? To what extent is your response the same for the following groups: students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students? What criteria do you use to identify at-risk students before they take the CAHSEE?*

Students who are not successful in English/Language Arts and math during the regular school year are invited to participate in a remedial summer school program. During the school year after school tutoring if offered to students in grades K–12. 10th grade students are issued the CAHSEE study guide by the Assistant Principal in charge of testing; tutoring classes explicitly for help in passing the exam are held prior to the March census admission. This holds true for <u>all</u> students in <u>all</u> groups. At-risk students are identified as those students who have a D of F in English/Language Arts and/or math.

4. **Student Remediation:** *To what extent are students in your district who initially do not pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE given the opportunity to be re-tested and to receive additional instruction tailored to their demonstrated needs? Does your district have*

procedures in place to track these students over time as they get closer to the graduation date to verify that they are participating in appropriate remedial instruction?

10th grade students who do not initially pass both parts of the CAHSEE are given an opportunity to take the exam again in November of the following school year. Generally results are not back in time for them to take the exam in May of their census year. If they are unsuccessful in November, they retake those parts not passed in May. This continues through the end of their senior year. Students participate in tutoring during the year to help them pass the exam. Students are tracked in our SASI XP system so we know which students need to receive the remediation services.

CAHSEE 2005 Instruction Study
District Executive Summary #89
Spring 2005

1. **Awareness:** *How has the district informed students and parents of content expectations and the new exit exam requirement? How often and by what methods does this communication take place?*

At the start of the spring semester, student transcripts are reviewed to determine which students are eligible to take the CAHSEE for the first time and which students need to retake a part(s) of the test.

The parents/guardians of all students eligible to take the CAHSEE are notified, in writing, approximately 2 weeks prior to the administration of the test. In addition, the state-mandated Annual Notification to Parents includes a section on the CAHSEE which is comprehensive in nature and informs parents of the content expectations. All teachers receive extensive training at the local as well as district levels on the content expectations of the CAHSEE. The teachers are required to include student preparation for the CAHSEE as a component of the core curriculum.

2. **Curriculum Validity:** *What actions has the district taken to adopt the California Content Standards expectations into the curriculum and to integrate them across all grade levels and subjects? How does the district consider required content expectations when selecting textbooks and curriculum materials*?

We use Board adopted, standards-aligned instructional materials across all grade levels, K–12. In addition, we provide extensive professional development throughout the year that emphasizes the program's commitment to provide student access to standards-aligned curriculum on a daily basis. The program has also adopted "Power Standards" that at the middle and high school levels emphasize those items most frequently tested on the CAHSEE as well as those skill areas that need to be addressed based on program data from standardized tests. Posters with the Power Standards are on display in each classroom and change on a quarterly basis. Students also receive notebook inserts that list the Power Standards.

Teachers are invited to serve on curriculum review committees which complete a comprehensive review of K–8 standards-aligned texts that have already been approved by the state to determine which are the best fit for our ethnically and linguistically diverse student population. Secondary teachers have a greater challenge because there is no formal process in place at the state level to have materials reviewed by practitioners/curriculum experts which would greatly streamline the lengthy local review process. In our program, we collect a wide variety of 9–12 texts from reliable vendors who are state approved at the K–8 level. A thorough review is conducted using state review guidelines. Our teachers, under the guidance of the Senior Director of Curriculum, Instruction, Assessment, and Technology, choose all texts for our at risk student population based on how closely they are aligned to the standards, as well as which materials would be most effective at maintaining high expectations without causing undue frustration for students.

3. **Instructional Validity:** *To what extent are all students in your district being taught the required content expectations, especially for the content on the required exit exam? How does the district or school principal ensure that all students (including students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students) receive classroom instruction - that is both regular and remedial instruction – that is well aligned with state*

content standards? To what extent is your response the same for the following groups: students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students? What criteria do you use to identify at-risk students before they take the CAHSEE?

See Number 1. In addition, the Teacher Evaluation process has been revised to make it more rigorous and to address each of the Standards for the Teaching Profession to determine whether the teacher is delivering standards-aligned instruction in the classroom.

See Number 2. We also adopt the state-adopted materials that specify that they are expressly for special education, English learners, and students in need of extensive skill building. The same process is used as described in number 2 to select high school materials for these special needs students.

We use the Measurements of Academic Progress local assessment approved by the state. Teachers also have state-approved CAHSEE preparation materials at their disposal that include several tests to be used for diagnosis and or pre/post assessment.

4. **Student Remediation:** *To what extent are students in your district who initially do not pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE given the opportunity to be re-tested and to receive additional instruction tailored to their demonstrated needs? Does your district have procedures in place to track these students over time as they get closer to the graduation date to verify that they are participating in appropriate remedial instruction?*

Our Assessment Coordinator works closely with teachers and students as test results become available. The specific areas to be targeted are reviewed and become part of the student's course of study. All eligible students are notified and scheduled to retake the portion(s) missed.

The Assessment Coordinator works closely with the principal, teachers, and students to ensure that students are receiving remedial instruction. Parents are also notified that the student needs to retake the test and the date(s) when the test will be administered. The CAHSEE is a high stakes test for our students. We have a structured process in place to ensure that our students do not "fall through the cracks."

CAHSEE 2005 Instruction Study
District Executive Summary #90
Spring 2005

1. **Awareness:** *How has the district informed students and parents of content expectations and the new exit exam requirement? How often and by what methods does this communication take place?*

CAHSEE is a known quantity in our community. Teachers in grade 4 begin to address curriculum that is tested and make students aware of the need to pass the CAHSEE.

Notification of parents begins in the Middle School through identification of students in need of remediation classes to prepare for the CAHSEE. The CAHSEE is discussed by the high school counseling staff in the Grade 8 pre-registration meetings for in-coming ninth graders. Students and parents at the high school level are notified prior to testing opportunities.

2. **Curriculum Validity:** *What actions has the district taken to adopt the California Content Standards expectations into the curriculum and to integrate them across all grade levels and subjects? How does the district consider required content expectations when selecting textbooks and curriculum materials*?

Our district has adopted all of the California Content Standards as the district standards. Student performance data is examined for strengths and weaknesses each year by teachers at all grade levels. Curricular plans are then revised to reflect the findings. Also, Principals review the student performance data for their students with each teacher as part of the evaluation process. Placement of students in remedial classes is based upon performance data on CSTs. The main criteria for selection of all instructional materials is the correlation to the standards.

3. **Instructional Validity:** *To what extent are all students in your district being taught the required content expectations, especially for the content on the required exit exam? How does the district or school principal ensure that all students (including students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students) receive classroom instruction - that is both regular and remedial instruction – that is well aligned with state content standards? To what extent is your response the same for the following groups: students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students? What criteria do you use to identify at-risk students before they take the CAHSEE?*

The [District] is in the midst of a process to create district guidelines for each grade level that includes the identification of Essential Standards, Curricular Maps and Pacing Guides for Grade K–8. Blueprints for the CAHSEE and released items are a key component of the process. The curriculum for special needs populations is the same. Efforts are being made develop instructional strategies to accommodate the needs of all learners. Prior to high school, at-risk students are identified by performance on the CSTs and course grades in English and Mathematics. Students are offered intervention during the school day, outside of school hours and summer school focused on development of skills in English-Language Arts and Mathematics to prepare students to pass the CAHSEE.

4. **Student Remediation:** *To what extent are students in your district who initially do not pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE given the opportunity to be re-tested and to receive additional instruction tailored to their demonstrated needs? Does your district have procedures in place to track these students over time as they get closer to the graduation date to verify that they are participating in appropriate remedial instruction?*

Students who do not pass the 10th grade testing are identified and invited for summer school. Courses are offered for students to prepare specifically for Mathematics and ELA sections of the test. Counselors meet and confer with student and inform parents of student performance on tests. Students are invited to take the exam twice during the year until they pass, consistent with direction from the state. Student performance data is reviewed by teachers of the remediation courses to identify students strengths and weaknesses and inform instruction and help address the individual needs of students. Students who have not passed the CAHSEE are identified in the student data base that is reviewed by counselors and administrators at the high school level at the end of each semester and after the testing results are returned. The four-year plan for students will reflect the interventions needed for student who have not passed the CAHSEE.

CAHSEE 2005 Instruction Study
District Executive Summary #91
Spring 2005

1. **Awareness:** *How has the district informed students and parents of content expectations and the new exit exam requirement? How often and by what methods does this communication take place?*

The district informs students and parents/guardians of the exit exam requirement individually as each student is enrolled. The students, and parent/guardians when they are available, are presented with a single page explanation of the CAHSEE, including the dates of administration, and the information on this page is explained to them. Students who are enrolling at the school in Juvenile Hall do not have parents with them. However, the relevant members of the Probation Department staff who act in *loco parentis* are regularly updated on the CAHSEE and other educational requirements by the school principal.

2. **Curriculum Validity:** *What actions has the district taken to adopt the California Content Standards expectations into the curriculum and to integrate them across all grade levels and subjects? How does the district consider required content expectations when selecting textbooks and curriculum materials*?

The Alternative Schools Department uses a board approved, standards-based course of study as a guide to instruction and textbook selection. Texts being considered for purchase are reviewed by a curriculum committee consisting of the department director, the curriculum coordinator, a member of the board of education, subject teachers and content experts from the Instructional Services Branch of the County Office of Education. As part of the review process the texts under consideration are mapped against the standards for the course. Once this is done, qualified texts are considered from the point of view of pedagogical usefulness and final selection is made.

3. **Instructional Validity:** *To what extent are all students in your district being taught the required content expectations, especially for the content on the required exit exam? How does the district or school principal ensure that all students (including students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students) receive classroom instruction - that is both regular and remedial instruction – that is well aligned with state content standards? To what extent is your response the same for the following groups: students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students? What criteria do you use to identify at-risk students before they take the CAHSEE?*

The instructional program offered by the Alternative Schools Department is driven by student need, and the students are almost universally at risk of school failure or are indeed school failures. In the areas assessed in the CAHSEE, English/Language Arts and Mathematics, the curriculum is designed around the standards which undergird the exit exam. In conjunction with the [University], we have developed a program called Character Based Literacy which is specifically designed to meet the needs of a student population marked by early and frequent truancy, social misconduct, learning disabilities, substance abuse issues, and poor or absent home support. In mathematics a similar effort, called the Numeracy Project, is close to completion and should be available at the end of this summer. At the present time all mathematics instruction is individualized. Students are assessed and then assigned work that fills in the gaps in their mathematics knowledge and/or develops their skills and knowledge from the point of present achievement.

4. **Student Remediation:** *To what extent are students in your district who initially do not pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE given the opportunity to be re-tested and to receive additional instruction tailored to their demonstrated needs? Does your district have procedures in place to track these students over time as they get closer to the graduation date to verify that they are participating in appropriate remedial instruction?*

Since students continually enroll and are released from the schools throughout the calendar year, monitoring their passage of the two parts of the CAHSEE is crucial. This is done on our departmental database. In March approximately 280 students were tested, with a 17% pass rate in English and a 14% pass rate in Mathematics. About half of these students are no longer enrolled in our programs ten weeks after testing, and only a handful will be available next November for the next administration. Thus there is no cohort to track. However, since the instructional program in English and mathematics is designed around the CAHSEE standards, all students who do not pass the tests(s) receive instruction designed to assist them in passing the CAHSEE.

CAHSEE 2005 Instruction Study
District Executive Summary #92
Spring 2005

1. **Awareness:** *How has the district informed students and parents of content expectations and the new exit exam requirement? How often and by what methods does this communication take place?*

Our students and parents are informed about the CAHSEE requirement during our initial individual intake meetings. We inform parents about the exit exam several times throughout the school year. Teachers discuss the exit exam during back to school night and in formal and informal student/parent/teacher conferences. Our district office sends mailings about the exit exam prior to each administration. All exit exam results are copied, mailed to parents and placed in the student cumulative file and student file.

2. **Curriculum Validity:** *What actions has the district taken to adopt the California Content Standards expectations into the curriculum and to integrate them across all grade levels and subjects? How does the district consider required content expectations when selecting textbooks and curriculum materials*?

We have had several in-service trainings for our teachers regarding integrating the California Content Standards into our curriculum. Teachers have spent time developing lessons related to the content standards using classroom text books. Teachers have gone through our textbooks by chapter and aligned the material in the text to the content standards. Our teachers have participated in trainings by our district curriculum specialists designed to help them teach the concepts required in the content standards and on the exit exam. When purchasing curriculum, our teachers carefully consider the needs of their students and the requirements of the content standards as well as its relevancy to passing the exit exam. Materials are often piloted before they are purchased. We are continually looking at new materials and creative ways to enhance the materials we already have to meet the needs of our students and the requirements of the content standards.

3. **Instructional Validity:** *To what extent are all students in your district being taught the required content expectations, especially for the content on the required exit exam? How does the district or school principal ensure that all students (including students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students) receive classroom instruction - that is both regular and remedial instruction – that is well aligned with state content standards? To what extent is your response the same for the following groups: students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students? What criteria do you use to identify at-risk students before they take the CAHSEE?*

All of our students are given an assessment in reading and mathematics during the first week of school. The results of this assessment are used to determine the appropriate academic placement of our students. Academic instruction is structured around the material students are required to master in the content standards. All of our tenth grade students are given copies of the CDE's CAHSEE Preparation Study Guides. Most teachers go through the books with their students and generate lessons based on the content of the study guides and the individual needs of students.

Most of our students come to us functioning well below grade level. This means that we are constantly striving to find a balance between teaching the material our students must master to pass the exit exam and teaching our students at the level in which they are currently

performing. We have special education teachers who work closely with our classroom teachers to facilitate the specific learning needs of our special education students. Special education students receive individual and small group instruction designed to help them learn the skills needed to pass the exit exam. This is an extremely difficult task because most of our special education students are also at- risk students. We use the SDAIE method of instruction for our English Learners which means that these students are being instructed at the level at which they are capable of learning, in accordance with the California ELD content standards. These students are performing far below the level required to pass the exit exam, but, they are also performing at or above the level that should be expected of them. Our teachers and our students find this extremely frustrating. Research indicates that even the most educated English Learners need at least four years to achieve English proficiency. There must be accommodations or exemptions created for these students in the requirements for the exit exam.

4. **Student Remediation:** *To what extent are students in your district who initially do not pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE given the opportunity to be re-tested and to receive additional instruction tailored to their demonstrated needs? Does your district have procedures in place to track these students over time as they get closer to the graduation date to verify that they are participating in appropriate remedial instruction?*

Because our student population is transitory—525 currently enrolled students with another 1200–1500 in and out of our programs in any academic year, tracking the exit exam results and remediation is an ongoing challenge. The testing coordinator spends hours each month tracking down reports from other school districts and informing teachers so they know what instruction individual students need. Students who do not initially pass the exit exam are given as many opportunities to pass the exam as is allowed by the CDE regulations. Student reports from previous exit exams are reviewed by the teachers so they can determine the specific needs of each individual student. Our teachers provide academic tutoring for these students both during class and after school. Students have the opportunity to participate in our after school tutorial program. We have also purchased an online CAHSEE prep program that our students can utilize in our tutorial. All of our teachers work very hard to both encourage and prepare our students to pass the exit exam.

Additional Comments

We are a court and community school program and as stated above, the majority our student population is transitory, at-risk and below grade level. The exit exam presents many difficult challenges for our students and teachers. Our most important priorities are to keep our students safe, instill a sense of accomplishment and self worth in our students and provide guidance as they become young adults, trying to find their way in society. While academic achievement is important and valuable and setting a high academic standard is part of what we strive to accomplish, it is not the most important aspect of our program. The exit exam is changing this, as we are forced to concentrate our efforts on academic achievement. Many of us (students and teachers) feel that we have had to let go of the most important priorities of our program in order to focus on the exit exam. We see the effects this has on our students every day and it is frustrating and heart-breaking—especially for our English learners and special education students. Hopefully, in the context of evaluating the effectiveness of the exit exam, some of these issues can be addressed.

CAHSEE 2005 Instruction Study
District Executive Summary #93
Spring 2005

1. **Awareness:** *How has the district informed students and parents of content expectations and the new exit exam requirement? How often and by what methods does this communication take place?*

California Content Expectations are communicated to parents and students throughout the district in grades K–12 in a variety of ways. The California Content Standards in math and language arts are published for grades kindergarten through eighth grade in a parent tri-fold that is sent home with every student. The kindergarten through sixth grades use a Standards Based Report Card backwards mapped from the California High School Exit Exam (CAHSEE) to communicate student proficiencies towards learning the standards. Teachers in grades kindergarten through twelve describe in detail the standards taught in each classroom and subject area at their Back to School Nights and parent conferences. The district has adopted four common standards, kindergarten through twelfth grade, in English Language Arts and math that are displayed in every classroom.

CAHSEE requirements are a focus for the eighth grade parent evening, the ninth grade student and parent orientation, the District English Learner Advisory Committee (DELAC), the Back to School Night classroom presentations, school newsletter, classroom newsletters, and School SITE Councils.

2. **Curriculum Validity:** *What actions has the district taken to adopt the California Content Standards expectations into the curriculum and to integrate them across all grade levels and subjects? How does the district consider required content expectations when selecting textbooks and curriculum materials*?

There has been a great deal of activity within the district to align our curriculum to the California Content Standards into the curriculum across all grades and subjects. Each instructional material adoption has involved extensive review of how well the text materials correlate to the standards. We have completed all of our adoptions for Standards based materials in math, science, social studies, language arts and interventions. The high school brings their instructional materials for Board adoption with rating sheets indicating the quality of alignment between the materials and the standards since this is not rated by the California Department of Education process.

A Secondary Standards Summer Institute was held several years ago to focus teachers and to give them practice in aligning their curriculum to standards. A shorter summer institute was held for teachers in grade Kindergarten through the sixth grade. The facilitator and follow up coach is a consultant with WestEd.

3. **Instructional Validity:** *To what extent are all students in your district being taught the required content expectations, especially for the content on the required exit exam? How does the district or school principal ensure that all students (including students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students) receive classroom instruction - that is both regular and remedial instruction – that is well aligned with state content standards? To what extent is your response the same for the following groups: students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students? What criteria do you use to identify at-risk students before they take the CAHSEE?*

The [District] provides weekly common planning times for teachers to work on improving their classroom instruction alignment to the standards. This is creating a more consistent instructional opportunity for all the students. Collaborative work was accomplished over several years to write and to implement a Standards Based Report Card for kindergarten through sixth grade. Pacing guides are being currently being developed in math and English Language Arts for grades Kindergarten through eighth grade. In ninth through twelfth grade, the English Language Arts and math departments have written common finals aligned to the standards to ensure consistent instruction and assessment for all students. Collaborative lesson planning and common units based on the standards is the practice in these grades.

Special Education students, depending upon their Individual Education Plan, are taught content standards but not necessarily at grade level. Our English Learners depending upon their California English Learner Development Test (CELDT) scores are scheduled into double periods of math and English Language Arts to preteach and front load vocabulary and academic English in grades nine through twelve. All students in grades seven through twelve have teachers who are trained in the use of Strategic Literacy Initiative (WestED) strategies. Teachers use these strategies throughout all content areas to scaffold support for core content proficiency.

Our at risk students are identified by their Test California Standards test results, grades, and Degrees of Reading Power test results. More work remains to be done to assess students who are in the basic range to strengthen their ability to pass the CAHSEE.

4. **Student Remediation:** *To what extent are students in your district who initially do not pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE given the opportunity to be re-tested and to receive additional instruction tailored to their demonstrated needs? Does your district have procedures in place to track these students over time as they get closer to the graduation date to verify that they are participating in appropriate remedial instruction?*

Students are given the opportunity to retest the CAHSEE at every state approved testing date. We need to strengthen our ability to use CAHSEE results in a systematic way to work on specific areas of concern with each student.

CAHSEE 2005 Instruction Study
District Executive Summary #94
Spring 2005
Spring 2005

1. **Awareness:** *How has the district informed students and parents of content expectations and the new exit exam requirement? How often and by what methods does this communication take place?*

[County] Office of Education's Alternative Education programs is made up of grade 7–12 students who have been expelled or are otherwise referred to the county office programs because of probation status, need for a clean & sober program, because they are pregnant or parenting teens or because their parents select home study as the instructional strategy best suited to their learning needs.

Parents are informed of content expectations and the CAHSEE requirement at required registration meetings held weekly to enroll newly referred students. A CAHSEE brochure is included in the registration packet given to each family. Parents are specifically told that one focus of the program is to make sure students obtain the skills necessary to pass the CAHSEE. Curriculum targets ELA grade 9–12 standards and mathematics standards for grades 6–7 and Algebra I (grade 8).

Letters are sent home to parents of students still needing to take and/or pass the test prior to each test administration. These letters describing the test requirement and logistics for the administration are sent in both English and Spanish.

Preparing for the CAHSEE Mathematics and English Language Arts study guides are distributed to tenth grade students each year.

2. **Curriculum Validity:** *What actions has the district taken to adopt the California Content Standards expectations into the curriculum and to integrate them across all grade levels and subjects? How does the district consider required content expectations when selecting textbooks and curriculum materials*?

For the past two school years Alternative Education has implemented the Character Based Literacy Program curriculum, which is based on the grade 9–10 ELA content standards. History Social Science is being integrated this year and science will be added in 2005–06. All lessons are tied to specific content standards, written products. Charts are used to verify that each has been addressed during the quarter and how all standards are addressed in a single school year.

Content maps were requested from publishers of all Mathematics texts . CAHSEE blueprints were reviewed by staff and teachers were provided resources for supplementing texts that do not cover all 25 Algebra I standards (more than are tested on the CAHSEE).

The curriculum committee reviews all materials considered for purchase to make sure they address the content standards.

3. **Instructional Validity:** *To what extent are all students in your district being taught the required content expectations, especially for the content on the required exit exam? How does the district or school principal ensure that all students (including students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students) receive classroom instruction - that is both regular and remedial instruction – that is well aligned with state*

content standards? To what extent is your response the same for the following groups: students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students? What criteria do you use to identify at-risk students before they take the CAHSEE?

Daily instruction includes 90 minutes of standards-aligned content using CBL lesson plans. Daily grammar exercises, vocabulary word walls, timelines, open mind portraits, graphic organizers and daily writing projects keep students engaged in the lessons as they improve reading comprehension, practice the skills necessary to pass the high school exit exam, and attain grade-level standards.

Mathematics instruction is also aimed at the content standards. Volunteer tutors also support math instruction.

RSP teachers and assistants provide supplemental instruction for students with IEPs. All teachers have their CLAD or SDAIE credentials and are trained to provide instruction for English Learners.

Staff is also supported by four hours of monthly professional development. A two-hour monthly CBL workshop is presented by CBL [instructor] from [University] and monthly two-hour Algebra instruction workshops are presented by [College] Skills Lab [Instructor].

Alternative Education students are all identified as at-risk. The focus of the entire program is to meet them where they are academically and to help them overcome the barriers to success.

4. **Student Remediation:** *To what extent are students in your district who initially do not pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE given the opportunity to be re-tested and to receive additional instruction tailored to their demonstrated needs? Does your district have procedures in place to track these students over time as they get closer to the graduation date to verify that they are participating in appropriate remedial instruction?*

CAHSEE results are distributed to classroom and RSP teachers who work with students individually to identify an individualized learning plan to remediate the areas of academic weakness. Supplemental instruction is provided to each student before the next test administration.

Parents and students are informed of the next test administration. Students who do not pass at the end of the school year are encouraged to attend the five-week extended year program focusing on CAHSEE skills. Parents are again notified in writing of this opportunity.

Because all students are referred to our program, CAHSEE passage is one of the requirements noted on incoming students' transcripts. Teachers and Guidance Technician track them over time they are enrolled in Alternative Education

CAHSEE 2005 Instruction Study
District Executive Summary #95
Spring 2005

1. **Awareness:** *How has the district informed students and parents of content expectations and the new exit exam requirement? How often and by what methods does this communication take place?*

   - Letter sent to parents regarding the requirements of the exit exam.
   - Included in the letter is the CAHSEE website for information and specifics on changes to the exam

2. **Curriculum Validity:** *What actions has the district taken to adopt the California Content Standards expectations into the curriculum and to integrate them across all grade levels and subjects? How does the district consider required content expectations when selecting textbooks and curriculum materials?*

   - All new textbooks for all core classes include California Content Standards
   - Review by all core departments on content standards via WASC-FOL Review (currently in process)

3. **Instructional Validity:** *To what extent are all students in your district being taught the required content expectations, especially for the content on the required exit exam? How does the district or school principal ensure that all students (including students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students) receive classroom instruction - that is both regular and remedial instruction – that is well aligned with state content standards? To what extent is your response the same for the following groups: students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students? What criteria do you use to identify at-risk students before they take the CAHSEE?*

   - District compreshensive schools had a very high pass rate for 2005 CAHSEE, At one school 99% of Hispanic students who took the test passed.
   - RSP teachers continue to review CAHSEE results and develop remediation plans for students based on CAHSEE content areas.
   - Schools use Tutorial Centers or one-on-one coaching and summer school classes.

4. **Student Remediation:** *To what extent are students in your district who initially do not pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE given the opportunity to be re-tested and to receive additional instruction tailored to their demonstrated needs? Does your district have procedures in place to track these students over time as they get closer to the graduation date to verify that they are participating in appropriate remedial instruction?*

   - All students who have not passed one or more parts of the test are given every mandated opportunity to pass this test.
   - Results of tests given to students' math and English teachers and Tutorial Center for remediation.
   - Students are tracked as they near graduation.

CAHSEE 2005 Instruction Study
District Executive Summary #96
Spring 2005

1. **Awareness:** *How has the district informed students and parents of content expectations and the new exit exam requirement? How often and by what methods does this communication take place?*

Annually for Fall 2003 and Fall 2004 a first class letter has been mailed home to each student about the CAHSEE requirement for graduation. The district annually sends home to all students the publication "Your Rights and Responsibilities As a Parent or Guardian" published by the [County] Office of Education which includes a statement on the CAHSEE graduation requirement. The announcement of the CAHSEE as a graduation requirement is included in the high school course sign up handbook provided to each student in the Spring of each year. In Fall 2005 the CAHSEE requirement for graduation will be placed in the student handbook provided to each student at the beginning of the year.

2. **Curriculum Validity:** *What actions has the district taken to adopt the California Content Standards expectations into the curriculum and to integrate them across all grade levels and subjects? How does the district consider required content expectations when selecting textbooks and curriculum materials*?

The district has adopted the California Content Standards and focus on their achievement through its district Strategic Plan where all student subgroups are reviewed based upon their achievement of Proficient standards on the state CST tests. In school site visitations district staff use a rubric to assist site staff in their focus on the CST implementation in their daily instruction. All K–8 text adoptions are based on CST appropriate based alignment. New adoptions at the 9–12 level are reviewed on their alignment to the CST content specifications for the grade levels. District staff are working with the secondary schools to refine the alignment of Algebra instruction at the Junior High and High school to include a pacing calendar for end of the quarter and semester common examinations.

3. **Instructional Validity:** *To what extent are all students in your district being taught the required content expectations, especially for the content on the required exit exam? How does the district or school principal ensure that all students (including students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students) receive classroom instruction - that is both regular and remedial instruction – that is well aligned with state content standards? To what extent is your response the same for the following groups: students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students? What criteria do you use to identify at-risk students before they take the CAHSEE?*

The district has adopted and implemented Standards based ELA instructional materials for grades K–8. The district will purchase and implement anew standards based ELA program (April 7, 2005) at the High school in the Fall of 2005.

Teachers have been provided training through the California state sanctioned AB466 standards trainings. An audit of the implementation of the ELA standards instruction at one junior high school conducted by Dataworks, this year (Winter 2005) indicated that there was a 90% alignment of instruction to the grade level standards in ELA.

The district is working in the area of mathematics, specifically Algebra, to make it the course offering at Eighth Grade. Staff is working to offer a consistent Algebra course, no matter what grade level the student takes it.

4. **Student Remediation:** *To what extent are students in your district who initially do not pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE given the opportunity to be re-tested and to receive additional instruction tailored to their demonstrated needs? Does your district have procedures in place to track these students over time as they get closer to the graduation date to verify that they are participating in appropriate remedial instruction?*

The High school offers a series of after school programs for students who have been identified as not passing one or more parts of the CAHSEE. This is coordinated through the district Educational Options Office. The district uses SASI as its student information system which includes a Proficiency Module. Using the test history component a student can be identified by which component of the CAHSEE they have not passed as well as progress towards meeting the minimum cut point required for passage.

The schedule has been established so Eleventh graders can take a remediation course in the Fall of each year and then test in February. Based on the February results the student can be programmed for remediation during Summer school and then be retested in September

CAHSEE 2005 Instruction Study
District Executive Summary #97
Spring 2005
Spring 2005

1. **Awareness:** *How has the district informed students and parents of content expectations and the new exit exam requirement? How often and by what methods does this communication take place?*

The District Director of Testing provides all information to students and parents regarding content expectations and the new exit exam requirements. Twice per year the Director mails the information to parents, prepares the information for teachers to provide it to their students and puts information on the website. Counselors meet with students twice per year to go over the information regarding each individual students testing status and offers the content information to the student.

2. **Curriculum Validity:** *What actions has the district taken to adopt the California Content Standards expectations into the curriculum and to integrate them across all grade levels and subjects? How does the district consider required content expectations when selecting textbooks and curriculum materials*?

All instructors have been working for the past seven years to infuse all standards into their respective curricular areas. We have been successful in doing this in all content areas. Our R.O.P. classes have infused a minimum of 15 state standards from ELA and math into the curriculum. All instructors are aware of the ELA and mathematics standards and reinforce those throughout the day. (P.E., Home Economics, Business, woodshop etc.) All textbooks selected are inspected and reviewed by the instructors in the field and are then approved by the Board of Trustees for the district. All instructional material is reviewed by departments and approved by the Board of Trustees.

3. **Instructional Validity:** *To what extent are all students in your district being taught the required content expectations, especially for the content on the required exit exam? How does the district or school principal ensure that all students (including students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students) receive classroom instruction - that is both regular and remedial instruction – that is well aligned with state content standards? To what extent is your response the same for the following groups: students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students? What criteria do you use to identify at-risk students before they take the CAHSEE?*

The site Principals monitors and supervises each instructor using a set of written expectations by the department and by the individual instructor. These expectations follow the California State Standards for Teachers as well as the State Content Standards. Through the monitoring process each Principal is in the classrooms often to observe and document the use of a particular set of instructional strategies as they apply to individual students (special education, English Learners and at-risk students). The classroom teacher, the counselor, and the principal depending on the situation recommend remediation. There is a before school lab, and an after school lab as well as an evening lab for students to remediate well aligned to CAHSEE content and state content standards. Identification of at-risk students is done using previous test results, grades, counselor interviews, attendance clerk alerts, parent conferences, Vice-Principal referrals, MFT concerns and individual teacher recommendations.

4. **Student Remediation:** *To what extent are students in your district who initially do not pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE given the opportunity to be re-tested and to receive additional instruction tailored to their demonstrated needs? Does your district have procedures in place to track these students over time as they get closer to the graduation date to verify that they are participating in appropriate remedial instruction?*

The first opportunity is to attend summer school, which provides specific classes for CAHSEE remediation in ELA and math. Each instructor is aware of the specific needs that every student needs to work on. They are then provided with a morning lab or an afternoon-evening lab prior to the next testing date. They are provided with these labs throughout their attempts at passing the CAHSEE. The Director of Testing, their classroom teacher in ELA and math, their counselor and the principal, tracks them.

CAHSEE 2005 Instruction Study
District Executive Summary #98
Spring 2005

1. **Awareness:** *How has the district informed students and parents of content expectations and the new exit exam requirement? How often and by what methods does this communication take place?*

Students and parents receive initial notification in the information packet sent home at the start of each school year. Identical information is provided to all incoming high school age students as they register throughout the school year. In addition, reminders are sent home at strategic times throughout the year as the test dates approach. These reminders are sent to both tenth grade students regarding their first attempt in the spring, as well as to eleventh grade students as prescribed by their previous test results. Parents and eligible students are notified that they are allowed to take the state examination with approved accommodations and modifications in accordance with law. Information about the CAHSEE is available to Spanish speaking parents in their native language.

2. **Curriculum Validity:** *What actions has the district taken to adopt the California Content Standards expectations into the curriculum and to integrate them across all grade levels and subjects? How does the district consider required content expectations when selecting textbooks and curriculum materials*?

The [County] Board of Education has policy stating that State Board of Education adopted/approved textbooks are to be used for instruction in all core academic subjects, at all grade levels, taught in the schools operated by the [County] Superintendent of Schools Office (CSSO). Only state approved textbooks, aligned to California content standards, are adopted by CSSO. Textbooks used in high school classes are standards-based. Curriculum mapping takes place throughout the year by staff to align instruction to the standards. Particular attention is paid to the alignment of lessons, textbooks and standards which are addressed on the California High School Exit Exam. Department meetings and subject matter teams meet to focus lessons and assessments that measure progress toward mastery of these standards.

3. **Instructional Validity:** *To what extent are all students in your district being taught the required content expectations, especially for the content on the required exit exam? How does the district or school principal ensure that all students (including students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students) receive classroom instruction - that is both regular and remedial instruction – that is well aligned with state content standards? To what extent is your response the same for the following groups: students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students? What criteria do you use to identify at-risk students before they take the CAHSEE?*

The California content standards found on the CAHSEE are the focus of instruction at all schools operated by CSSO with grades seven through twelve. All schools operated by CSSO house students who are at-risk either by virtue of their handicapping condition, because they are incarcerated or attending the County Community School. The principals at the various school sites ensure that the curriculum is aligned to the California Content Standards. Only students who are receiving special education services or are at-risk attend CSSO operated schools.

4. **Student Remediation:** *To what extent are students in your district who initially do not pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE given the opportunity to be re-tested and to receive additional instruction tailored to their demonstrated needs? Does your district have*

procedures in place to track these students over time as they get closer to the graduation date to verify that they are participating in appropriate remedial instruction?

Any student who has not passed the high school exit exam are tracked, remediated and given the opportunity to retest. Students are remediated using resources regularly available. Students who do not demonstrate sufficient progress toward passing the exit exam are provided supplemental instruction necessary to assist students to succeed on the exam. CSSO uses EduSoft to track and monitor student successes on the CAHSEE. Every effort is made to verify if newly enrolled, or incarcerated youth, have taken and/or passed both sections of the exit exam. Remedial, supplemental instruction is provided so that each student has been the opportunity to learn

CAHSEE 2005 Instruction Study
District Executive Summary #99
Spring 2005

1. **Awareness:** *How has the district informed students and parents of content expectations and the new exit exam requirement? How often and by what methods does this communication take place?*

In order to increase student and parent awareness of the expectations and accountability measures of both the content standards and the High School exit exam, or district has taken the following measures:

- Parent Conferences
- Back to School Night
- School Site Council/English Learner Advisory Committees
- District Advisory Committees
- Parent Information Letters-Site and District Level
- Student advisement meetings with school counselors
- Requirements written into school student handbooks

2. **Curriculum Validity:** *What actions has the district taken to adopt the California Content Standards expectations into the curriculum and to integrate them across all grade levels and subjects? How does the district consider required content expectations when selecting textbooks and curriculum materials*?

All textbooks that are selected are on the state adoption list and are standards aligned. The district has an evaluation process in place in which all textbooks that are being proposed for district adoption are evaluated by the content area department head, district curriculum committee, Assistant Superintendent of curriculum and approved by the school board. The district has also devoted staff development days for teachers to align benchmark assessments to state standards, calendar pacing of standards to be taught throughout the school year, and provide staff development towards standards based teaching strategies. Using the Focus on learning curriculum, standards-based mini lessons are implemented throughout all subject areas in grades K–12.

3. **Instructional Validity:** *To what extent are all students in your district being taught the required content expectations, especially for the content on the required exit exam? How does the district or school principal ensure that all students (including students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students) receive classroom instruction - that is both regular and remedial instruction – that is well aligned with state content standards? To what extent is your response the same for the following groups: students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students? What criteria do you use to identify at-risk students before they take the CAHSEE?*

Standards-aligned benchmark assessments have been developed in all core subject areas to assess whether or not students are mastering California state content standards. Students who do not score proficient on these assessments are classified as at-risk and interventions are implemented as necessary for students who are not meeting state and district expectations. High School Exit Exam preparation courses are also available at both the middle and high school level during summer and the regular school year. State–adopted English language Development curriculum has also been put into place at the elementary, middle and high schools. Reading intervention classes are also offered K–12 to students who are reading

significantly behind grade level, these intervention classes serve all subgroups of student in the district including, but not limited to English learners, migrant, and special education students.

4. **Student Remediation:** *To what extent are students in your district who initially do not pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE given the opportunity to be re-tested and to receive additional instruction tailored to their demonstrated needs? Does your district have procedures in place to track these students over time as they get closer to the graduation date to verify that they are participating in appropriate remedial instruction?*

The district offers re-testing for the Exit Exam in alignment with the state timelines. All high school counselors oversee student scheduling and passage of the high school exit exam. In order to offer additional assistance in passing the exit exam, English language arts and mathematics preparation classes are offered to students who have not passed the exit exam during summer and during the regular school year. The HSEE classes offered during summer are also available for middle school students. The high school counselors monitor students as they become closer to their graduation date to ensure that they are placed in the appropriate remediation classes and have the opportunity to re-take the exam.

CAHSEE 2005 Instruction Study
District Executive Summary #100
Spring 2005

1. **Awareness:** *How has the district informed students and parents of content expectations and the new exit exam requirement? How often and by what methods does this communication take place?*

All parents receive a counseling handbook each year. This handbook contains information regarding the content and necessity to pass the exit exam. All 9th grade parents participate in small group family counseling sessions in May. All 9th grade parents are again told of the exit exam. Our PTSA newsletter has a least one article each year about the CAHSEE. All parents are called with the school dialing system the week before they are tested to remind them of the test.

2. **Curriculum Validity:** *What actions has the district taken to adopt the California Content Standards expectations into the curriculum and to integrate them across all grade levels and subjects? How does the district consider required content expectations when selecting textbooks and curriculum materials?*

Numerous staff development days have been dedicated to aligning our curriculum to State standards. Subject areas have adopted common assessments to increase the standardization of instruction and alignment with standards. Many teachers have the content standards posted in their classrooms. Teachers include the content standards in their expected classroom learning results which are sent home and signed by parents.

3. **Instructional Validity:** *To what extent are all students in your district being taught the required content expectations, especially for the content on the required exit exam? How does the district or school principal ensure that all students (including students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students) receive classroom instruction - that is both regular and remedial instruction – that is well aligned with state content standards? To what extent is your response the same for the following groups: students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students? What criteria do you use to identify at-risk students before they take the CAHSEE?*

Common assessments by subject area has gone a long ways to insure all students receive standards based instruction. In addition, all administrators are in 4 classrooms per day. Administrators and counselors actively look for standards based instruction during their visits.

4. **Student Remediation:** *To what extent are students in your district who initially do not pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE given the opportunity to be re-tested and to receive additional instruction tailored to their demonstrated needs? Does your district have procedures in place to track these students over time as they get closer to the graduation date to verify that they are participating in appropriate remedial instruction?*

Students entering the high school with low test scores are automatically placed in reading development and/or math development. These are supportive courses that are in addition to their regular math or English classes. Seniors who have failed the CAHSEE as juniors are placed in High School Exit Math and/or High School Exit English. All students have access to Project Pride, which is a very popular after school tutoring program. Student records of pass and not pass are accurately kept to insure that all students are given every opportunity to re-take the test.

CAHSEE 2005 Instruction Study
District Executive Summary #101
Spring 2005

1. **Awareness:** *How has the district informed students and parents of content expectations and the new exit exam requirement? How often and by what methods does this communication take place?*

   - Students and parents informed of content expectations and exit exam requirements at beginning of year before registration through a news letter
   - All 10th and 11th graders and parents are notified of CAHSEE by newsletter one month prior to exam
   - In May, students not passing exam are notified about summer school classes
   - In class students are working on Power Standards, Release Questions and Blue Prints for the CAHSEE

2. **Curriculum Validity:** *What actions has the district taken to adopt the California Content Standards expectations into the curriculum and to integrate them across all grade levels and subjects? How does the district consider required content expectations when selecting textbooks and curriculum materials?*

   - All texts are aligned with California Standards. These materials are reviewed by the Curriculum Steering Committee and the Board of Trustees
   - Through the WASC review, Exemplars were identified for all classes and Power Standards were identified for ELA and mathematics.

3. **Instructional Validity:** *To what extent are all students in your district being taught the required content expectations, especially for the content on the required exit exam? How does the district or school principal ensure that all students (including students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students) receive classroom instruction - that is both regular and remedial instruction – that is well aligned with state content standards? To what extent is your response the same for the following groups: students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students? What criteria do you use to identify at-risk students before they take the CAHSEE?*

   - All students are taught the required content expectations. However, due to the Block schedule, some students only receive 90 minutes of instruction every other day. Therefore coverage rather than understanding is sometime the norm
   - Each day for the first 5 minutes of class all students receive instruction and practice on one of the released items in prep for the test.
   - Students are placed in intervention classes according to data from multiple assessments and teachers are monitored through monthly classroom visits.
   - Special Ed and ELL students are identified and monitored as separate groups.
   - STAR scores, District writing assessments, CELDT scores, IEPs and standard based report cards are used to identify at-risk students before they take the CAHSEE.

4. **Student Remediation:** *To what extent are students in your district who initially do not pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE given the opportunity to be re-tested and to receive additional instruction tailored to their demonstrated needs? Does your district have procedures in place to track these students over time as they get closer to the graduation date to verify that they are participating in appropriate remedial instruction?*

- All students who failed the CAHSEE are identified, their data is disaggregated and teachers given this information in order to ensure that instruction is differentiated to meet student needs. These students are given multiple opportunities to retake the CAHSEE.
- Teachers and administrators track these students to verify that they are receiving appropriate remedial instruction including the summer school program.

CAHSEE 2005 Instruction Study
District Executive Summary #102
Spring 2005

Introduction:

The [School] is designed to fulfill the educational needs of students who want a meaningful, career oriented education with and individualized approach. We work primarily with at risk students. Our school assists in accelerating learning for the student who does not have a high school diploma and teaches skills necessary for a desirable career. It offers a program that quickly builds on each student's strengths and abilities while giving them the help they need in any areas of concern.

In the academy classrooms the students focus on business and technology, transportation, or construction. As part of their curriculum, students work together to learn how to operate a small business, build a house, or repair an automobile. Students in the Business Academy take an active part in the development of the Downtown business district. The class participated in building a house last year. The Transportation Academy is focusing on repairing donated cars for low income families.

In the independent study portion of the school each student is tested in mathematics and reading when they enroll. Test scores are used as guides to give students schoolwork that enables them to learn new material at a challenging, but not overwhelming, pace. A teacher then meets with the student and the parent to establish goals for the year and plan standards based activities to reach those goals. The teacher meets with the student and parent weekly and parents, teachers, and students work as a team to provide an educational program enabling the student to make academic progress while focusing on career goals.

Independent study students are assigned at least 30 hours of work to complete per week in academic subjects. Although 20 hours of academic work per week is considered to meet the minimum attendance requirement, students are assigned more work to bring up their skills and to accelerate the learning process. In addition to this, each student is expected to complete between two and ten hours per week of community service or work experience.
(SARC-2001-02)

1. **Awareness:** *How has the district informed students and parents of content expectations and the new exit exam requirement? How often and by what methods does this communication take place?*

Students and parents participate in an orientation meeting before they are enrolled in the [School]. During this orientation meeting the California High School Exit Examination is discussed and parents and students are made aware of the standards that will be tested on the exam and that passing the test is required for graduation. Individual meetings are held with students, parents and an administrator to go over test results and to identify strengths and weaknesses. When students meet with their teachers for their course planning session, the teacher again discusses the CAHSEE with the student and talks about what will be required to pass the examination. Students are also given the California Department of Education Study Guide for English Language Arts and Math to take home for practice.

2. **Curriculum Validity:** *What actions has the district taken to adopt the California Content Standards expectations into the curriculum and to integrate them across all grade levels and*

subjects? How does the district consider required content expectations when selecting textbooks and curriculum materials?

Each textbook is aligned with the California Content Standards. However, since the [School] is a Charter School designed to serve at-risk students, many of the students enter the school 2–7 years below grade level. In these cases the students are assessed and placed in curriculum designed to meet their needs. This often means teaching review standards below their grade level as a means of intervention while introducing grade level standards. The school has a vocational focus and vocational activities identify CCS and CAHSEE standards and integrate them into vocational activities.

3. **Instructional Validity:** *To what extent are all students in your district being taught the required content expectations, especially for the content on the required exit exam? How does the district or school principal ensure that all students (including students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students) receive classroom instruction - that is both regular and remedial instruction – that is well aligned with state content standards? To what extent is your response the same for the following groups: students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students? What criteria do you use to identify at-risk students before they take the CAHSEE?*

This school targets at-risk students. Students receive one-on-one tutoring, and classes are very small ranging in size from 15–20 students. Students are assessed when they enroll and their course of study is tailored to their academic needs with an eye to providing a curriculum that improves their academic skills and completing the requirements for a high school diploma. We try to expose students to grade level expectations and curriculum, but focus on improving their reading and math skills from where they are at. We don't just teach with this test in mind. We have a broader sense of what they will need to be successful in life/or a career field and give them the skills they need to do that. The instruction goes far beyond just the test. The response is the same for all groups.

4. **Student Remediation:** *To what extent are students in your district who initially do not pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE given the opportunity to be re-tested and to receive additional instruction tailored to their demonstrated needs? Does your district have procedures in place to track these students over time as they get closer to the graduation date to verify that they are participating in appropriate remedial instruction?*

All students at [School] have the opportunity for retesting whenever CDE allows. The tests are given according to CDE timelines. When a variety of test scores reveal a student is not up to grade level in math and/or English, the student is given extra classes in these subjects until the test scores come up. A student might be assigned 2–3 classes of English a day or supportive math classes to boost foundation skills. These generally only count as elective credit. All students have access to additional instruction by way of one-on-one tutors. Curricula such as High Point and Barton Reading are offered to students in need of intervention. We have offered special classes just to cover the skills on the test, but have not had students willing to take them. Seminars are held for teachers to support their knowledge of the CAHSEE and to teach them intervention strategies. Parents are kept abreast of their student's progress during parent conferences and every tenth grade student receives a CDE CAHSEE Study Guide for English Language Arts and Mathematics to take home. The focus of the school is to provide the necessary remedial instruction by identifying where each student is at. There is no need for a tracking system. They either already have the necessary skills or we start with what they lack and move up.

CAHSEE 2005 Instruction Study
District Executive Summary #103
Spring 2005

1. **Awareness:** *How has the district informed students and parents of content expectations and the new exit exam requirement? How often and by what methods does this communication take place?*

A letter is sent to parents of all l0th grade students annually, informing them of the districts obligation to administer the exam in the spring of that school year. The content of the test is described to parents along with the requirement to pass the test in order to receive a graduation diploma. If students do not pass the test, remediation programs will be offered along with other testing opportunities to pass the exam before graduation in the senior year. We use the form letter from the State Department as a template for the letter this year.

2. **Curriculum Validity:** *What actions has the district taken to adopt the California Content Standards expectations into the curriculum and to integrate them across all grade levels and subjects? How does the district consider required content expectations when selecting textbooks and curriculum materials*?

All curriculum and instruction has been matched to the content standards adopted by the state department. Reading and writing skills are taught in English courses and supported in other curricular areas and our advisory program. All textbooks are standards approved textbooks by the state department.

3. **Instructional Validity:** *To what extent are all students in your district being taught the required content expectations, especially for the content on the required exit exam? How does the district or school principal ensure that all students (including students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students) receive classroom instruction - that is both regular and remedial instruction – that is well aligned with state content standards? To what extent is your response the same for the following groups: students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students? What criteria do you use to identify at-risk students before they take the CAHSEE?*

All course "Scope and Sequences" are matched to the state content standards and published. They are distributed to parents at back to school night each fall. Where appropriate, special education and English language learners are mainstreamed for standards based instruction opportunities. We also offer remedial programs for specific assistance in reading, special education, English language development and exit exam remediation in both English and Math for students needing additional assistance to pass the exam.

4. **Student Remediation:** *To what extent are students in your district who initially do not pass one or both parts of the CAHSEE given the opportunity to be re-tested and to receive additional instruction tailored to their demonstrated needs? Does your district have procedures in place to track these students over time as they get closer to the graduation date to verify that they are participating in appropriate remedial instruction?*

All students who do not pass the Exit Exam on the first try, are required to take an exit exam remediation class in either Math or English or both during the school year. Also, summer school is offered for remediation in math and English. We offer specific remediation programs in reading, English language development and special education. Students are monitored by the guidance department for assignment to remedial programs based on specific student

needs. Students who have not passed one or both parts of the Exit Exam are required to take the appropriate test(s) when dates for the test come up. Students and parents are notified of the test dates and preparations are made for students to have adequate opportunity to take and pass the test.

CAHSEE 2005 Instruction Study
District Executive Summary #104
Spring 2005

We are a county school, alternative education system. Our students come to use as a result of being expelled from their home school and district or by parent referral because of issues and problems that their home school have not been able to deal with and they, the students, must have district approval to attend. In a given year we will have 1,500 to 2,000 students come through our system. Few stay with us long enough to graduate.

1. **Awareness:** *How has the district informed students and parents of content expectations and the new exit exam requirement? How often and by what methods does this communication take place?*

Students are notified upon enrolling in our system. Parents attend the orientation with their sons and daughters and they too are apprised of the test at that time. The parents and students are given brochures and pamphlets that explain the content expectations and exam requirements. The orientation also covers these items.

2. **Curriculum Validity:** *What actions has the district taken to adopt the California Content Standards expectations into the curriculum and to integrate them across all grade levels and subjects? How does the district consider required content expectations when selecting textbooks and curriculum materials*?

The textbook adoption is determined by their being approved by the state for their compliance with the state standards. We are presently in the process of purchasing math and language arts books that are compliant.

3. **Instructional Validity:** *To what extent are all students in your district being taught the required content expectations, especially for the content on the required exit exam? How does the district or school principal ensure that all students (including students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students) receive classroom instruction - that is both regular and remedial instruction – that is well aligned with state content standards? To what extent is your response the same for the following groups: students receiving special education services, English learners, and at-risk students? What criteria do you use to identify at-risk students before they take the CAHSEE?*

All of our students are considered "at risk." We work to make the instruction as much like the comprehensive school as possible so students do not feel they are less than their peers in their home school. That is often difficult because in a given classroom we will have students ranging from a third grade reading level to twelfth grade. Students' attendance is also an issue. Our teachers prepare lessons, based upon state standards and present them in a variety of forms: lecture, group discussion, project based, research based, etc.

Appendix H: Students' Responses on the Student Questionnaire

Question 1

How did you prepare for this test? (Mark all that apply.)

A. A teacher or counselor told me about the purpose and importance of the test.
B. I practiced on questions similar to those on the test.
C. A teacher spent time in class helping me to get ready to take the test.
D. I did not do anything in addition to regular course work to prepare for this test.

Table H.1. Preparation for the ELA Test Reported by Students in the Classes of 2006 and 2007

	Class 2006				Class 2007			
Group	A	B	C	D	A	B	C	D
All	29.6%	31.0%	39.8%	29.5%	29.1%	31.1%	40.5%	29.6%
Passed	29.4%	32.3%	41.3%	31.9%	29.0%	32.2%	41.8%	32.2%
Didn't Pass	30.2%	26.8%	35.0%	21.7%	29.7%	27.2%	35.9%	20.3%
Gender Groups								
Female	31.1%	34.7%	42.7%	25.8%	30.4%	34.4%	43.3%	26.3%
Male	28.1%	27.3%	37.0%	33.2%	27.8%	27.2%	36.9%	33.6%
Race/Ethnicity Groups								
Asian	30.6%	31.5%	36.3%	33.2%	33.4%	34.0%	42.9%	26.8%
Black	28.8%	33.8%	41.5%	22.6%	28.7%	33.9%	42.2%	22.5%
Hispanic	30.8%	31.4%	41.6%	23.5%	30.8%	31.9%	42.4%	23.2%
White	27.7%	29.7%	38.5%	36.7%	26.8%	28.9%	37.8%	38.2%
Non-disadvantaged/Disadvantaged Groups								
Non-disadvantaged	28.3%	30.3%	39.1%	35.1%	28.3%	30.3%	39.1%	35.1%
Economically Disadvantaged	31.4%	32.3%	41.5%	23.0%	31.4%	32.3%	41.5%	23.0%
English Learners	31.4%	29.9%	39.7%	18.6%	31.4%	29.9%	39.7%	18.6%
Disabilities	29.2%	28.0%	36.7%	24.3%	29.2%	28.0%	36.7%	24.3%

Table H.2. Preparation for the ELA Test Reported by Repeat Test Takers

	Responses in 2004				Responses in 2005			
Group	A	B	C	D	A	B	C	D
All	29.9%	27.8%	38.8%	18.4%	30.5%	23.7%	25.2%	29.1%
Passed*	28.1%	29.8%	40.8%	20.0%	29.0%	24.7%	24.3%	33.1%
Didn't Pass*	31.3%	26.3%	37.2%	17.2%	31.7%	22.9%	25.9%	26.0%
Gender Groups								
Female	29.5%	28.6%	42.1%	15.6%	30.2%	24.9%	26.7%	27.4%
Male	30.2%	27.2%	36.3%	20.5%	30.8%	22.7%	24.1%	30.3%
Race/Ethnicity Groups								
Asian	29.7%	31.5%	37.5%	15.7%	32.9%	26.8%	22.5%	25.8%
Black	28.5%	29.7%	39.8%	16.7%	29.2%	25.6%	25.8%	27.3%
Hispanic	30.6%	27.0%	39.0%	17.4%	31.5%	23.1%	25.9%	27.5%
White	27.1%	29.4%	38.2%	24.5%	25.5%	24.0%	22.9%	38.0%
Non-disadvantaged/Disadvantaged Groups								
Non-disadvantaged	26.6%	29.6%	38.5%	22.8%	27.7%	22.3%	21.1%	38.1%
Economically Disadvantaged	30.6%	27.6%	39.4%	17.0%	31.5%	23.9%	26.3%	26.8%
English Learners	31.2%	27.1%	38.6%	15.6%	32.9%	23.8%	25.5%	25.2%
Disabilities	30.5%	26.3%	38.2%	19.0%	29.5%	23.6%	28.6%	26.7%

* *All repeat test takers did not pass the test in 2004. Students were labeled as "Passed" or "Didn't Pass" based on 2005 test results.*

Table H.3. Preparation for the Math Test Reported by Students in the Classes of 2006 and 2007

	Class 2006				Class 2007			
Group	A	B	C	D	A	B	C	D
All	26.6%	30.9%	26.2%	37.7%	26.7%	31.3%	26.5%	37.7%
Passed	25.8%	32.2%	26.0%	41.0%	26.1%	32.2%	25.8%	41.6%
Didn't Pass	28.5%	27.3%	26.6%	28.3%	28.5%	28.9%	28.3%	26.1%
Gender Groups								
Female	27.5%	34.8%	27.6%	34.6%	27.6%	34.8%	27.8%	35.2%
Male	25.6%	27.0%	24.8%	40.7%	25.9%	27.3%	24.7%	40.7%
Race/Ethnicity Groups								
Asian	25.5%	30.9%	19.9%	44.2%	25.1%	30.1%	19.3%	46.2%
Black	27.5%	32.7%	29.7%	29.3%	27.9%	33.9%	30.3%	29.1%
Hispanic	28.0%	32.8%	29.4%	30.1%	28.6%	33.3%	30.2%	29.7%
White	24.7%	28.0%	23.4%	46.5%	24.5%	27.7%	22.4%	47.7%
Non-disadvantaged/Disadvantaged Groups								
Non-disadvantaged	24.8%	29.2%	23.5%	45.2%	24.5%	28.6%	22.4%	46.7%
Economically Disadvantaged	28.5%	33.5%	29.5%	29.5%	29.2%	33.9%	30.1%	29.4%
English Learners	29.1%	33.1%	29.5%	23.3%	30.0%	33.2%	30.9%	22.2%
Disabilities	29.0%	27.4%	29.0%	28.6%	28.9%	29.3%	31.0%	26.2%

Table H.4. Preparation for the Math Test Reported by Repeat Test Takers

	Responses in 2004				Responses in 2005			
Group	A	B	C	D	A	B	C	D
All	28.6%	29.4%	30.4%	24.1%	29.0%	27.6%	22.9%	29.4%
Passed*	26.2%	31.4%	30.8%	27.0%	26.4%	30.5%	23.2%	31.6%
Didn't Pass*	30.3%	28.1%	30.1%	21.9%	30.8%	25.6%	22.6%	27.8%
Gender Groups								
Female	27.2%	31.7%	32.4%	23.3%	27.6%	29.7%	23.7%	29.1%
Male	30.0%	27.1%	28.3%	24.9%	30.4%	25.5%	22.0%	29.7%
Race/Ethnicity Groups								
Asian	28.9%	32.2%	30.9%	19.7%	32.6%	27.5%	22.6%	24.7%
Black	29.4%	29.0%	31.0%	22.5%	30.2%	28.0%	22.4%	27.5%
Hispanic	28.8%	29.6%	30.6%	22.7%	29.5%	27.2%	23.2%	28.3%
White	26.7%	29.0%	29.8%	30.2%	25.4%	28.7%	22.8%	35.2%
Non-disadvantaged/Disadvantaged Groups								
Non-disadvantaged	25.2%	30.5%	28.8%	29.9%	25.3%	28.8%	19.4%	36.2%
Economically Disadvantaged	29.3%	29.6%	31.1%	22.2%	30.1%	27.5%	23.5%	27.4%
English Learners	30.1%	29.7%	30.9%	19.0%	31.5%	27.4%	23.1%	24.8%
Disabilities	30.8%	27.0%	31.2%	22.7%	30.5%	25.9%	27.0%	25.6%

* *All repeat test takers did not pass the test in 2004. Students were labeled as "Passed" or "didn't Pass" based on 2005 results.*

Question 2

How important is this test to you?

A. Very important
B. Somewhat important
C. Not important

Table H.5. Importance of the ELA Test as Perceived by Students in the Classes of 2006 and 2007

	Class 2006			Class 2007		
Group	A Very Important	B Somewhat Important	C Not Important	A Very Important	B Somewhat Important	C Not Important
All	73.9%	21.2%	4.9%	75.5%	20.2%	4.4%
Passed	72.3%	22.7%	5.0%	74.2%	21.4%	4.4%
Didn't Pass	79.2%	16.4%	4.4%	80.3%	15.5%	4.2%
Gender Groups						
Female	77.4%	19.6%	3.0%	79.0%	18.4%	2.7%
Male	70.4%	22.8%	6.7%	71.9%	22.0%	6.1%
Race/Ethnicity Groups						
Asian	64.5%	28.8%	6.6%	65.6%	27.7%	6.7%
Black	82.2%	14.5%	3.3%	83.7%	13.2%	3.1%
Hispanic	83.0%	14.4%	2.6%	84.1%	13.5%	2.4%
White	64.6%	28.2%	7.3%	66.1%	27.4%	6.5%
Non-disadvantaged/Disadvantaged Groups						
Non-disadvantaged	67.3%	26.8%	6.0%	68.4%	25.8%	5.8%
Economically Disadvantaged	82.6%	14.6%	2.8%	83.5%	13.8%	2.6%
English Learners	86.0%	11.7%	2.3%	87.1%	10.7%	2.2%
Disabilities	74.3%	19.7%	6.1%	76.2%	18.2%	5.6%

Table H.6. Importance of the ELA Test as Perceived by Repeat Test Takers

	Responses in 2004			Responses in 2005		
Group	A Very Important	B Somewhat Important	C Not Important	A Very Important	B Somewhat Important	C Not Important
All	83.1%	13.7%	3.2%	87.6%	9.5%	2.9%
Passed	83.8%	13.6%	2.6%	90.0%	8.0%	1.9%
Didn't Pass	82.5%	13.8%	3.7%	85.8%	10.6%	3.6%
Gender Groups						
Female	87.5%	10.5%	1.9%	92.1%	6.6%	1.3%
Male	79.7%	16.1%	4.3%	84.2%	11.8%	4.0%
Race/Ethnicity Groups						
Asian	81.2%	16.0%	2.8%	87.9%	9.9%	2.1%
Black	82.6%	13.4%	4.0%	87.4%	9.4%	3.2%
Hispanic	85.8%	11.5%	2.7%	89.9%	7.9%	2.2%
White	72.5%	22.1%	5.4%	77.9%	16.4%	5.8%
Non-disadvantaged/Disadvantaged Groups						
Non-disadvantaged	78.0%	18.4%	3.6%	84.0%	12.5%	3.5%
Economically Disadvantaged	85.6%	11.7%	2.8%	89.5%	8.2%	2.4%
English Learners	87.6%	10.1%	2.3%	91.2%	7.0%	1.9%
Disabilities	77.7%	16.8%	5.5%	82.0%	13.0%	5.0%

Table H.7. Importance of the Math Test as Perceived by Students in the Classes of 2006 and 2007

	Class 2006			Class 2007		
Group	A Very Important	B Somewhat Important	C Not Important	A Very Important	B Somewhat Important	C Not Important
All	73.0%	21.9%	5.1%	74.8%	20.6%	4.6%
Passed	70.9%	23.6%	5.5%	72.6%	22.4%	5.0%
Didn't Pass	78.9%	17.2%	3.9%	81.4%	15.1%	3.5%
Gender Groups						
Female	76.6%	20.3%	3.1%	78.3%	18.9%	2.8%
Male	69.4%	23.5%	7.1%	71.0%	22.5%	6.5%
Race/Ethnicity Groups						
Asian	62.8%	29.4%	7.8%	63.7%	28.6%	7.8%
Black	81.7%	15.0%	3.3%	83.6%	13.6%	2.8%
Hispanic	82.3%	15.1%	2.6%	83.7%	13.9%	2.4%
White	63.1%	29.2%	7.7%	64.9%	28.0%	7.0%
Non-disadvantaged/Disadvantaged Groups						
Non-disadvantaged	65.6%	27.4%	7.0%	67.1%	26.4%	6.5%
Economically Disadvantaged	81.7%	15.5%	2.8%	83.0%	14.4%	2.6%
English Learners	85.8%	12.2%	2.1%	87.1%	10.9%	1.9%
Disabilities	74.2%	20.2%	5.6%	76.6%	18.2%	5.2%

Table H.8. Importance of the Math Test as Perceived by Repeat Test Takers

	Responses in 2004			Responses in 2005		
Group	A Very Important	B Somewhat Important	C Not Important	A Very Important	B Somewhat Important	C Not Important
All	83.2%	14.2%	2.7%	87.0%	10.3%	2.6%
Passed	84.1%	13.7%	2.2%	89.2%	9.0%	1.9%
Didn't Pass	82.5%	14.5%	3.0%	85.6%	11.3%	3.2%
Gender Groups						
Female	86.9%	11.7%	1.4%	91.0%	7.7%	1.2%
Male	79.3%	16.7%	3.9%	82.9%	13.0%	4.1%
Race/Ethnicity Groups						
Asian	82.5%	15.5%	2.0%	88.1%	9.6%	2.3%
Black	85.1%	12.3%	2.6%	88.2%	9.2%	2.6%
Hispanic	85.6%	12.3%	2.1%	89.1%	8.8%	2.0%
White	74.0%	21.5%	4.5%	78.7%	16.4%	4.9%
Non-disadvantaged/Disadvantaged Groups						
Non-disadvantaged	79.5%	17.6%	2.9%	84.9%	12.2%	2.9%
Economically Disadvantaged	85.5%	12.2%	2.3%	88.9%	9.0%	2.1%
English Learners	87.7%	10.5%	1.8%	90.7%	7.6%	1.7%
Disabilities	78.4%	17.2%	4.4%	82.2%	13.3%	4.5%

Question 3

Do you think you will graduate from high school?

A. Yes
B. No
C. Not sure

Table H.9. Expectations of High School Graduation Indicated by Students in the Classes of 2006 and 2007 After the ELA Test

	Class 2006			Class 2007		
Group	A Yes	B No	C Not sure	A Yes	B No	C Not sure
All	87.8%	1.4%	10.7%	88.7%	1.4%	9.9%
Passed	93.2%	0.7%	6.1%	93.4%	0.7%	5.9%
Didn't Pass	70.2%	3.9%	25.9%	71.3%	3.9%	24.8%
Gender Groups						
Female	89.5%	0.9%	9.5%	90.2%	0.8%	8.9%
Male	86.2%	1.9%	11.9%	86.6%	2.0%	11.3%
Race/Ethnicity Groups						
Asian	90.4%	0.9%	8.7%	91.3%	0.8%	7.8%
Black	89.1%	1.9%	9.0%	89.3%	1.8%	8.8%
Hispanic	81.9%	1.8%	16.3%	83.0%	1.8%	15.2%
White	93.4%	1.1%	5.5%	93.5%	1.1%	5.3%
Non-disadvantaged/Disadvantaged Groups						
Non-disadvantaged	94.0%	0.8%	5.1%	94.3%	0.9%	4.8%
Economically Disadvantaged	81.6%	1.9%	16.5%	82.7%	1.9%	15.4%
English Learners	75.2%	2.3%	22.5%	76.4%	2.4%	21.2%
Disabilities	73.5%	4.2%	22.2%	74.8%	4.1%	21.1%

Table H.10. Repeat Test Takers' Expectations of High School Graduation After the ELA Test

	Responses in 2004			Responses in 2005		
Group	A Yes	B No	C Not Sure	A Yes	B No	C Not Sure
All	73.4%	2.9%	23.6%	76.1%	3.1%	20.8%
Passed	80.0%	1.9%	18.1%	84.6%	1.6%	13.8%
Didn't Pass	68.4%	3.7%	27.9%	69.8%	4.2%	26.0%
Gender Groups						
Female	73.3%	2.2%	24.4%	77.5%	1.9%	20.6%
Male	73.5%	3.5%	23.0%	75.1%	4.0%	20.9%
Race/Ethnicity Groups						
Asian	68.5%	2.9%	28.6%	73.9%	2.0%	24.0%
Black	82.4%	3.7%	14.0%	82.1%	3.2%	14.6%
Hispanic	71.8%	2.7%	25.4%	74.7%	2.9%	22.4%
White	77.4%	3.7%	18.9%	79.5%	4.4%	16.1%
Non-disadvantaged/Disadvantaged Groups						
Non-disadvantaged	81.3%	2.2%	16.5%	83.5%	3.1%	13.4%
Economically Disadvantaged	71.6%	2.9%	25.5%	74.4%	3.0%	22.6%
English Learners	70.6%	2.6%	26.8%	73.7%	2.5%	23.7%
Disabilities	69.9%	4.7%	25.4%	72.2%	4.8%	22.9%

Table H.11. Expectations of High School Graduation Indicated by Students in the Classes of 2006 and 2007 After the Math Test

	Class 2006			Class 2007		
Group	A Yes	B No	C Not sure	A Yes	B No	C Not sure
All	86.9%	1.9%	11.3%	87.9%	1.8%	10.2%
Passed	92.4%	1.1%	6.5%	93.0%	1.2%	5.9%
Didn't Pass	71.2%	3.9%	24.9%	72.8%	3.8%	23.4%
Gender Groups						
Female	88.8%	1.2%	10.1%	89.8%	1.1%	9.2%
Male	85.0%	2.5%	12.5%	85.6%	2.7%	11.7%
Race/Ethnicity Groups						
Asian	89.8%	1.2%	9.0%	91.1%	1.2%	7.7%
Black	88.4%	2.2%	9.4%	88.6%	2.3%	9.0%
Hispanic	81.1%	2.1%	16.8%	82.6%	2.1%	15.4%
White	92.1%	1.7%	6.1%	92.4%	1.7%	5.9%
Non-disadvantaged/Disadvantaged Groups						
Non-disadvantaged	92.8%	1.4%	5.7%	93.3%	1.4%	5.3%
Economically Disadvantaged	81.0%	2.2%	16.8%	82.4%	2.2%	15.4%
English Learners	75.2%	2.4%	22.4%	76.6%	2.5%	20.9%
Disabilities	73.1%	4.4%	22.6%	74.7%	4.6%	20.8%

Table H.12. Repeat Test Takers' Expectations of High School Graduation After the Math Test

	Responses in 2004			Responses in 2005		
Group	A Yes	B No	C Not Sure	A Yes	B No	C Not Sure
All	74.9%	2.9%	22.2%	75.7%	3.4%	20.9%
Passed	80.9%	2.0%	17.1%	83.2%	2.1%	14.7%
Didn't Pass	70.5%	3.5%	26.0%	70.5%	4.4%	25.1%
Gender Groups						
Female	76.4%	2.1%	21.5%	78.1%	2.2%	19.7%
Male	73.3%	3.7%	23.0%	73.2%	4.7%	22.1%
Race/Ethnicity Groups						
Asian	65.6%	2.8%	31.5%	70.0%	3.2%	26.8%
Black	84.7%	2.8%	12.5%	83.3%	3.6%	13.1%
Hispanic	72.5%	2.7%	24.8%	73.8%	3.1%	23.1%
White	79.3%	3.3%	17.3%	78.9%	4.7%	16.4%
Non-disadvantaged/Disadvantaged Groups						
Non-disadvantaged	82.5%	2.5%	15.1%	83.2%	2.9%	13.9%
Economically Disadvantaged	72.4%	2.8%	24.7%	73.4%	3.4%	23.2%
English Learners	70.1%	2.7%	27.3%	70.9%	3.1%	25.9%
Disabilities	71.0%	4.2%	24.8%	71.9%	5.0%	23.1%

Question 4

Will it be harder to graduate because you have to pass a test like this?

A. Yes, a lot harder
B. Somewhat harder
C. Not much harder at all
D. I really don't know

Table H.13. Impact of the ELA Test on High School Graduation Perceived by Students in the Classes of 2006 and 2007

	Class 2006				Class 2007			
Group	A A Lot Harder	B Somewhat Harder	C - Not Much Harder	D Don't Know	A A Lot Harder	B Somewhat Harder	C - Not Much Harder	D Don't Know
All	20.8%	34.1%	34.1%	11.1%	17.3%	33.4%	37.7%	11.7%
Passed	13.6%	34.9%	41.2%	10.3%	10.9%	33.5%	44.7%	10.9%
Didn't Pass	44.4%	31.3%	10.4%	13.8%	40.5%	32.8%	12.1%	14.6%
Gender Groups								
Female	20.1%	35.1%	33.4%	11.5%	16.9%	34.4%	36.9%	11.8%
Male	21.5%	33.1%	34.7%	10.7%	17.9%	32.3%	38.1%	11.6%
Race/Ethnicity Groups								
Asian	16.0%	30.7%	42.7%	10.6%	13.0%	29.2%	46.6%	11.1%
Black	26.1%	37.7%	25.8%	10.4%	22.1%	37.3%	29.8%	10.8%
Hispanic	29.8%	38.9%	20.1%	11.2%	25.3%	39.2%	23.6%	11.9%
White	11.3%	28.4%	49.1%	11.2%	8.8%	26.5%	53.0%	11.7%
Non-disadvantaged/Disadvantaged Groups								
Non-disadvantaged	11.2%	31.0%	47.4%	10.4%	8.5%	28.9%	51.6%	10.9%
Economically Disadvantaged	30.2%	38.0%	20.2%	11.6%	25.7%	38.2%	23.9%	12.3%
English Learners	39.9%	34.3%	13.2%	12.6%	36.0%	35.7%	15.0%	13.3%
Disabilities	42.6%	30.2%	12.6%	14.6%	37.3%	32.4%	14.7%	15.6%

Table H.14. Impact of the ELA Test on High School Graduation Perceived by Repeat Test Takers

	Responses in 2004				Responses in 2005			
Group	A A Lot Harder	B Somewhat Harder	C - Not Much Harder	D Don't Know	A A Lot Harder	B Somewhat Harder	C - Not Much Harder	D Don't Know
All	46.7%	31.5%	9.6%	12.3%	48.7%	34.0%	10.1%	7.2%
Passed	42.6%	36.9%	10.5%	10.1%	41.4%	41.0%	12.3%	5.3%
Didn't Pass	49.8%	27.3%	8.9%	14.0%	54.1%	28.8%	8.5%	8.6%
Gender Groups								
Female	49.8%	30.3%	7.8%	12.0%	53.6%	32.9%	7.5%	6.1%
Male	44.3%	32.3%	10.9%	12.5%	45.0%	34.9%	12.1%	8.1%
Race/Ethnicity Groups								
Asian	46.8%	29.6%	10.3%	13.3%	48.2%	34.0%	9.3%	8.4%
Black	44.7%	33.7%	10.4%	11.2%	49.1%	34.2%	11.1%	5.7%
Hispanic	48.4%	30.4%	9.0%	12.3%	50.0%	33.5%	9.4%	7.1%
White	41.6%	34.4%	11.3%	12.7%	43.3%	35.8%	12.8%	8.1%
Non-disadvantaged/Disadvantaged Groups								
Non-disadvantaged	38.8%	39.3%	12.2%	9.7%	39.0%	41.1%	14.5%	5.5%
Economically Disadvantaged	47.9%	30.0%	9.3%	12.9%	50.1%	32.9%	9.6%	7.4%
English Learners	49.2%	28.4%	9.4%	13.0%	50.6%	32.3%	9.3%	7.8%
Disabilities	52.3%	26.2%	7.6%	13.9%	56.9%	27.0%	7.2%	8.9%

Table H.15. Impact of the Math Test on High School Graduation Perceived by Students in the Classes of 2006 and 2007

	Class 2006				Class 2007			
Group	A A Lot Harder	B Somewhat Harder	C - Not Much Harder	D Don't Know	A A Lot Harder	B Somewhat Harder	C - Not Much Harder	D Don't Know
All	24.4%	36.9%	31.2%	7.4%	20.8%	36.6%	34.8%	7.9%
Passed	16.2%	37.6%	39.3%	6.8%	13.2%	36.4%	43.0%	7.4%
Didn't Pass	47.5%	34.8%	8.5%	9.2%	43.7%	37.1%	10.0%	9.2%
Gender Groups								
Female	24.5%	38.2%	30.1%	7.2%	21.0%	38.1%	33.3%	7.6%
Male	24.3%	35.5%	32.4%	7.7%	20.8%	35.0%	35.9%	8.3%
Race/Ethnicity Groups								
Asian	17.2%	32.3%	43.5%	7.0%	14.0%	30.6%	47.6%	7.8%
Black	31.4%	39.6%	21.9%	7.1%	27.5%	39.7%	25.7%	7.0%
Hispanic	33.6%	41.1%	17.7%	7.5%	29.1%	41.8%	21.2%	7.9%
White	14.6%	32.1%	45.7%	7.6%	12.1%	30.7%	49.1%	8.2%
Non-disadvantaged/Disadvantaged Groups								
Non-disadvantaged	14.6%	34.3%	44.2%	6.9%	11.8%	32.8%	48.0%	7.4%
Economically Disadvantaged	33.7%	40.3%	18.2%	7.8%	29.4%	40.7%	21.7%	8.2%
English Learners	41.8%	36.9%	12.6%	8.7%	38.3%	38.2%	14.4%	9.2%
Disabilities	46.3%	31.8%	11.1%	10.7%	42.0%	33.9%	13.1%	11.1%

Table H.16. Impact of the Math Test on High School Graduation Perceived by Repeat Test Takers

	Responses in 2004				Responses in 2005			
Group	A A Lot Harder	B Somewhat Harder	C - Not Much Harder	D Don't Know	A A Lot Harder	B Somewhat Harder	C - Not Much Harder	D Don't Know
All	49.9%	35.0%	7.5%	7.7%	53.5%	33.9%	7.3%	5.2%
Passed	45.7%	40.0%	8.3%	6.0%	46.5%	40.2%	9.3%	4.0%
Didn't Pass	52.9%	31.4%	6.9%	8.9%	58.4%	29.6%	5.9%	6.0%
Gender Groups								
Female	51.9%	35.2%	6.2%	6.6%	56.0%	34.1%	5.8%	4.2%
Male	47.7%	34.7%	8.8%	8.8%	51.1%	33.8%	8.9%	6.2%
Race/Ethnicity Groups								
Asian	53.3%	29.9%	8.0%	8.9%	56.9%	29.4%	7.0%	6.7%
Black	46.5%	37.2%	9.9%	6.5%	52.9%	34.6%	8.5%	4.0%
Hispanic	51.7%	33.9%	6.7%	7.7%	55.0%	33.1%	6.7%	5.2%
White	45.2%	37.8%	9.0%	8.0%	48.7%	36.8%	8.9%	5.6%
Non-disadvantaged/Disadvantaged Groups								
Non-disadvantaged	42.4%	42.9%	9.0%	5.7%	45.3%	41.1%	9.7%	3.9%
Economically Disadvantaged	51.5%	33.2%	7.2%	8.1%	55.3%	32.5%	6.8%	5.3%
English Learners	53.8%	30.6%	6.9%	8.7%	57.1%	30.8%	6.1%	5.9%
Disabilities	55.6%	28.0%	6.3%	10.1%	61.3%	26.3%	5.7%	6.8%

Question 5

What do you think you will do after high school?

A. I will join the military.
B. I will go to community college.
C. I will go to a 4-year college or university.
D. I will go to vocational, technical, or trade school.
E. I will work full-time.
F. I really don't know what I will do after high school.

Table H.17. Post-High-School Plans Reported by Students in the Classes of 2006 and 2007 After the ELA Test

	Class 2006						Class 2007					
Group	A	B	C	D	E	F	A	B	C	D	E	F
All	5.9%	18.2%	55.0%	3.9%	3.4%	13.5%	5.0%	18.4%	55.9%	4.0%	3.5%	5.9%
Passed	4.7%	17.1%	61.1%	3.6%	1.7%	11.8%	4.0%	17.3%	61.5%	3.7%	1.9%	4.7%
Didn't Pass	10.0%	20.7%	35.0%	5.0%	9.0%	19.2%	8.7%	22.3%	35.5%	5.1%	9.5%	10.0%
Gender Groups												
Female	2.8%	19.7%	62.0%	2.4%	2.1%	11.0%	2.3%	20.0%	62.2%	2.5%	2.1%	2.8%
Male	9.0%	16.8%	48.0%	5.4%	4.8%	15.9%	7.9%	17.0%	48.7%	5.6%	5.2%	9.0%
Race/Ethnicity Groups												
Asian	2.3%	9.7%	77.4%	1.5%	1.3%	7.8%	2.1%	9.8%	77.7%	1.7%	1.3%	2.3%
Black	4.1%	14.9%	64.9%	3.4%	3.8%	8.9%	3.5%	15.5%	63.7%	4.1%	4.1%	4.1%
Hispanic	7.6%	19.9%	46.9%	4.2%	4.7%	16.6%	6.1%	20.4%	47.8%	4.3%	5.1%	7.6%
White	5.4%	19.4%	55.5%	4.4%	2.7%	12.6%	5.0%	19.6%	55.9%	4.5%	2.7%	5.4%
Non-disadvantaged/Disadvantaged Groups												
Non-disadvantaged	4.4%	17.1%	61.9%	3.6%	1.9%	11.2%	3.9%	17.2%	62.3%	3.8%	2.1%	4.4%
Economically Disadvantaged	7.4%	18.8%	48.8%	4.2%	5.0%	15.9%	6.1%	19.2%	49.5%	4.3%	5.2%	7.4%
English Learners	7.9%	19.5%	45.5%	3.8%	5.9%	17.4%	6.5%	20.3%	45.6%	3.8%	6.4%	7.9%
Disabilities	10.2%	24.2%	33.0%	5.8%	8.7%	18.1%	8.8%	24.5%	34.0%	6.0%	8.8%	10.2%

Table H.18. Repeat Test Takers' Post-High-School Plans After the ELA Test

	Responses in 2004						Responses in 2005					
Group	A	B	C	D	E	F	A	B	C	D	E	F
All	9.0%	23.9%	37.7%	4.6%	7.2%	17.6%	7.8%	29.9%	33.4%	5.5%	7.9%	15.4%
Passed	8.1%	25.5%	41.9%	4.5%	4.4%	15.6%	6.7%	33.0%	36.9%	5.9%	4.6%	12.9%
Didn't Pass	9.6%	22.8%	34.5%	4.6%	9.4%	19.1%	8.7%	27.6%	30.8%	5.2%	10.4%	17.2%
Gender Groups												
Female	4.6%	27.2%	44.8%	2.6%	4.7%	16.1%	3.7%	33.9%	39.9%	3.0%	4.9%	14.7%
Male	12.3%	21.4%	32.3%	6.1%	9.2%	18.7%	11.0%	26.9%	28.4%	7.4%	10.3%	16.0%
Race/Ethnicity Groups												
Asian	4.7%	23.1%	53.4%	2.6%	3.7%	12.6%	3.6%	30.4%	49.4%	2.7%	4.3%	9.6%
Black	5.9%	19.4%	54.8%	3.9%	5.8%	10.2%	6.1%	29.2%	44.2%	5.6%	6.2%	8.7%
Hispanic	9.4%	23.6%	36.3%	4.3%	7.5%	18.9%	7.9%	28.9%	32.9%	5.0%	8.4%	16.9%
White	9.9%	28.4%	27.8%	6.9%	8.5%	18.5%	9.7%	33.6%	23.2%	9.0%	9.1%	15.4%
Non-disadvantaged/Disadvantaged Groups												
Non-disadvantaged	8.6%	27.2%	36.1%	5.8%	6.4%	15.9%	8.3%	34.3%	30.5%	7.2%	6.8%	12.8%
Economically Disadvantaged	9.1%	22.6%	38.7%	4.2%	7.3%	18.1%	7.6%	28.1%	34.7%	4.9%	8.3%	16.3%
English Learners	8.5%	22.3%	40.7%	3.8%	6.7%	18.0%	7.0%	28.0%	37.0%	4.2%	7.6%	16.2%
Disabilities	10.1%	25.4%	30.8%	5.1%	9.9%	18.7%	9.4%	30.8%	27.4%	6.5%	10.3%	15.6%

Table H.19. Post-High School Plans Reported by Students in the Classes of 2006 and 2007 After the Math Test

	Class 2006						Class 2007					
Group	A	B	C	D	E	F	A	B	C	D	E	F
All	6.3%	18.1%	53.7%	3.9%	3.7%	14.2%	5.4%	18.3%	55.0%	4.0%	3.7%	13.6%
Passed	5.0%	16.4%	60.8%	3.5%	2.0%	12.3%	4.5%	16.6%	61.5%	3.6%	2.0%	11.8%
Didn't Pass	9.9%	25.5%	34.0%	4.9%	8.7%	19.6%	8.4%	23.6%	35.7%	4.9%	8.7%	18.8%
Gender Groups												
Female	3.0%	19.5%	61.0%	2.5%	2.3%	11.8%	2.5%	19.9%	61.4%	2.5%	2.3%	11.4%
Male	9.6%	16.7%	46.6%	5.3%	5.2%	16.6%	8.5%	17.0%	47.7%	5.5%	5.3%	15.9%
Race/Ethnicity Groups												
Asian	2.6%	9.7%	76.3%	1.5%	1.3%	8.5%	2.5%	9.8%	76.8%	1.6%	1.3%	8.0%
Black	4.5%	14.9%	63.8%	3.4%	3.9%	9.5%	3.8%	15.9%	62.9%	3.8%	4.2%	9.4%
Hispanic	7.8%	19.8%	45.7%	4.1%	5.2%	17.4%	6.4%	20.3%	47.2%	4.2%	5.2%	16.7%
White	6.0%	19.2%	54.3%	4.4%	2.9%	13.2%	5.6%	19.4%	54.9%	4.6%	2.8%	12.7%
Non-disadvantaged/Disadvantaged Groups												
Non-disadvantaged	4.9%	16.9%	60.8%	3.5%	2.1%	11.7%	4.5%	17.0%	61.5%	3.8%	2.2%	11.2%
Economically Disadvantaged	7.6%	18.6%	47.6%	4.1%	5.3%	16.8%	6.3%	19.2%	48.8%	4.1%	5.4%	16.2%
English Learners	8.1%	19.5%	44.3%	3.7%	6.2%	18.3%	6.7%	20.2%	44.9%	3.7%	6.4%	18.1%
Disabilities	10.3%	24.1%	32.2%	5.8%	9.1%	18.5%	9.2%	24.7%	33.4%	5.8%	8.8%	18.1%

Table H.20. Repeat Test Takers' Post-High-School Plans After the Math Test

	Responses in 2004						Responses in 2005					
Group	A	B	C	D	E	F	A	B	C	D	E	F
All	9.0%	24.8%	37.0%	4.5%	7.0%	17.8%	8.0%	32.1%	31.5%	5.8%	7.4%	15.2%
Passed	8.3%	26.0%	40.4%	4.7%	4.4%	16.1%	7.1%	34.3%	34.8%	6.3%	4.3%	13.2%
Didn't Pass	9.4%	23.9%	34.6%	4.3%	8.8%	18.9%	8.7%	30.5%	29.2%	5.4%	9.6%	16.6%
Gender Groups												
Female	4.9%	28.2%	43.6%	2.8%	4.3%	16.2%	4.1%	36.5%	37.2%	3.7%	4.7%	13.8%
Male	13.3%	21.2%	30.1%	6.2%	9.8%	19.4%	12.1%	27.4%	25.5%	7.9%	10.3%	16.7%
Race/Ethnicity Groups												
Asian	5.8%	22.5%	46.0%	3.3%	5.6%	16.8%	5.5%	33.5%	38.2%	4.2%	6.1%	12.6%
Black	5.5%	18.8%	57.3%	3.8%	4.6%	9.9%	5.2%	28.5%	46.9%	6.4%	4.9%	8.1%
Hispanic	9.4%	24.3%	35.9%	4.1%	7.4%	18.9%	8.2%	31.0%	31.2%	5.1%	7.9%	16.6%
White	9.8%	30.6%	26.8%	6.6%	7.4%	18.7%	9.4%	37.4%	21.3%	8.4%	7.8%	15.6%
Non-disadvantaged/Disadvantaged Groups												
Non-disadvantaged	8.2%	27.9%	39.0%	4.9%	4.7%	15.3%	7.1%	37.7%	30.8%	6.7%	5.3%	12.4%
Economically Disadvantaged	9.2%	23.0%	37.7%	4.1%	7.5%	18.6%	8.1%	29.6%	32.7%	5.1%	8.1%	16.4%
English Learners	9.0%	22.8%	37.8%	3.7%	7.7%	19.1%	7.8%	28.8%	33.5%	4.6%	8.1%	17.2%
Disabilities	10.0%	26.1%	30.3%	5.2%	9.7%	18.7%	9.7%	31.7%	26.2%	6.6%	9.9%	16.0%

Question 6

How sure are you about what you will do after high school?

A. Very sure
B. Somewhat sure
C. Not sure at all

Table H.21. Certainty About Post-High School Plans Indicated by Students in the Classes of 2006 and 2007After the ELA Test

	Class 2006			Class 2007		
Group	A Very sure	B Somewhat Sure	C Not Sure	A Very sure	B Somewhat Sure	C Not Sure
All	42.1%	45.0%	13.0%	43.4%	44.2%	12.4%
Passed	42.3%	45.9%	11.8%	43.7%	45.0%	11.3%
Didn't Pass	41.2%	41.9%	16.9%	42.3%	41.3%	16.4%
Gender Groups						
Female	44.8%	44.7%	10.5%	46.2%	43.7%	10.2%
Male	39.3%	45.2%	15.5%	40.5%	44.6%	14.8%
Race/Ethnicity Groups						
Asian	45.1%	43.5%	11.4%	46.6%	42.6%	10.7%
Black	54.6%	36.9%	8.5%	55.1%	36.3%	8.5%
Hispanic	39.3%	46.6%	14.1%	40.8%	45.7%	13.6%
White	42.0%	44.9%	13.1%	43.1%	44.2%	12.7%
Non-disadvantaged/Disadvantaged Groups						
Non-disadvantaged	43.2%	44.9%	11.9%	44.6%	43.9%	11.5%
Economically Disadvantaged	40.6%	45.4%	14.0%	41.9%	44.7%	13.4%
English Learners	41.0%	43.5%	15.6%	42.2%	42.8%	15.1%
Disabilities	41.0%	42.5%	16.5%	43.0%	41.3%	15.7%

Table H.22. Repeat Test Takers' Certainty About Post-High School Plans After the ELA Test

	Responses in 2004			Responses in 2005		
Group	A Very sure	B Somewhat Sure	C Not Sure	A Very sure	B Somewhat Sure	C Not Sure
All	42.3%	42.4%	15.3%	45.1%	41.6%	13.3%
Passed	42.1%	45.4%	12.5%	45.3%	44.0%	10.7%
Didn't Pass	42.4%	40.2%	17.5%	45.0%	39.7%	15.3%
Gender Groups						
Female	45.2%	41.7%	13.1%	48.8%	40.1%	11.1%
Male	40.0%	43.0%	17.0%	42.3%	42.7%	15.0%
Race/Ethnicity Groups						
Asian	43.5%	40.6%	15.9%	50.2%	38.3%	11.5%
Black	54.9%	36.0%	9.1%	55.5%	36.6%	7.9%
Hispanic	40.8%	43.1%	16.1%	43.5%	42.3%	14.2%
White	41.4%	43.5%	15.1%	44.5%	41.8%	13.7%
Non-disadvantaged/Disadvantaged Groups						
Non-disadvantaged	41.3%	46.5%	12.2%	44.6%	43.9%	11.4%
Economically Disadvantaged	42.2%	41.6%	16.2%	44.9%	41.2%	13.9%
English Learners	42.5%	40.7%	16.8%	44.8%	40.7%	14.5%
Disabilities	42.2%	41.4%	16.4%	46.5%	40.0%	13.5%

Table H.23. Certainty About Post-High School Plans Indicated by Students in the Classes of 2006 and 2007After the Math Test

	Class 2006			Class 2007		
Group	A Very sure	B Somewhat Sure	C Not Sure	A Very sure	B Somewhat Sure	C Not Sure
All	43.0%	43.7%	13.2%	44.4%	42.9%	12.7%
Passed	43.3%	44.6%	12.2%	44.6%	43.7%	11.7%
Didn't Pass	42.4%	41.4%	16.3%	43.8%	40.6%	15.6%
Gender Groups						
Female	45.7%	43.7%	10.6%	46.9%	42.8%	10.3%
Male	40.4%	43.7%	15.9%	41.7%	43.0%	15.3%
Race/Ethnicity Groups						
Asian	45.8%	42.5%	11.6%	47.3%	41.6%	11.1%
Black	55.7%	35.7%	8.6%	56.1%	35.1%	8.7%
Hispanic	40.5%	45.0%	14.5%	41.9%	44.2%	13.9%
White	42.9%	43.9%	13.2%	44.0%	43.2%	12.9%
Non-disadvantaged/Disadvantaged Groups						
Non-disadvantaged	44.0%	44.0%	12.0%	45.4%	43.0%	11.6%
Economically Disadvantaged	41.8%	43.7%	14.4%	43.0%	43.2%	13.9%
English Learners	42.2%	41.5%	16.3%	43.6%	40.9%	15.6%
Disabilities	42.8%	40.6%	16.6%	44.2%	39.7%	16.1%

Table H.24. Repeat Test Takers' Certainty About Post-High School Plans After the Math Test

	Responses in 2004			Responses in 2005		
Group	A Very sure	B Somewhat Sure	C Not Sure	A Very sure	B Somewhat Sure	C Not Sure
All	43.4%	42.4%	14.2%	46.3%	41.2%	12.6%
Passed	42.3%	45.0%	12.7%	45.9%	43.3%	10.8%
Didn't Pass	44.3%	40.4%	15.3%	46.6%	39.7%	13.7%
Gender Groups						
Female	45.6%	42.6%	11.8%	49.2%	40.5%	10.3%
Male	41.2%	42.1%	16.7%	43.3%	41.9%	14.8%
Race/Ethnicity Groups						
Asian	42.7%	41.1%	16.2%	48.2%	38.6%	13.2%
Black	56.6%	35.2%	8.3%	57.6%	34.9%	7.4%
Hispanic	41.8%	43.2%	14.9%	44.7%	42.2%	13.1%
White	41.6%	43.7%	14.8%	45.2%	41.0%	13.8%
Non-disadvantaged/Disadvantaged Groups						
Non-disadvantaged	43.6%	44.5%	11.9%	46.6%	42.9%	10.4%
Economically Disadvantaged	43.2%	41.9%	14.9%	45.9%	40.9%	13.2%
English Learners	43.3%	40.7%	16.0%	45.9%	39.8%	14.3%
Disabilities	44.2%	40.0%	15.9%	47.5%	38.6%	13.9%

Question 7

How well did you do on this test?

A. I did as well as I could.
B. I did not do as well as I could have.

Table H.25. Self-Reported Performance on the ELA Test by Students in the Classes of 2006 and 2007

	Class 2006		Class 2007	
Group	A As well as I could	B—Not as well as I could	A As well as I could	B—Not as well as I could
All	85.2%	14.8%	86.9%	13.1%
Passed	88.5%	11.5%	89.9%	10.1%
Didn't Pass	74.0%	26.0%	76.0%	24.0%
Gender Groups				
Female	87.7%	12.3%	89.5%	10.5%
Male	82.7%	17.3%	84.1%	15.9%
Race/Ethnicity Groups				
Asian	83.4%	16.6%	84.8%	15.2%
Black	85.3%	14.7%	87.0%	13.0%
Hispanic	82.7%	17.3%	85.1%	14.9%
White	88.3%	11.7%	89.1%	10.9%
Non-disadvantaged/Disadvantaged Groups				
Non-disadvantaged	88.1%	11.9%	89.1%	10.9%
Economically Disadvantaged	82.6%	17.4%	84.9%	15.1%
English Learners	78.6%	21.4%	81.0%	19.0%
Disabilities	79.1%	20.9%	80.5%	19.5%

Table H.26. Self-Reported Performance on the ELA Test by Repeat Test Takers

	Responses in 2004		Responses in 2005	
Group	A As well as I could	B—Not as well as I could	A As well as I could	B—Not as well as I could
All	75.5%	24.5%	84.6%	15.4%
Passed	76.5%	23.5%	89.4%	10.6%
Didn't Pass	74.6%	25.4%	81.0%	19.0%
Gender Groups				
Female	77.4%	22.6%	87.4%	12.6%
Male	74.0%	26.0%	82.4%	17.6%
Race/Ethnicity Groups				
Asian	70.9%	29.1%	83.2%	16.8%
Black	77.0%	23.0%	85.2%	14.8%
Hispanic	75.5%	24.5%	84.6%	15.4%
White	75.8%	24.2%	84.2%	15.8%
Non-disadvantaged/Disadvantaged Groups				
Non-disadvantaged	75.5%	24.5%	86.4%	13.6%
Economically Disadvantaged	75.8%	24.2%	84.6%	15.4%
English Learners	75.0%	25.0%	83.9%	16.1%
Disabilities	75.5%	24.5%	82.9%	17.1%

Table H.27. Self-Reported Performance on the Math Test by Students in the Classes of 2006 and 2007

	Class 2006		Class 2007	
Group	A As well as I could	B—Not as well as I could	A As well as I could	B—Not as well as I could
All	78.8%	21.2%	81.0%	19.0%
Passed	81.7%	18.3%	83.8%	16.2%
Didn't Pass	70.6%	29.4%	72.6%	27.4%
Gender Groups				
Female	78.4%	21.6%	80.7%	19.3%
Male	79.2%	20.8%	81.1%	18.9%
Race/Ethnicity Groups				
Asian	83.1%	16.9%	85.0%	15.0%
Black	76.7%	23.3%	79.1%	20.9%
Hispanic	76.3%	23.7%	79.1%	20.9%
White	81.1%	18.9%	82.5%	17.5%
Non-disadvantaged/Disadvantaged Groups				
Non-disadvantaged	80.7%	19.3%	82.3%	17.7%
Economically Disadvantaged	77.2%	22.8%	79.8%	20.2%
English Learners	77.1%	22.9%	79.4%	20.6%
Disabilities	75.7%	24.3%	76.9%	23.1%

Table H.28. Self-Reported Performance on the Math Test by Repeat Test Takers

	Responses in 2004		Responses in 2005	
Group	A As well as I could	B—Not as well as I could	A As well as I could	B—Not as well as I could
All	73.7%	26.3%	81.8%	18.2%
Passed	72.6%	27.4%	84.5%	15.5%
Didn't Pass	74.5%	25.5%	80.0%	20.0%
Gender Groups				
Female	73.2%	26.8%	83.3%	16.7%
Male	74.2%	25.8%	80.3%	19.7%
Race/Ethnicity Groups				
Asian	72.4%	27.6%	83.0%	17.0%
Black	74.3%	25.7%	83.1%	16.9%
Hispanic	73.8%	26.2%	81.5%	18.5%
White	73.7%	26.3%	82.1%	17.9%
Non-disadvantaged/Disadvantaged Groups				
Non-disadvantaged	70.3%	29.7%	82.5%	17.5%
Economically Disadvantaged	74.4%	25.6%	82.0%	18.0%
English Learners	75.5%	24.5%	81.4%	18.6%
Disabilities	76.1%	23.9%	80.8%	19.2%

Question 8

The main reasons I did not do as well on this test as I could have are (mark all that apply):

A. I was too nervous to do as well as I could.
B. I was not motivated to do well.
C. I did not have time to do as well as I could.
D. Conditions in the testing room made it difficult to concentrate.
E. There are questions on this test that cover topics I was taught, but I did not remember how to answer them.
F. There were other reasons why I did not do as well as I could.

Table H.29. Reasons For Not Performing Optimally on the ELA Test Indicated by Students in the Classes of 2006 and 2007

	Class 2006						Class 2007					
Group	A	B	C	D	E	F	A	B	C	D	E	F
All	28.7%	21.2%	8.6%	18.6%	19.1%	41.7%	28.1%	21.9%	8.2%	18.5%	19.0%	41.0%
Passed	26.8%	23.0%	7.8%	20.9%	18.6%	47.5%	26.4%	23.5%	7.6%	20.9%	18.3%	46.8%
Didn't Pass	31.3%	18.7%	9.8%	15.0%	19.9%	33.3%	30.8%	19.4%	9.2%	14.9%	20.2%	32.0%
Gender Groups												
Female	35.8%	17.3%	7.2%	18.4%	20.8%	42.0%	35.0%	18.0%	6.5%	18.8%	21.3%	41.6%
Male	23.6%	24.0%	9.6%	18.7%	17.9%	41.6%	23.1%	24.5%	9.4%	18.2%	17.4%	40.7%
Race/Ethnicity Groups												
Asian	24.0%	23.9%	8.7%	20.1%	16.7%	45.0%	22.6%	24.9%	7.8%	19.5%	16.2%	44.4%
Black	30.0%	18.0%	9.1%	16.1%	18.1%	38.3%	29.4%	20.2%	9.4%	17.1%	18.0%	35.7%
Hispanic	32.8%	17.1%	9.0%	16.9%	21.3%	37.5%	32.1%	17.4%	8.5%	16.8%	21.5%	37.0%
White	23.6%	27.7%	7.7%	21.2%	16.5%	47.5%	23.0%	28.1%	7.7%	21.0%	16.1%	46.6%
Non-disadvantaged/Disadvantaged Groups												
Non-disadvantaged	24.9%	26.5%	7.7%	20.5%	16.3%	46.3%	23.8%	27.3%	7.3%	20.6%	15.9%	45.7%
Economically Disadvantaged	31.7%	17.2%	9.3%	17.4%	21.4%	38.4%	30.8%	17.8%	8.8%	17.2%	21.5%	37.9%
English Learners	33.6%	14.5%	10.0%	15.0%	20.6%	32.8%	33.0%	14.6%	9.1%	14.7%	20.9%	31.8%
Disabilities	31.2%	18.8%	10.2%	16.3%	20.8%	33.6%	29.6%	19.4%	10.4%	15.6%	20.5%	33.5%

Table H.30. Reasons For Not Performing Optimally on the ELA Test Indicated by Repeat Test Takers

	Responses in 2004						Responses in 2005					
Group	A	B	C	D	E	F	A	B	C	D	E	F
All	35.0%	16.5%	9.5%	14.8%	21.1%	31.4%	28.8%	18.6%	10.2%	14.6%	19.4%	31.9%
Passed	34.4%	18.2%	8.7%	16.0%	22.9%	37.8%	29.0%	19.4%	10.3%	15.9%	21.9%	38.9%
Didn't Pass	35.5%	15.2%	10.1%	13.8%	19.8%	26.8%	28.7%	18.3%	10.2%	14.0%	18.3%	28.9%
Gender Groups												
Female	42.5%	12.9%	7.5%	12.9%	22.6%	29.9%	36.4%	13.9%	7.6%	13.5%	21.4%	30.9%
Male	30.1%	18.9%	10.8%	16.0%	20.2%	32.4%	24.6%	21.2%	11.6%	15.2%	18.2%	32.4%
Race/Ethnicity Groups												
Asian	26.1%	15.1%	11.9%	13.3%	17.5%	35.9%	27.8%	17.2%	10.1%	16.3%	18.0%	34.0%
Black	35.2%	16.6%	8.0%	12.6%	20.5%	32.6%	26.7%	19.4%	12.6%	13.8%	19.2%	28.3%
Hispanic	37.4%	14.7%	9.5%	14.2%	21.2%	28.3%	29.8%	17.1%	10.0%	13.5%	20.0%	30.0%
White	30.4%	24.8%	9.0%	18.3%	21.8%	40.5%	26.0%	24.0%	10.7%	18.4%	17.8%	38.8%
Non-disadvantaged/Disadvantaged Groups												
Non-disadvantaged	33.5%	23.5%	9.8%	16.8%	21.5%	37.2%	25.9%	26.9%	8.3%	16.4%	16.7%	40.3%
Economically Disadvantaged	35.8%	14.5%	9.6%	14.8%	21.0%	30.1%	29.4%	17.0%	10.3%	14.9%	19.9%	30.3%
English Learners	36.4%	13.2%	9.9%	13.3%	20.2%	27.4%	31.1%	15.4%	10.0%	13.0%	20.3%	28.1%
Disabilities	33.2%	16.9%	10.4%	15.0%	21.6%	29.6%	26.5%	17.6%	11.5%	14.8%	19.6%	29.3%

Table H.31. Reasons For Not Performing Optimally on the Math Test Indicated by Students in the Classes of 2006 and 2007

	Class 2006						Class 2007					
Group	A	B	C	D	E	F	A	B	C	D	E	F
All	21.7%	16.9%	5.0%	13.2%	51.6%	32.9%	21.6%	16.8%	5.1%	13.1%	51.0%	31.6%
Passed	19.8%	17.0%	4.4%	14.2%	56.7%	33.2%	19.3%	16.9%	4.5%	14.2%	55.8%	32.0%
Didn't Pass	24.9%	16.7%	6.1%	11.6%	42.5%	32.3%	25.5%	16.6%	6.2%	11.2%	42.3%	31.0%
Gender Groups												
Female	24.4%	12.9%	3.4%	12.3%	60.9%	32.1%	23.9%	12.9%	3.4%	12.3%	60.9%	31.3%
Male	18.9%	20.9%	6.7%	14.2%	41.9%	33.7%	18.9%	20.8%	7.0%	13.9%	40.3%	32.2%
Race/Ethnicity Groups												
Asian	17.4%	21.6%	4.8%	14.8%	47.5%	32.9%	16.8%	21.9%	5.2%	15.4%	46.2%	30.0%
Black	22.9%	14.9%	5.5%	12.6%	49.6%	31.5%	22.3%	14.4%	5.5%	10.5%	49.3%	30.2%
Hispanic	24.8%	13.9%	4.9%	11.9%	51.1%	30.9%	24.7%	14.2%	5.2%	11.9%	50.8%	30.2%
White	18.5%	20.5%	5.0%	14.8%	53.0%	35.9%	18.1%	20.1%	5.1%	15.0%	51.4%	34.7%
Non-disadvantaged/Disadvantaged Groups												
Non-disadvantaged	19.1%	19.2%	4.8%	14.2%	54.9%	33.4%	18.4%	19.1%	4.6%	14.0%	53.6%	32.3%
Economically Disadvantaged	24.2%	14.4%	5.3%	12.5%	49.9%	32.1%	23.7%	14.6%	5.5%	12.4%	49.7%	31.2%
English Learners	27.0%	13.3%	6.0%	11.4%	41.8%	28.3%	27.7%	13.5%	6.3%	11.2%	40.9%	26.5%
Disabilities	25.1%	17.0%	7.9%	12.8%	37.2%	33.2%	25.4%	17.0%	7.4%	11.9%	36.5%	32.5%

Table H.32. Reasons For Not Performing Optimally on the Math Test Indicated by Repeat Test Takers

	Responses in 2004						Responses in 2005					
Group	A	B	C	D	E	F	A	B	C	D	E	F
All	27.3%	14.1%	5.6%	11.1%	45.8%	29.5%	26.6%	15.3%	7.2%	11.8%	41.9%	26.1%
Passed	26.0%	13.7%	4.8%	11.4%	53.4%	31.2%	26.2%	12.8%	6.5%	11.6%	50.8%	25.9%
Didn't Pass	28.3%	14.5%	6.2%	10.8%	39.9%	28.3%	26.8%	16.6%	7.5%	11.9%	37.1%	26.2%
Gender Groups												
Female	30.1%	11.8%	4.0%	9.6%	52.8%	29.6%	31.1%	13.1%	5.2%	11.0%	50.1%	26.9%
Male	24.2%	16.7%	7.2%	12.7%	38.2%	29.5%	22.6%	17.2%	8.9%	12.5%	34.6%	25.4%
Race/Ethnicity Groups												
Asian	23.9%	13.8%	6.0%	13.2%	47.5%	30.2%	17.6%	16.1%	8.3%	11.7%	40.5%	26.3%
Black	26.0%	13.8%	6.7%	10.9%	42.3%	29.7%	28.0%	14.1%	7.3%	13.0%	40.4%	25.1%
Hispanic	28.9%	13.0%	5.0%	10.4%	45.4%	27.2%	27.6%	14.4%	6.6%	11.2%	41.9%	24.1%
White	23.4%	18.7%	7.0%	13.1%	46.5%	37.3%	24.9%	18.2%	8.8%	13.6%	42.3%	34.2%
Non-disadvantaged/Disadvantaged Groups												
Non-disadvantaged	24.3%	15.4%	4.6%	11.1%	54.6%	33.3%	25.7%	17.5%	5.9%	11.7%	51.4%	28.4%
Economically Disadvantaged	28.5%	12.9%	5.8%	11.0%	44.5%	27.7%	27.3%	14.6%	7.2%	11.7%	40.2%	25.1%
English Learners	29.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	14.1%	28.1%	13.2%	7.1%	11.4%	37.2%	21.8%
Disabilities	27.3%	15.6%	7.8%	11.3%	36.1%	29.7%	24.6%	15.8%	9.4%	12.1%	32.9%	27.8%

Question 9

Were the topics on the test covered in courses you have taken?

A. Yes, all of them.
B. Most, but not all of them (two-thirds or more were covered).
C. Many topics on the test were not covered in my courses (less than two-thirds were covered).

Table H.33. Self-Reported Exposure to Topics on the ELA Test by Students in the Classes of 2006 and 2007

	Class 2006			Class 2007		
Group	A All Covered	B Most Covered	C- Many Not Covered	A All Covered	B Most Covered	C- Many Not Covered
All	46.1%	45.4%	8.5%	48.0%	44.2%	7.7%
Passed	52.0%	42.0%	6.0%	53.6%	41.0%	5.4%
Didn't Pass	26.7%	56.3%	17.0%	27.8%	56.1%	16.1%
Gender Groups						
Female	48.8%	44.2%	7.0%	51.1%	42.6%	6.3%
Male	43.4%	46.5%	10.1%	44.5%	46.1%	9.4%
Race/Ethnicity Groups						
Asian	49.0%	42.0%	9.0%	51.0%	40.8%	8.2%
Black	39.4%	49.8%	10.8%	41.6%	48.3%	10.1%
Hispanic	38.7%	51.4%	9.9%	41.0%	50.0%	9.0%
White	54.5%	38.8%	6.6%	55.5%	38.3%	6.2%
Non-disadvantaged/Disadvantaged Groups						
Non-disadvantaged	54.8%	39.2%	5.9%	56.5%	38.0%	5.5%
Economically Disadvantaged	37.4%	51.8%	10.8%	39.7%	50.5%	9.8%
English Learners	30.3%	55.7%	14.0%	31.6%	55.6%	12.9%
Disabilities	30.7%	52.8%	16.5%	32.1%	52.6%	15.3%

Table H.34. Self-Reported Exposure to Topics on the ELA Test by Repeat Test Takers

	Responses in 2004			Responses in 2005		
Group	A All Covered	B Most Covered	C- Many Not Covered	A All Covered	B Most Covered	C- Many Not Covered
All	28.4%	54.4%	17.2%	25.7%	56.6%	17.7%
Passed	27.5%	57.2%	15.4%	26.3%	58.1%	15.6%
Didn't Pass	26.2%	60.7%	13.0%	27.1%	60.2%	12.7%
Gender Groups						
Female	27.6%	58.3%	14.1%	26.5%	59.6%	13.9%
Male	27.3%	56.4%	16.3%	26.1%	57.0%	16.9%
Race/Ethnicity Groups						
Asian	24.5%	54.7%	20.8%	24.1%	55.5%	20.4%
Black	28.3%	56.2%	15.5%	27.3%	55.4%	17.3%
Hispanic	27.7%	57.7%	14.6%	26.4%	59.2%	14.5%
White	27.9%	55.7%	16.4%	27.0%	55.1%	17.9%
Non-disadvantaged/Disadvantaged Groups						
Non-disadvantaged	28.1%	59.2%	12.7%	29.2%	57.5%	13.3%
Economically Disadvantaged	27.2%	57.4%	15.4%	25.6%	58.8%	15.5%
English Learners	27.3%	56.7%	16.1%	25.2%	58.9%	15.9%
Disabilities	27.9%	54.2%	17.9%	25.8%	55.6%	18.6%

Table H.35. Self-Reported Exposure to Topics on the Math Test by Students in the Classes of 2006 and 2007

	Class 2006			Class 2007		
Group	A All Covered	B Most Covered	C- Many Not Covered	A All Covered	B Most Covered	C- Many Not Covered
All	39.9%	48.6%	11.4%	40.4%	48.5%	11.1%
Passed	47.0%	45.2%	7.8%	47.0%	44.9%	8.1%
Didn't Pass	20.0%	58.3%	21.7%	20.5%	59.4%	20.1%
Gender Groups						
Female	40.7%	49.5%	9.8%	40.8%	49.3%	9.9%
Male	39.2%	47.8%	13.0%	39.5%	48.0%	12.5%
Race/Ethnicity Groups						
Asian	57.1%	36.1%	6.8%	57.4%	35.3%	7.3%
Black	29.7%	55.0%	15.3%	30.3%	54.4%	15.4%
Hispanic	31.6%	55.5%	12.9%	32.1%	55.6%	12.3%
White	46.7%	43.0%	10.4%	46.7%	42.9%	10.3%
Non-disadvantaged/Disadvantaged Groups						
Non-disadvantaged	48.7%	42.5%	8.8%	48.7%	42.2%	9.1%
Economically Disadvantaged	31.6%	55.1%	13.2%	32.2%	55.1%	12.7%
English Learners	28.1%	57.8%	14.1%	27.6%	58.9%	13.5%
Disabilities	22.3%	54.4%	23.3%	23.4%	55.6%	20.9%

Table H.36. Self-Reported Exposure to Topics on the Math Test by Repeat Test Takers

	Responses in 2004			Responses in 2005		
Group	A All Covered	B Most Covered	C- Many Not Covered	A All Covered	B Most Covered	C- Many Not Covered
All	20.7%	60.1%	19.2%	19.6%	62.5%	17.8%
Passed	20.1%	62.1%	17.9%	20.2%	65.2%	14.6%
Didn't Pass	21.2%	58.7%	20.1%	19.2%	60.7%	20.1%
Gender Groups						
Female	20.4%	62.2%	17.4%	18.9%	65.4%	15.7%
Male	21.1%	57.9%	21.0%	20.3%	59.6%	20.1%
Race/Ethnicity Groups						
Asian	22.4%	60.8%	16.8%	20.9%	62.6%	16.5%
Black	21.0%	58.2%	20.8%	18.7%	61.6%	19.7%
Hispanic	21.4%	61.3%	17.3%	20.2%	63.5%	16.3%
White	18.1%	56.4%	25.5%	17.8%	59.6%	22.6%
Non-disadvantaged/Disadvantaged Groups						
Non-disadvantaged	18.9%	61.2%	20.0%	18.5%	64.5%	17.1%
Economically Disadvantaged	21.7%	60.7%	17.6%	20.3%	62.8%	16.9%
English Learners	23.3%	60.5%	16.2%	21.0%	62.6%	16.4%
Disabilities	19.6%	55.9%	24.5%	18.7%	58.0%	23.3%

Question 10

Were any of the questions on the test different from the types of questions or answer opinions you have encountered in your homework assignments or classroom tests?

A. Yes, many were different from anything I had seen before.
B. Yes, a few were different from anything I had seen before.
C. No, all were similar to ones used in my classes.

Table H.37. Familiarity with the Types of Questions on the ELA Test Indicated by Students in the Classes of 2006 and 2007

	Class 2006			Class 2007		
Group	A Many different	B A few different	C All Similar	A Many different	B A few different	C All Similar
All	13.4%	52.0%	34.5%	9.3%	49.5%	41.2%
Passed	9.6%	50.8%	39.5%	9.1%	49.7%	41.2%
Didn't Pass	25.9%	55.8%	18.3%	25.9%	55.7%	18.5%
Gender Groups						
Female	9.9%	50.6%	39.6%	9.2%	48.9%	41.9%
Male	17.0%	53.4%	29.6%	16.4%	53.0%	30.6%
Race/Ethnicity Groups						
Asian	13.9%	51.7%	34.4%	13.6%	50.2%	36.3%
Black	16.1%	52.7%	31.2%	15.7%	51.1%	33.2%
Hispanic	15.5%	56.0%	28.5%	14.6%	55.0%	30.3%
White	10.7%	47.3%	41.9%	10.2%	46.3%	43.5%
Non-disadvantaged/Disadvantaged Groups						
Non-disadvantaged	9.9%	48.3%	41.9%	9.4%	46.9%	43.7%
Economically Disadvantaged	16.3%	56.2%	27.4%	15.5%	55.1%	29.4%
English Learners	22.1%	58.2%	19.8%	21.5%	58.1%	20.4%
Disabilities	25.7%	52.8%	21.4%	24.5%	53.4%	22.0%

Table H.38. Familiarity with the Types of Questions on the ELA Test Indicated by Repeat Test Takers

	Responses in 2004			Responses in 2005		
Group	A Many different	B A few different	C All Similar	A Many different	B A few different	C All Similar
All	25.7%	57.2%	17.0%	23.5%	58.9%	17.6%
Passed	20.9%	61.7%	17.4%	17.9%	62.2%	19.9%
Didn't Pass	29.4%	53.8%	16.8%	27.6%	56.4%	16.0%
Gender Groups						
Female	22.0%	59.6%	18.4%	20.1%	60.5%	19.3%
Male	28.5%	55.5%	16.0%	26.0%	57.6%	16.3%
Race/Ethnicity Groups						
Asian	30.3%	55.5%	14.2%	27.9%	58.7%	13.4%
Black	28.0%	53.6%	18.4%	24.9%	56.9%	18.3%
Hispanic	25.1%	58.3%	16.6%	22.8%	60.2%	17.0%
White	25.5%	54.8%	19.7%	23.9%	54.5%	21.6%
Non-disadvantaged/Disadvantaged Groups						
Non-disadvantaged	21.1%	59.5%	19.4%	18.6%	59.8%	21.7%
Economically Disadvantaged	25.8%	57.6%	16.6%	23.5%	59.4%	17.1%
English Learners	27.3%	57.3%	15.5%	24.8%	59.7%	15.5%
Disabilities	30.4%	52.3%	17.3%	28.3%	54.6%	17.2%

Table H.39. Familiarity with the Types of Questions on the Math Test Indicated by Students in the Classes of 2006 and 2007

	Class 2006			Class 2007		
Group	A Many different	B A few different	C All Similar	A Many different	B A few different	C All Similar
All	14.6%	51.3%	34.0%	14.4%	51.0%	34.7%
Passed	10.3%	49.3%	40.5%	10.3%	48.8%	40.8%
Didn't Pass	27.0%	57.2%	15.9%	26.7%	57.3%	16.0%
Gender Groups						
Female	11.6%	51.8%	36.6%	11.5%	51.3%	37.2%
Male	17.7%	50.8%	31.5%	17.5%	50.8%	31.7%
Race/Ethnicity Groups						
Asian	10.3%	41.9%	47.8%	10.3%	41.4%	48.3%
Black	19.7%	55.0%	25.4%	19.5%	54.6%	25.9%
Hispanic	17.0%	57.1%	25.9%	16.7%	56.9%	26.4%
White	12.2%	46.4%	41.4%	12.2%	46.1%	41.7%
Non-disadvantaged/Disadvantaged Groups						
Non-disadvantaged	10.7%	46.5%	42.8%	10.8%	46.1%	43.1%
Economically Disadvantaged	17.7%	56.6%	25.7%	17.3%	56.2%	26.5%
English Learners	21.1%	58.6%	20.3%	21.4%	58.6%	20.0%
Disabilities	30.9%	52.3%	16.8%	29.3%	53.5%	17.2%

Table H.40. Familiarity with the Types of Questions on the Math Test Indicated by Repeat Test Takers

	Responses in 2004			Responses in 2005		
Group	A Many different	B A few different	C All Similar	A Many different	B A few different	C All Similar
All	26.0%	58.8%	15.2%	25.8%	59.9%	14.2%
Passed	22.2%	62.3%	15.5%	20.6%	64.4%	15.0%
Didn't Pass	28.7%	56.4%	14.9%	29.5%	56.9%	13.7%
Gender Groups						
Female	21.8%	61.6%	16.6%	21.4%	63.8%	14.9%
Male	30.4%	55.9%	13.6%	30.4%	56.0%	13.6%
Race/Ethnicity Groups						
Asian	24.2%	60.9%	14.9%	25.9%	60.6%	13.5%
Black	27.2%	57.5%	15.3%	27.7%	57.7%	14.6%
Hispanic	25.2%	59.6%	15.1%	24.9%	61.2%	13.9%
White	28.9%	55.6%	15.4%	27.8%	56.6%	15.6%
Non-disadvantaged/Disadvantaged Groups						
Non-disadvantaged	22.0%	62.0%	16.0%	21.7%	62.4%	15.8%
Economically Disadvantaged	26.1%	58.6%	15.3%	25.7%	60.5%	13.8%
English Learners	26.5%	58.6%	14.9%	26.9%	60.0%	13.1%
Disabilities	34.8%	52.0%	13.1%	34.0%	52.9%	13.1%

Question 11

Were the questions on this test more difficult than questions you were given in classroom tests or homework assignment?

A. Yes, the test questions were generally more difficult than the questions I encountered in my course work.
B. The test questions were generally about as difficult as the questions I encountered in my course work.
C. No, the questions were not more difficult than questions I encountered in my course work.

Table H.41. Difficulty of the Questions on the ELA Test Perceived by Students in the Classes of 2006 and 2007

	Class 2006			Class 2007		
Group	A More difficult	B About as difficult	C Not more difficult	A More difficult	B About as difficult	C Not more difficult
All	18.8%	43.0%	38.3%	17.5%	42.6%	39.9%
Passed	13.2%	42.8%	44.0%	12.3%	42.4%	45.3%
Didn't Pass	36.9%	43.6%	19.5%	36.4%	43.5%	20.2%
Gender Groups						
Female	14.6%	43.5%	41.9%	13.5%	42.7%	43.8%
Male	22.9%	42.4%	34.7%	21.6%	42.5%	35.9%
Race/Ethnicity Groups						
Asian	16.5%	37.7%	45.8%	15.4%	37.0%	47.6%
Black	22.2%	41.1%	36.7%	21.0%	40.1%	38.8%
Hispanic	23.8%	48.6%	27.5%	22.0%	48.1%	29.9%
White	13.5%	38.2%	48.3%	12.7%	38.1%	49.3%
Non-disadvantaged/Disadvantaged Groups						
Non-disadvantaged	12.1%	39.2%	48.7%	11.3%	38.7%	50.0%
Economically Disadvantaged	24.9%	47.5%	27.6%	23.0%	47.0%	30.0%
English Learners	33.2%	46.9%	19.9%	31.9%	47.0%	21.1%
Disabilities	35.4%	41.9%	22.8%	33.6%	42.5%	23.9%

Table H.42. Difficulty of the Questions on the ELA Test Perceived by Repeat Test Takers

	Responses in 2004			Responses in 2005		
Group	A More difficult	B About as difficult	C Not more difficult	A More difficult	B About as difficult	C Not more difficult
All	38.1%	44.1%	17.8%	34.9%	46.5%	18.6%
Passed	35.0%	46.7%	18.3%	28.8%	50.6%	20.6%
Didn't Pass	40.6%	42.1%	17.3%	39.5%	43.5%	17.0%
Gender Groups						
Female	35.1%	46.1%	18.8%	31.4%	48.1%	20.5%
Male	40.4%	42.6%	17.0%	37.6%	45.3%	17.1%
Race/Ethnicity Groups						
Asian	45.7%	40.2%	14.1%	41.6%	43.4%	15.0%
Black	35.5%	40.3%	24.2%	34.5%	42.7%	22.8%
Hispanic	38.0%	45.5%	16.5%	34.6%	48.1%	17.3%
White	37.2%	41.4%	21.4%	34.6%	42.8%	22.6%
Non-disadvantaged/Disadvantaged Groups						
Non-disadvantaged	32.2%	45.1%	22.7%	27.5%	47.6%	24.9%
Economically Disadvantaged	38.5%	44.7%	16.9%	35.7%	46.9%	17.3%
English Learners	40.8%	44.3%	14.8%	37.4%	46.9%	15.7%
Disabilities	41.3%	39.9%	18.8%	40.3%	42.3%	17.4%

Table H.43. Difficulty of the Questions on the Math Test Perceived by Students in the Classes of 2006 and 2007

	Class 2006			Class 2007		
Group	A More difficult	B About as difficult	C Not more difficult	A More difficult	B About as difficult	C Not more difficult
All	24.0%	42.4%	33.5%	22.3%	41.6%	36.1%
Passed	17.6%	42.3%	40.1%	16.1%	41.0%	42.8%
Didn't Pass	42.3%	42.8%	14.9%	40.9%	43.5%	15.7%
Gender Groups						
Female	21.8%	44.6%	33.6%	20.3%	43.2%	36.5%
Male	26.3%	40.3%	33.5%	24.6%	40.2%	35.2%
Race/Ethnicity Groups						
Asian	13.5%	33.4%	53.1%	12.6%	31.7%	55.7%
Black	31.8%	42.3%	25.9%	30.0%	41.9%	28.1%
Hispanic	29.6%	48.0%	22.4%	27.3%	47.7%	24.9%
White	19.3%	38.1%	42.6%	18.2%	36.9%	45.0%
Non-disadvantaged/Disadvantaged Groups						
Non-disadvantaged	17.4%	39.1%	43.6%	16.2%	37.7%	46.1%
Economically Disadvantaged	29.8%	46.7%	23.5%	27.7%	46.2%	26.1%
English Learners	33.8%	47.1%	19.1%	32.8%	47.1%	20.1%
Disabilities	44.9%	38.3%	16.9%	42.5%	39.3%	18.2%

Table H.44. Difficulty of the Questions on the Math Test Perceived by Repeat Test Takers

	Responses in 2004			Responses in 2005		
Group	A More difficult	B About as difficult	C Not more difficult	A More difficult	B About as difficult	C Not more difficult
All	41.6%	44.2%	14.2%	41.4%	45.7%	12.9%
Passed	39.1%	47.0%	13.9%	37.5%	49.6%	12.9%
Didn't Pass	43.4%	42.2%	14.4%	44.1%	42.9%	13.0%
Gender Groups						
Female	39.0%	46.7%	14.3%	38.9%	48.1%	13.0%
Male	44.3%	41.6%	14.1%	43.9%	43.2%	12.8%
Race/Ethnicity Groups						
Asian	40.2%	44.1%	15.7%	39.4%	45.8%	14.8%
Black	41.2%	41.5%	17.3%	42.5%	43.1%	14.3%
Hispanic	40.8%	45.8%	13.4%	40.3%	47.3%	12.4%
White	45.2%	39.8%	15.0%	45.4%	40.9%	13.7%
Non-disadvantaged/Disadvantaged Groups						
Non-disadvantaged	38.6%	46.2%	15.2%	38.8%	47.4%	13.7%
Economically Disadvantaged	41.1%	44.9%	14.0%	40.7%	46.5%	12.8%
English Learners	41.4%	45.0%	13.6%	40.8%	46.6%	12.6%
Disabilities	49.8%	36.6%	13.6%	49.7%	38.2%	12.1%

Question 12

If some topic on the test were difficult for you, was it because:

A. I did not take courses that covered these topics.
B. I had trouble with these topics when they were covered in courses I took.
C. I have forgotten things I was taught about these topics.
D. None of the topics was difficult for me.

Table H.45. Reasons for Experiencing Difficulty With Topics on the ELA Test Indicated by Students in the Classes of 2006 and 2007

	Class 2006				Class 2007			
Group	A	B	C	D	A	B	C	D
All	8.3%	17.5%	38.4%	35.7%	8.2%	18.1%	37.9%	35.8%
Passed	5.7%	13.9%	38.4%	41.9%	5.7%	14.8%	38.0%	41.5%
Didn't Pass	16.9%	29.1%	38.4%	15.6%	17.4%	30.2%	37.7%	14.7%
Gender Groups								
Female	6.9%	16.3%	40.1%	36.7%	6.6%	16.8%	39.6%	37.0%
Male	9.8%	18.7%	36.7%	34.9%	10.0%	19.5%	36.4%	34.2%
Race/Ethnicity Groups								
Asian	9.3%	15.7%	36.5%	38.6%	9.2%	15.6%	35.8%	39.4%
Black	10.5%	18.2%	35.9%	35.4%	10.6%	18.7%	35.9%	34.8%
Hispanic	10.3%	21.6%	43.7%	24.3%	10.1%	22.4%	42.9%	24.6%
White	5.7%	13.4%	33.3%	47.6%	5.8%	14.0%	33.0%	47.1%
Non-disadvantaged/Disadvantaged Groups								
Non-disadvantaged	5.2%	13.0%	35.5%	46.3%	5.3%	13.5%	35.1%	46.1%
Economically Disadvantaged	11.1%	21.7%	42.5%	24.7%	10.8%	22.3%	41.5%	25.4%
English Learners	15.8%	26.4%	41.5%	16.4%	15.6%	27.2%	40.9%	16.3%
Disabilities	15.4%	27.5%	35.5%	21.6%	15.4%	28.0%	35.5%	21.1%

Table H.46. Reasons for Experiencing Difficulty With Topics on the ELA Test Indicated by Repeat Test Takers

	Responses in 2004				Responses in 2005			
Group	A	B	C	D	A	B	C	D
All	16.4%	30.3%	38.8%	14.5%	17.5%	31.4%	38.0%	13.1%
Passed	14.1%	29.2%	41.7%	15.0%	13.7%	29.6%	41.4%	15.3%
Didn't Pass	18.1%	31.1%	36.7%	14.2%	20.2%	32.7%	35.6%	11.5%
Gender Groups								
Female	14.6%	30.4%	40.4%	14.6%	15.1%	31.6%	40.1%	13.2%
Male	17.7%	30.2%	37.7%	14.5%	19.3%	31.2%	36.5%	13.1%
Race/Ethnicity Groups								
Asian	20.9%	33.6%	31.9%	13.5%	21.8%	32.1%	33.5%	12.7%
Black	17.1%	26.8%	35.8%	20.4%	17.7%	28.8%	34.9%	18.6%
Hispanic	16.2%	30.4%	40.6%	12.8%	17.4%	31.7%	39.7%	11.3%
White	15.4%	29.4%	36.8%	18.5%	16.3%	31.3%	34.4%	18.1%
Non-disadvantaged/Disadvantaged Groups								
Non-disadvantaged	12.6%	28.8%	40.5%	18.1%	12.6%	30.5%	39.6%	17.2%
Economically Disadvantaged	16.6%	30.4%	39.5%	13.5%	17.9%	31.3%	38.8%	11.9%
English Learners	18.4%	31.2%	38.2%	12.2%	19.8%	31.5%	38.3%	10.4%
Disabilities	17.7%	30.9%	35.2%	16.3%	19.5%	32.6%	33.8%	14.1%

Table H.47. Reasons for Experiencing Difficulty With Topics on the Math Test Indicated by Students in the Classes of 2006 and 2007

	Class 2006				Class 2007			
Group	A	B	C	D	A	B	C	D
All	13.5%	22.8%	44.7%	19.0%	13.5%	22.6%	44.7%	19.2%
Passed	10.3%	18.9%	48.0%	22.9%	10.5%	18.5%	47.8%	23.2%
Didn't Pass	22.7%	33.8%	35.4%	8.0%	22.4%	34.9%	35.3%	7.4%
Gender Groups								
Female	11.4%	24.7%	48.5%	15.4%	11.4%	24.4%	48.4%	15.8%
Male	15.6%	20.9%	41.0%	22.5%	15.8%	21.1%	40.8%	22.3%
Race/Ethnicity Groups								
Asian	8.3%	14.0%	45.2%	32.5%	8.3%	13.5%	44.9%	33.4%
Black	17.2%	28.1%	40.8%	13.9%	17.5%	27.9%	40.3%	14.3%
Hispanic	15.4%	27.8%	45.9%	10.9%	15.4%	28.0%	45.5%	11.1%
White	12.2%	18.5%	43.5%	25.8%	12.4%	18.2%	43.7%	25.7%
Non-disadvantaged/Disadvantaged Groups								
Non-disadvantaged	10.2%	18.6%	45.6%	25.6%	10.6%	18.2%	45.5%	25.7%
Economically Disadvantaged	15.8%	27.2%	44.9%	12.0%	15.7%	27.2%	44.6%	12.5%
English Learners	18.3%	28.7%	43.2%	9.9%	18.5%	29.8%	42.2%	9.5%
Disabilities	27.2%	28.3%	32.8%	11.8%	25.9%	29.5%	33.7%	10.9%

Table H.48. Reasons for Experiencing Difficulty With Topics on the Math Test Indicated by Repeat Test Takers

	Responses in 2004				Responses in 2005			
Group	A	B	C	D	A	B	C	D
All	21.9%	34.9%	36.0%	7.3%	22.0%	37.8%	34.8%	5.4%
Passed	20.5%	34.4%	39.3%	5.7%	19.8%	37.2%	38.5%	4.5%
Didn't Pass	22.8%	35.2%	33.6%	8.4%	23.5%	38.2%	32.3%	6.0%
Gender Groups								
Female	18.6%	37.5%	38.0%	5.9%	18.5%	40.8%	36.4%	4.3%
Male	25.2%	32.2%	34.0%	8.7%	25.6%	34.8%	33.2%	6.4%
Race/Ethnicity Groups								
Asian	19.1%	33.6%	36.6%	10.7%	21.6%	35.6%	36.0%	6.8%
Black	22.3%	34.6%	34.5%	8.6%	23.5%	38.0%	32.0%	6.5%
Hispanic	20.5%	35.2%	37.7%	6.6%	20.6%	38.5%	36.2%	4.8%
White	26.9%	34.0%	30.7%	8.4%	26.2%	36.2%	31.1%	6.4%
Non-disadvantaged/Disadvantaged Groups								
Non-disadvantaged	20.1%	38.1%	35.9%	5.9%	20.8%	39.4%	35.3%	4.5%
Economically Disadvantaged	20.8%	34.3%	37.4%	7.4%	21.0%	37.9%	36.0%	5.2%
English Learners	20.9%	33.9%	37.9%	7.4%	21.5%	36.8%	36.6%	5.1%
Disabilities	28.8%	31.8%	29.7%	9.7%	27.7%	35.5%	29.1%	7.6%